mine from Whittier, California. This brave American was killed in action in Afghanistan on May 26, 2009, on the 15th anniversary of his service in the military.

Sergeant Rowe was killed by an improvised explosive device. The 33-year old Rowe leaves behind his 7-year old son, Andrew, and his wife Cindy. My thoughts and prayers go out to Cindy and Andrew, and I hope that they can find some solace in the gratitude that our Nation owes to Sergeant Rowe for his honorable service to his countrymen.

Sergeant Rowe spent his entire adult life serving our country. He joined the Army in 1994 and served in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Last July he mobilized again for duty in Afghanistan.

He and his family have made the greatest sacrifice that one can make, and we are forever in his debt.

Sergeant Rowe, whose life embodied the meaning of the word ''patriot'', will be missed by family, friends and colleagues, but his honorable deeds will not be forgotten.

THE 21ST CZAR OF AMERICA

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, we have yet another czar appointed by the administration. The Pay Czar will set limits on how much money people can make that took bank bailout money.

The government is establishing a central committee accountable and answerable only to the President. These czars and czarinas avoid scrutiny of Congress. There is no advice and consent by the Senate and little oversight, and no one knows what these czars really do or how they're doing it. There is no authority found anywhere in the Constitution to appoint these czars. They enforce czar rules with no recourse by the citizens. The czars claim they know best how to take care of the masses.

It's appropriate that this administration and past administrations use this Russian term ''czar'' since the Russians, under the Soviet Union, invented the Politburo. The Soviet Politburo was made up of political party appointees that made all policy decisions and ruled the country through their dictates.

Now we have 21 czars. The newest, the Pay Czar, is moving us ever nearer to a socialist union which leaves us less and less control of the government by the people.

And that's just the way it is.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, despite the current focus on disagreements over funding for the International Monetary Fund and closure of the Guantanamo Bay detention facility, the primary intent of the supplemental is to continue funding for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. As Members who remain opposed to the bill, we need to make sure and make clear our opposition and work to defeat the bill.

It's notable that attempts to make important changes to the legislation, such as a call for an exit strategy from Afghanistan, or demands for increased transparency or accountability at the IMF, have been rebuffed. Continued funding of the war operations in Iraq ensures a continued occupation, thereby undermining the stated U.S. goal for withdrawal by the end of 2010. Funds for Iraq should be dedicated to bringing all of our troops home, and bringing those contractors home as well.

It's time to end this war. ''No'' to any more funds for the war in Iraq and the war in Afghanistan. And ''no'' if they try to put any other kind of legislation and tie it to the war funding.

Defeat the supplemental.

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.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT PICK WINNERS AND LOSERS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the recent focus on Israel and the Arab-Israeli conflict that continues today is vital and important to our world peace. There are a lot of people out there trying to revise history, however.

The State of Israel was established in 1948 by British mandate after the Holocaust of World War II. The Jewish people lay claim to this area since Biblical times. The establishment of the Jewish State of Israel merely formalized the return of their indigenous homeland by international agreement. Both the United States and the U.N., including the Soviet Union, recognized the State of Israel.

The day after the Jewish state was established in 1948, it was invaded by six surrounding Arab nations. A negotiated cease-fire ended hostility, with Jerusalem being split in the middle between Israel and Jordan.

In 1967 Israel was once again invaded by Syria from the north, Jordan from the east and Egypt from the southwest. During the war, Israel defended itself and expanded its border by including the Golan Heights that was controlled by Syria, the West Bank, controlled by Jordan, and Gaza, controlled by Egypt.

Some would have you believe that the establishment of the State of Israel changed the borders of Arab states in agreements that had existed for centuries. That is simply incorrect. The boundaries of the Middle East countries were fixed by Western powers after Turkey was defeated in World War I. The French took over Syria and Lebanon. The British took over Palestine and Iraq. The areas allotted to Israel had been under the control of the Ottoman Empire from 1517 to 1917. During this 400-year reign of the Turks, the Holy Land was only sparsely populated. The few folks living there were an oppressed Jewish population and mostly revolving Muslim immigrant groups, but also there were small groups of Christians in the area.

