

to help protect animals at the Federal level.

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

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

THE GROUND TRUTH

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, this evening I saw a film called "The Ground Truth." It was about Marines in the infantry who had been sent to Iraq. These Marines were from all over the United States of America.

It began introducing individual Marines, individual soldiers. And these individuals knew why they had enlisted. They were trusting their decision. They were feeling comfortable that they knew with who their enemy was and our enemy was dangerous and the danger was to the United States of America. They also knew that joining was their way out. Out of their towns, out of their neighborhoods, out of current dead-end situations; or up for training and/or education that would not be available to them outside of the military.

Their eyes were clear. Their voices were firm. Their resolve was intact. They went off to boot camp.

Boot camp gave them the steel they needed in their backbones. It gave them the practice they needed so they would be able to kill, kill their enemy. And they knew that that enemy was dangerous to the United States of America.

Their heads were shaved. Their voices were hard. Their anger was stirred. They knew their enemy and they were ready to fight.

So off they went to war. They went to Iraq or they went to Afghanistan. They got there. They went into battle against people, Iraqi people, recruits like themselves whom they considered were clearly their enemy. But then they found themselves killing children, running over them with their vehicles, on command firing on children, burning children. And women, one Marine told the story of mistakenly shooting a woman just before she waved a white handkerchief to show that they she was not an enemy. And men, men who could have been, or not, part of the insurgency. Never clear if they were killing innocents or if they were fighting the enemy. Their eyes became confused. Their voices became uncertain. Their resolve questioning.

And while they were moving through these emotions from certainty to un-

certainty, they and their buddies were being physically and mentally wounded. Those who were not killed or injured were likely to become victims of PTSD, posttraumatic stress disorder. But they did come home if they were not killed. They came home with sad, sad eyes. They came home feeling like outsiders in their homes, in their communities, because they could not share what they had been living with the last 9 months to 1½ years. They were confused and they were ashamed by what they had done. They were questioning their mission. They were embarrassed because their families thought they were heroes and they saw themselves as pretty bad people.

These men and these women, Mr. Speaker, were victims. They did what they were trained and commanded to do. In fact, one infantryman in the film said that at the end of the day, those who had not killed that day were chided by the others in their unit.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, you can be certain that these young people were in desperate need of help. Physical, which is obvious; and mental, which is harder to assess because their needs were labeled "behavior disorders."

So these individuals joined the military, did their jobs, no longer liked themselves when they came home, but came home in great need of help to find it was very difficult and sometimes absolutely impossible to get the help they needed. One soldier hung himself. Others drank or used drugs, acted out in anger, made life impossible for their loved ones until they began to patch themselves up and their lives back together again, or did not.

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few examples of what war does to those who are trained to kill, who do their job and are left feeling guilty. We must end all war. We do not want to put other individuals through this.

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

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

ISRAEL: AMERICA STANDS WITH YOU

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, a tyrannical government cares not about the fate of an individual citizen. But in a free country to murder a single innocent citizen is to provoke a fight with the entire nation. This is one of the great differentiations between Hezbollah and Israel. While desperately trying to retrieve two of her

soldiers who were abducted by Hezbollah terrorists, Israel takes great lengths to minimize civilian casualties. Conversely, Hezbollah takes great lengths to maximize civilian casualties in Israel while making breathing barricades out of the innocent men, women, and children in Lebanon.

Time and again Israel has made efforts for peace. Israel fully withdrew from Lebanon. Then she uprooted from Gaza. She was thanked with rockets, mayhem, and bloodbath.

The recent kidnapping and murder of Israeli citizens and soldiers were definitive acts of war. Hezbollah terrorists, along with the nations of Syria and Iran, who support them, are the aggressors, Mr. Speaker. And now as Israel has risen up to defend herself, along with each of the individual citizens whom she loves, we hear cries from the U.N. and other quarters for Israel to restrain herself.

What if, on 9/11, Mr. Speaker, the outcry was for the United States to restrain ourselves? Or what if Israel had listened to such calls for restraint 15 years ago when she learned that Saddam Hussein was building a nuclear reactor? The United States and our coalition forces would have faced terrorists with nuclear weapons when we lifted the iron hand of Saddam Hussein in 2003.

You see, Mr. Speaker, Israel understands that the entire world faces an evil, poisonous ideology that causes mothers to leap for joy when their children blow themselves to pieces in order to kill other innocent human beings. Israel understands that a dark ideology like that must never be allowed to gain nuclear weapons.

And why does the rest of the world not seem to understand that? This is the same ideology that murdered Olympic athletes in 1972, that took American hostages in Iran, that murdered Marines in their barracks in 1993, that bombed the World Trade Center in 1993, Riyadh in 1995, the Khobar Towers in 1996, the embassy in 1998, and the USS *Cole* in 2000.

And then, Mr. Speaker, this murderous ideology massacred nearly 3,000 Americans on September 11.

And today this is the same ideology that is launching rockets into Israel to kill innocent civilians. And, Mr. Speaker, lest we forget, it is the same ideology that is working feverishly to gain nuclear weapons, to terrorize the Western world in ways that we cannot yet imagine.

Seven decades ago, Mr. Speaker, another murderous ideology arose in the world. The dark shadow of the swastika fell first upon the Jewish people of Germany. And because the world did not respond to such an evil, it began to spread across Europe until it lit the fires of World War II's hell on Earth, which saw atomic bombs fall on cities and over 50 million people dead worldwide. All because, Mr. Speaker, the world's free people did not respond in time.

