

With all due respect, I profoundly disagree. Does anybody believe, for instance, that Libya, with its leader, gave up its nuclear weapons, its weapons of mass destruction, because they just wanted to sit down and reason together? Is it by accident that Libya, Khadafi, changed their position after we moved aggressively to respond to terrorism in the Middle East? I think not. And with all due respect, I do believe these threats I've outlined here today are real and that they are the heirs to communism and totalitarianism. And while their victims may not as yet add up numerically to the quantified brutality of previous dictators and killers, nonetheless, their potential to do equivalent destruction is without question. The focus on "one lucky day," while disrespectful to the other victims of jihadism before and after 9/11, cannot be allowed to turn into "many" lucky days.

We also have a situation today where the possibility of obtaining a nuclear weapon and exploding it in a metropolitan area cannot be swept off the table as unthinkable. In fact, we ought to be thinking about it every day and thinking about how we prevent it.

We have seen and can envision without straining credulity what would happen in our large cities and our places of governance or commerce were other attacks such as 9/11 to be initiated. What would happen to us all, urban and rural, large and small, men and women, east and west, north and south, if our dams, our transportation structure, our trains, our subways, our purification system, our ports, our electrical grids, or our energy sources were to be maliciously struck? The results, both real and psychological, would be catastrophic.

Nevertheless, we must not give in to fear. Instead, we must think about what victory will mean in this confrontation, and whatever the definition of our terms of multifaceted success, we must continue to properly consider the possibility of what success means to al Qaeda. Those in the United States may not have an agreed theory of victory or path to get there, but Osama bin Laden and his cohorts certainly have. Bin Laden's goal, as he; his deputy, Ayman al-Zawahiri; and others have often articulated, is to drive the United States out of Muslim lands, topple the region's current rulers, and establish Islamic authority under a new caliphate. The path to this goal, they have made clear, is to "provoke and bait" the United States into "bleeding wars" on Muslim lands. Since Americans, the argument goes, do not have the stomach for a long and bloody fight, they will eventually give up and leave the Middle East to its fate. Once the autocratic regimes responsible for the humiliation of the Muslim world have been removed, it would be possible to return to the idealized state of Arabia at the time of the Prophet Muhammad. A caliphate is in vision from Morocco to Central Asia, sharia rule

prevailing, Israel destroyed, oil prices skyrocketing, the United States recoiling in humiliation and perhaps even collapse just as the Soviet Union did after the mujahideen defeated it in Afghanistan. These are their goals, and these are the goals we must understand if we are to be successful in defeating al Qaeda.

Remember, they warned us prior to 9/11 as to what they intended. They issued a fatwa. They said they would go after the World Trade Center once again. And we, as a Nation, didn't take them seriously enough.

We are facing a strange ruthless "hydra-headed" enemy. As some have recently demonstrated in their research into the biographical backgrounds of jihadists, many of these individuals are simply driven by individual alienation and group dynamics, while, as I have pointed out, the leadership often has more ideological views. These differences must be exploited. Also, as the RAND Corporation has recently reported, our ability to help states with their counterinsurgency measures has to be greatly enhanced.

So, Madam Speaker, whatever the means, whatever the solutions, whatever the minor delineations between the terror-using groups, whatever the tactics we must use, we must take this jihadist threat seriously. It is our first duty as representatives in a constitutional government and as trustees charged with preserving and protecting our Constitution, which upholds our equal natural rights as citizens in this great land and as a part of this esteemed republic. Let us be wise. Let us be discerning. Let us be steadfast. Let us uphold our Constitution. And in the end, let us be successful.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 493. An act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of genetic information with respect to health insurance and employment.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1315. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance veterans' insurance and housing benefits, to improve benefits and services for transitioning servicemembers, and for other purposes.

THE 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, it's an honor for the 30-Something

Working Group to come to the floor once again. As you know, I'm a proud Member of the "Something" part of that 30-Something.

I yield to my colleague from the great State of Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, I know that the gentleman from Florida, and I appreciate his yielding, is going to spend the bulk of his time here on the 30-Something Working Group talking about gas prices and the increase that we have seen and some things that this Congress has done to address the issue.

