

would even bring it down even more if we were to do it now.

I say all of that, Mr. Speaker and Members, that as we start looking at alternative fuel, as we start looking at what Big Oil should be doing versus trying to say this is the last day of school, let's get more leases and push this kind of drill thing as though that's the answer—because if that was the answer, we wouldn't be at over \$4 a gallon that individuals are paying for gas. If you are fortunate enough to have a Pontiac Grand Prix, it costs \$62.74 for you to fill it up, leave alone someone that may have a Honda Accord. An Accord, it costs \$68.26. If you happen to have a Chevy Impala, lucky enough to have one, \$62.73 and \$2,798 a year.

A Chevy Suburban, many small businesses have to be able to move around big loads. You have \$124 at the pump, some \$4,391 that one may spend a year. A Ford Escape costs \$60.88 to be able to fill up, and many small businesses have Ford F10 trucks that cost \$113.83 to be able to fill that up.

I think that's important. For those individuals who are paying through the nose right here, right now understand what it means.

I'm going to close with this. A lot of air travel. A lot of people want to take trips this summer. Cannot take those trips, cannot reunite with family, cannot go on that business trip that they needed to go on to be able to keep that small business going because of the prices of flying on airlines right now, leave alone trying to take something with you. You get to the airport, now that's \$35, sometimes \$50, sometimes \$100 to carry a bag on the plane to check it, to get on the plane.

You better get some water because if you're trying to get water on the plane, that's \$5, leave alone a bag of mixed nuts or some sort of potato chips. They even sell them now, I mean it's almost like \$10 a pack, okay. Leave alone the price of the ticket.

And what we find out from the chairman of Transportation, if we were to go into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, it would be a \$10 drop in the price per barrel of oil as a result. It would save \$420 million per year for Northwest Airlines. You got folks getting laid off because folks walking around here talking about drilling only and not talking about some of the things we could do now to be able to save this economy.

It would bring about also a \$840 million saving per year to United Airlines, a \$900 million savings for American Airlines, another airline that's laid off thousands of people.

So when we look at this, we're looking at what we're paying because of the inaction of the White House. All we can do is put pressure on the White House. We ask our friends on the other side to join us on that. Some have. We're asking for more to do so. We're asking for the American people to not only work in a way of moving in a more greener way, but we also want to incentivize you in doing that.

Mr. Speaker, with that, it's always a great honor to come before the House. I'm glad that Mr. ARCURI joined me for a short while tonight, and we want to thank not only the Democratic leadership but all the Members of Congress that are about the solution as it relates to these gas prices, as it relates to moving in the direction, a new direction we look at in alternative energy; and it will be a brighter day not only for this country but also as it relates to the whole military issue that I will talk about the next time we come to the floor. I'm talking about what the military spends, which is the largest consumer of energy and which may save fuel on the face of the earth when it comes down to one entity.

With that, we yield back the balance of our time.

#### GREAT AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States Congress.

All of this subject matter that we have before us, we have weighty decisions here before this Congress. As we prepare to go forward into a Presidential election, these issues come more and more to the focus.

But also I know that while we are deliberating on our intense issues that will set the destiny of America, we have great Americans that have served in this Congress that have helped set the destiny and direction of this country as well. And as we move towards those dates, it's important that we recognize those people.

One of those folks that is among that group I'm talking about is with us here tonight, Mr. Speaker, and that's the gentleman from California, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, a brave patriot in his own right.

I would be happy to yield so much time as he may consume to Mr. DUNCAN HUNTER of California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I'm ready to give him more time with that wonderful introduction, one that I don't deserve. But I thank the gentleman.

I asked Mr. KING to let me take a little time from his time tonight to talk about a couple of wonderful individuals. The first person I would like to mention is, of course, a lady who has been a wonderful representative from my office for many years in Imperial County, which was a big part of my congressional district for many years, and that's Carole Starr. And Carole Starr, when I got my congressional district moved out to Imperial County from San Diego County and went literally all the way from the Pacific

Ocean to the Colorado River to Arizona, taking in the entire Mexican-California border, I found that I had a brand new constituency. It's a lot like the gentleman's from Iowa.

I had a large farming constituency, a community in Imperial County with people of great character and people with lots of issues that were vastly different than the issues of folks who live in San Diego, but also people with a wonderful sense of patriotism. In that big valley, Imperial Valley, we had the Naval Air Facility where the Blue Angels train in the wintertime, and where we now have one of the best training grounds of any location in the United States. We're adjacent to the big Chocolate Mountain Gunnery Range, and an airplane or a group coming from any part of the United States to train can get up there and train 365 days a year in that good desert air.

We also have that wonderful farming constituency, probably the most productive land in the world, acre-for-acre, under irrigation from the Colorado River. It's a place where we have lots of people with great character. And communities like Brawley and El Centro and Calexico and Imperial and lots of other wonderful communities in Imperial County.

Running that entire county for our office was a wonderful lady named Carole Starr. I lost the Valley a few years ago, Imperial Valley, in redistricting, but Carole Starr was such a fantastic person, and today is quite ill, she's under the weather right now and is home resting in Imperial County with a very difficult ailment. But I just thought it would be important to take the floor and talk about Carole for a minute because she was such a big part of our operation in Imperial County and such a wonderful leader in that county.

□ 2230

You know, I had a pretty full office in San Diego County and usually seven or eight folks there in the office. Carole Starr ran the Imperial County office all by herself, and whether you were a person of means in Imperial County, or if you just hitchhiked in and just came in off of the freeway off-ramp, you could walk into our congressional office in Imperial Valley Airport in Imperial and knock on that door, and Carole Starr would greet with you with a smile and say, "How can I be of service to you?"

And Carole weathered all these very difficult issues that we had, from the carnal bunt disease that took down our green crop one year, to the myriad problems with the Colorado River, the desalinization plant there at Yuma, the ongoing water struggles that always engulfed California politics, and of course, all of the day-to-day work that you find in any congressional office where you have folks that need to get that Social Security check or make sure that they get that particular veterans' service or have some help with the IRS.

Anybody could walk in Carole Starr's door, and they would be greeted with great professionalism, a warm smile, and a "How can I help you" attitude, and I always called Carole Starr the "Star of the Valley."

