greater flexibility in generating the one source of revenue it has. We think that this program is very important. We think that this change is essential. We think that this is an important commitment for this Congress to make to cultivate the leadership of the future in public service.

I salute the gentleman for leading this effort to pass this bill on the floor. I am privileged to have introduced it with the idea that this one small change can do a great deal to promote greater leadership not only in this institution but throughout our political process and throughout our governmental and nongovernmental institutions.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the two Congressmen who serves on the board of this Truman Scholarship fund. As has been explained here today, it is a very good use of money to help students obtain these different scholarships, to prepare them for work in public service.

The problem is that the principal cannot be invested in a very flexible kind of way. That is why this is a modernization act, to allow us to use those funds. I think it is completely noncontroversial. I serve with a Member of the other party on that board. Everybody, as far as I know, is in agreement that this modernization needs to take place. It is going to result in more money for scholarships, and people will be better prepared for public service. It seems like everybody wins, and so I am a strong supporter. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6206.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6206.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUIRING SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO SUBMIT ANNUAL REPORT ON CONGRESSIONAL INITIATIVES

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6375) to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress an annual report and to provide notice to the public on congressional initiatives in funds authorized or made available to the Department of Defense.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6375

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS AND NOTICE TO PUBLIC ON CONGRESSIONAL INITIATIVES IN FUNDS AUTHORIZED OR MADE AVAILABLE TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) IDENTIFICATION OF CONGRESSIONAL INITIATIVES.—Chapter 23 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 490. Congressional initiatives in funds authorized or made available to Department of Defense: annual report to Congress; notice to public

''(a) ANNUAL REPORT AND PUBLIC NOTICE REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the close of each fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on congressional initiatives applicable to funds authorized or made available for the Department of Defense for that fiscal year. Upon being submitted to Congress, each such report shall be posted on a publicly available Internet website of the Department of Defense.

''(b) CONTENT.— Each report under subsection (a) shall include, for each congressional initiative applicable to funds that were authorized or made available to the Department of Defense for the fiscal year covered by the report, the following:

''(1) A description of each such congressional initiative, including—

''(A) the geographic location (by city, State, country, and congressional district, if relevant) in which the funds covered by such congressional initiative are to be used;

''(B) the purpose of such congressional initiative (if known); and

''(C) the recipient of the funding covered by such congressional initiative.

''(2) For each such congressional initiative, an assessment of the utility of the congressional initiative in meeting the goals of the Department, set forth using a rating system as follows:

''(A) A rating of 'A' for a congressional initiative that directly advances the primary goals of the Department or an agency, element, or component of the Department.

''(B) A rating of 'B' for a congressional initiative that advances many of the primary goals of the Department or an agency, element, or component of the Department.

''(C) A rating of 'C' for a congressional initiative that may advance some of the primary goals of the Department or an agency, element, or component of the Department.

''(D) A rating of 'D' for a congressional initiative that cannot be demonstrated as being cost-effective in advancing the primary goals of the Department or any agency, element, or component of the Department.

''(E) A rating of 'F' for a congressional initiative that distracts from or otherwise impedes that capacity of the Department to meet the primary goals of the Department.

''(c) CONGRESSIONAL INITIATIVE DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'congressional initiative' means a provision of law, or a directive contained within a joint explanatory statement or report accompanying a conference report or bill (as applicable), that specifies—

''(1) the identity of an entity or project, including a defense system, for which funds are authorized or made available in that law (or conference report or bill) and that was not requested by the President in a budget submission to Congress; and

''(2) the amounts of the funds so authorized or made available.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''490. Congressional initiatives in funds authorized or made available to Department of Defense: annual report to Congress; notice to public.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 490 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to funds made available to the Department of Defense for each fiscal year after fiscal year 2006.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would also ask that after I make my opening remarks, I be allowed to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), the sponsor of this bill, and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the time for purposes of debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is legislation a number of Members have asked to bring to the floor in both bodies to illuminate to the world what they call congressional initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, let me give you my take as one Member of this very important body on congressional initiatives that are sometimes pejoratively called earmarks.

The Constitution of the United States charges the United States Congress, not the President, not the Pentagon, not a general, not some under secretary, charges us with raising and equipping the forces of the United States of America, the Armed Forces, the armies and the navies that the Constitution refers to; and, of course, by implication the United States Marine Corps and the United States Air Force.