The actual boundaries of what became the State of Israel were set by the United Nations in 1947. When formally established in 1948, the attacks on the tiny new state of Israel began immediately by the neighboring Arab states.

Yasser Arafat formed the Palestine Liberation Organization, or the PLO, in 1964. He formed a state within a state in the Palestinian homeland of Jordan. Arafat many times stated that Jordan is Palestine. It was not until the 1967 war that the Arab nations backed the PLO for the purpose of taking back land that Israel had won in that defensive war of 1967. In 1967 Arab forces massed against Israel, surrounding the tiny nation.

Egyptian President Nasser was allowed to kick the U.N. peacekeepers out of the Sinai Peninsula, which acted as a buffer between Egypt and Israel. The world watched as hundreds of thousands of Arab troops tried to ''drive Israel into the sea.'' The unexpected brilliance of the Israeli military stopped the aggression from all directions, and Israel was secure for a moment.

As a result of that war for survival, Israel fairly won land: The Sinai, the West Bank and Gaza. Everywhere else in the world, territory acquired in self-defense is only returned in the context of a negotiated peace. Israel has never been fully afforded that negotiated peace. Israelis have returned land time and time again when a peaceful settlement was reached. Soon they may run out of land to give away.

In the Camp David accords of 1978, Israel returned the Sinai to Egypt in return for a peace treaty. Jordan and Syria have less formal but similar agreements with Israel.

Now one issue is whether Israeli Jews that have settled into the West Bank should leave or not be allowed to have natural expansion of their own communities. This should be negotiated between the Israeli Government and the Palestinians. The United States should not interfere in and prevent negotiations by picking winners and losers.

This year the United States is picking the loser of Israel. The United States should help broker negotiations

and help get all parties to negotiate, but not demand either side take a certain position.

Israel has been a longtime ally of the United States, and our interest should be that the sides involved solve this problem without the United States dictating who wins and who loses.

And that's just the way it is.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S SPEECH GIVES NEW HOPE TO THE WORLD

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to praise President Obama for his historic speech in Cairo last Thursday. By speaking with respect and honesty to the Muslim world, the President built new bridges, bridges of understanding and peace.

The speech contrasted sharply with the approach taken by the previous administration. There was no arrogance or fear-mongering in President Obama's speech. He made no threats. He did not talk about an endless war on terrorism.

Instead, the President called for a new beginning between the United States and the Muslim people. He renewed his pledge that America ''is not—and never will be—at war with Islam.''

He called for cooperation instead of conflict. He courageously acknowledged the mistakes of the past and called for an end to mistrust.

The President marginalized violent extremists by saying, and I quote him, ''The enduring faith of over a billion people is so much bigger than the narrow hatred of a few.''

He defended Israel's right to live in peace while recognizing the Palestinian people's right to a state of their own.

On Iran, President Obama urged diplomacy and reiterated his call for a nuclear-free world. And he advocated for democracy, for religious freedom, economic opportunity and the rights of women and girls.

Madam Speaker, everyone listening to the speech had to be inspired by the President's eloquence and good will. But the President also acknowledged that the speech was just a start. Now we face the hard work, the work of making peace a reality, especially in Iraq and Afghanistan.

On this issue, I've urged the President to move in a bold new direction. I've called upon him to speed up the timetable for the withdrawal of our troops and military contractors from Iraq, and to leave no residual forces behind, because I believe the sooner we return full sovereignty to Iraq, the better.

I voted against the supplemental appropriations action because it will prolong our occupation of Iraq and sink us deeper into the quagmire of Afghanistan.

We must develop a plan to redeploy our troops out of Afghanistan. Otherwise, we'll face another endless occupation, one that will fuel anti-Americanism and promote instability, which actually is happening in Afghanistan and Pakistan today.