And I wanted to talk a little bit about the energy bill that we passed last year and the debate that took place along the way, one of which was what we should do about these taxpayer subsidies, \$14 billion, that we're giving to the big oil companies at a time when they're making all-time record profits, your money and mine, taxpayer subsidies.

And it's clear that with oil at \$117 a barrel and rising that ExxonMobil does not need taxpayer subsidies. They're going to make their money. They're doing quite well. They just set the all-time record for profit in one quarter in the history of American business. So there is no need for them to have that subsidy, and the majority of this House overwhelmingly agreed. Last year not once but twice, we passed legislation out of this House, in 2007, sent it over to the Senate, that would say that we are going to redirect every penny of that \$14 billion away from the big oil companies and into research and development on alternative sources of energy, alternative fuels. And what we sent over to the Senate was legislation that had bipartisan support in this House.

Now, we sent it over to the Senate, and, unfortunately, as the gentleman from Florida knows, the rules in the Senate are different than the rules of the House. So they have to have 60 votes to bring a bill to the floor, and they didn't have the 60 votes to bring it to the floor, but they had enough to pass the bill. But the point of this is we in this House took affirmative action, not once but twice, to find alternative sources of energy, to create a national commitment, and to provide the funding that's necessary for R and D on alternative sources of energy.

But that's not all that this House has done. Today the leadership of the House called on President Bush to stop filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Now, that's something that I sent a letter to President Bush about last month and something that would save from the price of gas between 4 and 24 cents. Now, that's not going to make the difference. When gas is at \$3.55 a gallon, 24 cents may not seem like a lot. But at least it's an affirmative step in the right direction that we need to recognize, A, that we do have the responsibility in this country to do

everything that we possibly can to relieve the burden on individuals, families, and businesses in this country and that burden that has been brought upon them by the incredible increase in gas prices. And what that is going to do is, for the temporary time being, lower costs a little bit, which is going to make a difference for families in this country. It's not going to solve the problem. It's certainly not a long-term solution. But it's something that we all can agree on in this Congress is a necessary step to suspend shipments into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. That's something that President Bush has not joined us in yet, but I'm hopeful that we will be able to work together and find solutions to the problem.

Now, we, last year this Congress, passed a number of other pieces of legislation dealing specifically with rising gas prices, trying to head them off. We voted to hold OPEC accountable for oil price fixing. It passed this House 345-72, overwhelming bipartisan support. It faces the threat of a veto on the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. We voted to crack down on gas price gouging. That passed 284-141, overwhelmingly bipartisan; yet the President, again, has threatened to veto that legislation. As I talked about, we voted to repeal the subsidies of the big oil companies at a time when they're making all-time record profits and redirect every penny into alternative sources of energy. Unfortunately, that faced a veto threat, and we were unable to get it through the Senate.

But what did become law, and at this point I would turn it over to the gentleman from Florida, was our new energy independence law, which, for the first time in 30 years, increased the cafe standards, the miles-per-gallon average that we see in our cars that are made in this country, for the first time in 30 years, from an average of 24 miles per gallon to an average of 35 miles per gallon. That by itself, when it's fully phased in, is going to save the average individual in this country about \$1,000 a year on their fuel bill. That is real reform, and that is something that this House did, working with the Senate. We sent it to the President. He signed it. And that's something that we can definitely look forward to in the future. Now, again, that is not by itself going to lower the price of gas. The Strategic Petroleum Reserve shipments that we are talking about is going to have an impact but not a long-term impact. The only thing that we can do to solve this problem in the long term is to get ourselves off of oil. That's what this should be about. And we do have a healthy debate in this House and among our colleagues on how to achieve that.

There are some folks who believe that the issue is entirely supply and that we should spend our money at the Federal level in ways that will further our dependence on foreign oil. Build more refineries, drill in the Arctic Na-

tional Wildlife Refuge, drill off the coast of Mr. MEEK's Florida, drill in the Outer Continental Shelf, that is one school of thought. And those are folks in this House that have the intent to bring down gas prices. They definitely have good thoughts in mind on that.

