AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, October 23, 2006
Volume 42—Number 42
Pages 1823–1865

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Bill Signings; Meetings With Foreign Leaders
CVS Pharmacy, remarks to reporters—1856
Iftaar dinner—1830
Medicare reform—1856
National Republican Senatorial Committee reception—1856
North Carolina
Tour of Victory Junction Gang Camp, Inc., in Randleman—1843
Waldo C. Falkener Elementary School in Greensboro—1837
North Korea, U.N. Security Council Resolution—1830
Pennsylvania, reception for congressional candidate Don Sherwood and the Pennsylvania Victory Committee in La Plume—1844
Radio address—1827
Transportation Department, swearing-in ceremony for Secretary Peters—1833
Virginia
Reception for senatorial candidate George Allen in Richmond—1850
U.S. Air Force Memorial dedication in Arlington—1828
U.S. military in Iraq and Afghanistan, meeting with organizations that support—1862

Bill Signings

John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, statement—1836
Military Commissions Act of 2006, remarks—1831
Northern California Coastal Wild Heritage Wilderness Act, statement—1836

Communications to Congress

Colombia, letter on continuation of national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers—1855
Sudan, blocking property of and prohibiting transactions with Government, letter—1826

Communications to Federal Agencies

Provision of U.S. Drug Interdiction Assistance to the Government of Brazil, memorandum—1830

Executive Orders

Blocking Property of and Prohibiting Transactions With the Government of Sudan—1824

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Croatia, Prime Minister Sanader—1835

(Continued on the inside back cover.)

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for $80.00 per year ($137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for $93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is $3.00 ($3.75 for foreign mailing).

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is also available on the Internet on the *GPO Access* service at http://www.gpoaccess.gov/wcomp/index.html.

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents.*

Contents—Continued

Notices

Continuation of the National Emergency With Respect to Significant Narcotics Traffickers Centered in Colombia—1854

Proclamations

50th Anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution—1844
National Character Counts Week—1823
National Forest Products Week—1823

Statements by the President

See also Bill Signings
Population of the U.S. reaching 300 million—1837

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1864
Checklist of White House press releases—1863
Digest of other White House announcements—1862
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1863

US GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
Washington DC 20402

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
Penalty for private use, $300

PRESORTED STANDARD
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
GPO
PERMIT NO. G-26

Proclamation 8070—National Character Counts Week, 2006

October 13, 2006

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

America's strength is found in the spirit and character of our people. During National Character Counts Week, we renew our commitment to instilling values in our young people and to encouraging all Americans to remember the importance of good character.

As the primary teachers and examples of character, parents help create a more compassionate and decent society. And as individuals, we all have an obligation to help our children become responsible citizens and realize their full potential. By demonstrating values such as integrity, courage, honesty, and patriotism, all Americans can help our children develop strength and character.

Countless individuals throughout our country demonstrate character by volunteering their time and energy to help neighbors in need. The men and women of our Armed Forces set an example of character by bravely putting the security of our Nation before their own lives. We also see character in the family members, teachers, coaches, and other dedicated individuals whose hearts are invested in the future of our children.

Our changing world requires virtues that sustain our democracy, make self-government possible, and help build a more hopeful future. National Character Counts Week is an opportunity to recognize the depth of America's character and appreciate those who pass on our values to future generations.

Now, Therefore, I, George W. Bush, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim October 15 through October 21, 2006, as National Character Counts Week. I call upon public officials, educators, librarians, parents, students, and all Americans to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this thirteenth day of October, in the year of our Lord two thousand six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and thirty-first.

George W. Bush

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 17, 2006]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 18. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Proclamation 8071—National Forest Products Week, 2006

October 13, 2006

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

During National Forest Products Week, we take time to appreciate the natural splendor of our country's forests and acknowledge the importance of these woodlands to our economic and environmental vitality. It is also an opportunity to renew our commitment to conserving our natural resources and to using them responsibly.

Our forests are important to our economic well-being, supplying products that drive our economy and create jobs and opportunities.

