

Today, she observes that lunch is just not made like it used to be with instant boxed potatoes, nutritional charts to follow and new regulations. Bowling reminisced about the days she spent at Colony Elementary School with fellow cooks, Ada Clay and Thelma Lincks, and soon after, Opal Nicholson and Maggie Wilkerson, rolling out dough for yeast rolls, mixing cornmeal and flour for cornbread and putting their own personal touch on recipes.

Working at Colony in western Laurel County was ideal for Bowling, being a short distance away from her home while her three children were enrolled in classrooms just down the hall from the lunchroom.

Over the years, Bowling became close to the school staff and to the teachers especially. Her time was not always spent with her hands in the dough; she kept records of payroll, processed the free lunch forms and ensured that the cafeteria ran smoothly in her position as lunchroom manager.

"People who weren't in the lunchroom had no idea the bookwork involved," she said.

Children at the school who could not afford to pay for their lunch would be hired as help for the cafeteria, Bowling said, to help serve food, and, on occasion, wash dishes in exchange for payment.

Bowling made only \$25 a week to help with the bills, while her husband, Oscar, was out on the road driving a truck to help support the four. Her youngest son at the time, Larry, had not started school yet and so \$10 of her pay was handed to a babysitter.

Being involved with the school was very important to Bowling. As an avid PTO volunteer and member, she rarely missed a meeting. School involvement is still something she continues to value, even now that her children have graduated and have children of their own.

"My oldest, Charlotte, is 60 years old," she noted.

Bowling continues to volunteer at Colony Elementary's annual Thanksgiving celebration. Bowling assists in the lunchroom preparations for the traditional turkey and stuffing feast, although she's still adjusting to the new way of doing things which usually involves using up-to-date machines for mass meal production.

"The equipment is so new and different," she commented.

Instead of children dropping pocket change and crumpled dollar bills for the lunchroom staff to count and pencil in, computers are now used to calculate change and handle payments.

"The last year I was there they started using computers," Bowling said. She retired in 1997.

Even though the old homestyle recipes are no longer prepared at the school's cafeteria, Bowling still keeps the recipes alive in her own kitchen. Every Sunday, Bowling cooks for her family.

"I love to cook if people like to eat."

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

PETTY OFFICER 1ST CLASS CALEB A. NELSON

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a true American hero, PO Caleb Nelson of Nebraska, who was tragically killed on October 1, 2011, in Zabul Province, Afghanistan.

Caleb graduated from Navy boot camp 6 years ago to become a machinist's mate. However, he aspired to be the best-of-the-best and, in November 2006, graduated from SEAL qualification training and became a member of

Naval Special Warfare Group Two. Caleb has been described by his commander as a cherished teammate and a gifted SEAL operator. This is certainly illustrated by the numerous awards and decorations he amassed during his short time in the service, including the Bronze Star with Valor, Purple Heart, Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, Expert Rifle ribbon and Expert Pistol ribbon. Before deploying to Afghanistan this past March, Caleb had deployed to Iraq in 2009.

Not only was Caleb a dedicated combat veteran, he was a loving husband, father, and son. His father, Reverend Larry Nelson, remembers his son as a go-getter and a truly good person. His friends and neighbors tell a similar tale. Karen Wagner, Caleb's neighbor, remembers him as a wonderful kid who was always willing to help out, even if it came down to mundane things such as cleaning out the gutters.

Caleb Nelson's life came to a cruel end when his vehicle hit an improvised explosive device while his SEAL team was conducting mounted combat reconnaissance patrols. I pray that Caleb's family and friends find strength during this trying time and my condolences go out to them. Caleb's service and sacrifice, his heroism and selflessness will remain an inspiration for all of us.

TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Taiwan as it prepares to celebrate its National Day on Monday. Double Ten Day, as it is known, marks the anniversary of the uprising on October 10, 1911, that led to the collapse of imperial rule in China. This year's commemoration takes on special meaning as Taiwan celebrates the 100th anniversary of this historic day.

Over the years, we have seen Taiwan make a successful transition to democracy, holding elections and peacefully transferring power. As we look back on the achievements of the past century, we also look forward to a bright future for Taiwan. Taiwan is a valued ally of the United States. The United States has enjoyed a close friendship with Taiwan for many years, and I will continue working to strengthen this relationship.