It is our job to build this budget, not just to work around the fringes of the defense budget, it is our job to build this budget from the ground up. From my perspective the recommendation that comes over from the President is just that: It is a recommendation. It is not charged by the Constitution. It is

not mandated by the Constitution. It is our job to build the defense budget of the United States.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, we do that. I think we do that very effectively. I think this great bill, this $532 billion defense bill, is a reflection of that. It was put together by my committee, the Armed Services Committee, Democrats and Republicans, and by the gentleman from Florida's Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense who do such a good job.

Let me give you one example of what we did, one thing that might pejoratively be called earmarks by people who think that somehow what the administration sends over is sacrosanct and what we add is somehow an illegitimate addition.

We had the Army and United States Marine Corps come to us this past spring after we were putting our budget together after the President's recommendation had come over, and they said we are not going to have enough money to reset the United States Army and Marine Corps, largely because of that tough, harsh theater in Iraq and Afghanistan, and that means repairing the tanks, trucks, aircraft and all of the other equipment that you need for warfighting. We need wherewithal, the additional money to fix that fire engine so it can go back in the firehouse and be ready for the next emergency, whether it is the 9/11 force of this country, the Marine Corps, special operations, United States Army, United States Navy, United States Air Force.

Mr. YOUNG and I in our committees listened to the United States Army and to the Marine Corps. We said, come in and you lay out for us everything that you need to get our forces ready to fight again so they are reset. That ''reset'' is a term of art.

They gave us a bill, $27.7 billion for the Army, $11.7 for the Marine Corps. We looked at the President's budget which only funded a part of that; we looked at the supplemental which only funded a part of that, and we looked at the balance. We took that balance and we added every single dime that was identified by our warfighting leaders as something that they needed in combat, and we added that to the President's budget. I guess you could call that a $20 billion earmark. That was a congressional initiative that exactly described the duty that is charged to us by the United States Constitution and how we discharge that duty.

Let me give a few other congressional initiatives. One reason why I support this bill, incidentally, and it is fine with me is because I put my initiatives on the Internet and if people want to look at them and see what we add, that is great.

Let me tell you some of the initiatives that I added and I asked Mr. YOUNG to add in his bill: jammers, jammers that would protect our Armed Forces, when they are dismounted, against roadside bombs that are electronically triggered from remote areas that were not in the administration's budget, we added those. So jammers that protect the lives of our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines, we added, congressional initiatives.

Body armor, extra body armor, more Humvees that have the thick armor that can repel the fragments from these IEDs, these roadside bombs. We put in things that are important for the warfighters of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that I am here to reaffirm our constitutional right, not to do just bits and pieces of the defense budget, but to do the entire budget; and what the administration recommends is the edges. If they didn't come over with a recommended budget, we could build and we are totally equipped to build this budget from the ground up. We have the expertise to do it, Democrat and Republican, and we could do it from the ground up.

Having said that, I support this bill which says that the Department of Defense is free to comment on their ratings on what congressional initiatives have requested and placed into the bill; and from my personal perspective, that is fine with me. I put mine on the Internet for the world to see.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 6375. This is not the way to accomplish earmark reform because, quite frankly, it gives all the authority to the executive branch. The gentleman from California, Chairman DUNCAN HUNTER, is right when he says that we are charged under the Constitution to raise and maintain the military. And that is the very reason that I oppose this particular bill. It contravenes congressional responsibility and authority. This bill also fails to achieve meaningful reform. The Democratic Open Government and Honest Leadership bill will offer a better approach, which will be taken up, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the 110th Congress.

This sets a huge administrative burden on the Department of Defense to identify thousands of contractors and multiple thousands of geographic locations, and list every congressional district. It gives the executive branch, I repeat it again, the executive branch, the right to grade the performance of Congress. That is not a good thing.

Let me mention another matter which I have urged and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), Chairman HUNTER, has urged in the past. And that is the bill that should have been on the calendar regarding the Iraqi Inspector General. That is a bill that would eliminate the termination date of October 7. That termination date, unfortunately, got put in the defense bill, and there has been a great deal of media attention to it, and quite honestly, we should not have a termination date because that is an ongoing process. And I feel very strongly that that bill should be on the calendar. I want to say very clearly, Chairman HUNTER agrees with me that that bill is a good bill and should be on the calendar. And it is not up to us. It is not our choice to say it should not be, but somewhere along the line, Mr. Speaker, it was sidetracked despite the fact that the chairman and I both pushed it very, very heartily.