America's forests are also an important part of our Nation's natural beauty, and we must continue to conserve and use these resources in a manner that preserves them for future generations. My Administration is committed to protecting our forests and woodlands against fire damage. Through the

Healthy Forests Initiative, we have reduced the danger of fires by removing hazardous fuels from millions of acres of Federal land, making communities safer from catastrophic fire and improving wildlife habitat.

Recognizing the "importance and heritage of our vast forest resources which are inseparably tied to our present and our future," the Congress, by Public Law 86–753 (36 U.S.C. 123), as amended, has designated the week beginning on the third Sunday in October of each year as "National Forest Products Week" and has requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this week.

Now, Therefore, I, George W. Bush, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 15 through October 21, 2006, as National Forest Products Week. I call upon all Americans to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this thirteenth day of October, in the year of our Lord two thousand six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and thirty-first.

George W. Bush

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 17, 2006]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 18. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Executive Order 13412—Blocking Property of and Prohibiting Transactions With the Government of Sudan

October 13, 2006

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*)(IEEPA), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*)(NEA), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, and taking appropriate account of the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006 (the "Act"),

I, George W. Bush, President of the United States of America, find that, due to the continuation of the threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States created by certain policies and actions of the Government of Sudan that violate human rights, in particular with respect to the conflict in Darfur, where the Government of Sudan exercises administrative and legal authority and pervasive practical influence, and due to the threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the pervasive role played by the Government of Sudan in the petroleum and petrochemical industries in Sudan, it is in the interests of the United States to take additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997. Accordingly, I hereby order:

Section 1. Except to the extent provided in section 203(b) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1702(b)) or in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses that may be issued pursuant to this order, all property and interests in property of the Government of Sudan that are in the United States, that hereafter come within the United States, or that are or hereafter come within the possession or control of United States persons, including their overseas branches, are blocked and may not be transferred, paid, exported, withdrawn, or otherwise dealt in.

Sec. 2. Except to the extent provided in section 203(b) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1702(b)) or in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses that may be issued pursuant to this order, and notwithstanding any contract entered into or any license or permit granted prior to the effective date of this order, all transactions by United States persons relating to the petroleum or petrochemical industries in Sudan, including, but not limited to, oilfield services and oil or gas pipelines, are prohibited.

Sec. 3. (a) Any transaction by a United States person or within the United States that evades or avoids, has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate any of the prohibitions set forth in this order is prohibited.

(b) Any conspiracy formed to violate any of the prohibitions set forth in this order is prohibited.

Sec. 4. (a) Subject to paragraph (b) of this section, restrictions imposed by this order shall be in addition to, and do not derogate from, restrictions imposed in and under Executive Order 13067.

(b)(i) None of the prohibitions in section 2 of Executive Order 13067 shall apply to activities or related transactions with respect to Southern Sudan, Southern Kordofan/Nuba Mountains State, Blue Nile State, Abyei, Darfur, or marginalized areas in and around Khartoum, provided that the activities or transactions do not involve any property or interests in property of the Government of Sudan.

(ii) The Secretary of State, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, may define the term "Southern Sudan, Southern Kordofan/Nuba Mountains State, Blue Nile State, Abyei, Darfur, or marginalized areas in and around Khartoum" for the purposes of this order.

(c) The function of the President under subsection 6(c)(1) of the Comprehensive Peace in Sudan Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–497), as amended by section 5(a)(3) of the Act, is assigned to the Secretary of the Treasury as appropriate in the performance of such function.

(d) The functions of the President under subsection 6(c)(2) and the last sentence of 6(d) of the Comprehensive Peace in Sudan Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–497), as amended by subsections 5(a)(3) and (b), respectively, of the Act, are assigned to the Secretary of State, except that the function of denial of entry is assigned to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(e) The functions of the President under sections 7 and 8 of the Act are assigned to the Secretary of State.

Sec. 5. Nothing in this order shall prohibit:

(a) transactions for the conduct of the official business of the Federal Government or the United Nations by employees thereof; or

(b) transactions in Sudan for journalistic activity by persons regularly employed in such capacity by a news-gathering organization.