And you know, over the years, Mr. Speaker, when I would visit Imperial Valley with my family, and especially my two boys, Duncan and Sam, Sam started out when we got Imperial County. Really, he had just been born. He was a brand new baby, and over the years, he grew, and one of the things that we did many times when we were in Imperial Valley was we would always match up Carole, who stood about five three, with Sam. And Carole always wanted to see how fast he was growing and try to estimate when he would surpass her height.

I know one time, back when DICK CHENEY came to Imperial County to work with me on some of the desert issues, and Carole Starr would always do a back-to-back with my son Sam to see how much he had grown over the last month or so. And on that occasion—and that was about, oh, I don't know, about 1992 or 1994—in fact, my son Sam Hunter at that point surpassed Carole Starr in height, and of course, he's been growing ever since. He's now about six two.

But Carole Starr was just a warm, wonderful person who had a trademark of directness and honesty and good will. And today, she lies quite stricken by a very severe ailment, and I just hope that God will hold her in the palm of his hand and take care of her and give comfort to her family because Carole Starr represented the very best of our outreach to our community.

And I know every Member of this body has several dimensions to their service. One dimension is what we do here on the House floor and what we do with respect to legislation and bills and the administration, whether it's Democrat or Republican. But the other dimension is how we relate to our constituents in our district, and just like the gentleman from Iowa, we all have about 700,000 folks in our district. And some of them have real pressing problems, and in some cases, we are the last resort for those constituents who have been to Federal agencies and have been turned down or stiff-armed or have no other options, and they come to us.

And sometimes we're able to help them, but we're only able to help them when we have great, wonderful people serving us in our district offices, and Carole Starr, who ran the entire Imperial County—and I called her the "Star of the Desert" because she truly was one of those people with a great, great heart and great professionalism.

Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to mention a couple of other individuals who are very important to me, and I know we've got lots of people retiring this year. We've got a lot of folks that have served here for many years. I just want to mention a couple of people, JIMMY SAXTON and TERRY EVERETT, two great

personal friends and two great servants of this country on the House Armed Services Committee are, in fact, retiring.

You know, JIMMY SAXTON came in, I believe it was in 1982 when he came into office, and I remember he replaced Ed Forsythe. In fact, when he went in to get the obligatory picture taken with then-President Ronald Reagan when he was a candidate for Congress, Ed Forsythe had passed away. And he was that well-known Congressman who had a butch haircut, and he wore a bow tie and was quite well-known on Capitol Hill.

And when JIMMY SAXTON walked up to Ronald Reagan and said I'm running for Ed Forsythe's seat, Ronald Reagan, not having read the Washington Post all that much, said "Go get him," and of course, JIMMY SAXTON said, "I can't do that, he's a decedent, and I'm running for the open seat."

But JIMMY SAXTON started a career in which he represented his Third District in New Jersey so ably, and he worked on environmental matters. He worked on local issues, and he protected those important military bases and gave them their best shot at surviving base closure, which he did very effectively, I might add, and he helped to bring the New Jersey back to New Jersey, that great battleship.

But I think JIMMY's most important work was done in the Armed Services Committee, in that committee and on the House floor. He chaired that very important Subcommittee on Terrorism. He traveled around the world. Every time you found two Green Berets or Navy SEALs or Army Rangers, JIMMY SAXTON was there talking to them, learning what they needed, learning about operations, and then making a difference when we marked up the Defense bill.

And JIMMY SAXTON will be sorely missed. He's now the ranking member on the Air and Land Forces Subcommittee that makes important decisions. To Chairman ABERCROMBIE, he's the ranking member, and he of course is still the JIMMY SAXTON of great diligence who puts in lots of hours, working these important issues.

And I'm going to miss JIMMY SAXTON. He's one of those great public servants who gives so much more to this country than he gets, and he likes it that way.

And he's got a little bit of a back ailment right now. I think that's because he was probably the only guy in the history of New Jersey athletics who was about a 5-foot-9 shot-putter, held the State shot put record as a high schooler, weighing a whopping 160 pounds. And maybe JIMMY SAXTON started out at six two or six three, but right now he's got a little bit of an ailing back because of that great prowess that he had with the shot put.

JIMMY SAXTON is just a great, wonderful person, and he's helped to make the Special Operations that is now so important to war fighting and espe-

cially important to the war on terror, to make our Special Operations effective and to make it not only a leading command in many of the theaters, a command that is to be supported by the combatant commanders in those particular theaters, but also a supporting force when it's necessary.

And the way the Special Operations has laminated and integrated and worked with the line units in our war-fighting theaters has been a real part of the success of the American operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. A lot of that was due to JIMMY SAXTON. He is a guy who can look at an issue, without becoming parochial and without becoming polarized, get all the information and try to make a wise decision, using that great judgment.

And so I'm going to miss JIMMY SAXTON, and more than that, I think this is country going to miss him.

You know, the other guy I'd like to talk about just briefly is TERRY EVERETT. Here's a guy who came from a working background, went to work for a newspaper, was a writer and editor and, finally, a publisher and an owner of a little string of newspapers in Alabama and then ran for Congress and got elected. And TERRY EVERETT is another one of those guys who, like JIMMY SAXTON, has gone right to the heart of national security.

And as the chairman of the Strategic Subcommittee, and also a member of the Armed Services Committee who's on the Intelligence Committee, he has a unique understanding of the importance of space assets and what we have to do with space assets to maintain our economy and our security. And there's probably very few people, if anybody else, in the Congress who understands space as well as TERRY EVERETT.

TERRY EVERETT's not a guy you will find making speeches. He's always the guy with the shortest remarks at the press conference when he attends a press conference. But when you close the doors, when you're working on the Intel Committee or the Armed Services Committee, or a combination of issues that affect both those committees, he's one of the hardest working guys that you will ever see.

It's guys like TERRY EVERETT that make this country's security apparatus run so well. They don't put out a lot of press releases, but they put out a lot of hard work.

And also, TERRY's got that great sense of being able to work with people, gain their trust, find out what the issues are, and then work to resolve those issues. That's so important when you work with lots of intelligence officers, when you work with the Special Operations Command, when you work with the space command, and you have to not only do that but you've got to serve the people back home.

