

The IAEA classification of the enclosed declaration is "Highly Confidential Safeguards Sensitive"; however, the United States regards this information as "Sensitive but Unclassified."

Nonetheless, under Public Law 109-401, information reported to, or otherwise acquired by, the United States Government under this title or under the U.S.-IAEA Additional Protocol shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

BARACK OBAMA.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 5, 2009.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

□ 1600

#### CROSS-BORDER CRIME

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about one of the most important things taking place in our country, and that is the battle on the second front. I am not talking about the war in Afghanistan or the war in Iraq, but I am talking about the battle that is fought daily on the southern border of the United States with Mexico and those people that try to come into the United States illegally. I call it the border wars.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about that crime comes into the United States from the south, from all countries, through Mexico. And then we hear that it is not really a problem. Sometimes it is very difficult for us to know exactly what the truth is. It always tends to be based upon who is giving us that information.

Recently, I was down on the Texas-Mexico border. I visited with numerous of our sheriffs and I asked them this question: How many people do you have in your county jail that are charged with crimes in your county? I am not talking about people being held on immigration violations, just people in jail charged with misdemeanors or felonies. And so the different sheriffs gave me the information that I would like to relate to you tonight.

We will start off in far west Texas, in El Paso, a large population. The Sheriff's Department says: About 18 percent of the people in our county jail are foreign nationals in the United States legally, illegally, charged with crimes, misdemeanors or felonies.

You move next door to Hudspeth County, a vast county the size of Connecticut and Rhode Island, not very many sheriff's deputies in that county. Sheriff Arvin West says: 90 percent of the people in my county jail are foreign nationals.

Moving on down the Rio Grande River toward the Gulf of Mexico, Culberson County Sheriff Carrillo, 22 percent. The three next counties, Jeff Davis, Presidio, and Brewster Counties did not have information that they could furnish me, so I will move on down the river and talk about the other ones.

Val Verde County, 39 percent of the people in the county jail are foreign nationals; Kinney County, 71 percent, foreign nationals; Maverick County, 65 percent; Dimmit County, 45 percent; Webb County, that is where Laredo is, 45 percent are foreign nationals; Zapata County, 65 percent; Starr County, 53 percent; Hidalgo County, 23 percent; and then Cameron County, down on the Mexico-Texas border that buttresses the Gulf of Mexico, is 28 percent.

You can make statistics prove whatever you want them to, Mr. Speaker, but those are a lot of people in American jails from foreign countries that have been charged with committing crimes in this country. That is one reason, maybe the primary reason, why we need to protect the sanctity of the border.

We talk about border security. We are spending money on border security. We are sending a lot of money down to Mexico to spend on border security. But the truth of the matter is cross-traveler crime is still being committed, and people are committing crimes in American counties who are foreign nationals, and it is time the United States realize this truth and secure the border.

A lot of these people are charged with drug crimes, the drug cartels, drug runners. Many of those people in our jails are those individuals. We are learning now that there is a new effort to build tunnels into the United States, not just over in California, but in Texas and Arizona, as well, where needed.

So, obviously, the sheriffs in these counties need help, and we need everybody working on the border, all the Federal agencies, the Border Patrol, the ATF, the DEA, we need all of them. Plus, we need the locals who patrol the whole county. Unlike the Border Patrol that only patrols the first 35 miles inland, the county sheriffs patrol the vastness of the county.

So what can they do about it? There are a couple of programs that we need to help the sheriffs be involved in. One of those is they can get from the Department of Defense used equipment, equipment that has been used by our military, and all they have to do is repair it and they can use that equipment. We are talking about Humvees. We are talking about trucks. We are talking about, even, helicopters. They can repair that equipment by sending it to the State penitentiary where those mechanics are that can repair it. They can also buy, at a low price, equipment that has been used occasionally, new or used equipment that is no longer used by our military.

So both of those things, we should encourage the sheriffs departments to use and to get that equipment. Because, you see, Mr. Speaker, the drug cartels have more money, they have more people, they have better equipment than we do on this side of the border, and that is one way we can enforce the security of the border.

We ought to also use the National Guard on the border. The border Governors have requested the use of the National Guard, and we should use the National Guard.

And lastly, Mr. Speaker, I have met with the sheriffs from Brownsville all the way to San Diego, and they are in a group called the Southwest Border Sheriff's Coalition. There is 31 of these sheriffs, and they have asked, through me, to ask the President of the United States to meet with them so the sheriffs can tell the President firsthand what is taking place on the border from Brownsville, Texas, all the way to San Diego, California, and hopefully the President will do that. We need to protect the border. That is the first duty of government.

And that's just the way it is.

#### TOO MANY HAVE DIED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, a recent report from the Associated Press gave us a new and very grim reminder of the human cost of the conflict in Iraq.

According to the A.P., the Iraqi Government has secretly recorded over 87,000 killings since the year 2005. The A.P. also added its own statistics on the known number of deaths between 2003 and 2005.

When you add those numbers, you get over 110,000 Iraqi civilian deaths since the beginning of the American occupation. But, Mr. Speaker, the death toll is even higher than that. The A.P. said that an Iraqi official estimated the actual number of deaths to be 10 to 20 percent higher because of the thousands who are still missing and civilians who were buried in the chaos of war without official records.

Of course, the death toll itself does not measure the full human cost of the conflict. It doesn't include the injured. It doesn't include the children who have been orphaned. It doesn't include the families that have been devastated by the loss of their loved ones and their breadwinners. It doesn't include the suffering of the 4 million refugees. It doesn't include the countless deaths from indirect causes, which includes the lack of health care because hospitals were closed and so many doctors were forced to flee. And it doesn't include the people who have seen their futures taken away from them because of their schools and colleges being closed by the fighting. It is no surprise that the A.P. report said almost every person in Iraq has been touched by the violence.

