

shouldn't he be right about the world, and why shouldn't we have been doing something about that?

Since 1980, we have known very well that M. King Hubbert was right about the United States. If he was right about the United States, maybe he would be right about the world. If it is true that the world's oil production would peak about now, then no matter what we do, drill a half million wells, like we drill in the United States, which would be millions worldwide, it still goes downhill no matter what we have done. Our production is downhill.

Very interesting, in 8,000 years of recorded history, the age of oil will be but a blip: 300 years. What will our world look like? Our next chart introduces us to that.

Sooner or later, whether we like it or not, we will transition from fossil fuels because they will one day be gone. We will transition from fossil fuels to renewables. This chart looks at the options that we have. We have some finite sources, and we need to come back for another hour and talk in detail about some of these finite sources that we have here and what their potential is, and then let the listener judge as to what contribution they think will be made from this.

One of the challenges we have is the fantastic density of energy in our fossil fuels. One barrel of oil has in it the energy equivalent of 12 people working all year long. Hyman Rickover gives some fascinating examples in his speech to those physicians nearly 50 years ago. He said that each worker in the factory had at his disposal the power equivalent of 244 men turning the wheels and so forth; that every family had the mechanical system, stoves and vacuum cleaners, toasters, that represented the work of 33 full-time faithful household servants. He said 100,000 men pushed your car down the road, and the equivalent energy of 700,000 men pushed a jet plane through the sky.

Two little examples to help realize this, just think how far one gallon of gasoline or diesel, how far that one gallon of gasoline or diesel takes you. I drive a Prius. It drives 50 miles on a gallon. How long would it take me to pull my Prius 50 miles?

If you go out and work really hard all day, I will get more work out of an electric motor for less than 25 cents worth of electricity. Now energy-wise electricity is about half the cost of gasoline, but about 25 cents worth of electricity, and that may be humbling to represent that you are worth less than 25 cents a day in terms of fossil fuel, but that is the reality. And that is why we have such an incredibly high standard of living, we have this incredible energy source at our disposal.

The challenge is to transition to renewable forms of energy that will provide the same quality of life. We have some finite resources that we can go through. The tar sands, the oil shales, the coal, nuclear fission, nuclear fu-

sion. We don't have time today to talk about these in detail. We will come back and talk about those in detail. And then all of the renewables. These will one day be gone, except for nuclear. We will talk about nuclear. If we ever get fusion, we are home free. I think that is most unlikely. If we go to breeder reactors, we buy some problems, but then we have relatively secure energy if you can handle the waste, and so forth, from that.

But there are only so much tar sands, oil shale, and coal. They come at great expense. They are pretty polluting processes. Ultimately, we will be down here, getting all of our energy from these resources: Solar, wind, geothermal, ocean energy, agricultural resources, soy diesel, biodiesel, ethanol, methanol, biomass.

Now there is a lot of talk about cellulosic ethanol. I understand the President on television was saying that there is going to be limited amounts of energy we can get from ethanol because already we have doubled the price of corn. So now we need to turn to biomass, to cellulosic ethanol.

Cellulosic ethanol is liberating the glucose that is so tightly bound in the starch molecule that enzymes in our body can't liberate it, but there are microbes that live in the guts of the wood-eating cockroach, *cryptocercus*, and in the stomach of cows and sheep and goats and so forth that does that for them. So the cellulosic ethanol is liberating the glucose from the big cellulose molecule.

Waste energy. Just a word of caution, that huge stream of waste we have is the result of profligate use of fossil fuels. In an energy deficient world, there will be nowhere near as much waste as we have now. We jolly well ought to be using the waste energy now. It is a much better use of this waste than burying it in a landfill, but it will not be the ultimate solution to our problem.

Hydrogen. I want to make sure that everyone understands that hydrogen is not an energy source. We talk about it because when you burn it you get water that is pretty darn clean, and it is a great candidate for fuel cells, if we ever get fuel cells. Think of hydrogen as a battery, something to carry energy from one source to another.

We have only a few moments remaining, and I would like to put the last chart up. That will introduce us to a longer discussion we will have next time.

We are very much like the young couple whose grandparents have died and they have inherited a lot of money. They have established a lifestyle where 85 percent of the money they spend comes from their grandparents' inheritance, and only 15 percent from what they are earning.

Here we are getting 85 percent of our energy from fossil fuels and only 15 percent from anything else, and the fossil fuels are not going to last. The kids look at what they are doing and

say gee, that is going to run out. We have to do something. Either we have to make more or use less. That is exactly where we are.