And TERRY also, incidentally, is a master woodworker. I remember I was in his little woodworking studio there at his house in Alabama, and I was going to ask TERRY if I could work on

some cabinets in his woodworking studio. And he said sure, and I looked down and there were some spots of blood on the floor. I said, "What's that?" He said, "Well, that's just where I cut my hand kind of badly with that machine over there." He said, "I leave that blood there just to remind me to be careful." I haven't completed my woodworking course with TERRY EVERETT, but I look forward to that.

So, Mr. Speaker, those are a couple of great individuals who have really made their mark in this House, and they're going to be leaving us. We're sorry to see them go.

And incidentally, another guy who's done a great job on this committee, ROB ANDREWS from New Jersey, also. Great, great, wonderful individual, often was really a center of bipartisan cooperation on important issues. And you know, we'd be sometimes polarizing on the Armed Services Committee, with a Democrat position and Republican position. Most of the time we're bipartisan, but then we'd start to polarize. We'd all kind of wait to listen to ROB ANDREWS because he would look at the issue on the merits. And sometimes he'd come down on one side and sometimes he'd come down on the other, but you knew that his position was always a result of reason and was not necessarily a result of looking over and kind of counting the votes and trying to figure out where his team was going or where the other team was going.

We need folks like that in these difficult, partisan times to bring us together, find that common ground and move the country forward. And I always thought ROB was the very representative of that style that is so important to the success of this House.

So, Mr. Speaker, thanks for letting me take this time. It's always fun to come down and take a big bite out of somebody else's time, and I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for letting me take some of his minutes here. I really appreciate it.

And the gentleman from Iowa, incidentally, is a very wonderful friend and a great colleague and a guy who really has been working this energy issue with great energy and was a wonderful host to those of us who spent our time in Iowa in that Presidential race, including those of us like myself who had rather short-lived campaigns. The gentleman from Iowa was always there, always gracious, always willing to put a group together, and helped to create that great forum that is Iowa politics. I want to thank the gentleman.

And I want to thank him, also, for his great help on the border fence, a very important issue. And he helped to push this bill that we finally got passed in 2006. We got a mandate to build 854 miles of double-border fence, got watered down a little bit by the other body, but we're still constructing. And we've got projects now in Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and California. And the gentleman did a lot of work to make sure that happens.

So I want to thank him.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, I really thank the gentleman from California as I reclaim my time, and I'd be glad to yield however much time might be needed to continue the compliments to myself. I'll be quite as generous with that particular time.

But I want to say, Mr. DUNCAN HUNTER from California is a brave and great patriot and has poured forth his appreciation for many of his colleagues, and I'm sure as the months unfold we'll hear this emerge in many accolades for the accomplishments of DUNCAN HUNTER.

And I want to say as you came to Iowa to campaign for the Presidency, and sometimes it was late nights, and it was often early mornings. And I remember this situation, the night of the straw poll, August 11, 2007, when it was the big test. And everybody had to count their straw polls and votes that came in, and however that shook out, that gave some people momentum, and other people lost momentum. And some people that had momentum had already left the State before the votes were counted.

But I had an early press call to be down to the State Fair on the east side of Des Moines fairly early the following morning. It was a Sunday morning. I arrived there, but I had to wait in line because DUNCAN HUNTER was there with his cowboy hat, and he was already working the State Fair. I don't know if it was before the sun came up, but it was right away in the morning. That's the kind of tenacity that we expect in your successor, and I yield back to you.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank you, and let me tell you, the State Fair in Iowa was wonderful. It was also wonderfully hot. That was a good little scorcher, the State Fair, but man, you had a tremendous State Fair. I've never seen one like it.

□ 2245

So I just want to thank you and all of the wonderful people of Iowa. The great thing about them, they'll always listen to you and they'll let you make your point. And they very much, I think, treasure the fact that they're one of the first primaries in the Nation. And where they point this thing has a lot to do with the final nominations for both parties.

It was a lot of fun. And let me tell you, campaigning in a State where you get to go to a lot of State fairs is not a bad deal. We had a great, great time in Iowa. And also going to the county fairs in the various counties. And I will say that in some counties there's a lot of road between fairs. But the gentleman takes that in stride.

Mr. KING of Iowa. There is that. And we have some county fairs that are larger than a lot of State fairs.

We live our fairs there in the State and we live our politics. And it's all politics all the time, 24/7. And that brings people to where they're paying

attention to the issues and they take it seriously. And we have a statewide conversation going on constantly—over the telephones, the e-mail, over the back yard, in the coffee shop, at the fairs, all the activities that are going on.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman. Thanks a lot for letting me take that time to talk about Carole Starr and TERRY EVERETT and JIMMY SAXTON.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thanks for your comments. I thank, again, the gentleman from California as I reclaim the balance of my time.

I think that my transition, as I watch the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee walk from the floor, I take this over to the subject matter of Iraq and Afghanistan, Mr. Speaker. It's been a little while since we've had intense discussions on that here on the floor.

I would point out, as a matter of refreshment to those who haven't been so focused on our situation, we are a country at war. And we were attacked on September 11, 2001 and we lost 3,000 Americans in those three locations where we were attacked.

The President then launched an offensive in Afghanistan, drove the Taliban out of Afghanistan, and people on that land voted for the first time in the history of man. Ever since Adam and Eve there hadn't been people go to the polls in Afghanistan. That happened fairly quickly; I believe it was about a little more than 1 year from the time that we went in.

And in Iraq, where Saddam Hussein was violating, let me say, the United Nations Resolution 1441—and many others—the decision was made, based upon global intelligence, to go in and remove that tyrant who was killing his own people on a regular basis. He had started a war against Iran, where there were more than 1 million killed. And he had used weapons of mass destruction to destroy thousands of his own country men, women and children.

I have made a number of trips into Iraq. I sat with the chief justice who was on the panel that was lined up to try Saddam. And I asked the chief justice and the other justices, what is the penalty that Saddam is looking at? Now, he was in jail, and no one knew whether he was going to face the death penalty. And one of the other junior judges tried to explain to me, and he said that the penalty that Saddam is facing, well, we have a series of penalties; we have prison terms, we have life without parole—well, actually, he said we have the death penalty, then we have life in prison, and then we have other shorter terms, and it goes on down just like it does in the United States.