□ 1715

We just have a very strong disagreement. We don't question their motives. We just believe there's a better way. That is to use every penny that we spend in this country, whatever dollar amount that may be, on alternative energy. Whatever we determine to spend, spend it all in getting us off of oil. Don't spend one penny in furthering our dependence on oil because that is not going to solve the problem in the short-term and certainly not in the long-term.

So that is the difference of opinion that exists, should we invest in research and development and finding an alternative source of energy, getting us off of oil, or should we invest on the supply side for today in a way that is going to further and even deepen our dependence on oil. That is the debate that exists in this House.

So at that point I would thank the gentleman from Florida for his strong leadership on this issue, for allowing me the time to speak, and I would turn the time over to Mr. MEEK from Florida.

Mr. MEEK. Thank you, Mr. ALTMIRE. I want to thank you so very much for coming to the floor. You have to run back and do the work for your constituents back in your district.

Madam Speaker, I am going to do an abbreviated 30-Something today. Last night, we were on the floor talking about a letter that our friends on the other side, Republican colleagues, wrote to Speaker PELOSI. It was just, based on the information that I received from the letter and some of the reading that I have done and the research that we have done here on the 30-Something Working Group, I just had to come back today to finish making the point. So I think it's important, since the letter from the Republican leadership is talking about how we need to work together in a bipartisan way.

Madam Speaker, I know that you have heard me before say that bipartisanship is only achieved when the majority allows it. I have said that in the two previous Congresses, hoping that Republican leadership will work with the Democratic minority at that time to achieve this bipartisanship. We have worked time after time here on this side of the aisle to make sure that we can include Republicans and all Members of the House in good legislation.

The legislation dealing with price gouging on the military contract that was on the floor yesterday; unanimous vote. Never would have made it if it wasn't for the Democratic leadership allowing it to come to the floor. That

bill would have never seen the light of day, leave alone the crack under the door, if we were under the Republican leadership that we used to be. But I am so glad that the American people found it fit to make sure that we allow Democrats to be in charge of this House so that those kinds of pieces of legislation were able to get to the floor.

As you know, Madam Speaker and Members, I always remind the Members of the daily report on what's going on in Iraq. We had a lot of chest beating going on in this chamber for about 4 or 5 years of who loves the troops, who supports the troops, and all of this and all of that and going back and forth. I have a tattoo on my arm saying I support the troops. That is not what they are looking for.

But I think it's very, very important that the Members realize as we end our legislative business for this week and as we start our legislative business for next week and as we go home to talk to our constituents this weekend, I think it's important for us to reflect on the real reality of what is going on with so many military families' communities.

As of today, April 24, we have the total number of deaths out of Iraq, 4,046; the total number of wounded in action and returned to duty, 16,520; and the total number of wounded in action, not returning to duty, is reported at 13,309. That number could have gone up since we last checked. But I think that it's important that we continue to put that into the RECORD so that people can reflect on our efforts in trying to draw down our troops in Iraq but making sure the necessary personnel stays there, a very small number, not 142,000 that is there now, and above.

I want to, Madam Speaker, pick up where I left off last evening. I think it's important because there was some action on the floor yesterday and I didn't want any of the Members to get confused when they go back to their district saying, Well, I voted on a motion to recommit, which, as we know, which is a procedural motion here on the floor, that really didn't make a lot of sense and really was counter-productive versus productive. We had a debate here, and it's nothing wrong with that because we can go back and forth. But let's go back and forth on fact and not fiction.

What I did not have last night, Madam Speaker and Members, what I have right now is the actual letter that went to the Speaker from the Republican leadership on this very issue. But I had to go further and we had to make sure that not only we had the letter that went to the Speaker and read that letter and the full text. I can contest to two pages. You have all of the Republican leadership that is elected. I won't call any names out. You know who they are.

