

An alliance of activists, Act for Sudan, plans to picket Fisher's Washington offices on Friday. "Our government should not be seeing this as the time to reward the government of Sudan," said Act for Sudan spokesman Eric Cohen.

Fisher said in an interview Wednesday that the objections are misplaced and based on the erroneous idea that he is working as a lobbyist. Under the terms of the license issued by the Treasury Department, which enforces sanctions against Sudan, Fisher may only represent the Khartoum government in legal matters and is forbidden from lobbying or engaging in public relations, records show.

"I am not a lobbyist," Fisher said. "I am a lawyer, and the Embassy of the Republic of Sudan is my client."

The State Department has designated Sudan a state sponsor of terrorism since 1993, when the United States imposed sanctions on the country for harboring terrorists such as Osama bin Laden. The restrictions remained amid persistent allegations of genocide and other crimes during a 20-year civil war. A fragile peace agreement in 2005 led to the formation this year of the new nation of South Sudan.

The Khartoum regime has long sought ways to persuade the U.S. government to lift its restrictions, including the hiring of a Washington lobbyist in 2005, who was later prosecuted for working on behalf of the country in violation of sanctions.

The Washington Post reported in 2009 that the regime had worked through the nation of Qatar to enlist the help of former Reagan administration official Robert "Bud" McFarlane, who is now an adviser to Newt Gingrich's presidential campaign.

Documents filed with the Justice Department under the Foreign Agents Registration Act show that Fisher was hired Nov. 1 to "counsel and assist the Republic of the Sudan in satisfying appropriate U.S. conditions to reduce and eliminate the Sudanese Sanctions Regulations and related U.S. laws." A license allowing the deal was issued by Treasury on Nov. 16, records show.

The fee is \$20,000 per month, paid quarterly. Fisher's wife also received a gift of a purse and two candlestick holders from the republic on Nov. 2, disclosure records show.

A Treasury official, speaking on background, said that the agreement adheres to sanction guidelines because legal representation, but not lobbying or public relations, is allowed.

"Recognizing the importance of due process and opportunity for redress, our regulations ensure that even the worst actors have the opportunity to challenge the blocking of their property before U.S. government agencies and courts," the official said in a statement.

Fisher said Sudan's government needs legal representation to continue implementing the 2005 peace accord, which includes complex negotiations over transportation and other infrastructure issues with South Sudan.

"Is it controversial? Yes. But is it improper to have counsel under the Sixth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution? I don't think so," Fisher said. "Why would they not have a right to counsel like anyone else?"

A "NO" VOTE ON NDAA: LET'S PROTECT AMERICA BY SHOWING OUR COMPASSION AND HONOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, now that the war in Iraq is drawing to a close, this is the perfect moment to reset our national security strategy, to change our underlying approach to protecting America.

Unfortunately, on the very day that the President visited Fort Bragg to affirm our full military withdrawal from Iraq, this body approved—without my vote—the National Defense Authorization Act, which will continue to dedicate billions upon billions of taxpayer dollars to warfare and weaponry.

While it's true that the bill represents some modest attempt at cuts, authorizing less than current law spending and less than the President requested, we're still talking about \$662 billion in defense programs. \$662 billion is a lot of money. It is particularly a lot of money at a time when the House majority won't part with a thin dime to create jobs and is committed to scaling back unemployment benefits.

The NDAA includes funding for the continued prosecution of the war on Afghanistan—a disastrous policy that proves to be a bigger failure with each passing day. We continue to spend enormous amounts of the American people's money on a war the American people don't support, and in so doing, more young Americans are either killed or maimed.

And to what end? For what benefit? For a policy that has emboldened the insurgents, inflamed anti-Americanism, and done little to bring peace, security, and stability to Afghanistan.

The authorization of military spending flies through the Congress while the domestic investments we need to put our people back to work are dead on arrival on the other side of the aisle. The authorization of war spending—exorbitant, excessive amounts of war spending—is rubber-stamped by this body when we could be spending pennies on the dollar to protect America more effectively with diplomacy, development, and other SMART Security tools.

To make matters even worse, the National Defense Authorization Act includes unacceptable provisions relating to the handling of detainees. It grants the President—any President—and the military broad powers to throw a U.S. citizen in jail indefinitely for suspected terrorist ties: without a swift civilian trial, without full rights of due process, without the proper presumption of innocence.