And as I watched the chief justice listen to the more junior justice explain that to me—which didn't explain a lot, actually—the chief justice, sitting there with a big white mustache, was tapping his pencil on the table and he wanted to be recognized. And I turned

to him for clarification and he said, Saddam is charged with crimes against humanity. Under Iraqi law, there is only one penalty, and that's death. And that's, ladies and gentlemen, when the world found out that Saddam was actually facing a death penalty. And about a year later then he did meet the end of his rope.

And that was a dramatic time in the history of Iraq. It took the fear away from the Iraqis. They were never sure whether he was going to emerge, whether he would be found not guilty and released onto the streets. They were never sure if he would light up again or reconfigure his Baathist political machine, reestablish his force of tyranny across the country, take over the control of the people and terrorize the Shias, and control the oil again and use that country for his own evil purposes. They knew that Uday and Qusay were dead, but they didn't know that Saddam would not come back until they knew he was dead as well. That changed the dynamics in Iraq. And thousands, in fact, millions of Iraqis are grateful for the sacrifice that's been made by coalition troops, American troops and American taxpayers, who have given up a fair amount of treasure to match a significantly large loss of blood and humanity in that country.

But what do we have today and where are we today and how did we get here? Well, in this Congress, this 110th Congress, Mr. Speaker, when NANCY PELOSI took the gavel—I will not forget that moment in time—and they began, on that side of the aisle, to bring resolutions to the floor in an attempt to unfund the war in Iraq. A whole series of pieces of legislation came raining down in this 110th Congress, directed to the floor, approved to coming to the floor by Speaker PELOSI, forty resolutions to undermine our military effort in Iraq. Forty different resolutions on the floor of this Congress calling for votes, trying to divide us, trying to see where they could find a way where they could squeeze off the resources to our military and ensure defeat, which is what it surely would have done. But we stood up, and we put the pressure back on the other side. And enough Democrats voted with Republicans to save this agenda that so many have sacrificed their lives and their blood for.

When I talk to the soldiers that serve there, and the airmen and the Marines and the Navy personnel, and when I talk to the parents who have lost a son or a daughter, they say, You can't pull us out of this fight. Don't do this to us, please. We're all volunteers. We're all volunteers here to carry out this mission. We want to take this fight away from our children and our grandchildren. We want it done in our time.

They put their lives on the line and they set aside years of their lives, many of them multiple deployments to go over there, 100 percent of them volunteers. Not just for the military.

They didn't just sign up, they knew when they signed up or when they re-upped that the odds were good that they would be deployed into the theater of either Iraq or Afghanistan.

And so they're all volunteers, Mr. Speaker. And they volunteer because they love this country, they understand our history, and they understand that we need to direct its destiny, not people that live in foreign countries, not the people that hate America, but the people that love America are the ones that protect our destiny. They're in uniform, they're in places like Iraq and Afghanistan, they're standing up and defending our freedom, and we need to stand with them.

And so I'm troubled, Mr. Speaker, when I pick up an op-ed, and it was written by the junior Senator from Illinois, the junior Senator who served 147 days in the United States Senate, his only Federal office exposure, until he decided that he wanted to be the President of the United States. That junior Senator has been to Iraq one time, one time almost 900 days ago, but for more than 900 days he said, We've got to get out of Iraq, we've got to get out now, we've got to pull our troops immediately out of Iraq. And the only conditions are leave a rear guard there to guard their backs so they don't get shot in the back on their way out of Iraq. That's what I heard. I heard it not exactly in those words, but I heard that theme over and over again. And it was exactly the words "immediately pull our troops out of Iraq." That's what the junior Senator from Illinois said. That's the position he holds today.

He does understand that to pull 142,000 troops out of Iraq takes a little bit of time. He has said in his op-ed that's printed July 14 in the New York Times that he would consult with commanders on the ground and the Iraqi Government to ensure that our troops were redeployed safely and our interests protected. Well, that's the only consultation he's willing to accept is if somebody else will plan the logistics of the retreat.

And I would remind the body that victory in a war is defined by who's standing on the ground that was fought over when the war is over. It's like a street fight; whoever is standing there on the corner won the fight, and the one whose buddies drug him off or walked or ran away is the one that lost. We all know that. You can't run away from a fight and declare victory. It doesn't work in a street fight, it doesn't work in a battle, and it doesn't work in a war. And you can say what you want to about history, but they're going to write history according to the facts; and the facts will be who was standing in Iraq at the end of the war, not who declared defeat and pulled troops out.

But it is not just tantamount to a declaration of defeat to pull troops out and run away from an enemy, it is a declaration of defeat itself by any measure, by any judgment of history. I

would just remind, again, Mr. Speaker, that we pulled out of Vietnam, "peace with honor," I remember, "peace with honor." And I remember this Congress voting to shut off all dollars to go to the South Vietnamese where they were, by then, trained to defend themselves. And we had made a sacred oath to the South Vietnamese people that we would provide for them all of the military equipment, all the munitions, and all of the air cover that they would need and use to defend themselves. And they were trained and equipped and they had their military squared away to do that. And this Congress passed legislation on an appropriations bill that said, "These monies in this appropriations bill and any monies heretofore appropriated shall be prohibited from being spent to defend any military mission in Vietnam, on the ground of Vietnam, in the skies over Vietnam, in the seas around Vietnam"—North or South Vietnam it actually said—"or in the skies or land around Laos and Cambodia, neighboring counties." They covered it pretty good.

Any money that was in the pipeline was prohibited from being spent to allow the South Vietnamese people to defend themselves. And any money in the Department of Defense appropriations bill would be prohibited from being used to let the South Vietnamese people defend themselves with those resources.

We failed the South Vietnamese people. We gave them a solemn promise and a solemn oath, and we pulled out on them. And this country remembers people hanging on to the struts of helicopters as they lifted off of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, a disgraceful image in the minds not just of patriotic Americans who saw that, sadly, but an image in the minds of people like al Qaeda who are inspired now because we didn't stick it out then.

