

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 gentleman 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

their side, often provide either the immediate aid that saves their lives, or the special comfort of a comrade during their final moments on this earth. Such is the unshakable bond of the Marines and Sailors who live at the tip of the spear, where the measure of a man or woman's life is defined by actions, and where moments of courage and compassion confer a nobility that clearly compels equal recognition in the eyes of the citizens they defend.

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 that if you asked any one of those Sailors to voice an opinion about the proposed change that they would support the change with the same degree of commitment they always show "their Marines" and, most would wonder why our country took so long to take this simple action.

After all is said and done, the substance of the proposed change focuses us on the young men and women who willingly gave the last full measure of devotion to this country. The redesignation honors them and constitutes an ethical imperative. * * * it is the right thing to do and we must do it.

The second imperative revolves around a very practical truth. In an environment where decisions taken find their foundation in understanding the context of the issue, most Americans, even those here in the rarified air of Washington DC, simply do not realize that the Department of the Navy includes both the Navy and Marine Corps. The practical result of that lack of knowledge finds very concrete expression in the history of deliberation and budgets within the Department of Defense. Many Congressional, White House, and even Department of Defense staffers must constantly be reminded that the Department of the Navy, and its total obligation authority includes both the Navy and the Marine Corps in order to avoid cutting away the muscle of the Corps as it competes for funding. The Marine Corps' advertising efforts and information campaign within the Capital Region help to overcome the challenge, but why should the Marine Corps and the Department of the Navy have to begin their efforts from a position of informational weakness? Certainly, the stroke of a pen changing the existing designation provides a demonstrable first step in overcoming the positional deficit plaguing the Corps since its inception some two hundred and thirty-four years ago.

Indeed, 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 Vandegrift 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. He refused to, in his words, come on "bended knee" to argue the case for Marines and Sailors who served so bravely and brilliantly in places like Tripoli, Montezuma, Belleau Wood, Tarawa, and Iwo Jima. 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.

It is time again for our Congressional Leaders to "do the right thing" in a time when fiscal reality might again place our Marines and the Sailors who serve with them at a disadvantage born not from malice aforethought as was the case in 1946, but born of a lack of education existing for more than two hundred and thirty years. The stroke of a pen, adding three words "and Marine Corps" will complete General

Vandegrift's action of some sixty-three years ago, will ensure our leaders, their staffs, and their constituents clearly recognize the equal 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. This is not a request made from a "bended knee." It is a request made from the position of attention, facing forward, but not forgetting the sacrifice of those Marines and Sailors of the past. The change constitutes an ethical and practical imperative and is "the right thing to do."

Very respectfully,

JAMES GILES KYSER IV,
Colonel, U.S. Marine Corps (Retired).

Madam Speaker, the marines who are fighting today deserve this recognition—those living and fighting and those who have given their lives for this country.

I have beside me an actual copy of a letter that was sent to a marine family. This is the way it is today—the Secretary of the Navy with the Navy flag, "Dear Marine Corps family, on behalf of the Department of the Navy, we extend our deepest sympathy in the loss of your loved one."

Madam Speaker, if H.R. 24 and Senate 504 become the law of the land, it will be the way it should be to a family—to a Marine family who gave a life for this country. It will say the Secretary of the Navy and the Marine Corps, and it will have the Navy flag and the Marine flag. It will say, "Dear Marine Corps family, on behalf of the Department of the Navy and the Marine Corps, please accept my sincere condolences on the loss of your loved one."

This is all it is about—bringing the team together. It is time that the Marine Corps is recognized as part of the fighting team.

With that, Madam Speaker, before I yield back my time, I will ask God to please bless our men and women in Afghanistan and Iraq. I will ask God to, please, with his loving arms, hold the families who have given children, dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I close three times by asking God: God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

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

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

GUANTANAMO BAY DETAINEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about an issue of great importance to our country.

Shortly after I returned from a trip to Algeria in 1998, where thousands had been killed from terror attacks in the wake of the two U.S. Embassy bombings in Africa where 267 people were killed, including one of my constituents from McLean, Virginia, who was serving at the Nairobi Embassy, I authored a bill creating the National Commission on Terrorism.

The commission's report in June of 2000 provided evidence of the growing threat of international terrorism and the steps needed to combat the threat. A Congressional Research Service report described the main finding of the commission this way: "It calls on the U.S. Government to prepare more actively to prevent and deal with a future mass casualty, catastrophic terrorist attack."

Regrettably, the commission's recommendations were not implemented until after the attacks on 9/11 when 3,000 people were killed, including 30 from my congressional district.

I was disappointed that both the Clinton administration and, later, the Bush administration did not take more seriously the recommendations of the commission. I take seriously the responsibility of congressional oversight, especially in matters with potential national security implications. Profound national security issues were, of course, thrust to the forefront on 9/11.

Following the attacks, Congress granted the President the authority "to use all necessary and appropriate force against those who planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attacks against the United States."

In the ensuing war on terror, many individuals were captured and transferred to Guantanamo Bay. On January 22, 2009, in an attempt to fulfill his campaign pledge, President Obama issued an Executive order requiring that Guantanamo be closed no later than 1 year from the date of issuance. However, in the weeks and months following, the Justice Department, under the direction of Attorney General Eric Holder, has failed to provide necessary information to Congress regarding their plans for implementing this order.

It is important for the American people to know the full details on all of the detainees currently housed at Guantanamo Bay. They are not simply felons who are serving their time with