□ 1930

We need a whole new approach to the region. Instead of sending in more troops and investing in military solutions that won't work, we should be investing in smart, peaceful power that will work. Smart power means helping the people of Afghanistan and Pakistan to build roads, schools, hospitals, and better agricultural systems. It means helping to create jobs and assisting those who have been displaced by the war. This is what the people of Afghanistan and Pakistan really want from the United States. If we provide smart assistance to them, Madam Speaker, we will defeat the violent extremists. We will bring peace to the region, and we will make America safer. This strategy is at the core of my SMART Security Platform for the 21st Century. This is legislation that is described in House Resolution 363.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to consider House Resolution 363 and to support it.

REDESIGNATING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AS THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

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. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues in the House from both parties for joining me as cosponsors of H.R. 24, legislation to redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps. As of today, this legislation has 278 bipartisan cosponsors.

For the past 7 years, the language of this bill has been part of the House version of the National Defense Authorization Act. Each year, the full House of Representatives has supported this change. This year, I am grateful to have the support of Senator PAT ROBERTS, a former marine, who introduced the same bill in the Senate, S. 504. With his help, I am hopeful that this will be the year the Senate supports the House's position and joins in bringing proper respect to the fighting team of the Navy and Marine Corps.

The Navy and Marine Corps have operated as one entity for more than two centuries, and H.R. 24 would allow the name of their Department to illustrate this fact. This legislation is not about changing the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Department, reallocating resources between the Navy and Marine Corps or altering their missions. Redesignating the Department as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps is a symbolic gesture, but it is important to the team.

Over the years, I have been encouraged by the overwhelming support for this change that I have received from so many members of the United States Armed Forces. Last month, I received a letter from retired Marine Colonel Giles Kyser, who kindly expressed his support for H.R. 24.

He wrote, ''As a combat commander of marines and sailors in Iraq, I submit that no one understands the parity of the two services better than the corpsmen and chaplains serving alongside 'their marines.' I dare say, if you asked any one of those sailors to voice an opinion about the proposed change, most would wonder why our country took so long to take this simple action.''

The colonel further wrote, ''When President Truman considered disbanding the Marine Corps after World War II in 1946, then Commandant of the Marine Corps, Medal of Honor recipient Alexander Vandergrift brought the issue before the Congress of the United States. The general merely presented the Marine Corps' combat lineage and let those actions speak for themselves. After hearing the general's remarks, our congressional leaders did the right thing: not only preserving our Corps but ensuring its roles, missions; and even its size became part of the law of the land.''

The colonel further stated in his letter, ''The stroke of a pen, adding three words 'and Marine Corps,' will complete General Vandergrift's action of some 63 years ago; will ensure our leaders, their staffs and their constituents clearly recognize the coequal status of the Marine Corps; and will ensure once and for all time the equality of our marines in the eyes of the Nation and its people.''

Madam Speaker, I submit the full text of Colonel Kyser's letter for the RECORD.

MAY 14, 2009.

Congressman WALTER B. JONES
House of Representatives,
Rayburn Building, Washington, DC.

CONGRESSMAN JONES, Per our discussions on 12 May I wanted to pass on a few suggestions regarding your proposed Bill (H.R. 24) ''To redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps.'' I believe your initiative comes at a time in the history of our Nation and of our Navy and Marine Corps when permanently establishing the Marine Corps' parity as an equal service with the Army, Navy, and Air Force constitutes an ethical and practical imperative not only from the standpoint of history, but from the standpoint of educating key leaders and their staffs.

Your efforts to-date clearly underscore why according the Marine Corps equal status within the Department of Defense constitutes the ''right thing to do.'' The contributions of our Marines, written in blood across the globe during our current contingency operations merit a change raising the awareness of the Nation and its leaders regarding the role our Marines play in their defense. Moreover, and if only as a supporting argument, how many Americans truly at understand that the sacrifices made since September 11 2001 by our Marines always take place with Sailors at their side on the battlefield? Those Sailors, who while at