Getting back to H.R. 6375, I hope that we will take a good look at it. This bill defines an earmark as any change to the President's budget creating the perception that all congressional initiatives are ''pork'' and that Congress has no right to review administration spending requests. It is not a good bill. Consequently I do oppose H.R. 6375.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, before making my opening statement, I now yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations chairman, Mr. YOUNG, out of deference to his leadership and longtime activity in this field.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, and I understand his interest in this bill, but I am opposed to this bill. I am opposed to this bill.

If it were simply a bill requiring that the congressional initiatives be identified, I have no problem with that. As a matter of fact, the Defense Subcommittee identifies all congressional earmarks, if you would like to use that term, in the report that we publish along with the bill itself.

But here is what offends me about this bill. This bill would say to the Department of Defense, you have to look at all the initiatives by the Congress and then issue a report card and the report card would say it gets an A, it gets a B, a C, a D, an E or an F. I don't want the Pentagon having to spend all that time grading the work that we in the Congress do.

I have cited the Constitution many times, and I am going to do it again today. Article I, Section 9, Chairman HUNTER referred to it generally. It says: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.'' Not made by budget requests from the White House but made by law. There is another part of that sentence that people tend to ignore. It says: ''and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.'' And we do that and the administration does it . . . sometimes. Read this Constitution from cover to cover. You will not find anything in this Constitution that says Congress can only appropriate money that has been requested by the President. Nothing in here says that. Article I, Section 9, however, says the President cannot spend any money that has not been appropriated by law.

This is not a good bill. It flies in the face of the Constitution, and it adds burdens to the Defense Department to grade us on a report card for the work that we do.

One final point. Chairman HUNTER mentioned the $20 billion that we added for reset. That was part of a $70 billion so-called bridge fund for the war in Iraq. This Congress, this House of Representatives, your Appropriations Committee asked and asked and asked over and over again from the Department of Defense, ''What do you want in this $70 billion?''. To this day we are waiting for a formal answer. So Congress had to take the initiative and determine by dealing with the services themselves what was needed in that $70 billion bridge fund, and we did it and we did a good job at it.

This bill is not a good bill. I hope you will vote ''no.''

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank our Republican leadership for bringing this important bill to the floor today. At a time when our Nation is fighting wars in Iraq and Afghanistan as well as waging a global war on terror, we must ensure that every defense dollar we allocate is well spent on programs, equipment, and other initiatives that support our troops in winning the battle and advancing the mission of our armed services. We cannot afford to be wasteful in spending. Our freedom and the lives of our men and women in uniform are on the line if we waste or misappropriate funding.

The bill before us today, the Defense Spending Report Card Act, has already passed the Senate two times as amendments to the 2007 Department of Defense appropriations and authorization bills. The first amendment passed on voice vote, and the second amendment received overwhelming bipartisan support with only one Senator voting against it, 96–1, and unanimous in the Senate. Unfortunately, the amendments were stripped out in conference. But today we have an opportunity in the House to pass similar legislation in a bipartisan way that will send a message to both our constituents and our troops overseas that we are serious about fully funding our military needs and bringing some accountability and transparency to the appropriations process.

H.R. 6375 is quite simple. It requires the Department of Defense to annually report, number one, the total cost of spending initiatives in defense appropriations bills; two, the purpose of these initiatives; and, three, an analysis of the usefulness of each initiative to advancing the goals of the Department of Defense. While there are no requirements directing what Congress must do with this report card, it will provide Members of Congress with a helpful tool by which to determine the value and cost effectiveness of each defense spending initiative. This transparency will also encourage greater accountability in the funding process, which voters in both parties will truly appreciate.

In recent months we have seen the potential to abuse power that can result from a closed-door favoritism approach to government spending. Most people will agree that a little sunshine on the Federal appropriations process, as well as the authorizing process, and, by the way, this bill covers any House initiative that requires the Department of Defense to spend money, is always a good thing; and this bill takes an important step towards that goal. We should not be afraid of transparency but, rather, support it for the benefit of our troops and the integrity of the Congress.

Again, let me thank our leadership and Chairman HUNTER for bringing this bill to the floor.

