

small individuals to bring forward their idea, and it gives me the greatest pleasure to help small firms that have the dynamic energy to grow their market share with a good idea.

As Barry Carpenter prepares to pick up the torch, what advice do you have to give him?

Barry brings strengths to the leadership of this organization that are quite different to mine. He is highly respected for his capacity to understand this industry, and for honesty and integrity. I am thrilled that he will take over, and I will try not to get in his way as he leads with new ideas and creativity and builds on the strengths of NMA as we know it today.

NMA's member response services have created a new gold standard for the industry, for large and small firms. Our availability to assist and guide firms through the maze of regulatory requirements is legendary. I will continue to support Barry in any way appropriate and possible and am thrilled that the lengthy transition will give us opportunities to work together in a different way to serve the needs and interests of our great meat industry, and liberate me to think about new projects that can be valuable for the future of our organization.

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

(Mr. HINCHEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRESSWOMAN WOOLSEY'S 250TH IRAQ SPECIAL ORDER

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

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to join Congresswoman WOOLSEY in her 250th special order on the ongoing quagmire in Iraq. I just want to take a moment to commend Congresswoman WOOLSEY and thank her for her leadership and her commitment to ending this occupation of Iraq and bringing our troops home. It was her resolution several years ago that we were able to begin, actually, the debate on this floor with regard to bringing our young men and women home. So I do have to salute you, Congresswoman WOOLSEY, and thank you again very much for your commitment and your tenacity and your willingness to be a voice that is so desperately needed to be heard.

Madam Speaker, it's really, though, unfortunate that Congresswoman WOOLSEY, myself, Congresswoman WATERS, and all of our colleagues have to come even once to this floor and speak out against the invasion and subsequent occupation of Iraq. But the reality is, we are in Iraq. And the reality is, also, that the cost of our invasion and the subsequent occupation of Iraq have been very high.

As of February 10, 2008, according to the Defense Department, 3,955 of our brave young men and women have given their lives, nearly 30,000 United States troops have been injured, and

countless thousands of Iraqis have been killed. We've committed a half trillion dollars and gotten what in return? We are still occupying a country which has undermined our standing and credibility in the world, what we have done as it relates to our occupation of Iraq.

And so we have an opportunity once again to talk about why we do not believe funding the President or giving the President another blank check for waging war in Iraq makes any sense. We have the opportunity to turn this around in the coming war supplemental, which I understand may be once again before us next month. We must insist that the only funds that the President should get should be to protect our troops on the ground and bring them back home safely, not one more dime to continue the occupation, nor one more dime to continue the combat that is taking place in Iraq. And of course we call that, and it is better known as a fully funded redeployment.

Equally as important, when our troops come home, we must ensure that they all come home. And that's why we continue to work with our colleagues to include provisions to prohibit permanent military bases in Iraq. We have been successful, in a bipartisan fashion, in including language in a number of authorizing and appropriation bills, as well as a stand-alone bill, H.R. 2929, which passed the House in July of 2007 by an overwhelming bipartisan vote.

In spite of the fact that the President has signed these provisions into law, I believe it's six times since 2006, he issued a statement as he signed the fiscal year 2008 Department of Defense authorization bill signaling his intention to ignore the provisions banning permanent military bases, to ignore that provision. Sadly, unfortunately, this is a pattern coming from the White House that really does seem intent on cutting Congress out of any decisions relating to the permanent stationing of the United States military in Iraq.

At the end of last year, without formal congressional input, this declaration of principles for a long-term relationship of cooperation and friendship between the Republic of Iraq and the United States of America was discussed between Prime Minister Maliki and President Bush. Now these "principles" will set the stage for future agreements on the disposition of United States troops in Iraq. To make certain that this does not end up being a backdoor way to keep our troops in Iraq indefinitely, which of course many of us are worried about, I recently introduced H.R. 5128, which will require that any formal agreement emerging from this declaration of principles has the approval of both the House and the Senate. Further, it states a sense of Congress that the Iraqi Parliament should put their seal of approval on any agreement as well, which just makes sense.

Finally, it will prohibit funding for any agreement that may emerge from

these principles that does not have the approval of the House and the Senate.

There's no denying that a majority of the American people are with us. A recent CNN Opinion Research Corporation poll has found that nearly two-thirds of all Americans oppose the occupation of Iraq.

Madam Speaker, we need to end this occupation and bring our troops home as safely and as quickly as possible. And it is because of the courage and fortitude of Members such as Congresswomen WOOLSEY and WATERS, who come to this floor each and every day. When the history of this period is written, historians will look back and say that there were some who opposed this and wanted it to end and end quickly.

□ 1845

FIGHTING IDENTITY THEFT AND DEFENDING THE HOMELAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CLARKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, according to a 2005 GAO study, employers reported the use of 1.4 million Social Security numbers that did not exist. Nearly 1.7 million numbers had been used by multiple individuals, sometimes as many as 500 times for the same Social Security number. In my district, the Waukegan police find that at least 20 fake Social Security cards are found by law enforcement every week.

Now, upgrading the Social Security card should be common sense. It's about seniors. It's about identity theft. It's about illegal immigration. And it's about keeping Americans safe.

When we look at today's Social Security card, we find a 1930s design. It lacks a picture. It lacks a bar code. It lacks a magnetic strip. It poses almost no barrier to the thousands of counterfeiters that make false Social Security cards.