Sec. 6. For the purposes of this order:

(a) the term "person" means an individual or entity;

(b) the term "entity" means a partnership, association, trust, joint venture, corporation, group, subgroup, or other organization;

(c) the term "United States person" means any United States citizen, permanent resident alien, entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States (including foreign branches), or any person in the United States; and

(d) the term "Government of Sudan" includes the Government of Sudan, its agencies, instrumentalities, and controlled entities, and the Central Bank of Sudan, but does not include the regional government of Southern Sudan.

Sec. 7. For those persons whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to section 1 of this order who might have a constitutional presence in the United States, I find that, because of the ability to transfer funds or other assets instantaneously, prior notice to such persons of measures to be taken pursuant to this order would render these measures ineffectual. I therefore determine that for these measures to be effective in addressing the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13067 there need be no prior notice of a determination made pursuant to section 1 of this order.

Sec. 8. The Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of State, is hereby authorized to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this order. The Secretary of the Treasury may redelegate any of these functions to other officers and agencies of the United States Government, consistent with applicable law. All executive agencies of the United States Government are hereby directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of this order and, where appropriate, to advise the Secretary of the Treasury in a timely manner of the measures taken. The Secretary of the Treasury shall ensure compliance with those provisions of

section 401 of the NEA (50 U.S.C. 1641) applicable to the Department of the Treasury in relation to this order.

Sec. 9. This order is not intended to, and does not, create any right, benefit, or privilege, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, instrumentalities, or entities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

Sec. 10. This order shall take effect upon the enactment of the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006.

George W. Bush

The White House,
October 13, 2006.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:27 a.m., October 16, 2006]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on October 17. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Blocking Property of and Prohibiting Transactions With the Government of Sudan

October 13, 2006

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

Consistent with subsection 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b)(IEEPA), and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1631 (NEA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") to take additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997.

On October 13, 2006, I signed into law the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006 (DPAA), which, among other things, calls for support of the regional government of Southern Sudan, assistance with the peace efforts in the Darfur region of Sudan, and provision of economic assistance in specified areas of Sudan. Section 7 of the DPAA maintains the sanctions currently imposed on the Government of Sudan. However, section 8(e) of the DPAA exempts from the prohibitions of Executive Order 13067 certain areas in Sudan, including Southern Sudan, Southern Kordofan/Nuba Mountains State, Blue Nile State, Abyei, Darfur, and marginalized areas in and around Khartoum.

Pursuant to IEEPA and the NEA, I determined that the Government of Sudan continues to implement policies and actions that violate human rights, in particular with respect to the conflict in Darfur, where the Government of Sudan exercises administrative and legal authority and pervasive practical influence, and that the Government of Sudan has a pervasive role in the petroleum and petrochemical industries in Sudan. In light of these determinations, and in order to reconcile sections 7 and 8 of the DPAA, I issued this order to continue the countrywide blocking of the Government of Sudan's property and to prohibit transactions relating to the petroleum and petrochemical industries in Sudan.

The order blocks the property and interests in property of the Government of Sudan that are in the United States, that hereafter come within the United States, or that are or hereafter come within the possession or control of United States persons, including their overseas branches. The order also prohibits all transactions by United States persons relating to the petroleum or petrochemical industries in Sudan, including, but not limited to, oilfield services and oil or gas pipelines.

The order specifies that Executive Order 13067 remains in force, but that the prohibitions in section 2 of that order shall not apply to activities and transactions with respect to Southern Sudan, Southern Kordofan/Nuba Mountains State, Blue Nile State, Abyei, Darfur, or marginalized areas in and around Khartoum, provided that the activities or transactions do not involve any property or interests in property of the Government of Sudan.

Sincerely,

George W. Bush

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Richard B. Cheney, President of the Senate. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

October 14, 2006

Good morning. Earlier this week, the Government of North Korea proclaimed to the world that it had conducted a successful nuclear weapons test. In response to North Korea's provocative actions, America is working with our partners in the region and in the United Nations Security Council to ensure that there are serious repercussions for the North Korean regime.

North Korea has been pursuing nuclear weapons and defying its international commitments for years. In 1993, North Korea announced that it was withdrawing from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The United States negotiated with North Korea and reached a bilateral agreement in 1994: North Korea committed to giving up its pursuit of nuclear weapons in exchange for help with peaceful nuclear power.