A bit more than half of all of this other than fossil fuel energy is nuclear power: 8 percent of total use in our country, 20 percent of electricity, it probably could and should be more than that, and then 7 percent. That is going to have to grow until it is 100 percent, but some don't have much potential for growth.

Conventional hydroelectric, that is peaked out. We will come back and spend a full hour talking about the potential of these. There are exciting challenges here, and I think it will inspire the best of America.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here for another session of the 30-something Working Group. We have had a very interesting week in Congress this week, and we want to share some of that with our fellow Members of Congress and those people paying attention for the record on the week of sunshine in the United States Congress.

In the past several days we have, as Democrats, continued to honor our pledge to try to open up government, knowing that the more information that we share, the more information that we have about the inner workings of government, the better off we are all going to be.

I think we have all seen over the past several years how a very closed, secretive government rules and what the end result may be of a very closed and secretive government. We are trying to fix that problem.

As you watch the news, Madam Speaker, as you watch the news every single day, it seems like we continue to hear stories about problems that we knew about many, many years ago, but we never did anything about it because you are not allowed to admit you make mistakes.

What we have tried to do this week is try to prevent the kinds of situations we have had with Walter Reed, try to prevent the kinds of situations we have had with Iraq, and try to prevent the kinds of situations we have had with Hurricane Katrina. All of these things were happening behind closed doors, and the people involved at the Pentagon or the Department of Defense, or whether it was in FEMA, the problem was people in the organization or in the agency or in certain departments knew things weren't going well or knew there wasn't a plan or knew we didn't have the proper people in place to execute whatever the exact role was of that agency, but nobody was allowed

to tell anybody or talk about it. And if you talked about it, you were fired.

We saw Hurricane Katrina on TV. We continue to see the war on TV, and we see what has happened at Walter Reed. Can you imagine people knew about what was going on at Walter Reed and didn't say anything? And then getting up in front of the TV cameras and say: We are for the troops, and you're not. That is a problem.

The new Democratic majority has begun the problem of fixing that problem this week. We are restoring accountability. This week we passed whistleblower protection and other government reform bills so that those people involved in the agencies who know how the agencies need to be run will not be subjected to the political whims of the day.

We want them to share with us what the problems are. We want them to share with us how we fix the agency or the department or the execution of the mission of a specific department. And I think it is important politically. As I am joined here by my good friend from Florida, Mr. MEEK, I think it is important that we recognize what has happened since the Democrats have taken over.

Now we are not here to just say we are the only political party in the country and we are the best and this and that. We had a political situation in this country since 2000 where the presidency was Republican and for the most part the House and the Senate were Republican the whole time, and the Republicans have controlled this Chamber for 14 years. And a culture of coverup happened, to where the Republican majority in the House would not oversee or provide the proper oversight to what was going on in FEMA, in the war, and a lot of these other agencies.

And what has happened when the Democrats took over Congress and the American people said we need to bring a little balance to this situation, just look at what has happened. Walter Reed, who knows if that would have ever come up if the Democrats weren't poking around saying what is going on with veterans' health care?

□ 1600

All of the issues in Iraq. Today we passed a supplemental to begin to put the framework together to get our kids home from Iraq. And look at what is going on with Katrina and the oversight we are providing for that.

These are things that are happening because the American people put balance back into the government. And we want to continue to honor the pledges that we made previous to the last election. We want to make sure that it is not just the whistleblower protection, but it is the 67 hearings that we have already had, Democrats have already had on Iraq. Sixty-seven. No, it's even more.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, it is more than 67 hearings. You meant 97 last week, but now it is 104 hearings. Three digits.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And what is today, March 14?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. March 15. That's a good thing, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. In a couple of months we've had more hearings than the Republican majority had.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Definitely at this point in the 109th Congress, in the 108th Congress.

But go ahead, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think it is important for us to really recognize the importance and the results already of what has been happening. And I don't know if this is a coincidence or not, but Halliburton just picked up and moved; they just picked up and said we're moving out of the country.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That is no-bid contract Halliburton.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yes. And it is a shame that a company that gets that much public tax money would pick up and leave the very country that they get their money from to have their corporate headquarters.

But it is important that we are living up to our commitment. We are providing the oversight, 104 committee hearings. We are restoring accountability with the whistleblower protection; Presidential library donation; FOIA requests, where you can actually access documents in the government, freedom of information. So a lot of sunshine came down on the Capitol this week.