I wish the people of Taiwan sincere congratulations and best wishes on the 100th anniversary of their National Day.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to draw the attention of my colleagues to the approach of a very special day in the history of our friend and partner, the Republic of China—ROC—on Taiwan. On October 10, 1911—precisely 100 years ago—the Republic of China was founded, and since then has celebrated October 10 as its National Day.

Over the course of this century, the Republic of China has been a firm friend of the United States—from World War II to the Cold War, up to the

present day. More recently, the ROC on Taiwan has emerged as one of the great success stories of the past century—a free market democracy that is a model for the entire region.

I believe that it is especially appropriate to note this anniversary on the Senate floor because of the unique and important role that the U.S. Congress has played in supporting the U.S.-Taiwan relationship, by virtue of the Taiwan Relations Act. Unique among all of our international partnerships, the TRA established in law America's commitment to support the people of Taiwan as they seek a safe and secure place in the world.

I am grateful for the opportunity to wish the people of Taiwan my congratulations on this auspicious anniversary, and hope my colleagues will join me in celebrating a very special National Day.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise to continue the discussion that I began Monday with the majority leader, Senator REID, on the need to bring the national defense authorization bill to the floor of the Senate.

Since our colloquy Monday, Senator REID has sent a letter to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator CARL LEVIN, and me. I would like to have a copy of the letter printed in the RECORD.

In the letter, Senator REID lays out his concerns about some of the detainee provisions that were included in the Defense authorization bill as a result of a bipartisan compromise between Chairman LEVIN, myself, and Senator GRAHAM, and cosponsored by a large, bipartisan group of members of the Armed Services Committee. In fact, this compromise was so bipartisan that after extensive debate on many amendments and a number of votes during markup by the committee using the regular order of the Senate, the resulting package of detainee provisions was adopted and made part of the bill by an overwhelming vote of 25 to 1.

Now, I understand that the White House has some objections to these detainee provisions that were adopted by the Armed Services Committee, and Senator REID has essentially endorsed the White House position. In doing so, he is blocking the Defense authorization bill from coming to the floor, using his authority as majority leader to control the business of the Senate.

As I said Monday, I do not think that opposition to this particular provision outweighs the importance of this legislation to our national security mission, our troops, and their families. I stated on the floor Monday that I would work with Senator LEVIN and the administration to try to resolve their concerns about the detainee provisions in the bill. I stand by that commitment. But for the record, I want to address some of the issues raised by the majority leader.

The majority leader quotes White House Deputy National Security Adviser John Brennan from a recent speech he made at Harvard saying, "Our counterterrorism professionals would be compelled to hold all terrorists in military custody, casting aside our most effective and time-tested tool for bringing suspected terrorists to justice—our federal courts."

This statement is simply and completely untrue. It is a total mischaracterization of section 1032 of the bill.

The section of the bill dealing with military custody was extensively debated in committee and reflects the bipartisan compromise reached on all the detainee provisions. Section 1032 does not extend to all terrorists.

It applies, as Chairman LEVIN made clear in a public statement on Tuesday, only to members of al-Qaida and its affiliates, like al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula which launched the December 2009 attempt to bomb a civilian airliner over Detroit and which subsequently attempted an attack on the United States by using parcel bombs this time last year. And it only applies to members of al-Qaida and its affiliates who are captured in a very narrow set of circumstances: those captured attacking the United States or its coalition allies or attempting or planning such an attack.

This narrow focus is far from Mr. Brennan's claim that military custody would be required for all terrorists. That is simply wrong. It grossly distorts the scope of the provision.

The focus on al-Qaida and its affiliates was intentional. Al-Qaida is and has been for the last 10 years the focus of the Authorization for the Use of Military Force, AUMF, that Congress passed overwhelmingly after the attack on our country on September 11, 2001. We are at war with al-Qaida and its affiliates. The President has said so plainly.

In fact, it was just days ago that the Obama administration used the fact that we are at war with al-Qaida to kill an American citizen, Anwar al-Awlaki, in Yemen. That was a decision I fully support. Awlaki had become a leading operational planner for what administration officials now regard as the branch of al-Qaida that poses the most significant threat to the United States.

The inconsistency in Mr. Brennan's position and, to the extent he speaks for the White House, the administration's national security policy as a whole is that this administration asserts the right—correctly, in my view—to kill a member of al-Qaida or its affiliates through use of military force but would deny that the same individual should be held in military custody if captured. Instead, following Mr. Brennan's point of view, if we capture an al-Qaida terrorist in the very act of carrying out an attack on our homeland or U.S. interests elsewhere, we should revert to law enforcement methods and hold that al-Qaida ter-

rorist under civilian law enforcement standards.