After I came to office, we discovered that North Korea had been violating this agreement for some time by continuing work on a covert nuclear weapons program. My administration confronted the North Korea regime with this evidence in 2002, and the North Koreans subsequently walked away from the 1994 agreement.

So my administration decided to take a new approach. We brought together other nations in the region in an effort to resolve the situation through multilateral diplomacy. The logic behind this approach is clear: North Korea's neighbors have the most at stake, and they are North Korea's principal sources of food, energy, and trade, so it makes sense to enlist them in the effort to get the North Korean regime to end its nuclear program.

This diplomatic effort was called the six-party talks, and these talks included North and South Korea, China, Japan, Russia, and the United States. In September of last year, these diplomatic efforts resulted in a wide-ranging joint statement that offered a resolution to the problem and a better life for the North Korean people. In this joint statement, North Korea committed to abandoning all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programs. North Korea was offered the prospect of normalized relations with Japan and the United States, as well as economic cooperation in energy, trade, and investment. And the United States affirmed that we have no nuclear weapons on the Korean Peninsula and no intention to attack or invade North Korea.

Unfortunately, North Korea failed to act on its commitment. And with its actions this week, the North Korean regime has once again broken its word, provoked an international crisis, and denied its people the opportunity for a better life. We are working for a resolution to this crisis. Nations around the world, including our partners in the six-party talks, agree on the need for a strong United Nations Security Council resolution that will require North Korea to dismantle its nuclear programs. This resolution should also specify measures to prevent North Korea from importing or exporting nuclear or missile technologies. And it should prevent financial transactions or asset transfers that would help North Korea develop its nuclear or missile capabilities.

By passing such a resolution, we will send a clear message to the North Korean regime that its actions will not be tolerated. And we will give the nations with the closest ties to North Korea—China and South Korea—a framework to use their leverage to pressure Pyongyang and persuade its regime to change course.

As we pursue a diplomatic solution, we are also reassuring our allies in the region that America remains committed to their security. We have strong defense alliances with Japan and South Korea, and the United States will meet these commitments. And in response to North Korea's provocation, we will seek to increase our defense cooperation with our allies, including cooperation on ballistic missile defense to protect against North Korean aggression and cooperation to prevent North Korea from importing or exporting nuclear or missile technologies.

Our goals remain clear: peace and security in Northeast Asia and a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula. We will do what is necessary to achieve these goals. We will support our allies in the region; we will work with the United Nations; and together we will ensure that North Korea faces real consequences if it continues down its current path.

Thank you for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 7:50 a.m. on October 13 in the Cabinet Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on October 14. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 13 but was embargoed for release until the broadcast. The Office of the Press Secretary also released a Spanish language transcript of this address.

Remarks at the United States Air Force Memorial Dedication in Arlington, Virginia

October 14, 2006

Thank you all. Thank you very much. Mr. Secretary, thank you for your kind words. Secretary Nicholson, General Hayden, General Pace, Secretary Wynne, General Moseley, Chief Master Sergeant McKinley, Ross Perot, Jr., Major General Grillo, members of the Armed Forces, military veterans, and distinguished guests: Laura and I are honored to join you on this historic day.

With today's ceremony, the United States Air Force begins a year-long celebration of its 60th birthday. As someone who recently crossed that milestone—[*laughter*]—it's not all that bad. [*Laughter*] I can think of no better way to begin the celebrations than by dedicating this magnificent monument. So, General Grillo, here in the company of the brave men and women of the United States Air Force, I proudly accept the Air Force Memorial on behalf of the American people.

A soldier can walk the battlefields where he once fought; a marine can walk the beaches he once stormed; but an airman can never visit the patch of sky he raced across on a mission to defend freedom. And so it's fitting that, from this day forward, the men and women of the Air Force will have this memorial, a place here on the ground that recognizes their achievements and sacrifices in the skies above.

Building this memorial took a lot of talent and creativity and determination. Like the aircraft whose flight it represents, this memorial is a incredible feat of engineering. Like the country whose freedom it represents, this memorial is hopeful and optimistic. By its design, this monument raises our eyes toward the vast and open skies and focuses our mind on the endless possibilities of human flight.