And I couldn't be prouder of the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, and STENY HOYER and JIM CLYBURN and RAHM EMANUEL and JOHN LARSON, our leadership and the Chairs of our committees for really applying the pressure and really trying to fix things and make things better.

I yield to my friend from Florida.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, Mr. RYAN. Thank you for yielding. So kind of you. My good friend from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN, you know, yesterday when we were down here, we talked about the bipartisan votes, the fact that we are allowing an opportunity for the Members of Congress to vote for good commonsense, good government legislation that they have been denied of voting on for 12 years. And now we are in the majority, and we have an opportunity to put legislation forth. And as Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ experienced in the last Congress, we had, Madam Speaker, very few bipartisan votes because it was the bills that came to the floor that encouraged a lack of bipartisanship. As a matter of fact, it encouraged partisanship, to keep us divided. And that is not what Americans asked for. They didn't say, hey, Congressman, I am sending you to Washington, D.C. to be a partisan. I am sending you to Washington, D.C. to make sure that we have accountability; to make sure that we are fiscally responsible; to make

sure that we hopefully move in a new direction when we need to move in a new direction.

And I am so happy today, with this whole Accountability in Contracting Act, that there were 347 votes in the affirmative. Madam Speaker, I am more concerned about the 73. How do they go back home and say, well, I don't believe in accountability in contracting; I'm against that. You know, I would think that the folks that did vote against this very good piece of legislation are probably going down the line of saying that I am committed to being a partisan, because it wasn't my idea or it wasn't their idea. Well, the good thing that I am excited about, because I am not going to focus on the individuals who decided not to vote for it, I am going to focus on the 119 Republicans that did vote for it and the 228 Democrats that did vote for it. Every last Democrat that was voting on that bill voted in the affirmative because it was the right thing to do. And I commend the bipartisanship, and we will continue to talk about that.

Whistleblower protection, we talked about that yesterday, such a good vote. I am going to say it again, Madam Speaker: 331 voting in the affirmative. Bipartisan, the House. The majority of the House voted to protect whistleblowers.

Mr. RYAN, someone is in there in an office somewhere here in Washington, DC, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, or in a regional office in Atlanta and come to work every day saying that this is not the way we should be doing things. This is against the law. That individual will be protected once we get it through the legislature, once we get it through the Senate and hopefully to the President.

But what I am more concerned about, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. RYAN, is that the President has already said of these accountability measures that we are passing that he is willing to veto three out of four of them.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. There is a surprise.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Which is very interesting. I don't know of the 73 that voted against it today, if that is going to be the basis for saying that that is the reason why I am going to veto it, because 73 Members of the House voted against it. But neither be here nor there, I am glad that we are here in the majority, Madam Speaker. We have been in the minority, but we still have not allowed the majority to get to our heads or to our heart.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I will yield, but I was just making a wonderful point. I will yield, Mr. RYAN, if you want me to yield.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Okay, make your point.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We are not letting it get to our heads or our heart or the reason why we are here in the first place.

And the reason why the 30-something Working Group continues to come to the floor, Madam Speaker, because some folks thought, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, this is just a minority project. Oh, they are in the minority, they want to go to the floor, they want to talk about what's wrong, they want to talk about what they will do if they ever get in the majority, and that will be it. Well, guess what? We are here in the majority celebrating the fact that we are doing the things that we said we would do. I mean, that is a paradigm shift in Washington politics: you run for office and you come here and you actually do what you said you were going to do. And now that is being carried out.

We have always said some of our friends on the other side of the aisle wanted to be a part of good government, 6 in '06, implementing the 9/11 Commission. We were able to get 299 votes with 68 Republicans voting with us on that. Raising the minimum wage, we were able to get 315 votes with 82 Republicans voting with us. Funding on enhancement of stem cell research, H.R. 3, 253, with 37 Republicans, on and on and on. And the reason why that is happening is not because Republicans all of a sudden say, hey, I want to vote with Democrats and I am going to be bipartisan. They are voting because they always wanted the opportunity, Madam Speaker, to vote for good legislation.

Back home, I am going to tell you right now, there are Republicans that are saying I wanted the 9/11 recommendations to be fully implemented to protect America. They don't care who is the leader of the Republicans in the House and who is the leader of the Democrats in the House. They want to be secure. And those Republicans that voted with Democrats to implement every last one of those 9/11 recommendations did so on behalf of their constituents.

So we come to the floor to talk about bipartisanship. We come to the floor because we have always said bipartisanship can only be allowed, Madam Speaker and Members, if the majority allows it; and we are allowing it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much to my good friend.

