

ways in which this role should inform the formulation of our comprehensive strategy, but first let me discuss the other options.

Those who would have us significantly reduce our role on the world's stage cannot provide a credible description of who or what would replace the U.S. in the role of world leadership. The U.N. is not up to the task, nor is there any other international organization. As already mentioned, there is no other country in a position to fill the role of world leadership.

To embrace such an approach, we would have to accept that significant portions of the world would simply be left to their own devices. Yet we know that places as remote as the Hindu Kush are home to those who would attack us and our allies. What other corner of the world, then, do we judge to be so distant and so remote as to be beyond our interest? And how would world fault lines, such as the Taiwan Strait, the India-Pakistan Line of Control, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict respond to a world leadership vacuum? The answer is, not well. In short, for the U.S. to abdicate its position of world leadership would be highly detrimental to our national interest.

What then does accepting a role of world leadership entail? And if it is a current necessity, is it an inherent good to be indefinitely maintained? In other words, should the U.S. view our position as world leader as so necessary to our security that we act largely to maintain this position, which is the primary characteristic of a hegemonic power or empire? Again, the answer is no. To do so is to put our national interest in opposition to the national interests of much of the rest of the world. It is inconsistent with the desires of the American people, with the extent of the costs they're willing to bear for world leadership and, I would argue, with our sense of morality and fair play. Our vital interests should be defined as suggested by President Clinton, by our role as the world's indispensable nation: taking a leadership role in advancing and protecting our interests around the world in concert with our friends and allies as part of an open and evolving international system that is fair to all nations. To do so, we must restore the prestige and credibility of the United States, and repair and rebuild the relationship with our major international partners. With this role as our goal, we can define those interests critical to achieving it, and develop and adopt an appropriate strategy.

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.)

IT IS TIME TO HELP AMERICANS WITH GAS PRICES

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, the American people are hurting with the cost of gasoline at the pumps, the rising price at the pumps, a weak economy that we're facing nationally and pending tax increases, a housing crisis that's facing many Americans, the struggles we've had in western North Carolina with bad trade deals.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are hurting, and it is because of rising prices at the pumps. That is the most egregious and powerful punch that this Democrat Congress has laid before the people of America.

There are some in this House that have been advocating for increasing the supply, making sure that new oil refineries are online, new American production of oil and natural gas. Then we have those, mostly liberals in this House, mostly Democrats, that say, No. We don't want any new production. No. We will side with the extreme environmentalists, not with American people who are screaming. They will support the screaming environmentalists rather than the families that are screaming, screaming when they take their kids to school, screaming when they just go out for a Saturday afternoon.

I will tell you the American people need help when it comes to the price of fuel. And this Democrat Congress has abdicated its responsibility in this role. The American people will be furious when they find out that we have American resources that can be tapped into. And so many of us, my colleagues and many in this House, have been advocating more supply. And yet the Speaker of the House will say, No, we don't want new American supply. That won't do anything to the price of gasoline at the pumps.

Well, just this morning, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Ben Bernanke, testified before the Financial Services Committee. And in answering a question about the cost of price at the pumps, the question was posed to him, "Would increasing supply cut the price of gas at the pumps?" His response—here. I have blown it up large so that my Democrat colleagues can read it. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve said, "A 1 percent increase in supply could lower prices by as much as 10 percent." A 1 percent increase in supply could lower prices by as much as 10 percent. This was the testimony, as of this morning, in front of the Financial Services Committee.

This is a very important thing for this Congress to understand, that if we allow for more exploration here that has been prevented by law, it can bring down prices.

Now, I'm not a newcomer to this. I have been advocating things from my first days here in Congress. I think we

need to have an American energy policy that is multi-tiered. First, we need to have new refineries. We also, along with that, have to have new domestic exploration of oil. That can be done off the deep waters of our coast. It can be done in remote areas of Alaska, such as ANWR. It could be done in the Rocky Mountain West with oil shale production. These things can be done if Congress acts. And I think it's high time Congress acts with the price of gasoline over \$4 a gallon in western North Carolina.