They wrote this letter to the Speaker and in this letter it talks about how 2 years ago this week you stated that House Democrats had a commonsense

plan to lower gas prices. In light of skyrocketing gas prices affecting the working families, and it goes on, the public sector, and it says to date the national average stands at \$3.51 a gallon, and according to AAA, it's \$1.18 higher than it was before the 110th Congress started. Then it goes on to say, More than 50 percent increase. It goes on and on and on. And, once a nightmare scenario, \$4 a gallon is now very real and possibly becoming reality in the summer. Now let me just say this. I also owe credit to the Republican leadership. They said, We are looking forward to working toward a commonsense plan.

Well, that's the letter. In the release, Madam Speaker, they go on to say, using words like, House Republicans stand ready to work with Democratic colleagues in a bipartisan fashion to address America's energy prices. Another line I want to take out, And in light of skyrocketing gas prices affecting working families in an economy that is struggling, we stand ready to assist.

Now I just wanted to read that and I just want to point to what the facts are. Now I can go back to my office and write a letter that I feel good about, even if I didn't want to fact check it. I can go and say, Well, let me see; let me write a letter that makes me feel good as an individual. Well, I mean that is fine if I am writing it to a friend of mine that I went to college with and we are going back and forth about our different opinions on politics or whatever the case may be.

But when you're a part of the leadership of the United States Congress and you write a letter to the Speaker to make a point on the floor on a motion to recommit to say I wrote you, and have the Members here thinking goodness, am I voting the right way or the wrong way, when the evidence in your voting record doesn't stand towards what you said you want to do, or that you would like to do if you have the opportunity to do it.

Yes, gas prices are high. I said last night that many of my friends on the other side of the aisle, they are real people the too. They have to put gas in their tanks too. They have constituents that are sitting there trying to figure out, playing what I call the gas pump game, trying to stop at \$10 and make it to work, and you have a little bit over, 2, 2½ gallons, maybe 3, if you're lucky. I know those individuals. I know what it means to sit at the dining room table, trying to figure out what you're going to pay and what you can't pay because the gas price has gone up, you have children, you have bills to pay, leave alone trying to pay for college.

Let me just make this quick point. I didn't have this last night, Madam Speaker, but thanks to the 30-Something Working Group and the people that support us, they blew this up for me because I wanted to make the point a little clearer because I like to break

this thing down so all the Members know exactly what is going on.

Now I would say that the folks that assist us in getting together, they went a little further, making sure we had the names and signatures on the letter. I like to cover those names and signatures because I can tell you at the 30-Something Working Group we never individually pointed any Member of Congress out as it relates to what we disagree with them. So I want to continue with that philosophy as part of the leadership of the 30-Something Working Group. But I just want to make this point.

Now this goes down the Republican leadership. You can read the letter, and you can probably get the letter somehow under all of this transparency we see now, especially for the Members, and if the Members want to get a copy from me, I will be more than happy to supply you with it if you were unaware of your leadership wrote this letter.

We had a piece of legislation that Mr. ALTMIRE talked about on the no oil producing and exploitation cartels. That is H.R. 2264. This legislation enables the Department of Justice to take action against OPEC-controlled entities for participating in oil cartels that drive up the price of oil globally and in the United States.

I am just going to point to right here. It goes from the top of the power, down to the bottom, voted no. That is no. Second in control voted no. The fifth in control voted no. Going all the way down, they all voted no against that.

Now that is something to give our Department of Justice the teeth it needs to go after those individuals that are not holding the interests of the American people, and they are holding greed. They voted no on it. I don't understand it because I want to make sure when individuals come to this floor, and it's a legitimate argument, I don't have any issues with it. But I want to make sure that the Members know if you're going to come to the floor, come right. If you're going to come right, make sure that you're not trying to fake anybody out. Because 30-Something Working Group is going to be on the floor and we are going to set the record straight. I just want to make sure that folks understand that this is serious business, because my constituents are paying too much for gas and we are up here trying to do something about it.

The Energy Price Gouging Act, H.R. 1252. This legislation empowers the Federal Trade Commission and gives it the authority to investigate and punish those who artificially inflate energy prices. Again, this is the Democratic Congress, just exactly as the Speaker said that we would do to drive gas prices down. What happened on that second piece of legislation? No. Second in control, no. Third person in control of the Republican conference, no. Fifth person, no. No, no, no. And they all signed the letter talking about what are you going to do about gas prices.