First, let me say that that is a beautiful orange and blue tie, Mr. RYAN, an excellent choice of colors, and coincidentally, the colors of my alma mater which, by the way, is playing in the NCAA tournament beginning tomorrow night. And who will be at the White House to celebrate the national championship in football? But I digress.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I didn't get invited to the White House.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And we can talk another time about which team our team defeated in order to get there, Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think we have gotten through that.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Anyway, to get back to the matter at hand,

Mr. MEEK referred to the fact that the 30-something Working Group was probably expected to shrivel up and die, to blow away after we won the majority, to just not re-emerge because one might think that there was no point in our continuing to exist. However, because the United States Congress and because we believe Democrats are responsible in the leadership of this Congress for accountability, we absolutely need to make sure that we use multiple facets of opportunity available to us to hold people accountable.

We had an opportunity the last number of years to use this forum to hold our good friends on the other side of the aisle accountable, yet we still need to hold this administration accountable. And Lord knows that they certainly need it, as they continue to demonstrate every single day.

And I just want to move on a little past the whistleblower act and the 104 hearings that we have had on this war in Iraq that have been scheduled since we took over the leadership of this Congress to the Attorney General, the U.S. Attorney firings that occurred in the last 10 days or so.

I just came from a House Committee on the Judiciary meeting in which we adopted legislation that will ensure that we reassert the Congress', on the Senate side, role in confirming U.S. Attorneys and restore the check and balance that used to be in place before a provision was inserted in the dead of night by the Republicans in the conference committee without any committee reviewing it whatsoever. They completely changed the way the U.S. Attorneys were confirmed. They politicized that process without any Member being able to have the opportunity to debate it in the light of day.

And clearly we can see as a result of the actions of Attorney General Gonzales and the fact that he has chosen to throw a staff person under the bus rather than have the buck stop with him, seems to be a pattern in this administration, i.e. Scooter Libby. We need to make sure that Congress reasserts our oversight role, and that is exactly what we just did in the Judiciary Committee.

But let's just recap what happened with the U.S. Attorneys. Eight U.S. Attorneys were fired. Now, the U.S. Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President, and we certainly don't deny that. However, when asked, when an inquiry was made, as is the Congress' responsibility, as to why those eight U.S. Attorneys were fired, the answer that we got was, well, the eventual answer we got was that it was performance related. Well, of course the eight U.S. Attorneys took umbrage at that and some of them came forward and suggested that there were actually some lawmakers, our good friends on the other side of the aisle specifically, that called and inquired about the progress of cases against Democrats in their jurisdiction. And then coincidentally, a few weeks later those that had

gotten called that weren't responsive enough seemed to have been let go.

Now, in the wake of all of this, in the wake of the Attorney General being less than factual in front of a committee of this body and in the wake of the clear difference in what he said and what actually happened, you have the chief of staff to the Attorney General who has resigned. Last week you had another individual responsible for overseeing the U.S. Attorneys resign. Now, they say that he was on his way out anyway.

But it is time, and thank God we are able to now exercise Congress' oversight role and make sure that we have some fairness, make sure that we have justice administered in the way that Americans expect it to be, and that we are not politicizing the Department of Justice or the legal process that U.S. Attorneys oversee in each of their jurisdictions. Without us pointing that out, it would normally have just been swept under the rug. The administration would have just tried to ride it out and weather the storm. But now that we have a Democratic Congress, they can't do that anymore.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That just happened.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That just happened. And it is funny how the chiefs of staff are dropping like flies, first the Vice President's, and now the Attorney General's.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, if you would yield. I mean, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, we were just talking just the other day about outing CIA agents; we were just talking about it. And in the last Congress folks were like, why are you all speculating? We are not speculating, I mean, someone is not telling the truth. Now a court of law said that people did know certain things. And you are right, Mr. RYAN, I mean, the most endangered job, especially if you are on the other side of the aisle, is to be chief of staff. Now people are looking at the chief of staff in a different way than they have done before in the past.

□ 1615

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If I can make a point.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Make that point.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The Attorney General's office, with all these problems, let's think about the role and the mission of the Attorney General's office in the post-9/11 era. We now have Senators calling the current Attorney General not up to the job, I think was the phrase, he is not up to the job, and the other comments that those folks have made.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. They actually went farther than that. You have a former Chief of Staff of the White House, a U.S. Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. SUNUNU, who said, "I think the Attorney General should be fired," period, dot, in the words of Mr. MEEK.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The thing is, this has been going on for a long time, and it's not until now where the threat of oversight looms, like impending danger.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I know Mr. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ will be returning soon, but while we have two high level members of the House Appropriations Committee on the floor at the same time, since you share with me how important the Appropriations Committee is, we need to talk about what's going to happen next week, because I think it's important that the Members understand that we are carrying out a great mission here.