And I read General Giap's book, the general who is credited with being the mastermind that set up the strategy that historians will describe as the defeat of the United States in South Vietnam. I would argue that we were not defeated there, but we were defeated here on the floor of this Congress. That's the fact of it, Mr. Speaker.

And on page eight of General Giap's book, he writes that he got his first inspiration that they could defeat the United States because we were willing to settle for a negotiated settlement in Korea. Because we didn't press forward for a complete 100 percent total victory over North Korea, he got the sense that we didn't have the stomach to finish a war that we were in. And so he set about with a strategy of the war of attrition, and they lost over 100,000 of their troops, killed in the Tet Offensive in 1968. And Walter Cronkite turned that into a defeat for the United States rather than a victory for our troops that so gloriously defended their positions and their compounds and the

South Vietnamese people. Over 100,000 North Vietnamese troops killed in the Tet Offensive, and Walter Cronkite interpreted that as a defeat for the United States because he didn't know why there were sappers inside the wall but not inside the U.S. Embassy in Saigon.

That's how history turned. History turned because it was redefined by liberal media people, and has since then been redefined by historians. And it's defined this way in the minds of Osama bin Ladin, General Giap, and also people like Muqtada al Sadr. And as I was actually in Kuwait, June 11, 2004, watching al Jazeera TV, Muqtada al Sadr came on and he said—and I was watching the closed caption going underneath the screen, he was speaking, I presume, in Arabic, the closed caption said—and I heard the voice of Muqtada al Sadr, he said, "If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq, the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu."

The inspiration for our enemies doesn't come from some ideology that causes them to rise up and move in a fashion that—they're not seeking a better world or a better life, it's hatred for us. And they think they can defeat us because they believe we're soft and we lack resolve. And they go back and keep score of our history and they say, well, they pulled out of Vietnam, they pulled out of Lebanon, they pulled out of Mogadishu, surely they'll pull out of Iraq. Well, they're dealing with a different Commander in Chief today than who was in charge in any of those circumstances. This time it's George W. Bush who is sticking this out. And I'm sticking it out with him, Mr. Speaker, because he's right. The central battle in this global war on terror is now and has been for a long time Iraq, Iraq, Iraq.

□ 2300

That's changing. It's transitioning over to Afghanistan, perhaps Pakistan, but today it's Iraq, Iraq, Iraq. And we have everything but a sewed-up victory there.

When I look at the statistics that come out of Iraq, it tells me this: that civilian violence is off. It's down by about 80 percent from its peaks. Our military casualties are down dramatically as well. There has been 1 week where the accidental deaths in Iraq, 1 by my record so far, where the accidental deaths in Iraq were greater than the combat deaths in Iraq. That means you're getting down to one or two or three for the week. The casualties in Afghanistan have been for the last 4 to 6 weeks roughly equal to or greater than they are in Iraq.

Now, I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you consider this: that we have about 140,000 to 142,000 troops in Iraq; we have about 26,000 troops in Afghanistan. So the numbers work out to be that there are about 5.38 times more troops in Iraq than there are in Afghanistan.

And if the casualties are roughly equivalent in each of the two countries, the casualty rate in Afghanistan is 5.38 times greater than the casualty rate in Iraq. That is a dramatic sea change, Mr. Speaker, in the numbers of casualties within the two countries. And it isn't just because the casualties have gone up in Afghanistan, which they have, but it's because they have gone down dramatically in Iraq.

And the Department of Defense issued a couple of weeks ago sectarian attack statistics. Now, if you remember, we had people like the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who professes to be an expert on these issues, the one who said pull the troops out now, let's cut and run out of there and move them back to their horizon, who said that we had a civil war in Iraq and we had sectarian violence in Iraq and the place was melting down in shambles and chaos and the war could not be won. It was already lost. That from a retired Marine, that we already lost. Well, the sectarian violence, the violence that was described as uncontrollable, unmanageable, and going to get worse, the last report that came from the Department of Defense was sectarian violence, Shias killing Sunnis, Sunnis killing Shias for the sake that they are opposite sects, sectarian violence: zero. No recorded cases of attacks for sectarian reasons. Civilian violence off at least 80 percent, our casualties down to a level below where they are in Afghanistan for the last couple of weeks at least and spanning over the last 6 weeks equivalent roughly to Afghanistan. But the casualty rates in Afghanistan are 5.38 times higher than they are in Iraq.

Now, why is anybody unsatisfied with this? When I kept asking the question: Describe for me, define for me a victory in Iraq. How do you define that victory in Iraq? These folks over here are pretty cagy, Mr. Speaker, because they're not going to define a victory in Iraq. They know that we can achieve that. So they set up these benchmarks, 18 benchmarks for the Iraqis to reach, and if they didn't meet the benchmarks, then they were going to pull the plug on the funding and shut off the support for the troops and bring them all home. That was the strategy. And that was the strategy when General Petraeus came here to Congress—I think it was the 12th or 15th of September last year—and he gave a report on the situation in Iraq. And the junior Senator from New York said, "It would require the willful suspension of disbelief to believe you, General Petraeus." "The willful suspension of disbelief."

Well, look where we are today, Mr. Speaker? Who was telling the truth then? Was it the skeptic that came forward and denied the facts that were in front of her? Was it the general that laid out objectively the circumstances, with proper cautions, with proper caveats, but still with the proper strategy? And he sat down at Leavenworth and

spent months writing the manual, the counterinsurgency manual. And I have that manual, and I have pored through it. I haven't read every word of it, but I have read a lot of the pieces in it. And that strategy was put together, as I sense it, as I read it, from the experience that General Petraeus had in Iraq and other experiences around other locations where he had been deployed, plus a lot of reading, a lot of experience, a lot of activity with other officers.

I remember going to Iraq for the first time in 2003, and I talked to the officers. They didn't know very much about the culture in the Middle East, and they didn't have a lot of books that they'd read about it. And I came home and started to read. I went back to Iraq, and I saw the bookshelves in their offices in places like Baghdad and Fallujah with more books on the Arabic culture, on the Muslim religion, on ways to understand the culture and the religion and the military tactics. We saw our officers start to get up to speed and learn, and they got up to speed and learned. And no one has learned that I can tell any more or any faster than General Petraeus.