Having flown an F–102, I know the exhilaration of flight, and as a son of an aviator who was shot down in combat, I am keenly aware of its dangers. I have spent a lot of time with the aviators, and one thing about them that has always struck me, aviators, by their nature, are optimistic people. It takes an optimist to climb into a steel tube, race to the sky at 1,500 miles an hour heading toward danger, and expect to return home safely. Yet this is precisely what the men and women of the Air Force do for our country every day.

America is grateful for your service, and I'm proud to be the Commander in Chief of such fine men and women.

Today, it's hard to imagine a world without the Air Force protecting us in the skies above. Yet by the standards of history, air power is still a relatively new phenomenon. Men have been fighting on land and sea for thousands of years, but there are still Americans alive today who were born before man had ever flown. Over the past century, manned flight has gone from the dream of two brothers working in an Ohio bicycle shop to an indispensable tool in our Nation's arsenal.

We saw the importance of air power 6 days ago—six decades ago, after our Nation was attacked at Pearl Harbor. Soon after the attack, General Hap Arnold called Lieutenant Colonel Jimmy Doolittle into his office and gave him an unprecedented mission—retaliate against Tokyo. Just over 4 months later, Doolittle's raiders had shocked the world by striking the enemy capital some 4,000 miles away from Pearl Harbor. To do it, they had to load B–52 bombers on the deck of an aircraft carrier, sail within a few hundred miles of enemy territory, take off and drop their payloads, knowing they had little chance to make it safely to China.

But the Doolittle raid sent a clear message to America's enemies: If you attack this country and you harm our people, there is no corner of the Earth remote enough to protect you from the reach of the aviators who wear our Nation's uniform.

Five years ago, our enemies learned this lesson anew after the attacks of September

the 11th, 2001. Within weeks of the attack, pilots at Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri boarded B–2 stealth bombers, flew halfway across the world, refueling in mid-air, took out the Taliban and Al Qaida targets in Afghanistan, dropped into Diego Garcia for engine-running crew changes, and then made the journey home. Jimmy Doolittle would have been proud.

Together with Navy and Marine aircrew, submariners, Special Ops forces from every service, and a vast coalition of nations, the United States Air Force helped deliver justice to a regime nearly 7,000 miles away from the World Trade Center and helped put the terrorists on the run. Five years have passed since the opening salvos in the war on terror, and every day in this war, we depend on the skill and determination of the men and women of the United States Air Force. In this war, battlefield airmen on the ground scout out enemy positions, locate targets for aviators circling above, and use advanced laser guidance systems to steer bombs, allowing us to strike the terrorists and spare innocent civilians.

In this war, Air Force aviators in Nevada step into a camouflage trailer on their base, sit down in front of computer consoles, and fly Predator unmanned aerial vehicles half a world away over the skies of Iraq, using them to find and remove terrorist nests in remote corners of the world.

In this world—in this war, our airmen operate advanced space satellites circling the Earth. They beam down real-time images of terrorist positions to our troops on the ground so they can strike the enemy before the enemy can strike our country. In this war, Air Force C–130 crews deliver supplies to our troops on the frontlines; Air Force teams disarm and remove roadside bombs; Air Force maintenance squadrons keep our planes in the air; Air Force A–10 Thunderbolts provide close air support for troops in contact with the enemy. And Air Force search and rescue teams evacuate soldiers and sailors, airmen, and marines injured in the war on terror.

Whether they are serving on the frontlines or bases overseas or here in the homefront, the men and women of the United States Air Force bring honor to the uniform, and they are bringing us victory in the war on terror.

And the stakes in this war could not be higher. Terrorists and extremists are fighting to overthrow moderate governments across the broader Middle East so they can take control of countries and use them as bases from which to attack America. If we do not defeat these enemies now, we will leave our children to face a Middle East overrun by terrorist states and radical dictators armed with nuclear weapons. We are in a war that will set the course for this new century and determine the destiny of millions across the world. Defeating the terrorists and extremists is the challenge of our time and the calling of this generation.