On Tuesday, I know the House will meet at 10:30 for morning business, and we will consider suspension bills, what have you, but we are going to have on the floor next week H.R. 1227, which is the Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act. That is going to resolve many of the issues that gulf coast States and States in the future will face, and will allow us, allow the Federal Government to work in an appropriate way versus an inappropriate way of not being prepared for the needs of the American people.

Then on Wednesday we are going to deal with U.S. troop readiness and accountability act, the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act. Mr. RYAN, you and I were talking about this yesterday, and you were marking it up, or you have marked it up in the Appropriations Committee.

I think it's important that we share with the Members, as they break to go home back to their districts, that the real story within this bill is that it has accountability, that it is protecting the troops in a way that the Department of Defense has said that they should be protected, using their own rules and regulations for readiness.

Now, what does that mean? That is to assure, Mr. RYAN, as you mentioned yesterday, that they have what they need when they go into theater, that it is already there before they get there. They have things that are simple like Kevlar vests, up-armored vehicles, to make sure that they have appropriate downtime before they are put back into the theater. These are Department of Defense regulations. These are not regulations that we came up with here in Congress, this is Department of Defense regulations. So we took those regulations and put it into this legislation.

Looking at holding the Iraqi government to the benchmarks that the President spoke about, when he spoke of his escalation on plan, it's holding the President and also the Iraqi government accountable for benchmarks as it relates to continued funding. Also, I mentioned the strategy of redeployment of U.S. troops by 2008. I think that is very important.

Yesterday I read some poll numbers, Mr. RYAN, that the American people are far ahead of the Bush administra-

tion on this issue. Guess what, we are helping the American people make sure their message makes it into law, makes it into this great emergency supplemental that has teeth in it and that has benchmarks for accountability and fiscal responsibility.

Also, when we look at refocusing military efforts on Afghanistan and fighting terrorism, it's in the bill. What is also in the bill is expanding funding for veterans health care and hospitals. Our track record is clean on this, \$3.6 billion went into veterans health care prior to the Walter Reed story breaking, prior to this emergency supplemental, and the continuing resolution that we passed almost a month ago.

If we can talk a little bit about this legislation, the legislation is coming up next week, but talk about the significance, not only of housing for individuals who are in gulf coast areas, but also the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act. You all just had a great discussion on it today.

Can you share it with the Members so they know exactly what they are voting on next week? You know, in the 30-Something Working Group, we hate to see Members that don't fully understand what they are voting on, because when they go back home and a veteran walks up to him and says, Congressman, Congresswoman, why didn't you vote for additional funding for veterans health care, or when they go to a military base, a Reserve unit, National Guard or Active duty, and they say, well, Congressman, Congresswoman, why are you putting me back into the theater and I just left the theater 120 days ago? That is against Department of Defense regulations.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Can I share a story with you? I know I have shared this with you before, but I think it's worth repeating.

Right before we debated the Iraq war resolution a couple of weeks ago, I took the opportunity to go to Walter Reed and visit our wounded soldiers, had a chance to meet with six or eight of the finest young men that I have ever encountered. One of them was a young man who suffered from an inexplicable illness and was recovering at Walter Reed.

When I met him, his wife and his 6 year-old little boy were there. The gentleman explained to me that he had been in the middle of his third tour of duty, and he had a 6 year-old little boy. Each tour was 1 year, 1 year.

Now, if you do the math, that means that he missed half of his little boy's life. The overwhelming sadness that came over me was almost too much to bear. I mean, this little boy was so sweet, his wife was so understanding, they were so committed to his dad's service, her husband's service. The little boy said to me, just spontaneously, you know, as 6 year-old little boys are, I have a 7 year-old little boy so I know, he spontaneously burst out, he knew

his dad was supposed to finish his tour in August, and he was going to come home forever in August. We forget this is about families and people, and we are destroying the fabric of these families.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I have to run to the whip's office for an important meeting. I am a member of the Ways and Means Committee. Maybe you all will get a call. I know you are all important, you may get a call as members of the Appropriations Committee to go to the Democratic whip, office of the majority whip, but let me just say this very quickly, the men and women in uniform are standing by for us to sling-shot them in. They want us to stand up for them.