And when I read this op-ed in the New York Times, written by the junior Senator from Illinois, who spent 147 days in the Senate and decided he should be the leader of the free world, he writes a few things in here that are quite disturbing. I will just take this kind of from the top. This is his op-ed that says what he is going to learn when he goes to Iraq. Now, this is a classic case of really getting the sequence of things wrong.

Now, I'm a cynical person sometimes. That's what it takes to maintain sanity in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, and I would say that I could name more than one individual in this Congress that decided that they were getting enough pressure from their constituents that they wanted to flip and change their position on the war on terror and particularly the central battlefield of that, which is Iraq. And I can name more than one individual that I believe decided they wanted to change their position, turn against the war, and so they set up a trip to go to Iraq so that they could learn what was going on over there, having already made up their mind that they were going to flip and turn against it. I could name more than one person. I choose not to do that, but I can do that. And they aren't all Democrats either, Mr. Speaker. That is a cynical thing to do. It's a cynical thing to do to come to a conclusion without the facts and then set up a trip so that you can validate the conclusion that you've already come to and come back and say, "Well, here's what I've learned. I've learned that we've got to pull out and pull out now, and since I have been there, I really am convinced of that." That has happened in this Congress multiple times actually from both sides of the aisle.

Well, Senator OBAMA takes it way another level. He goes to way another level, and he decides, I'm going to go to Iraq for the first time in 900 days. For more than 900 days, he has said we're going to pull the troops immediately out of there. And he's already decided what he's going to find out when he gets there. That's not exclusive new. I said I can name some people who have done that, and I think it's cynical and it's wrong. And remember when he said "the audacity of hope"? Now, that's kind of an oxymoron. Hope is not in an active sense. Wishful thinking is what hope is. "The audacity of hope." Well, what about the audacity of declaring to the world what he's going to learn when he gets there in a couple of weeks and putting it in an op-ed in the New York Times and telling us, well, I will go there and I am going to learn what's there, and then here's what I am going to do when I come back after I learn what it is I don't know. He's going to pull the troops out immediately. And he writes in his op-ed, dated the 14th of July: "But the same factors that led me to oppose the surge still hold true."

How does he know that, Mr. Speaker? How can he know that the same factors that led him to oppose the surge, the same factors presumably that led him to oppose our operations in Iraq, still hold true? What factors? What factors has he verified today that he thinks are going to be confirmed when he gets there? And if he already has his mind made up, why waste the jet fuel? Why put those global warming greenhouse gasses up in the atmosphere and fly over to Iraq if you already know what you think? What is going to be validated by his presence there when he already invalidates his own objective judgment by writing the op-ed that tells the world what it is that he wants us to know that he has concluded after he actually goes there but tells us before?

And he says of the Iraqis that the "leaders have failed to invest tens of billions of dollars in oil revenues in rebuilding their own country."

Not so. They are investing now tens of billions of dollars. I know that they were in a situation where they had about \$60 billion in revenue and they were working furiously to get it so that they could get it down and out to the people. And we are getting that revenue out to the people. I met with the mayor of Ramadi some months ago. He sounded like, let's say, the mayor of Altoona: "I need more resources. I can't quite get the bureaucrats out of the way. I've got to build a sewer. We need a water plant. We have got to fix some streets." That's what it sounded like to me. And those are the streets that al Qaeda owned them less than a year before, and we went shopping in downtown Ramadi. It was the center of death for a long time there.

So the Iraqis are investing tens of billions of dollars. But if they weren't, is the punishment for not taking your

tens of billions of dollars and investing it, is the punishment turning your back over to al Qaeda? What kind of a foreign policy is that?

And then we go on and he says: "They have not reached the political accommodation that was the stated purpose of the surge." Well, what is that political accommodation? He does not say. And he doesn't say because he can move that ball of string in front of the kitten again. He can play Lucy with Charlie Brown and the football in the fall, set the ball, and when Charlie comes along, the Iraqis, to make their political accommodations and they get ready like Charlie Brown to kick the football, then Lucy, the junior Senator from Illinois, can say, "Whoops. Nope, that wasn't the target. That was a different political accommodation. I'll tell you what it is if you hit it." Well, you're not going to hit it with this man. He already has his mind made up. No amount of accomplishments, no amount of statistics, no amount of real data on the ground, no amount of sacrifice is going to change his mind because politically he has concluded that it strengthens his hand to, let me say, invalidate the sacrifice of thousands and thousands of Americans who have either given their lives; their limbs; parts of their bodies; their health, mental and physical; their treasure; and years out of their lives. To take that fight from us, to take that fight from our children and grandchildren would all be invalidated because it would strengthen his hand politically. That's the calculus.

So it says here, and again I am reading from this New York Times op-ed dated July 14 by the junior Senator from Illinois, 147 days in the Senate and decided he wanted to be President—it says here in his op-ed: "The good news is that Iraq's leaders want to take responsibility for their country by negotiating a timetable for the removal of American troops."

Well, that's an opinion on an opinion. And my opinion on that opinion is, Mr. Speaker, that the Iraqis are starting to feel their oats a little bit. Yes, we have made a lot of progress, and a very good sign of the progress is that at least politically Prime Minister Maliki needs to say, "I want to negotiate a timetable." That tells me that the Iraqis are building in their confidence, and that's good news.

Two other things that have happened in the last 1½ years that didn't exist before is the Iraqi people understand we are not there for their oil and they understand we are not there to occupy, and that has helped dramatically in helping the Iraqis to make progress moving forward. But "the good news is that Iraq's leaders want to take responsibility for their country by negotiating a timetable for the removal of American troops," he could have chosen his words a little better. That sets a little wrong with me, that word "removal." But what that says is we are succeeding in Iraq. And a year ago, 2

years ago, 3 years ago, 4 years ago, the answer was did all the Iraqis want us to leave? Yes. All of the Iraqis wanted us to leave, just not anytime soon. They wanted to make sure that their country was stable. We have been training troops there for a long time, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know that the junior Senator knows that.

