

And of course, Mr. Speaker, here in America we have seen 35,000 of our finest and bravest men and women killed or wounded in battle, and 140,000 of our troops remain in harm's way today.

Mr. Speaker, war is not a video game. Real people die or are horribly wounded and scarred, and they are scarred and wounded for life. Real families suffer. We need to remember that when we make momentous decisions about war and peace in this House, we have to consider those statistics.

Today, our country is faced with another tough decision about war: What to do about the situation in Afghanistan. I oppose the supplementary funding request for Iraq and Afghanistan. It will prolong our occupation of Iraq through at least the year 2011, and it will expand our military presence in Afghanistan indefinitely.

Instead of attempting to find military solutions to the problems we face in Iraq and Afghanistan, the administration must fundamentally change our mission in both countries to focus on promoting reconciliation, economic development, humanitarian aid, and regional diplomatic efforts.

Diplomacy and economic development are two of the cornerstones of my Smart Security Platform for the 21st century. This plan would employ the many effective nonmilitary tools that we have to fight terrorism. These tools will cost a lot less and be far more effective. They will save lives, stop terrorism, and keep us safe at the same time, or at least safer than a military option. I invite all of my colleagues to consider House Resolution 363, which describes the full plan.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the military option has taken us down the wrong road in both Iraq and Afghanistan for the past 7 years. The military option hasn't made us more secure. It has cost our Treasury over \$1 trillion so far, with no end in sight. And the human toll has been appalling. It is time to do something that will make our Nation safer and save countless lives. The smart security platform for the 21st century will achieve both of these goals.

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

FORT LEAVENWORTH, A POOR FIT FOR GUANTANAMO DETAINEES

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in January, shortly after taking office, President Obama ordered the closure of the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base within the year. Up to

250 detainees who are suspects from the war on terrorism will be processed and moved, possibly to facilities located inside the United States. The U.S. disciplinary barracks at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, is apparently one of the facilities under consideration to house these prisoners.

I have visited Fort Leavenworth, the city of Leavenworth, and surrounding communities. I have talked to city officials, local businesses, and State legislators. I have spoken to U.S. military officers and foreign military students attending the Army's Command and General Staff College located at the fort.

Simply stated, Fort Leavenworth is a poor fit for placing Guantanamo detainees. Fort Leavenworth is known as the "Intellectual Center of the Army," where the leaders of our military and foreign militaries are educated. However, should these politically sensitive detainees be located at the fort, many countries will likely discontinue sending military students to America to be trained. This action would disrupt Fort Leavenworth's primary mission of military education. It would greatly impair a successful international military student program that has spread good will around the world for 100 years.

Additionally, our country should not make Fort Leavenworth's soldiers and their families and northeast Kansas unfairly bear this responsibility at the cost of their safety and economic well-being. The 3,000 residents who live on post as well as the residents of nearby communities would be living at a higher security risk. Since the fort has no major medical facilities, dangerous detainees would need to be transported to a local hospital or V.A. for medical attention. Local public safety officials are not capable of handling a terrorist incident or protests that may occur and would require greater resources. The need to increase security at the fort would likely close off citizen access to Sherman Airfield, the only public airport in Leavenworth, as well as stop rail and river barge traffic that runs to the post. These actions would have significant economic consequences.

Finally, the fort's disciplinary barracks lack the capability to house terrorist suspects. It is largely a medium-security facility for military prisoners. It would cost hundreds of millions of dollars to upgrade the disciplinary barracks to maximum security level and to construct the hospital, residential, and support facilities that would be required to house the additional prisoners and security personnel. As a small post surrounded by a civilian population, there is no room to grow.

Fort Leavenworth is clearly an unsuitable location. I am a sponsor of legislation introduced by my colleague of Kansas, Ms. JENKINS, to prevent Guantanamo detainees from being relocated there.

□ 1615

The decision to close Guantanamo Bay detention facility and relocate terror suspects should not be made recklessly. I'm troubled that the administration is seeking to move forward on Guantanamo despite the absence of a closure and relocation plan and despite the lack of congressional review. In their recently submitted FY 09 war supplemental request to Congress, they ask us for \$80 million to close the Guantanamo detention facility to relocate prisoners, support personnel and services.

I join the gentleman from California, Representative HUNTER, in asking the Appropriations Committee not to include this funding in the supplemental until we see a plan. Still lacking these details this week, I'm pleased to see that our appropriations chairman, Mr. OBEY, announced his refusal to provide the funding.

This critical national security decision deserves critical thought. Detainees should not be moved where they do not belong. And detainees do not belong at Fort Leavenworth.

JUVENILE JUSTICE IMPROVEMENTS ACT

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation that I recently introduced, along with several cosponsors, the Juvenile Justice Improvement Act.

Mr. Speaker, every day in America, 90,000 youth are incarcerated in our juvenile correctional facilities. Seventy percent of these youth are held for non-criminal acts like running away or violating curfew. Instead of working with these youth and these families to identify the root of their problem and help them find alternatives to their negative behavior, our policy in too many places around this country is to simply lock them up. Even more shocking, 7,500 of our Nation's young people sit in adult jails on any given day, even though study after study has proven that that practice of putting youth in adult facilities only increases the likelihood of recidivism and puts them at risk amongst that sometimes very dangerous adult population.

Sadly, these are not the only consequences of putting juveniles in the adult system. Keeping children safe in the adult juvenile justice system is extremely difficult. All too often, physical and sexual assault become commonplace. According to the Department of Justice's statistics division, 21 percent and 13 percent of all substantiated victims of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence in jails in 2005 and 2006 respectively were youth under the age of 18. That number is disturbingly high when you take into account that juveniles account for only 1 percent of all

inmates. Thirteen percent of all sexual violence in our prisons is against these young people. They represent 1 percent of the total population. Moreover, and not surprisingly, youth have the highest rate of suicide in our jails. And as we know too well in Connecticut, placing juveniles with adults only exacerbates that problem.