□ 2245

History has taught us that evil ideologies must ultimately be defeated in the minds of human beings. But in the meantime, in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, they must often be defeated upon the battlefield.

The battle Israel fights in these days is a battle to protect all of humanity from an evil ideology that has no respect for innocent human life anywhere on the Earth. That is why, Mr. Speaker, Israel's war is our war, and if there is hope for peace and freedom in this world, free peoples across this world just unite to defeat this hellish ideology of terrorism. This time, Mr. Speaker, we must not wait too long.

So may the people of Israel take comfort in these days, knowing that America stands with you. May you find victory, and may the light of God's peace shine down upon the streets of Jerusalem, forever.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONCERN ABOUT U.S. ARMS SALE TO PAKISTAN

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentlewoman from New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to express concern about the Bush administration's \$5 billion arms sale to Pakistan. Though little can be done to stop the deal, I believe the plan is misguided.

Considering the recent linkage of the Mumbai bombing to terrorist groups operating in Pakistan, this sale may further slow a 2-year peace process between India and Pakistan.

The government of India has made a strong commitment to fighting terrorism all over the world. Like the United States, nothing has deterred their firm policy to fight this regional and global menace. Unfortunately, Pakistan has not yet figured out a way to deter terrorist cells from growing within their borders.

We have to be careful where we are sending such highly sophisticated weaponry. While Pakistan has been an ally in the global war on terror, the government has simply watched while terrorist groups such as Lashkar-e-Tayyaba committed terrorist acts in Jammu and Kashmir and other parts of India. Its actions within its own country proved themselves not fit for receiving these arms.

Mr. Speaker, foreign military assistance to Pakistan has been used against

India in the past. This new U.S. policy of military sales to Pakistan will contribute to increasing security concerns throughout South Asia, particularly in India. This material is not being used against al Qaeda, but there is a potential that it would be used in a war against India. We don't need to reward Pakistan for being our friend in the war on terrorism by giving them advanced weapons systems that are not likely to be used in that effort.

Pakistan has also faltered on proliferation in the past. In fact, just last week Pakistan announced that it is increasing its capacity to produce nuclear fuel, a move which signals a major expansion of the country's nuclear weapons capabilities. These reactors paired with some of our most highly technological jets and materials could be disastrous to the region.

Mr. Speaker, we may be supporting the Pakistani military, but we may also be increasing the rift in peace relations between India and Pakistan and in the South Asia region.

Mr. Speaker, economic assistance is certainly necessary to reform Pakistan's schools, provide health care programs and support economic restructuring that will stop Pakistan from being a breeding ground for terrorists. But military assistance is another matter. Allowing this sale sends the wrong message to the government and the people of India. I fear that it will mean a step backwards in U.S.-India relations and in South Asia's regional stability.

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

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

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.)

TACKLING THE IMPOSSIBLE? LAWMAKERS ADDRESS PHYSICIAN PAYMENT OVERHAUL

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor tonight to talk to my colleagues about a bill, H.R. 5866. This is a bill that will repeal the SGR, the formula by which physicians are paid under Medicare, and replace it with a more sustainable, more market-friendly Medicare economic index

which in fact reflects the actual costs of input for the physician delivering the care.

Mr. Speaker, the Medicare Physician Payment Reform and Quality Improvement Act of 2006 has four main goals: First, to ensure that physicians receive full and fair payment for services rendered; secondly, to create quality performance measures that allow patients to be informed consumers when choosing their Medicare provider; thirdly, to improve Quality Improvement Organization accountability and flexibility; and, fourth, to find reasonable methods of paying for these benefits.

Current law calculates an annual update for physician services based on the sustained growth rate, or SGR, as well as the Medicare economic index and the adjustment to bring the MEI update in line with the SGR target. When expenditures exceed the SGR target, the update for a future year is reduced. If expenditures fall short, the update for future years is increased. This is an economic incentive for physicians to limit health care spending.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the system simply doesn't work. Healthcare spending continues to grow and physicians exceed their target expenditures every year. Subsequently, Medicare reimburses them less and less. The net result is that patients have less and less access to their physicians, and those patients covered by Medicare arguably are our nation's most frail and complex patients.

This bill just introduced ends the application of the SGR January 1, 2007. Instead, we propose using a single conversion factor for Medicare reimbursement: The MEI, Medicare economic index, minus 1 percent. This eliminates the negative feedback loop that constantly creates a deficit in healthcare funding and introduces a more market sensitive system.

Regarding quality measures, the American Medical Association and other physician organizations have been working to create a relevant evaluation system for outpatient healthcare. In conjunction with these organizations, we propose creating a voluntary system of evidence-based quality measures.

Each physician specialty organization will create their own quality measures applicable to core clinical services which they will submit to a consensus building organization. Taken as a whole, these measures should provide a balanced overview of the performance. They will allow patients to better understand the quality of the healthcare providers they choose and be a fair assessment to reduce healthcare disparities across groups and regions. This will arm patients with critical information related to quality of care giving and give physicians a yardstick to measure their own performance and make improvements.

Additionally, these provisions largely follow the spirit of an agreement brokered between medicine and leaders on