Today, along with my colleague from Illinois Peter Roskam, we have introduced legislation to finally give Americans the choice between the old 1930s design Social Security card and the new secure Social Security card. This card offers enhanced protections across the board. It would replace that flimsy and easily counterfeitable Social Security card with a 21st century identity document that gives seniors real protection. Our legislation and this design is based on the government's common access card. Already the U.S. government has issued 10 million of these cards, and its protections, in our judgment, we believe, should be offered to people in the 21st century against Social Security card counterfeiters.

We think this legislation is important to propose a significant barrier to those who would counterfeit Social Security cards, to help seniors in fighting identity theft, and to make sure that a person who has that number and this card is really who they say it is.

We saw on September 11 that 18 of 19 hijackers had valid U.S. IDs during their crime of the century. I think it's time to make sure that at least the Social Security card has the 21st century protections that we can offer to make sure that we protect seniors, to make sure that we protect all Americans, and to protect the Social Security system. That's why we think that this legislation to create these secure Social Security cards is an idea whose time has come.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR ADOPTION OF H. RES. 979, RECOMMENDING THAT HARRIET MIERS AND JOSHUA BOLTEN BE FOUND IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS, AND ADOPTION OF H. RES. 980, AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO INITIATE OR INTERVENE IN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS TO ENFORCE CERTAIN SUBPOENAS

Mr. McGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-526) on the resolution (H. Res. 982) providing for adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 979) recommending that the House of Representatives find Harriet Miers and Joshua Bolten, Chief of Staff, White House, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with subpoenas duly issued by the Committee on the Judiciary and for the adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 980) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. McGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-527) on the resolution (H. Res. 983) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THANKING THE HONORABLE LYNN WOOLSEY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FOR ALL SHE HAS DONE IN TRYING TO CONVINCE CONGRESS TO BRING OUR SOLDIERS HOME FROM IRAQ

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, this evening I come to the floor to be with my friend and colleague Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY as she gives her 250th speech and Special Order on this floor. I come to be with her to commend her for the tremendous leadership that she has provided not only in speaking out against the war in Iraq, but because she has given numerous press conferences, she has been on numerous speaking engagements, she has spoken with editorial boards, she has written articles, she has done everything that could be done in order to provide leadership and to encourage and urge the Congress of the United States to bring our soldiers home.

Unfortunately, her messages have not always been heard. But there are those of us, those of us who work with her in the Progressive Caucus, those of us who work with her in the Out of Iraq Caucus, who have tried to not only give support but to do the same kinds of things that she has been doing in order to end this war.

The American people are tired of this war, and I find it disingenuous for some of the pundits to say that somehow this is off the radar screen, that this is not an issue that the American public cares about anymore, that somehow it is the economy. Of course it is the economy, but you cannot separate what is going on within our economy from the war. We must look at this war for what it is.

First of all, it is a war that we certainly should not be in. We were misled. There were never any weapons of mass destruction. Saddam Hussein is dead. Four thousand of our American soldiers have been killed in this war. Countless Iraqis, Iraqi civilians, and others who have made up the coalition forces from other countries are also dead. And so here we are, and the pundits are talking about it is not about the war, it's not on the radar screen of the American public, that the economy is, when, in fact, our economy is in recession because of this mismanaged war.

We have a President of the United States who came in as a fiscal conservative supposedly belonging to the party of the fiscal conservatives who have been spending, spending, spending on this war in Iraq, over \$500 billion on this war in Iraq, at the same time giving tax cuts to the richest 1 percent of the corporations of America and denying the dollars that we need to invest in our own domestic problems that need to be addressed.

We had a bridge fall down in Minneapolis, and people wondered why did

that happen. And when we took a close look at the reviews, the assessments that had been done about the state of affairs of our bridges and our infrastructure, we learned that many of our bridges in America are in the same position that that bridge was in, and we know that they have been assessed to be dangerous, that they need repair.

Why don't we have the money to invest in our infrastructure? Why is it we cannot create the jobs by investing in our infrastructure? Why can't we repair the bridges and the roads and the highways and build credible transportation systems? It is because this administration has decided that we are going to spend a disproportionate amount of the taxpayers' dollars on this war in Iraq, and we don't know when we are going to get out of this war in Iraq. And this administration would have us believe, because they have sent more soldiers and spent more money in the so-called surge, that somehow we are winning the war. What are we winning? What does winning look like? I don't recognize it.

I know this: I know that these 4,000 soldiers that have been killed in Iraq are not with their families, that their families, many, are in disarray; many of them very patriotic, who went to war because the President said that they were needed; and many of them who are no longer with us, their families are suffering. And we have others who have been injured who have come home, and they have not gotten the best medical treatment that they should have received, even though they were promised that, if they serve, they would be taken care of.

So here we are. We have destabilized the Middle East and we have occupied Iraq. We have Iran that is threatening us, Syria, Lebanon destabilized, and Pakistan is a joke.

I will simply conclude by thanking LYNN WOOLSEY for all that she has done to try to convince this Congress we should bring our soldiers home.

DEATH IS LESS COMPLICATED THAN FILLING OUT YOUR 1040

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, it's been said over and over again that nothing in this world is certain except death and taxes. I was a practicing physician for over 25 years back in Texas, and I will tell you that sometimes death even seems a little less complicated than our tax system.

The complexity of the Tax Code is a consequence of countless deductions and exemptions aimed at steering a social agenda, a social agenda, when it's supposed to be a Tax Code. The result is a Federal law fraught with opportunities for avoiding taxes and loopholes to be exploited all at the expense of fellow Americans.

Everyone is familiar with the problems inherent in our convoluted Tax