I would like to address a few other questions that have been raised by many of our distinguished leaders here. My position is actually closer to Chairman HUNTER's position, which is I support this bill as does Chairman HUNTER, but I do not oppose what would be called earmarks or congressional narratives. I, in fact, have many defense contractors in my district. I annually make requests to the Appropriations Committee. I work with the defense authorizations committee. In fact, almost every major defense contractor has a facility in my district. I have argued with the Department of Defense about what they have as their priorities. I absolutely believe Congress has the right to initiate whatever spending we so chose. We have the right to override the Department of Defense. We have a right to plus-up the Department of Defense. And, by the way, anything that is in the President's budget that comes to us we can plus-up and it isn't covered by the report card. But I believe in transparency. I release every request I make. I defend publicly every request I make.

This bill is very simple. It is about transparency. It isn't about whether or not we are going to do congressional initiatives. Of course we are. If Chairman HUNTER and our ranking member and soon-to-be leader of Armed Services, Mr. SKELTON, hadn't fought the Defense Department on certain things, sometimes the Defense Department does not support the troops in the field. In the Appropriations Committee sometimes they appropriate things that aren't needed, but there is nothing to fear then. If you can defend it, that the generals in the field and that the military experts believe it is a better bill, why would you be afraid of transparency?

Now, to the argument of report cards, we do report cards. We do report cards and it doesn't take millions and millions of dollars and hours and hours to do report cards. And we have done report cards on multiple things over in the Government Reform Committee. We have done it in other agencies. It is a way that we can force a public measurement and a public debate about how contracts are given. Should they be given just on the basis of what is in your district or should they have a national merit? Can you defend it on a national merit? When we debate which kind of planes to move to, whether we go to more this kind of carrier or that kind of carrier, how many ships we buy, should it be driven by who has a shipbuilding district and whether one place is going to close down versus another, that should be a public debate. And if the administration and the House disagree, let us force that debate and have that transparency. Because at the end of the day, this bill is very, very simple: Do you believe in more transparency or don't you?

I appreciated my distinguished friend Mr. SKELTON's point on the Inspector General in Iraq. Yes, we need more Inspectors General in general. That is just part of the problem. We have lost the confidence, both parties, of the American people about the process. Those of us who are arguing for what is best for our troops, what is best to protect our country have nothing to fear, absolutely nothing to fear from transparency.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today in favor of Mr. SOUDER'S commonsense legislation. As defense spending takes up a great percentage of Federal spending each year and is perhaps the most complex spending issue we confront in Congress, it is past time for us to have a clear tool to determine the effectiveness of the billions of dollars we spend each year.

One of the difficulties in accounting for Defense spending is just trying to figure out the total amount of funds spent. Representative SOUDER'S legislation will require the Department of Defense to provide to us a clear number of how much is spent each year.

Earlier this year, in my position as a member of the Budget Committee, I wrote Secretary Rumsfeld decrying the poor condition of financial management at the Department. When this administration took office, DOD announced it was adding $100 million to the budget as a down payment on improved financial management; and yet, Deputy Secretary of Defense England testified before the committee that the department was unable to complete a proper financial statement. Additionally, the GAO has reported that the Department has failed on being able to track the spending we have provided in supplemental appropriations despite the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, mandating that departments must be able to perform this kind of recordkeeping.

As Congress will likely consider another supplemental package of possibly more than $100 billion early next year, it is critical that we, as legislators, have the tools to determine whether this money is being well-spent. Funds allocated to the Department of Defense are directly responsible for the safety of our soldiers who are risking their lives defending our freedom. We have a duty to ensure that this spending is free of waste, fraud, and abuse.

I congratulate the gentleman on a well-constructed and critical bill and urge its immediate passage.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6375.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

NAMING OF ARMED FORCES READINESS CENTER IN HONOR OF CAPTAIN WILLIAM WYLIE GALT

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 3759) to name the Armed Forces Readiness Center in Great Falls, Montana, in honor of Captain William Wylie Galt, a recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 3759

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. NAMING OF ARMED FORCES READINESS CENTER IN GREAT FALLS, MONTANA, IN HONOR OF CAPTAIN WILLIAM WYLIE GALT, A RECIPIENT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR.