And of course, Mr. Speaker, here in America we have seen 35,000 of our finest and bravest men and women killed or wounded in battle, and 140,000 of our troops remain in harm's way today.

Mr. Speaker, war is not a video game. Real people die or are horribly wounded and scarred, and they are scarred and wounded for life. Real families suffer. We need to remember that when we make momentous decisions about war and peace in this House, we have to consider those statistics.

Today, our country is faced with another tough decision about war: What to do about the situation in Afghanistan. I oppose the supplementary funding request for Iraq and Afghanistan. It will prolong our occupation of Iraq through at least the year 2011, and it will expand our military presence in Afghanistan indefinitely.

Instead of attempting to find military solutions to the problems we face in Iraq and Afghanistan, the administration must fundamentally change our mission in both countries to focus on promoting reconciliation, economic development, humanitarian aid, and regional diplomatic efforts.

Diplomacy and economic development are two of the cornerstones of my Smart Security Platform for the 21st century. This plan would employ the many effective nonmilitary tools that we have to fight terrorism. These tools will cost a lot less and be far more effective. They will save lives, stop terrorism, and keep us safe at the same time, or at least safer than a military option. I invite all of my colleagues to consider House Resolution 363, which describes the full plan.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the military option has taken us down the wrong road in both Iraq and Afghanistan for the past 7 years. The military option hasn't made us more secure. It has cost our Treasury over \$1 trillion so far, with no end in sight. And the human toll has been appalling. It is time to do something that will make our Nation safer and save countless lives. The smart security platform for the 21st century will achieve both of these goals.

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

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

#### FORT LEAVENWORTH, A POOR FIT FOR GUANTANAMO DETAINEES

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in January, shortly after taking office, President Obama ordered the closure of the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base within the year. Up to

250 detainees who are suspects from the war on terrorism will be processed and moved, possibly to facilities located inside the United States. The U.S. disciplinary barracks at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, is apparently one of the facilities under consideration to house these prisoners.

I have visited Fort Leavenworth, the city of Leavenworth, and surrounding communities. I have talked to city officials, local businesses, and State legislators. I have spoken to U.S. military officers and foreign military students attending the Army's Command and General Staff College located at the fort.

Simply stated, Fort Leavenworth is a poor fit for placing Guantanamo detainees. Fort Leavenworth is known as the "Intellectual Center of the Army," where the leaders of our military and foreign militaries are educated. However, should these politically sensitive detainees be located at the fort, many countries will likely discontinue sending military students to America to be trained. This action would disrupt Fort Leavenworth's primary mission of military education. It would greatly impair a successful international military student program that has spread good will around the world for 100 years.

Additionally, our country should not make Fort Leavenworth's soldiers and their families and northeast Kansas unfairly bear this responsibility at the cost of their safety and economic well-being. The 3,000 residents who live on post as well as the residents of nearby communities would be living at a higher security risk. Since the fort has no major medical facilities, dangerous detainees would need to be transported to a local hospital or V.A. for medical attention. Local public safety officials are not capable of handling a terrorist incident or protests that may occur and would require greater resources. The need to increase security at the fort would likely close off citizen access to Sherman Airfield, the only public airport in Leavenworth, as well as stop rail and river barge traffic that runs to the post. These actions would have significant economic consequences.

Finally, the fort's disciplinary barracks lack the capability to house terrorist suspects. It is largely a medium-security facility for military prisoners. It would cost hundreds of millions of dollars to upgrade the disciplinary barracks to maximum security level and to construct the hospital, residential, and support facilities that would be required to house the additional prisoners and security personnel. As a small post surrounded by a civilian population, there is no room to grow.

Fort Leavenworth is clearly an unsuitable location. I am a sponsor of legislation introduced by my colleague of Kansas, Ms. JENKINS, to prevent Guantanamo detainees from being relocated there.

□ 1615

The decision to close Guantanamo Bay detention facility and relocate terror suspects should not be made recklessly. I'm troubled that the administration is seeking to move forward on Guantanamo despite the absence of a closure and relocation plan and despite the lack of congressional review. In their recently submitted FY 09 war supplemental request to Congress, they ask us for \$80 million to close the Guantanamo detention facility to relocate prisoners, support personnel and services.

I join the gentleman from California, Representative HUNTER, in asking the Appropriations Committee not to include this funding in the supplemental until we see a plan. Still lacking these details this week, I'm pleased to see that our appropriations chairman, Mr. OBEY, announced his refusal to provide the funding.

This critical national security decision deserves critical thought. Detainees should not be moved where they do not belong. And detainees do not belong at Fort Leavenworth.

#### JUVENILE JUSTICE IMPROVEMENTS ACT

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation that I recently introduced, along with several cosponsors, the Juvenile Justice Improvement Act.

Mr. Speaker, every day in America, 90,000 youth are incarcerated in our juvenile correctional facilities. Seventy percent of these youth are held for non-criminal acts like running away or violating curfew. Instead of working with these youth and these families to identify the root of their problem and help them find alternatives to their negative behavior, our policy in too many places around this country is to simply lock them up. Even more shocking, 7,500 of our Nation's young people sit in adult jails on any given day, even though study after study has proven that that practice of putting youth in adult facilities only increases the likelihood of recidivism and puts them at risk amongst that sometimes very dangerous adult population.

Sadly, these are not the only consequences of putting juveniles in the adult system. Keeping children safe in the adult juvenile justice system is extremely difficult. All too often, physical and sexual assault become commonplace. According to the Department of Justice's statistics division, 21 percent and 13 percent of all substantiated victims of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence in jails in 2005 and 2006 respectively were youth under the age of 18. That number is disturbingly high when you take into account that juveniles account for only 1 percent of all