I just want to make sure that this is serious. Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation Act, a tax act of 2008, that is H.R. 5351. This bill will end unnecessary subsidies to big oil companies and invest in clean and renewable energy and energy efficiency. It also expands tax incentives for renewable energy programs.

I tell you, we want through for clean sweep on that one because that was taking money out of the pockets of those that have made record profits worldwide. Clean sweep here, folks. I am going to say Members. Clean sweep. I just want to make sure. From the top, all the way to the bottom, no. I guess that was the ultimate insult to those that had been celebrating the protection of the Republican Congress for so many years, and now the Democratic Congress is now elected and we are doing what we said we would do if we had the opportunity to do it.

Now we are going green instead of going into profit making for big oil companies. The protection is no longer there. I have no problem with Mobil or any of them out there. I don't have any problem with them. I mean they are businesses, and I don't think that profits are a bad word.

□ 1730

But when you have the former Congress in the front seat protecting and have your back versus the American people, I got a problem with that. And so I think that it is important, and that is the reason why I came back here today on this last day of our legislative business to point this out.

Clean sweep. Clean sweep. Every last one of the Republican leadership voted no against that legislation. And I am going to make a point on that piece that I am going to point out this last vote. But I am going to make a point on why this clean sweep did not make sense as it relates to the policy of the vote that took place from the entire Republican leadership.

The market manipulation provision in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. It goes on that it was signed into law in December, and this deals with the wholesale price of gasoline and petroleum, and required the Federal Trade Commission to enforce and punish those. Again, that is part of the market manipulation scheme.

The top voted no, and next two in charge I assume voted yes. And then the rest voted no, all the way going down to the bottom of the Republican leadership that voted yes. So we have six of the Republican leadership voting no, and we had three of the Republican leadership voting yes.

I said all of that to say that if we are going to sign a letter, you have got to fact check your own voting record if you are going to try to make a statement and put a press release out to the media to say that we are pushing them. It may look good on the website, but you don't want to put this on your website, because it doesn't speak toward the words.

Now I am going to tell you the reason why. Where is that chart? I need my chart on how many leases that are out there and what has happened.

Madam Speaker, we love charts here in the 30-Something Working Group. This is what we do.

This chart here shows how many leases that are out there and how many wells that are actually out there. On the red part is actually the leases. And you can see from 1994, here are the leases. These are the actual wells that are out there.

Well, under the Republican leadership of the previous Congress and the one before that, those are the ones I can attest for, because I was here. They did all they could to continue as many leases as they could. You know, we want to give it. If big oil wanted it, they can get it. It was an open door policy. Whatever you guys want, we want to take care of it.

I have another chart to talk about, the 2001 meeting that took place in Vice President DICK CHENEY's office, this energy conference that took place and how it took off for big oil and how it went against the American people.

But as you start looking at the drilling leases now, you see all the leases that are there and we see all of the wells that have been drilled and we see gas prices going up. So to say more leases, more drilling is better, it doesn't speak to that. That was the old strategy, Madam Speaker and Members, that the Republican leadership used to take. Give them what they asked for and gas prices will go down.

Well, that has not worked. So for the pot trying to call the kettle black, or saying Democrats have been doing something bad or something like that, or you haven't done anything, you can't forget that the President of the United States is a Republican too and has been a part of what the American people are experiencing.

Now, let me just share this with you. I had this chart last night, but I want to bring it out again because some of the Members might not have been up last night at 10 p.m. I was.

May 16th of 2001. You heard me refer to the White House energy plan that was submitted. This is Mr. CHENEY's task force. They were meeting. And I believe also this is a quote. "If you look at future prices with respect to gasoline, they will appear to be headed down." This what was said out of the White House at that particular time. But you can see it had a reverse effect on what the American people were told at that time. Gas prices continued, as you see the goal here, to go up.

Here is the meaning of the meeting here, I believe somewhere around June of 2005, of course, our leader with the Saudi Arabian king there, trying to build relations hopefully that we were all hoping would drive gas prices down. But as you can see, they continued to go up, and oil sets a new record above \$119 a barrel and the retail gas raises to the national average of \$3.51. Some

people may say, where are you buying that gas, because that is cheap. That is an AP report of 4-22-08.