I emphatically reject the idea, Madam Speaker, that defending the Nation requires an assault on civil liberties and the rule of law. Madam Speaker, it makes no sense to say we are defending freedom by undermining freedom, to say we're going to defeat authoritarian forces by adopting authoritarian tactics of our very own.

Just the opposite, in fact. We protect American interests and values by showing our Nation's compassion and honor—the better angels of our nature and not our darkest instincts.

United States security depends on winning hearts and minds around the world, but we'll never do it with military occupations and repressive detention policies. We'll do it by bringing our troops home and by immediately adopting the principles of a smarter security policy.

#### ISRAEL, TOGETHER WE STAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. A few months ago, Prime Minister of Israel Benjamin Netanyahu addressed a joint session of Congress in this very Chamber.

He was welcomed by Members with a standing ovation. Several times during his speech, Congress responded with applause. When a person in the gallery attempted to disrupt his speech, the entire House stood and applauded to show support for the Prime Minister over the disruption.

The Prime Minister noted that people can speak out in a democracy that supports free speech. We all know what happens when citizens challenge their governments in Syria, Iran, Libya, and other repressive countries. The Prime Minister clearly laid out his concerns for the Middle East, support for a two-state solution and a clear and unequivocal message against Iran's nuclear weapons development.

And following his speech, the joint session of Congress gave the Prime Minister a closing standing ovation.

Recently, New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman commented on Congress' response to the Prime Minister.

He said: "I sure hope that Israel's Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, understands that the standing ovation he got in Congress this year was not for his politics. That ovation was bought and paid for by the Israel lobby."

Now, Madam Speaker, I don't know if Mr. Friedman was in the Chamber at the time, and I do not know if he interviewed Members of Congress following the Prime Minister's speech. I certainly know he did not speak with me nor many of my colleagues before he came to this wrong conclusion. So for the record, I wanted to make it clear why I and others stood when the Prime Minister of Israel addressed the joint session of Congress.

I rose for the Prime Minister because he is a leader of state. We always show respect for such leaders—but in this case, there were greater reasons for our action.

I also rose because Prime Minister Netanyahu is the leader of a nation I respect, of a people I admire, and of a culture that I cherish.

I stood up in support of a nation that protects religious freedom for all religions even when they are surrounded by other nations that will not permit Christian churches nor synagogues to be built and are surrounded by those

whose people burn down Coptic Christian churches.

For Israel's tenacity, courage, intelligence, creativity, inventiveness, and endurance over thousands of years, I stood in respect.

When Iranian leader Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said Israel must be "wiped off the map" and "the uniform shout of the Iranian nation is forever 'death to Israel'" and that the Western powers "launched the myth of the Holocaust . . . They lied; they put on a show and then they support the Jews," I stood up in support of Israel and stood against these hostile and hateful and false comments.

While Iran continues to develop nuclear weapons and openly threatens Israel and the Middle East and Europe, while some may cower in fearful silence, we will stand against nuclear proliferation by these rogue nations. That is why we passed strong sanctions against Iran and why we support all options to protect our friends.

We stood in support of Israel's continuous support of the safety and security of the people of the United States. When we were attacked by terrorists, Israel stood by us and continues to stand by us, and they take personal risks in doing so. We stood to show our gratitude to the people of Israel.

Now, like any relationship, ours is not perfect nor without differing thoughts and opinions. To be sure, there are times when we honestly disagree. That is the nature of governments elected by the people. There will be debate, but we must use these as opportunities to learn from each other, to reaffirm our promises, and to grow. All of that strengthens our bonds because we put respect, true resolution and a commitment to peace above all else.

Mr. Friedman would do well to understand the true issues behind our support. We are jointly committed to peace, to a two-state solution, to fighting terrorism, to supporting the tolerance of other religions, to supporting democracy, to standing up against those who would rain thousands of rockets on an innocent people.

We will not be silent. We will speak out against terrorism, and we will stand together.

So, for all of these things, I and others stood in respect, in support, and in an open show of our joint commitment to peace and civility.

And together we will stand again.

□ 1110

TRIBUTE TO STAFF SERGEANT  
VINCENT J. BELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Staff Sergeant Vincent J. Bell, United States Marine Corps. He was 28 years old, the son of Pamela Alexander-Bell and James Bell, the husband of Karen

Navarrete, and the brother of London Bell and Andrea Roe.