By insisting that law enforcement custody rather than military custody should apply, the administration has to contend with the requirement to provide Miranda warnings to criminal suspects and the Federal rules that require presentment before a Federal magistrate within a short period of time after arrest, normally within 24 to 48 hours, for a criminal suspect to be informed of the charges against them and to be assigned a lawyer.

I would also note that the detainee provision that Mr. Brennan and the majority leader now complain of contains a national security waiver that can be exercised to transfer even members of al-Qaida or its affiliates into civilian law enforcement custody if that is warranted by the circumstances and deemed the appropriate course of action.

I strongly believe the language adopted by the Senate Armed Services Committee is reasonable, fair, and most importantly constitutional. However, as I just stated, I will work with Chairman LEVIN and the administration to remedy any deficiencies in the language. However, I believe the administration must now present to the Senate and the Armed Services Committee its specific concerns. Absent this, I would hope the majority leader would move to this important legislation and let the Senate implement its prescribed duties.

I look forward to hearing from the majority leader and the administration so that the Senate may move forward on this vital and important legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter to which I referred.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, October 4, 2011.

Hon. CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN MCCAIN,
Ranking Member, Senate Armed Services Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEVIN AND RANKING MEMBER MCCAIN: I am writing to follow up on our conversations regarding the detainee provisions (Sections 1031–1036) included in the Armed Services Committee's reported version of the Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Act.

As a whole, I strongly support the legislation your Committee has reported. Despite the widely varying views of the members on your committee on many critical issues, you have worked together to craft a bipartisan bill that once again will ensure strong and sustained support for the men and women that sacrifice so much in defense of our nation.

However, as you know, I do not intend to bring this bill to the floor until concerns regarding the bill's detainee provisions are resolved. The Obama Administration and several of our Senate colleagues have expressed serious concerns about the implications of the detainee provisions included in the legislation, particularly the authorization of in-

definite detention in Section 1031, the requirement for mandatory military custody of terrorism suspects in Section 1032, and the stringent restrictions on transfer of detainees in Section 1033. As Deputy National Security Adviser John Brennan stated in a recent speech:

[S]ome—including some legislative proposals in Congress—are demanding that we pursue a radically different strategy. Under that approach, we would never be able to turn the page on Guantanamo. Our counterterrorism professionals would be compelled to hold all captured terrorists in military custody, casting aside our most effective and time-tested tool for bringing suspected terrorists to justice—our federal courts. . . . In sum, this approach would impose unprecedented restrictions on the ability of experienced professionals to combat terrorism, injecting legal and operational uncertainty into what is already enormously complicated work.

I share the concerns about these provisions. I strongly believe that we must maintain the capability and flexibility to effectively apply the full range of tools at our disposal to combat terrorism. This includes the use of our criminal justice system, which has accumulated an impressive record of success in bringing terrorists to justice. Limitations on that flexibility, or on the availability of critical counterterrorism tools, would significantly threaten our national security.

I have no doubt that you share my commitment to maintaining an effective counterterrorism policy, and you have a strong record demonstrating that commitment. As important as the broader bill is to sustaining the strength of our Armed Forces, I hope we will be able to resolve these concerns quickly so that the legislation can be passed expeditiously. To that end, I want to make my staff available to work with your staff on possible solutions to these concerns.

Thank you for your outstanding leadership on the Armed Services Committee. I look forward to working with you on this issue, and on maintaining the strength and superiority of our national defense.

Sincerely,

HARRY REID.

FOREIGN AID FUNDING

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of State and Foreign Operations, I have strongly supported funding to protect U.S. interests around the world.

I am also fortunate to have Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM as a ranking member, who, like Senators Judd Gregg and MITCH MCCONNELL before him, is a strong supporter of these programs. We recognize, as does the Pentagon, that military power alone is not sufficient to protect our security. In fact, sending Americans into harm's way should be an absolute last resort. We also need to invest in international diplomacy and development.

Foreign aid today is an oft-maligned term that is widely misunderstood. It is viewed by many as a form of charity or a luxury we can do without, or as a sizable part of the Federal budget. It is none of those things.

This is not a Democrat or Republican issue. It is about whether the United States is going to remain the global leader it has been since World War Two. Three weeks ago, President George W. Bush said: