

against explosive devices designed to maim and kill his fellow soldiers, as well as innocent Iraqi men and women, and, yes, too many children. He placed his body in harm's way. He laid his life down for others. He died in our country's service and was posthumously awarded a second Bronze Star.

But this great Nation owes him a debt far beyond its power to repay. It is because of the bravery and sacrifice of American patriots like Tony Capra that a dangerous dictator no longer menaces his own people and the world, and that 25 million human beings who were oppressed for a quarter of a century are currently struggling to establish a democratic government that answers to its own people, that stands for freedom, and respects the rule of law. That was Tony Capra's vision. That is why he served his country so well.

I hope, in time, that Tony's unwavering patriotism and courage gives some comfort to his family. I know it does. But, today, there is so little we can say to soften this blow. As his young brother James said shortly after his death, "It's like a puzzle. Our family is not complete without all the pieces together."

Memories of Tony are all that can be put in his place, and I know how insufficient they must seem right now. But my sincere hope for you, the family and friends of Sergeant Capra, is that those memories will turn in time from a source of grief to a well of comfort; that you will be consoled by the loving and devoted way he lived, and the fearless way he died in the service of others.

Let me end with this thought. We often speak in abstractions in this Chamber. We use words like "supplemental," "counterinsurgency," "redeployment." But behind each of these words is a young life like Sergeant Capra's. More than 4,000 Americans, like Tony Capra, have paid the ultimate price, have given the ultimate sacrifice for our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan. They bear the burden of the decisions we make here almost every day. And we have a responsibility, indeed, we have a moral obligation, to never forget the Tony Capras and the 4,000 others whom we have lost.

Mr. Speaker, may God bless Tony Capra, a man of courage, patriotism, valor and commitment, and may He console and strengthen those who grieve his loss.

TIME FOR A DIVORCE FROM CORN-BASED ETHANOL

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, Congress has a love affair with corn-based ethanol, and that love affair, Mr. Speaker, is on the rocks.

Ethanol has led to increased food prices, food shortages, and more pollution and less energy. As we have in-

creased our reliance on ethanol, food supplies and prices have soared and have led to a global food shortage as customers stock up before stores run out. Shortages have led to food riots in Egypt, Haiti and other nations. There is an international shortage of basic commodities such as rice and wheat, and this has resulted in protests and riots.

American consumers are reactionary. They read about the international shortage and the riots and they run to the store to buy more food, stocking up. Yesterday, Wal-Mart and Costco announced they were limiting purchases of rice. You can only buy four bags of rice on any one trip at Wal-Mart.

Mr. Speaker, who would have thought that in the United States we would start having food rationing?

Also, because of inflation of the prices of corn-based ethanol, other food products are going up. Prices on beer, bread, coffee, pizza and rice are dramatically increasing. Anything that has a corn-based product has also increased in price.

In Mexico, cornmeal prices are up 60 percent. In Pakistan, flour prices have doubled. And even China is having a food inflation problem. In America, the cost of all groceries is skyrocketing. The shortage of staple food has larger consequences for our country, and, of course, it adds to inflation.

Also, we are now finding out that corn-based ethanol contributes to global warming. In March, Science Magazine reported that "Using good cropland to expand biofuels increases global warming."

Under Congress' ethanol mandates, farmers must plow more land to grow enough corn to use in our vehicles. This releases carbon stored in plants and in the soil. And Science Magazine continues to say that corn-based ethanol will increase greenhouse gases by 93 percent in 30 years.

Ethanol also pollutes. Factories that convert corn into ethanol release carbon monoxide, methanol and some carcinogens at a very high level. The science that predicted less CO₂ from corn ethanol is now being questioned as junk science.

Ethanol pollution has also contributed to the dead zone in the Gulf of Mexico. What that is, Mr. Speaker, is the water that runs down into the Gulf of Mexico at the mouth of the Mississippi, because of the pollutants in that water, it causes a dead zone about the size of New Jersey where nothing lives and nothing grows.

As Congress continues to subsidize corn-based ethanol, farmers are using more and more fertilizer to plant corn, and thus more fertilizer runs into the Mississippi River, down the river to the Gulf of Mexico, and the dead zone continues to grow.

You see, we don't eat corn anymore. We burn it in our cars. Farmers planting more corn only increase the dead zone problem. So now we are having a

problem with food production that comes from the sea, from the Gulf of Mexico, all because of corn-based ethanol.

And, of course, ethanol hurts other industries. While grain producers have benefited from ethanol mandates because of record profits, some other industries are hurting. The losers are livestock farmers and ranchers, who have lost about \$30 more an animal since the fall.

□ 1545

In other words, corn prices going up cost more to feed their beef, and then beef prices continue to go up as well. And we pay. The consumer always pays.

So, Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to rethink its love affair with ethanol. We need to lift the offshore drilling prohibition against drilling for crude oil and for natural gas. We need to develop our own natural resources. We need to allow permits for clean coal production. We need to use safe nuclear energy. And, we need to get back to eating corn instead of burning it in our vehicles. It is time for us to get a divorce from corn-based ethanol.

And that's just the way it is.

RETIRED OFFICERS AS PAWNS OF THE PENTAGON

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday the front page of the New York Times included a story about the efforts of the Pentagon's public affairs operation to influence retired military officers now working as military analysts for some of our Nation's largest media organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I am very angry about the issues raised by the New York Times story, as are many of my colleagues who have called me aside to discuss it. The story does not reflect well on the Pentagon, on the military analysts in question, or on the media organizations that employ them.

Mr. Speaker, maybe I am too idealistic, but this story is appalling to me on a number of levels. For me, it all comes down to trust and credibility. And it would be a dangerous thing for the American people to lose trust in the Pentagon, in our retired officers corps, and in the press, each of which has a critical role to play in preserving our Nation's freedoms.

Through the years, I have frequently urged our military services to improve their efforts to tell America about the good work that is being done by our country's sons and daughters in the uniform. Our military services have an important story to tell, and public affairs offices are critical to that task. But credibility is paramount. Once lost, it is difficult or impossible to regain.

There is nothing inherently wrong with providing information to the public and to the press; but, there is a

problem if the Pentagon is providing special access to retired officers, and then basically using them as pawns to spout the administration's talking points of the day. There are allegations that analysts who failed to deliver the message required by the administration mysteriously lost access to future briefings and information. I find this deeply troubling. We deserve to be able to trust the actions of the Pentagon.

We also deserve a retired officer corps that is worthy of the respect it receives from the American people, who place great faith in their judgment and their loyalty to our Nation. Americans trust our Active Duty and retired military, and rightly so.

I know a number of the retired officers employed by the media as military analysts to be honorable people. But the special access they are alleged to have received and the circumstances of their employment, without proper disclosure of their outside interests or biases, raise a number of uncomfortable questions that deserve serious answers.

Which master do these analysts serve: The United States Government, which supplies their retirement pay? The Pentagon, which may reduce the amount of analysis they actually need to do by providing detailed talking points promoting the current administration's message agenda? The defense contractors, who pay them for serving on boards for their defense expertise and, perhaps more to the point, for their Pentagon connections?

Will their analysis, either by design or just by lucky coincidence, result in contracts or other advantages for the companies from which they take home a paycheck?

Mr. Speaker, it hurts me to my core to think that there are those from the ranks of our retired officers who have decided to cash in and essentially prostitute themselves on the basis of their previous positions with the Department of Defense. I would hate to think that, because a few people have blurred ethical boundaries and cashed in on their former positions, that we might tarnish the military's hard-won reputation for professionalism and objectivity and love of country first and foremost.