Staff Sergeant Bell enlisted in the Marine Corps on July 7, 2001, and became an artilleryman. During his career, Staff Sergeant Bell served his country with distinction and deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom with Battalion Landing Team 2/1; 2nd Battalion, 11th Marine Regiment; Battalion Landing Team 2/4; and 5th Battalion, 11th Marine Regiment.

On October 31, 2011, Staff Sergeant Bell deployed with the 2nd Battalion, 11th Marine Regiment, where he served as a Howitzer section chief for a 10-man team in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. On November 30, Staff Sergeant Bell was in Kajaki, Helmand province, Afghanistan, when he stepped on an improvised explosive device while on a dismounted patrol. He succumbed to his wounds, making the ultimate sacrifice for his country.

Staff Sergeant Bell loved being a marine. He said that "the ability to serve is the greatest calling an American could do, even more so to be a United States marine." Staff Sergeant Bell was well respected by his seniors and subordinates alike. His company commander, Captain Joshua Kling, said he "can't remember one conversation with Staff Sergeant Bell where he wasn't smiling and telling me how great it was. To suffer hardness and adversity with good cheer is the quality of a fine man. He was a rocket man, a cannoner, a platoon sergeant, an entrusted marine who always got the job done."

His platoon commander, First Lieutenant David Waters, said that all marines who served with Staff Sergeant Bell "understood his sacrifice and will miss him as a brother and friend. He faced the fear and danger of this profession with a true heart. He had the heart of a warrior and spirit of a true patriot. I know he will be in heaven guarding the way."

Staff Sergeant Bell loved his marines and being a mentor to them. Previously, he served as an instructor with the 11th Marine Regiment's Artillery Training School where he provided advanced training to the section chiefs for the regiment.

Upon returning to the 2nd Battalion, 11th Marines, Staff Sergeant Bell was excited that he was with a unit getting ready for deployment. Captain Kling noted that he was "chomping at the bit to be challenged—for an opportunity to train, teach, and mentor marines." Sergeant Erick Granados described Staff Sergeant Bell as "an outstanding marine, a great leader, and most of all, a good man. Firm but fair, guidance was always there when we needed it, but he let us do our job. He empowered his marines to take responsibility and lead others."

Staff Sergeant Bell was devoted to his family, fellow marines, and friends. His brother said that "Vincent was an outstanding marine and a good man. He had courage, commitment, and

strong values. He believed in following orders, loved our country, and served our country with pride. He believed in doing the right thing for the right reason. Vincent had an amazing sense of humor, even in tough times. He had a very caring and nurturing personality and was a mentor to young people since he was a young man."

Staff Sergeant Bell told his mother that it was a privilege to serve under both President George Bush and President Barack Obama. In 2009, Vincent called his mother from Iraq and told her that he had reenlisted because he wanted to have the privilege to serve under the first African American President of the United States.

Staff Sergeant Bell's wife Karen said that "Vincent was a kind, giving man. I'll miss my husband every day of my life, but his spirit will remain alive with me, his family, and his marines." Karen's brother and sisters considered Vincent to be their big brother. Her parents shared a mutual respect for Vincent. They knew how much he loved and cared for her. In addition to his family and friends, Staff Sergeant Bell was also devoted to the family's wonderful dogs Nala and Nemo.

Staff Sergeant Bell's personal decorations include the Purple Heart, posthumously; the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal with one gold star; the Good Conduct Medal with two bronze stars; and the Combat Action Ribbon with one gold star.

Since Staff Sergeant Bell's death was announced, his unit has received condolences from marines across the globe who served with him. This reflects his professionalism, leadership, and the lives he touched as a United States Marine. Our Nation has lost a good man—a son, brother, husband, and a marine—who gave his life in defense of freedom. He will be missed, and his sacrifice will not be forgotten.

LEAVE NO MAN BEHIND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remind all Americans that we still have troops in harm's way. As the Iraqi war comes to a close and we prepare to draw down in Afghanistan, we cannot forget those who serve us, the men and women. We cannot forget those that are still being held captive in those foreign lands. And these are our volunteers. These are young men and women that went to the fight and volunteered to go there willingly because America calls.

Several weeks ago, I sent a letter to the President, asking him for his continued commitment for those that we have left behind, those that have been held against their will in Iraq and Afghanistan. Unfortunately, I never got a response. I never received a response.

And recently, if you read the British tabloids, one of the British papers talked about PFC Bowe Bergdahl who