But in any case, the timetable for American troops coming home needs to be set upon the security levels in Iraq, not some arbitrary date. But the dates that are being proposed by the Iraqi leadership are well beyond the date that is in this op-ed that's written by the junior Senator from Illinois. So they are not on the same page. Maybe he doesn't know that because he hasn't gone there for 900 days. And when he sits down and talks to them, and I hope he does, is he going to come back and correct this? I don't think so because he already has his mind up. He has given us a report from Iraq, sent to us a couple weeks before he goes to Iraq. That's kind of being a little bit trigger happy with your op-ed, I would say.

□ 2315

Now here is another piece that I underlined. Obama says, "Only by re-deploying our troops can we press the Iraqis to reach comprehensive political accommodation and achieve a successful transition to Iraqis' taking responsibility for the security and stability of their country. Instead of seizing the moment and encouraging Iraqis to step up, the Bush administration and Senator MCCAIN are refusing to embrace this transition."

Really? If he had gone to Iraq like I have and dozens and dozens of Members of Congress have and thousands upon thousands of Americans in uniform have, he might have been exposed to some of the things I have seen. For example, October 2003, Mosul, Iraq, General Petraeus commanding the 101st Airborne showed us, and this would be about 11:30 at night, he brought Iraqi troops into formation that had been training. And those Iraqi troops stood at attention. And we reviewed the Iraqi trainee troops October 2003. May, 2003, they had elections in Mosul. Liberation took place about the 22nd and 23rd in that area of March 2003. Just a little over a month later, there were elections in Mosul, Iraq, where they elected a governor, a vice governor and other officers there. That was all under the direction of General Petraeus.

And so if you go there, Mr. Speaker, and you witness those things, you understand the reality on the ground is significantly different than the reality imagined by the gentleman who penned this op-ed. And I would continue, by the way, I repeat the statement where he says, the Bush administration and Senator MCCAIN are refusing to embrace this transition to Iraqi security forces providing the security in Iraq. They are the people that invented it, Mr. Speaker. It has been the President and his appointed officers who have

made sure that we had the resources to train Iraqi troops and to get Iraqi troops stood up so our troops could stand down. Do you remember that phrase? When the Iraqi troops stand up, we can stand down. That statement came out over and over again.

And I have met with Iraqi troops across that country over and over again. And sometimes they train pretty good. And sometimes they didn't perform so well. But today, we know they fight well for Prime Minister Maliki. And because of that, the day is coming where we can transition. And we've drawn the surge volume of the troops down now, and we're back to the more stable number of 100,000 to 142,000 troops. We think those numbers will be diminished some more throughout the summer.

But let it be a strategic decision, not a political decision. Politicians don't do a good job of fighting wars. I've described what we did on the floor of this Congress to pull the rug out from underneath the South Vietnamese. I just didn't tell you about the 2 or 3 million who died in the aftermath. That blood is on the hands of the people who didn't keep their promise to the South Vietnamese. And I don't want the blood on our hands for not following through on our mission that we committed ourselves to. Once you engage, you're with the troops 100 percent. You're with the mission 100 percent. You cannot separate the troops from their mission. And it doesn't work to say, I'm for the troops but I oppose their mission. It doesn't work to say, I celebrate our brave troops, but I brought a resolution to the floor, an amendment to try to cut the funding for them. I tried to cut their food, their fuel, their bulletproof vests, M-4s and their Humvees. That is not support. And they need moral support as well as financial support, Mr. Speaker.

And under the next paragraph in his op-ed in the New York Times it says, "It is a strategy for staying that runs contrary to the will of the Iraqi people." Really? How would he know what the will of the Iraqi people is? It helps to go there and find out. You can get somebody in this country to tell you anything you want to hear. And you can repeat it over and over again. When you go there and you see the faces of the Iraqi people and you move among their troops and among their civilians, you get an entirely different idea. You get an idea of gratitude. I have gotten written letters from them where they have profoundly thanked us for the sacrifice of our American soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines. We've given them a lot. We've given them our treasure. And we've given them our sons and daughters. And they're willing to step up to this freedom. We cannot squander it.

This is another comment made by OBAMA in this op-ed to the New York Times. It says, "It is a strategy for staying that runs contrary to the will of the Iraqi people." And moving for-

ward it says, "That is why, on my first day in office, on my first day in office, I would give the military a new mission: Ending this war." That is the definitive statement made by the junior Senator from Illinois: "On my first day in office, I would give the military a new mission: Ending this war."

Regardless of the circumstances on the ground, Mr. Speaker, regardless of how badly we might need to have troops there to stabilize the Iraqi defense forces, regardless of the threat, regardless of the threat across the Straits of Hormuz, Iran and their nuclear efforts and Ahmadinejad's lunatic approach to the world, denying the holocaust, declaring that he wants to annihilate Israel and annihilate the United States, and have him sitting there on one side of the Straits of Hormuz where 42.6 percent of the world's oil supply comes through and take our troops and skedaddle out of Iraq, and hand southern Iraq over to the influence of the Iranians perhaps? Where 70 to 80 percent of the Iraqi oil is? And again, right on the other side of the Straits of Hormuz, on both sides of the Straits is where most of the oil is in Iran, on the east side of the Straits of Hormuz and Iraq on the west side of the Straits of Hormuz, in there is a mother lode of oil. Those oil fields are developed, that oil is coming out of there, and it's coming down the Straits now. And if Iran follows through on their threat to close the Straits of Hormuz, they have a stranglehold on the oil supply for the world. Not only do they have that, but they have a stranglehold on the valve that turns the economy off or on if they choose to do so. And they have threatened to close the Straits. And we have in the past put our Navy in there to keep the Straits open.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the time for the Speaker, NANCY PELOSI from San Francisco, to declare that we should open up our Strategic Petroleum Reserves, dump that oil on the market where we have, I understand, about 2 months of supply in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and use that to drive the price down? What do we do when those reserves are empty and the oil production in the world hasn't gone up, and we haven't developed our energy supplies in the United States? What do we do then? What do we do if Ahmadinejad then closes the Straits of Hormuz after our Strategic Petroleum Reserve is empty and we have taken a dime or so off the gas price in the United States, taken some pressure off the world demand for oil because we wouldn't be quite so much in the market which would give the Chinese a better deal on oil, that would be the strategy that we're working with?