Mr. RYAN, I told you the other day a great Ohio saying, you have to have these sayings in Washington, D.C. and in politics, where they said that we have to remember that the field mouse is fast, but the owl can see at night. It's important that every Member of the House remember why we are here in the first place. People voted for us, you mentioned families, people voted for us to stand up for them, not stand up for a political party or to stand up on behalf of, oh, well, my President is in the White House.

Guess what, the President is the President for the entire country. I don't say your President, he is my President too. When we have issues such as this and we have supplementals, the President said we had a nonbinding resolution, it's nonbinding.

Guess what, this is binding. For folks who are looking for a binding document, this will be a binding document with accountability measures. I hope the two of you as members of the Appropriations Committee can go into it further, because we do have some Members that are on the fence, and we want those Members to vote on behalf of the continuing emergency supplemental so that the troops get what they need. They want us to stand in for them. They want to make sure that we make sure that we sling-shot them in for a win for a change, and this is on behalf of the men and women in uniform, our veterans have been waiting for them.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, there is no better way to support the troops than this supplemental bill that just passed out of our committee, and it will be on this floor next week. If you want to talk about sling-shooting the troops in, what we have done, and the Democratic leadership, and Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OBEY has been absolutely phenomenal as to what we have been able to do; \$1.7 billion more than the President's request for defense health care. I don't know how you could vote against us; \$450 million for post-traumatic stress disorder; \$450 million for traumatic brain injury care and research; \$730 million to prevent health care fee increase for our troops; \$20 million to address problems at Walter Reed, and almost \$15 million for

burn care; another \$1.7 billion in addition to the President's request for veterans health care, \$550 million to address the backlog in maintaining VA health care facilities, which has been a huge problem; \$250 million for medical administration to ensure sufficient personnel to support the growing number of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans who are coming back so that they can have the level of service that they need.

Now it's one thing to say you support the troops and then you turn around and you vote against a bill that has \$4- or \$5 billion in it to support the veterans and the troops coming back. It seems quite apparent to me that this is something that we need to do.

Believe me, nobody wants to get out of war faster than me. I want to be out this afternoon, tomorrow morning. Let's come back. This has been foolish to begin with, but there is a certain reality on logistical needs and diversity in the country of how we should do this.

So what we have done today was create a real framework for our kids to come back home, to let the Iraqis stand up, and put these benchmarks. I just want to talk for a minute about what these benchmarks are. Some people say, well, you are tying the President's hands, you are trying to micromanage more. We are not. That is not true.

The facts of the matter are these, the President and the Pentagon have benchmarks. So how many Iraqi troops need to be trained, what does the political situation need to look like? Have they achieved their political and military benchmarks that have been set by the President? All we are saying is that you have to show some progress towards those benchmarks by July.

Now, granted, we have already been in this war longer than we were in World War II. So by July you better show some progress as to meeting the benchmarks. If you are not showing progress, we will begin to redeploy out.

But if by July you are showing some progress, you will then have until October to actually meet the benchmarks. If you don't meet them by October, we redeploy. If you do meet them by October, we redeploy, because you have met the benchmarks.

This is just bringing this war to a reasonable end. What we have done today, I think the end is in sight.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am so glad that you went through those benchmarks and stressed that these were the President's benchmarks that we used. The President, on January 10, outlined the benchmarks for success, that he felt were imperative that we need.

Those were that we must give the United States the authority to pursue all extremists, we must rein in the militias and have Iraqis step up to the plate to enforce security. They have to decide how their oil revenues are going to be distributed. That is a very important benchmark that has to be accom-

plished, and they have to pass reconciliation initiatives to keep their country together. Their country is essentially about to fall apart. They are in the midst of civil war and are absolutely at the breaking point.

Besides those benchmarks that we had in that supplemental that we passed out of the Appropriations Committee today, and besides the incredibly necessary emergency funding that the troops need and that our veterans need, we also put provisions in that legislation to make sure that our troops can catch their breath.

I referred to that soldier who I met in Walter Reed, whose little boy just wanted him to come home, and who had missed half his little boy's life. We have soldiers, many, many soldiers, who have completed three tours of duty, are about to go on their fourth, who are deployed for 365 days and then that deployment is extended.

The language we put in that bill ensures and says to the Army that they need to make sure that those deployments are not beyond 365 days.

□ 1630

The President can waive that provision by submitting a report to Congress detailing why that unit's deployment is in the interest of national security. But that is the kind of accountability that we are inserting to protect our troops, to make sure that the President certifies that that deployment, that extension is absolutely essential to protect national security, despite the assessment that the unit is not fully mission capable.