And like generations that came before, we will answer history's call with confidence. We will confront the threats to our way of life; we will fight for our liberty without wavering; and we will prevail.

Victory in this war depends on the one thing that has not changed since the founding of the Air Force six decades ago—the courage of the men and women who wear the Air Force blue. We see that courage in the men and women of the Air Force who return from battle with wounds they will carry with them for the rest of their lives. We see that courage in the airmen who left our shores to defend freedom and did not live to make the journey home. They gave their lives so that their fellow Americans could enjoy a bright horizon of freedom and peace. We mourn every loss. We pray for their families. And here at this memorial, we consecrate their memory for the ages.

This memorial lies in sight of Arlington National Cemetery, where so many of those fallen airmen are buried. This memorial also lies in sight of the Pentagon, where our Nation came under attack. It is a fitting location. Under these magnificent spires, we pay tribute to the men and women of the Air Force who stand ready to give all for their country. And looking from this promontory to a place once filled with smoke and flames, we remember why we need them.

Every man and woman who has worn the Air Force uniform is part of a great history. From the Berlin Airlift to the Korean war to Vietnam to the Gulf war to Kosovo and

today's war on terror, a long blue line of heroes has defended freedom in the skies above. To all who have climbed sunward and chased the shouting wind, America stops to say: Your service and sacrifice will be remembered forever and honored in this place by the citizens of a free and grateful nation.

May God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:48 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld, who introduced him; Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force Rodney J. McKinley; and H. Ross Perot, Jr., chairman of the board, and Maj. Gen. Edward F. Grillo, Jr., USAF (Ret.), president, Air Force Memorial Foundation.

Remarks on the United Nations Security Council Resolution on North Korea

October 14, 2006

Today the United Nations Security Council passed a unanimous resolution, sending a clear message to the leader of North Korea regarding his weapons programs. This action by the United Nations, which was swift and tough, says that we are united in our determination to see to it that the Korean Peninsula is nuclear-weapons free.

I have said all along there is a better way forward for North Korea. There's a better way forward for the people of North Korea. If the leader of North Korea were to verifiably end his weapons programs, the United States and other nations would be willing to help the nation recover economically.

The message today, however, says to the leader of North Korea that the world is united in our opposition to his nuclear weapons plans.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:30 p.m. on the South Grounds at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Chairman Kim Jong Il of North Korea. He also referred to U.N. Security Council Resolution 1718.

Memorandum on the Provision of United States Drug Interdiction Assistance to the Government of Brazil

October 16, 2006

Presidential Determination No. 2007–03

Memorandum for the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense

Subject: Provision of U.S. Drug Interdiction Assistance to the Government of Brazil

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 1012 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2291–4), I hereby certify, with respect to Brazil, that (1) interdiction of aircraft reasonably suspected to be primarily engaged in illicit drug trafficking in that country's airspace is necessary because of the extraordinary threat posed by illicit drug trafficking to the national security of that country; and (2) that country has appropriate procedures in place to protect against innocent loss of life in the air and on the ground in connection with such interdiction, which shall at a minimum include effective means to identify and warn an aircraft before the use of force is directed against the aircraft.

The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to publish this determination in the *Federal Register* and to notify the Congress of this determination.

George W. Bush

Remarks at the Iftaar Dinner

October 16, 2006

Please be seated. Good evening, and *Ramadan Karim*. Welcome to the White House. Laura and I are really glad you're here. This is the sixth year that we have been pleased to host an Iftaar at the White House. We're honored to be with you, and once again, we're honored to pay tribute to the month of Ramadan.

Islam is a religion that brings hope and comfort to more than a billion people around the world. It has transcended racial and ethnic divisions. It has given birth to a rich culture of learning and literature and science.

And tonight we honor the traditions of a great faith by hosting the Iftaar here at the White House.

I'm so pleased our Secretary of State, Condi Rice, has joined us. Thank you, Madam Secretary. I'm pleased that Dr. Elias Zerhouni, who is the Director of the NIH, is with us. Good to see you, Elias. I thank Imam Eid from the Islamic Institute of Boston, who's with us. I welcome all the ambassadors and other members of the diplomatic corps.