Our national security is at risk. The destiny of this Nation is at risk. And if we pull out of Iraq, if we elect an OBAMA for President, and he follows through on this thing that he is about to learn in a couple of weeks when he goes to Iraq and he has already con-

cluded and he writes in the op-ed, I'm going to editorialize this part, and I will be straight about that, he writes in the op-ed, I'm going to Iraq, and I'm going to learn all this, and I'm going to come back, and these are the decisions I have already made, and I'm going to remake them when I come back. "That is why on my first day in office, I would give the military a new mission: Ending this war." That means get out of Iraq. Pull out immediately. He said it over and over again, leave that blood and treasure there and leave the disgrace of pulling out there, and let the world declare it to be a defeat for the United States. Let al Qaeda use it as a recruiting tool, a recruiting tool for them to pick up terrorists around the world. That is what would happen, Mr. Speaker, if we pull out.

And I do think we're close to where the Iraqis can stand on their own and it is far more stable. But to just simply betray the judgment of General Petraeus before setting foot on the ground that has been liberated by the surge and the people who have given their lives, their blood and their treasure is a disgrace to do. And so I urge this body to urge some of their Presidential candidate to shift his position.

In the meantime, I intend to stand with a man who is an authentic American hero, a man who has served America for every day of his adult life, a man who sat in the Hanoi Hilton for at least 5½ years, that served there with our own great SAM JOHNSON in this Congress, served with the most decorated living American hero who happens to be from Sioux City, Iowa, and a man whom I call a friend, Colonel Bud Day, a Medal of Honor and 69 other medals on down. Those men stand up with JOHN MCCAIN for his service. And they know that that he has character. It can't be challenged. The background of JOHN MCCAIN is a solid background all the way through. And the background that we have, that we follow for the junior Senator for Illinois, we're having trouble finding the place that would give us encouragement that he would have the tools necessary to lead the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I want somebody that stands up for our freedom. I want somebody who has got an attitude of an east Texan serving us in the United States, in the White House. I want somebody with an attitude like President Bush has. Sometimes you have to be a lit bit ornery, a little cussed, a little belligerent and a little bit of an enigma. And that will keep our enemies off of our back and keep them guessing a little bit. But they need to know. Our enemies need to know we're committed to victory. And we're going to stick with victory. And we're not going to let up, that Iraq cannot be our Alamo. And it will not if we send a Commander in Chief that will stand for victory. I would conclude, Mr. Speaker, that America has never elected a President who was for retreat at a time of war. We will not do it again in 2008.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 5 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons due to family matters.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SKELTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, July 23.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, July 23.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STEARNS, for 5 minutes, today.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on July 9, 2008 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 6304. To amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, and for other purposes.

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on July 10, 2008 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 802. To amend the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships to implement MARPOL Annex VI.

H.R. 3721. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1190 Lorena Road in Lorena, Texas, as the "Marine Gunnery Sgt. John D. Fry Post Office Building".

H.R. 3891. To amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act to increase the number of Directors on the Board of Directors of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

H.R. 4185. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11151 Valley Boulevard in El Monte, California, as the "Marisol Heredia Post Office Building".

H.R. 5168. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 19101 Cortez Boulevard in Brooksville, Florida, as the "Cody Grater Post Office Building".

H.R. 5395. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11001 Dunklin Drive in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "William 'Bill' Clay Post Office Building".

H.R. 5479. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 117 North Kidd Street in Ionia, Michigan, as the "Alonzo Woodruff Post Office Building".

H.R. 5517. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7231 FM 1960 in Humble, Texas, as the "Texas Military Veterans Post Office".

H.R. 5528. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 Commercial Street in Brockton, Massachusetts, as the "Rocky Marciano Post Office Building".

H.R. 6331. To amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to extend expiring provisions under the Medicare Program, to improve beneficiary access to preventive and mental health services, to enhance low-income benefit programs, and to maintain access to care in rural areas, including pharmacy access, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 17, 2008, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7580. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the eighteenth annual report on the Profitability of Credit Card Operations of Depository Institutions, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1637 note. Public Law 100-583, section 8 (102 Stat. 2969); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7581. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's Annual Report to Congress on the Presidential \$1 Coin Program, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 5112 Public Law 109-145, section 104(3)(B); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7582. A letter from the Senior Vice President, Office of Congressional Affairs, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the Bank's report on export credit competition and the Export-Import Bank of the United States for the period January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7583. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7584. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7585. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — The Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) Grant Program and Other Federal Student Aid Programs [Docket ID ED-2008-OPE-0001] (RIN: 1840-AC93) received July 8, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7586. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on the

Community Services Block Grant Statistical Report and Report on Performance Outcomes for Fiscal Year 2005; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7587. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification terminating the suspensions pertaining to the issuance of temporary munitions export licenses for exports to the People's Republic of China, pursuant to Public Law 101-246, section 902(b)(2) (104 Stat. 85); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7588. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7589. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification for FY 2008 that no United Nations organization or United Nations affiliated agency grants an official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes, condones, or seeks the legalization of pedophilia, or which includes as a subsidiary or member any such organization, pursuant to Public Law 103-236, section 565(b) (108 Stat. 845); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7590. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Texts of Conventions and Recommendations adopted by the International Labor Conference at Geneva, pursuant to Art. 19 of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7591. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed technical assistance agreement for technical data, defense services, and defense articles to the United Arab Emirates (Transmittal No. DDTC 003-08); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7592. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed agreement for the export of defense articles or defense services to the Government of Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 012-08); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7593. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed license for the manufacture of military equipment to the Government of the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DDTC 045-08); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7594. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding an application for a license for the manufacture of military equipment abroad and the export of defense services, including technical data, and defense articles to the Government of Poland (Transmittal No. DDTC 071-08); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7595. A letter from the Board of Directors, Tusiad, transmitting an analysis of the factual and legal deficiencies of H. Res. 106; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7596. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S., transmitting proceedings of the 108th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Kansas City, Missouri, August 18-23, 2007, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 118 and 44 U.S.C. 1332; (H. Doc. No. 110-