Our readiness is shot. We are spread so incredibly thin, and we are talking about the impact on human beings' lives.

How about the length of deployment? The language in our bill requires the Defense Department to abide by its current policy and avoid extending the deployment of units in Iraq in excess of the 365 days. We have to make sure that those units are fully mission capable, and the time between deployments is essential as well.

The Defense Department would be required to abide by, again, its current policy and avoid sending units back into Iraq before troops get the required time out of the combat zone and training time, 365 days for the Army, and 210 days for the Marines. And the President can also waive that provision in the interest of national security. He just has to certify to Congress that that is the case.

And that is the kind of accountability that the American people insisted upon on November 7. They asked us for a new direction, in the 6 in 2006 items of our agenda that we have already passed, and they insisted that we move this war in a new direction so that there would be an end in sight, so that the President would no longer have a blank check, and so that we could make sure we could protect our men and women in uniform who are

protecting us. And I would be happy to yield to the gentleman. And I am going to have to take my leave of the gentleman because I have constituents that are in town that I need to speak with. I look forward to you carrying on.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I look forward to the old team being back down here. And I just want to continue as to what we are doing to try to fix this problem.

As I said, with the benchmarks and making sure the Iraqi soldiers stand up, but a key component of this, as Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ has just mentioned is that we are saying that our troops can't leave here, the United States, and go to Iraq if they don't have the requisite level of equipment and training. And I don't think there is anybody in the country who would want to send one of our soldiers or lots of our soldiers off to war knowing, and the legal term is *mense rea*, you know, with intent, send kids that don't have the proper equipment and training.

And the training part is something that Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was just talking about. We have a readiness crisis in the Army. We are not capable now of handling another situation, military situation.

Now, I think if you would ask the American people are we overstretched, they would all say yes. And if you talk to the military families, they say, yes, we are overstretched to the point where we have kids in battle who don't have everything that they need. And that is unacceptable. And so in our supplemental bill, we are saying that if you don't have the training and the equipment and the proper amount of rest, you are not going.

Now, we put a waiver in there so that the President could waive it if there is a national security interest involved. But we don't like it. I know I don't like it. I shouldn't speak on behalf of everybody.

But the bottom line is, the President is the President. He is the Commander in Chief. He won the election in 2004. So we are left to deal with the situation.

And if you look at some of the polling in the country, 76 percent of Americans favor requiring U.S. troops returning from Iraq to have at least 1 year in the U.S. before being redeployed. That is a Gallup poll. Seventy-seven percent favor requiring U.S. troops to come home from Iraq if Iraq's leaders fail to meet promises to reduce violence there. And 76 percent of the American people don't think the Bush administration has done everything they could reasonably be expected to do to care for the needs and problems of veterans.

But the bottom line is the American people want accountability, and the American people want to change course. You don't see the kind of tidal wave election that we had in November without a message that comes with it. And the message is, we need to change direction. And the Iraq supplemental bill that passed out of the Appropriations Committee today and will pass

off the floor next week is that change in direction.

Is it everything all of us want? No. Are there things in there that we don't like? Yes. But we have to change direction in this war. It is not going well.

And you talk to the families and, you know, as a Member of Congress, I have made the phone calls, other Members of Congress have made the phone calls to parents. We have been to the funerals, and it is not good. And quite frankly, I don't want to go to any more. But I found out yesterday that I have got to go to another one.

This war has got to end, and it has got to stop. And what we are doing is the quickest way for us to go about bringing a reasonable, thoughtful end to this war, and that means getting our troops out of the middle of a civil war in Iraq.

There are only 2,000 al Qaeda members in Iraq. The war on terrorism needs to move back to Afghanistan, the country that harbored Osama bin Laden. And in this bill there is 1.2 billion additional dollars from the President's request to focus back on Afghanistan, because now Afghanistan, we are starting to lose our way in Afghanistan now because of the lack of focus.

So I think it is very important that the American people recognize what is in this bill. There are benchmarks there that the Iraqis need to meet. And if they don't begin to meet them and show some progress, we start moving out.

We have had 4 years for them to get their stuff together. And for whatever reason, they haven't. And I think, contrary to what some of my friends on the other side have been saying, and the President has said, and people who have kids and everything realize this, this is very basic, that the President is saying, well, if you give them a benchmark, then they are just going to wait us out, and then we leave, and then they will take over, like everything is great right now, and then it will get bad. But it is bad right now.