The Armed Forces Readiness Center in Great Falls, Montana, shall be known and designated as the ''Captain William Wylie Galt Great Falls Armed Forces Readiness Center''. Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to such facility shall be deemed to be a reference to the Captain William Wylie Galt Great Falls Armed Forces Readiness Center.

□ 1330

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. I would also at this time like to yield the balance of my time, after I finish my opening remarks, to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG), who was the sponsor of this bill, and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the time for purposes of debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of these bills that it is good to go out on as we close down this session of Congress. This is an excellent initiative by my good friend from Montana to name the Armed Forces Readiness Center in Great Falls, Montana, in honor of Captain William Wylie Galt, who was a recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, we just had a hearing under the leadership of JOHN MCHUGH, who is the outgoing chairman of the Personnel Subcommittee in Armed Services on the Medal of Honor and on the criteria for the award. And we had some initiatives, some good discussions with our service representatives on ensuring that we have the appropriate guidelines for giving this great medal. And it was an uplifting hearing, because it is a hearing in which the acts of Americans who went far beyond the call of duty were reviewed and were discussed.

Mr. Speaker, I think anytime somebody passes this, walks by the Armed Forces Readiness Center in Great Falls, Montana, and they see that it is named after Captain Galt, they are going to be reminded, perhaps inspired, of his heroism.

The Congressional Medal of Honor is a symbol of adherence to duty, honor and country; and I think it is absolutely appropriate that we name, with this dwindling pool of Medal of Honor recipients, and the gentleman, as a veteran of the United States Army knows, we now have a very small pool of living Medal of Honor winners. So I think that wherever it is possible to name our buildings and our institutions and installations after Medal of Honor recipients, it is a point of inspiration for young people that will be enduring.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I fully support Senate bill 3759. It establishes an Armed Forces Readiness Center in Great Falls, Montana, as a memorial to Captain William Wylie Galt. And reading his resume, reading his citation, receiving the Medal of Honor, it is one of courage and selfless sacrifice. There is no question in my mind this is a very good gesture, as it should be more often, to those who exhibited the highest type of valor for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman for his kind words. And there are times in this responsibility of being a Congressman that sometimes you forget why you are here. It gives me tingles up the middle of my spine to think about the Galt family and how much they have contributed to the State of Montana and to this Nation over the years.

This legislation would name the Armed Forces Readiness Center in Great Falls, Montana, in honor of Captain William Wylie Galt, a recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor, as was said.

The Armed Forces Readiness Center will house the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve units who have spent recent tours in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

William Galt was born on December 19 of 1919 in Geyser, Montana. He was commissioned as a 2nd lieutenant, Infantry, through the Army ROTC program upon graduation from Montana State University in the spring of 1942.

I sometimes give Mr. HUNTER a hard time because he did in fact attend the University of Montana for 1 year. And I can tell you, Missoula has not been the same since he left.

Captain Galt was in Italy during World War II. For conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty, Captain Galt, at a particularly critical period following two unsuccessful attacks by his battalion, of his own volition went forward and ascertained just how critical the situation was. He volunteered, at the risk of his life, personally, to lead the battalion against the objective.

When the lone remaining tank destroyer refused to go forward, Captain Galt jumped on the tank destroyer and ordered it to attack. As the tank destroyer moved forward, followed by a company of riflemen, Captain Galt manned the .30 caliber machine gun in the turret of the tank destroyer, located and directed fire on an enemy anti-tank gun, and destroyed it.

Nearing the enemy positions, Captain Galt stood fully exposed in the turret, ceaselessly firing his machine gun and tossing hand grenades into the enemy's zigzag series of trenches despite the hail of sniper and machine gun bullets ricocheting off the tank destroyer.

As the tank destroyer moved, Captain Galt so maneuvered it that 40 of the enemy were trapped in one of the trenches. When they refused to surrender, Captain Galt pressed the trigger of the machine gun and dispatched every one of them.

A few minutes later, an 88-millimeter shell struck the tank destroyer and Captain Galt fell mortally wounded across his machine gun. He had personally killed 40 Germans and wounded many more.

Captain Galt pitted his judgment and superb courage against overwhelming odds, exemplifying the highest measure of devotion to his country and the finest traditions of the U.S. Army.

His courage and unrivaled determination to win for his country led to a win for America that day, but at the cost of his own life. William Galt is a true example of not only a Montana hero, but