Finally, I think our media have a serious responsibility to disclose potential conflicts of interest when they do their reporting. This applies to all of their stories, of course, and not just to those that include retired officer military analysts. I understand that different organizations have different rules, but perhaps it would not be out of order for our journalism schools and professional journalism organizations to develop ethical guidelines for dealing with such issues.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's military exists to protect America's freedoms for its citizens today and for future generations. The First Amendment guarantees the right of all Americans, including retired servicemembers and members of the press, to speak freely

and without restraint. But with our rights come responsibilities to act honestly and ethically.

I have no doubt we will continue to discuss these matters in the days ahead.

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.)

93RD ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the 93rd anniversary of the onset of the Armenian genocide. It is on this date that the Ottoman officials captured more than 200 Armenian intellectual leaders and placed them in prison. Unfortunately, these actions were only the beginning of the Ottoman-led atrocities against the Armenians.

During the following years, at least 1.5 million Armenians were arrested and compelled to march hundreds of miles to what is today the Syrian desert. And along the way, prisoners of all ages endured hunger, thirst, rape, sexual abuse, and other forms of torture.

While it is difficult for us to commemorate these terrible acts each year, we must continue to remember those horrors that can occur when governments persecute citizens based on ethnicity or religious affiliation.

We often hear those words of George Santayana's famous quote that, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." And these words are ringing true today as well. Already, there are those who deny that the Armenian genocide occurred despite the vast evidence to the contrary. Meanwhile, our generation has seen its own mass murders occur in Rwanda and Sudan.

So, I urge my colleagues in the majority to bring House Resolution 106, which commemorates these atrocities that occurred only a few generations ago, to the House Floor for a vote. Now is the time for America to officially ensure that U.S. foreign policy reflects sensitivity concerning human rights issues.

Just yesterday, I had the privilege of meeting Alice Khachadoorian-Shnorhokian. Alice is a resident of Mahwah, New Jersey, which is a town in my district. Alice was born in Turkey in 1912 to a successful, respected Armenian family of eight. And when Turkish officials ordered Armenians to denounce their faith and nationality, she and her parents refused. As a re-

sult, her family was rounded up and ordered to march into the desert. Alice and her brother were too young, of course, at that age to walk, so her parents had to put them in boxes on either side of a donkey and march into the desert.

When they arrived in Aintab, her mother befriended their Turkish neighbors, and these neighbors ultimately enabled them to get a permit which allowed Alice and her family to escape. Alice moved to the United States in 1980, and became a citizen of the U.S. just 5 years later. And, as a survivor, she says she wants to, "see justice so that the words 'never again' become a reality."

So, while I am a Member of Congress, I will always remember Alice's words and her wish. We must fully recognize the friendship with our allies in Turkey today, but we cannot change nor should we forget the past. I hope that there can be some reconciliation between Turkey and Armenia, and that a proper acknowledgement of the crimes of the past can now allow them to move forward into a future of peace and also of mutual understanding.

WAR IN IRAQ

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, China is facing growing criticism for its record on human rights. It has been condemned for its recent crackdown on Tibet, its oppression of dissidents at home, and its support for the regime in Sudan that is responsible for the genocide in Darfur.

Russia is another country that has received justifiable criticism for cracking down on freedom. President Putin has rolled back many of the democratic gains Russia made after the Cold War. And the recent elections in Russia were a sham, clearly rigged to favor Putin's candidate.

Because of all of this, you would think that the people of the world would have a much higher opinion of the United States, the world's greatest democracy, than they would have of anti-democratic China and Russia. But that just isn't the case. Incredibly, according to the most recent annual survey of international attitudes, America is viewed more negatively around the world than China and Russia.

The Study of World Opinion was conducted by the BBC World Survey. According to the BBC, America's image abroad plummeted after our invasion of Iraq in the year 2003, and continued to decline in the following years.

The latest survey, which was released on April 1, however, has shown some good news. America's image is a little better than it was last year. But it is not because the world has suddenly changed its opinion about the Bush administration and its policies in Iraq.

The director of the survey was quoted as saying, "It may be that, as