However, I'm hopeful that with this legislation, H.R. 1873, the Juvenile Justice Improvement Act, we can start to reverse these dangerous trends.

Mr. Speaker, by keeping youth out of the adult criminal justice system and by using rehabilitative programs and services that are proven to try to help stop that cycle of crime, youth involved in these systems can emerge as proactive, positive and productive members of our community and of our workforce.

Specifically, this bill would protect youth prosecuted as adults from being held in adult jails or lockups while awaiting trial except in very limited circumstances. In these limited circumstances, youth prosecuted as adults must be sight and sound separated from adults in that facility to help protect their safety. Fortunately, some States already allow youth who have been convicted as adults to serve their sentence in juvenile correctional facilities. H.R. 1873 would remove a provision in current law that penalizes these States for choosing to house youth convicted as adults in more appropriate settings while not endangering other youth in the facility.

The Juvenile Justice Improvement Act would also work to keep youth out of locked facilities for noncriminal status offenses like running away or violating curfew. It would do this by closing a loophole in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.

This vital legislation would also encourage States to take steps to eliminate the use of dangerous practices such as choking youth or restraining them to fixed objects for the purpose of coercion, punishment or the convenience of staff. These steps would include collecting data on the use of these dangerous practices in prisons, providing training to staff on effective behavior management and creating an independent monitoring system to oversee conditions across the country at juvenile facilities.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Juvenile Justice Improvement Act would reward States through incentive grants that are implementing ideas that are research and evidence based. Such reforms would include making juvenile justice facilities safer based on this research, improving public safety in the rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents based on research, and better addressing the mental health needs of juvenile justice inmates based on research.

Mr. Speaker, these changes to the juvenile justice system are critical to ensure that all of our youth become law-abiding, contributing members of society. There is not always political util-

ity in government to stand up for youthful offenders, Mr. Speaker. It is not an easy thing for Members of this House or State legislatures to stand up and fight for.

But we need to fight for these kids under the age of 18 who may have made a mistake, maybe a big mistake, to try to give them a second chance or at the very least to try to make sure that when they are in prison, when they are locked up behind bars that they are safe from the ravages that can be associated with incarceration. If we can do those things, we are a better Congress and we are a better society.

With that, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 1873.

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

LONE WOLF HUNTER

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the statements written as part of an assessment by the Department of Homeland Security classifying disgruntled veterans as a threat to U.S. security and potential recruits for right-wing extremist groups. The report was distributed among law enforcement agencies throughout the country earlier this week. When I was back home in San Diego, our El Cajon police department had actually gotten this memorandum classifying me. Because I served three tours overseas with the United States Marine Corps, two in Iraq in Operation Iraqi Freedom and one in Afghanistan in Operation Enduring Freedom, I am a possible terrorist.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to go over some stuff with this DHS memorandum. It is the "Right-wing Extremism: Current Economic and Political Climate Fueling Resurgence in Radicalization and Recruitment." And here is a picture of it here. This is an actual Department of Homeland Security memorandum that went out to every local, State and Federal law enforcement agency in the entire country.

I would just like to go over a few points of it. It first starts off by saying that "the Department of Homeland Security Office of Intelligence and Analysis has no specific information that domestic right-wing terrorists are currently planning acts of violence." So they don't have any evidence for anything, but they are still going to call people like me possible "terrorists."

We read further down: "The possible passage of new restrictions on firearms and the return of military veterans fac-

ing significant challenges reintegrating into their communities could lead to the potential emergence of terrorist groups or lone wolf extremists capable of carrying out violent attacks."

I wasn't paranoid before, Mr. Speaker, but if we are going to pass new regulations on firearms, we are going to change the Second Amendment. And the fact that I would like to keep my own guns and that I'm a veteran who has served, that makes me a possible terrorist, as stated by our own government, by our own administration.

I read further down: right-wing extremism—and by the way, it is interesting that they don't talk about left-wing extremism or liberal extremism or progressivists. It is just right-wing extremism, and that is okay to talk about. It is okay to scorn those people that are right wing. They aren't as American as everybody else. "Right-wing extremism in the United States can be broadly divided into those groups, movements and adherents that are primarily hate oriented," I'm quoting here from this memo, "those that are mainly anti-government, rejecting Federal authority in favor of State or local authority." That means every single one of our Founding Fathers was a possible terrorist because they believed in local authority. They believed in States' rights. They didn't want an all-encompassing, dominating Federal Government.

It also includes groups of individuals that are dedicated to a single issue, such as opposition to abortion or immigration. I'm quoting again.

So I'm pro-border security. I think that illegal immigration is called "illegal immigration" because, well, it is illegal. That once more makes me a possible terrorist. I'm pro-life. That makes me a possible terrorist too.

I keep reading down: "Returning veterans possess combat skills." That is me. I possess combat skills. So do millions of other Americans that have served in our Armed Forces since 2001—"combat skills and experience that are attractive to right-wing extremists."

The DHS, our own government, is concerned that right-wing extremists, I guess that's me, will attempt to recruit and radicalize returning veterans in order to boost their violent capabilities.

That sounds pretty scary. I must be pretty scary. I wonder if DHS is on their way here to get me right now. I will stay here and wait for them for a little bit longer.

I read further down: "Many right-wing extremists are agnostic toward the new Presidential administration and its perceived stance on a range of issues, including immigration and citizenship, the expansion of social programs"—that is a new one. If you don't like the expansion of social programs, you're a possible terrorist, too—"and restrictions on firearms ownership and use." If you weren't paranoid before, you ought to be getting paranoid now.