What we are saying is if we communicate to the Iraqis that we are going to stay there indefinitely, then they will never get their stuff together because they are always relying on us. And what we are saying is, we are not going to be there indefinitely; you better start getting along with each other.

And I hate even saying that because I didn't want this war to happen in the first place. Now we broke them and now we are saying, get your stuff together.

But the bottom line is this, we are where we are, and they need to get together. And the political and religious factions need to get together. And if they don't, we need to leave. And if they do, we need to leave.

I think we have spent enough money, 400, going to be \$500 billion in Iraq. \$500 billion. And 3,100-plus lives, 20-some thousand soldiers who have been amputees, brain injuries, post-traumatic stress disorder. Enough is enough.

Enough is enough. It is time to bring this war to an end. And that is what our supplemental ultimately does.

And so, in closing, I would just like to say, Madam Speaker, that the last 3 weeks we have had hearings in our Labor, Health and Education Subcommittee, and we have had great people testifying on health care in the United States, education in the United States, very interesting stuff. But there are two things that have really hit home to me as I was sitting through these committees with all these experts.

And we had the education experts saying to us that this may be the first generation of Americans who will not have the standard of living or improved standard of living, compared to that of their parents. That was one hearing.

And then the next hearing came in and it was the health care experts. And the health care experts were saying that this generation may be the first generation of Americans that do not exceed the life expectancy level of their parents because of the crisis that we are having in health and obesity in the United States. Literally, your parents may, if you are a kid, your parents may live longer than you live. First time.

And when you look at the money that we are spending to destroy and to kill, as opposed to the money that we spend to create and to build up, it is tragic. It is tragic. And I hate voting for this stuff, but we have to because we have got to get out of there.

But the bottom line is this, we are spending hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars, and the Head Start program that helps kids get off the ground is being cut by \$100 million in the President's budget. We are going to fix that. That is not going to end up that way.

But when you look at we are spending hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars and flatlining funding on programs like Gear Up and TRIO that help young kids get into colleges and that we are not covering enough kids with children's health care, I hope we all remember this when we get through this war and it is time to make the proper investments in our country.

We only have 300 million people in this country. China has 1.3 billion. India has 1 billion. We need everybody on the field playing for us.

Let's put this war to an end. Let's bring our kids home with dignity, and make sure that when they get home these veterans have the proper health care that they need and that they deserve, and then let's start making some investments into this country so that we can be the best that we can possibly be.

Madam Speaker, you can e-mail us at 30somethingdems@ mail.house.gov, or visit us at www.speaker.gov/30something and comment. All of the charts that were seen here are on display on the Web site.

And with that, we conclude our 30-something for the week, and we will see you next week.

VACATING SPECIAL ORDER OF MR. POE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas). Without objection, the 5-minute speech of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is hereby vacated.

There was no objection.

PROSECUTION OF BORDER PATROL AGENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, this afternoon I want to discuss criminal cases, three criminal cases that have occurred in these United States. All three of these criminal cases have to do with law enforcement officers that were prosecuted by the Federal Government for alleged crimes that they committed on the southern border with Mexico. And I want to discuss the facts of each of these cases so that we have a clear understanding on what has occurred on the border and the border war with Mexico, and how our Federal Government is so relentless in prosecuting the border protectors and not prosecuting those who come across the border illegally.

The first case has to do with the Border Patrol by the name of David Sipe. David Sipe patrolled the Texas/Mexico border down in what is called the McAllen area. Pinedas, Texas, is exactly where it occurred. That is on the tip of Texas, on the Gulf of Mexico that borders Mexico.

In April of 2000, he was on patrol, as he did for many years, as a Border Patrol agent. And a sensor goes off on the border. What that means is that people are coming across the border without permission, illegals, if we can use that phrase.

David Sipe goes to the area where the sensor goes off and he sees 12 to 15 illegals coming across the border. Agent Sipe orders them to stop.

Now, first of all, Madam Speaker, we have one patrolman and 15 illegals. It takes quite a law enforcement officer to have the courage to stop that many people coming into the United States. But he did so because that was his responsibility.

Three of those illegals, however, ignored Agent Sipe and ran into a brushy area there on the Texas/Mexico border. He caught those three individuals. And one of those individuals who was illegally in the country, a Jose Guevara, attacked Border Agent Sipe. And according to Border Agent Sipe, Guevara was going for the agent's weapon while he was being attacked by this illegal.

So Agent Sipe pulled out a flashlight. It is not just a little flashlight that we