I think it is important that we look at this chart. I hope that we can put this chart on our 30-Something Working Group website. It is not there yet, I don't think, but we will get it on there. Hopefully by the end of this week we will have it up, if Members want to pull that down and take a look at it.

Now, again, I am stating the obvious. January 22nd, 2001, \$1.47; today, \$3.53. That is as of 4-23-08. So we know that is today where we are on the gas price. And that source is AAA. Can we put that on our website, too? That would be very helpful.

I think what else is important, Madam Speaker, as I start to come in here for a landing here, the average price per gallon of fuel paid by the U.S. military units in Iraq is \$3.23 a gallon. That is how much they are paying. That is an AP fact from the Associated Press. That is 4-22-08. Then it goes on, the price per gallon of gasoline for Iraqi residents is \$1.36, and that is the AP on the same date, on 4-22-08.

Let me just finish with two other points here. The cost for fuel the U.S. military consumes per month is \$153 million, and oil revenues that the Iraqi government is expected to take in this year is \$70 billion.

Now, this leads to another point. If I had enough time I would make it, but I am going to cut my 30-something piece short today, because if I was to start talking about the Iraqi government, and that is the whole failure of the whole piece, what they are not doing to assist us. Because when you look at it, I think the U.S. military should be paying the price that Iraqis are paying.

Since we are over there carrying out this great deed, why are we spending \$3.23 a gallon? I don't know why. And when we have just average Iraqis that are not taking the incoming that our troops are taking—they are paying a price, the Iraqi civilians, I must add—but the individuals that have to go out there on that midnight shift to protect the streets of Iraq are paying \$3.23. I mean, we are just in the business of making sure that Americans pay more than anyone else.

So I am just going to put it that way. I just want to lay that out. Maybe somebody at the White House may hear me and may call somebody over in the parliament over in Iraq, if they are meeting, if they even have a quorum, to be able to deal with that issue.

This issue as it relates to gas is something that is very personal to many Americans. Again, I just want to make sure that the record was set straight on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as it relates to what Democrats have done to bring down gas prices. But, of course, we do not have the presidency of the United States, not as of yet, to be able to fulfill the total reality of how do we move towards alternative

fuels, how do we go greener, even greening the Capitol.

Madam Speaker and Members, when I come back to the floor next week, I believe it will be Wednesday, I want to talk about the initiatives that we have going on right here in this Capitol, all the way down. I just wrote an article for one of the local publications here in Washington, D.C. talking about what we are doing.

Think about it. Greening the Capitol was not even a discussion until we, and when I say "we," the Democrats took control of the House, empowered by the American people. I will talk about that, and I will maybe enter it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so it will be there to highlight exactly what the House Administration Committee and other committees that the Speaker has appointed to deal with this very issue are doing.

But, in closing, if you are going to send a letter to the Speaker, the Republican leadership, if you are going to send a letter to the Speaker, make sure you fact check your own letter. That is the message of today. And if you don't fact check it, I guarantee you that those of us that are in the Capitol will find the time to do it, especially on an issue that hits such a chord with so many Americans.

So, let's try to vote together. Let's try to work together. Let's try to resolve the problems of everyday Americans as it relates to the economy, as it relates to health care, as it relates to what is going on in Iraq together. Let's not stand in the schoolhouse door and then, you know, write a letter and say, oh, well, we don't know what you guys are doing. We would love to be a part of it. I don't know why you are sitting on your hands. You said 2 years ago you would do something. You haven't done it as of yet, as though we are working hand-in-hand. When I say "we," I am talking about the Republican leadership, and making sure that we achieve that.

Madam Speaker, with that, it is always an honor coming before the House. It is always good bringing this great information. I would like to thank the working members of the 30-Something Working Group and our staff.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JOHN A. BOEHNER, REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, Republican Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 7, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Pursuant to Section 841(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (P.L. 10-181), I am pleased to appoint Mr. Dean G. Poppo of Virginia to the Commission on Wartime Contracting.