But that's not it. We can't just stop there. Certainly it will bring down prices, as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve said, if we increase that production. But we have to go a step further. We have to ask the American people to conserve energy. Conservation is not a means to American energy independence, though it is a sign of personal virtue. But it can help on the margins. And it can help family budgets across western North Carolina.

But beyond that, we have to heavily invest in alternative sources of energy. There will be a day when our economy is powered by alternative sources of energy. Whether it's an electric car or hydrogen-powered automobile, a natural gas-powered automobile, or even perhaps some nuclear-powered device, these things are possible and we have to heavily invest in that. But until that day comes, it is imperative that this Congress act and act now for American energy independence through domestic energy exploration. American oil, American natural gas, that creates American jobs and keeps wealth here in America.

Mr. Speaker, it is time this Congress acts, and it's time that we take the proper steps to help the folks across America who are struggling with high gas prices.

HONORING TONY SNOW

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to honor the memory of Tony Snow, commentator, news anchor, White House press secretary, a husband and father. The great American. We lost Tony this last weekend, and it's a tremendous loss for his family, for his colleagues and indeed, for the Nation.

It's also a great loss for humanity at large. Since Tony lost his battle with cancer on July 12, many Americans have heard stories about his wit, his humor, and his devotion to his family. I have a story of my own that I would like to share about Tony, a story that shows that Tony was very much a man of his word.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain privileges that come with being a servant here in the people's House. For me, one of those privileges is from time to time being able to go to 1600 Pennsylvania

Avenue. Whether it is a meeting or a social event, a trip to the White House is always a big deal. It's always exciting.

It was on one of those trips to the White House that I had the great fortune to meet Tony Snow. I didn't set out to meet Tony Snow that day. It happened because I had something that I had been asked to share with the President. It was a letter. It was a letter brought back by a soldier from Iraq. It was a letter that was handwritten by an Iraqi woman. It was a letter that was taken to this soldier early one summer Iraqi morning, the heat, the dust, the barriers, the wire; and this woman made her way up to the checkpoint and handed this letter to the soldier and said, Can you get this to President Bush?

The soldier lived in my district back in north Texas. So after he came home, he brought the letter with him, and he was determined to get it to the President. And he did what anyone else would do with a letter to get to the President; he brought it to the town hall where his congressman was speaking and handed me the letter in front of a great number of people and said, "Can you please help me get this letter to the President?" Of course I said I would. But I didn't really know how I was going to do that and brought the letter back to Washington.

I worked with the White House congressional liaison, but I wasn't really getting the letter to where it needed to be. So we had the White House picnic scheduled, and at the last minute, I put the letter in my pocket. I said, Well, if I see the President, I will hand the letter to him personally. But as is usually the case, you go to one of these events and the President is absolutely mobbed by people, and I honestly just didn't think I could get through the swarm of individuals that were lining up to have their picture made with the President.

So I turned around, and there was Tony Snow. I didn't know Tony, but I walked up to him and struck up a conversation. And he was very happy to oblige. He was warm, he was witty, certainly very, very easy to talk with. He was a larger-than-life press person, a pundit, a press secretary, having just a pleasant and regular conversation with a very freshman congressman from Texas.

It dawned on me that day that Tony might be the right person to whom to give this letter to take to the President. I asked him. I said, I have a letter that a soldier asked me to deliver to the President that was given to him by a woman in Iraq. Do you think you can help me? He said of course he would take the letter, and he'd be happy to see that it got into the hands of the President.

Now, that was the White House picnic in June. Many, many months went by, many, many weeks went by, a couple of months went by. I didn't hear anything, and I really wondered what had happened to that letter, if it had

ever gotten to where it was intended to go.

And then at another event right at the start of school in September back in my district, the same soldier came up to me at a Chamber of Commerce breakfast. Again, a lot of people around, and very excitedly said, "I just want you to know what you have meant to me getting my letter to the President." And I was somewhat taken aback because I didn't know the President received the letter. He said, Oh, yes. They called me from the White House. They identified themselves. At first I thought it was some of my buddies that were kidding with me. But in fact the letter had gotten to the White House. The President called me and thanked me for it. In the letter, the woman had thanked the President for everything he had done for the Iraqi people and said she was praying for him every day, and the President was deeply touched by the woman's words.

Now, Tony Snow did not have to take that letter from me that day. He didn't have to deliver it to his boss. He didn't have to take it to the President. But that's just the kind of person he was: honest, decent, and a man of his word at all times.

Well, certainly for me it was a great honor for me to meet Tony Snow that day. Certainly the country again mourns his loss, and I just wanted to bring to the floor this evening one of the other stories of what a great American Tony was and how much, as a country, we will miss him and honor his memory.

□ 2030

**AIR FORCE GENERAL MOSELEY
AND SECRETARY WYNNE
SHOULD BE HONORED, NOT
FIRED**

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the June 5 forced resignations of Air Force Secretary Michael W. Wynne and Chief of Staff General T. Michael Moseley represent the first time in United States history the top uniformed and civilian leaders of any service were ousted simultaneously. The actions of Secretary of Defense Gates are totally unprecedented and deserve deeper scrutiny and inquiry.

Successful leaders must focus on today's problems while simultaneously anticipating future challenges. The tenures of Moseley and Wynne were defined by these characteristics. They cultivated a service that was second to none.

Moseley and Wynne developed and employed new technology, such as the unmanned aerial vehicles that are yielding unparalleled effects on the battlefield. They also recognized that the Air Force has to adapt to a changing world, and they directed the service

to build competencies in new areas such as cyberspace and alternative fuels. And finally, Wynne and Moseley took action to re-capitalize the Air Force's aging fleet with a wide array of assets, including the tanker, the F-22, and the next generation bombers. These are steps that will prove essential as the service confronts future challenges.

Secretary Gates' real reasons for the firing of Secretary Wynne and General Moseley may never be known. However, I have come to believe that his stated reasons do not necessarily match up with reality. The publicly stated reason was primarily because of the violation in sending nuclear control units to Taiwan. Perhaps the real reason for the firings is because of disagreements on the strategic defense of this Nation.

The parts that were in violation were removed from the nuclear control list in 1991. The parts shipped were just special lamps. Moseley and Wynne had approved a correction on this matter and were spending over \$1 billion to make those corrections. If Secretary Gates, or others in the Pentagon, had some concerns, they could have voiced those concerns much earlier.

In addition, it is important for the Secretary to release the full report by Admiral Kirkland Donald, who investigated the case of the mistaken shipment to Taiwan. Admiral Donald's findings directly led to the firing of Moseley and Wynne, and the report should be made public as soon as possible. I call on the Secretary tonight to make this report public.

Now, there have been reports that Moseley and Wynne constantly clashed with the Secretary of Defense's office over greater procurement of the F-22. In order to avoid a showdown with the Air Force, the Defense Department decided that instead of closing down the F-22 line, it would restrict how many planes the Air Force could buy and leave the ultimate decision to the next administration.

The F-22 will serve as replacements for the aging F-117s and F-15s. The Air Force needs a minimum of 381 F-22s to fill out its 10 air and space expeditionary forces. However, it has been authorized funds for only 183. As a result, the Air Force must keep selected F-15s and F-16s in service much longer than had been expected. Mostly and Wynne fought hard for the F-22 against the wishes of Secretary Gates and his office.

Now, considering the impressive record of General Moseley and Secretary Wynne, one must ask why they were forced to resign. While I certainly understand and share the Secretary's concern regarding the Air Force's control over its nuclear inventory, I think the reason for the firings extends far past his publicly stated reason.

We had a clash of philosophies here. Moseley and Wynne were not leaders that were content with simply toeing the line for today. They were pushing