Ramadan is the holiest month in the Muslim calendar. For Muslims in America and around the world, Ramadan is a special time of prayer and fasting, contemplation of God's greatness, and charity and service to those in need. And for people of all faiths, it is a good time to reflect on the values we hold in common, including love of family, gratitude to God, the importance of community, and a commitment to tolerance and religious freedom.

America is a land of many faiths, and we welcome and honor the Muslim faith in our Nation. Our society is enriched by our Muslim citizens. Your commitment to your faith reminds us all of the precious gift of religious freedom in our country. America is a more hopeful nation because of the talents and generosity and compassion of our Muslim citizens.

Tonight we have with us a group of special guests—American Muslims who are serving our country. We have with us New York City police officers and a EMT worker who risked their lives to save their fellow citizens on 9/11, a military doctor, and a member of the Navy's Chaplain Corps, members of our Foreign Service, and military veterans who have served in Afghanistan and Iraq to protect our country and help those nations build free and democratic futures.

One of our guests is Farooq Muhammad. Farooq is the son of Pakistani immigrants and was born and raised in Brooklyn. He spent the past decade with the New York City Fire Department, first as an emergency medical technician and now as a paramedic. Farooq was at the World Trade Center on 9/11, treating victims when the towers collapsed—he narrowly escaped death himself. He also recently volunteered in the mountains of Kashmir, where he helped treat the victims of last year's devastating South Asian earthquake. Farooq's courage and compassion represent the best of the American spirit.

Paramedic Muhammad is a proud Muslim; he is a patriotic American. And those are characteristics he shares with the other special American guests gathered in this room. All of you bring credit to your faith. You make America a better and stronger country, and we're honored by your presence tonight.

The United States also appreciates the many Muslim nations who stand with us in the war on terror—some of whom are represented here tonight. You know that the majority of the victims of the terrorists have been innocent Muslims, and many of you have seen terrorist violence in your own cities and your streets. We welcome you here. We are proud to work with you to defeat the terrorists and extremists and help bring a brighter future to millions of Muslim people throughout the world who yearn for moderation and peace.

On this special evening, we celebrate the millions of Muslims that we are proud to call American citizens. We honor the many Islamic nations that America is proud to call friends. And we renew the ties of friendship that should bind all who trace their faith back to God's call on Abraham.

Laura and I are grateful that you're here. Once again, I wish you a blessed Ramadan. And now Imam Eid will say the blessing.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:52 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Imam Talal Y. Eid, founder and director of religious affairs, Islamic Institute of Boston.

Remarks on Signing the Military Commissions Act of 2006

October 17, 2006

Please be seated. Welcome to the White House on an historic day. It is a rare occasion when a President can sign a bill he knows will save American lives; I have that privilege this morning.

The Military Commissions Act of 2006 is one of the most important pieces of legislation in the war on terror. This bill will allow the Central Intelligence Agency to continue its program for questioning key terrorist leaders and operatives like Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the man believed to be the mastermind of the September the 11th, 2001, attacks on our country. This program has been one of the most successful intelligence efforts in American history. It has helped prevent attacks on our country. And the bill I sign today will ensure that we can continue using this vital tool to protect the American people for years to come. The Military Commissions Act will also allow us to prosecute captured terrorists for war crimes through a full and fair trial.

Last month, on the fifth anniversary of 9/11, I stood with Americans who lost family members in New York and Washington and Pennsylvania. I listened to their stories of loved ones they still miss. I told them America would never forget their loss. Today I can tell them something else: With the bill I'm about to sign, the men our intelligence officials believe orchestrated the murder of nearly 3,000 innocent people will face justice.

I want to thank the Vice President for joining me today. Mr. Vice President, appreciate you. Secretary Don Rumsfeld, I appreciate your service to our country. I want to thank Attorney General Al Gonzales; General Mike Hayden, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency; General Pete Pace, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I appreciate very much Senator John Warner, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and Congressman Duncan Hunter, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, for joining us today. I want to thank both of these men for their leadership. I appreciate Senator Lindsey Graham from South Carolina joining us; Congressman Jim Sensenbrenner, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee; Congressman Steve Buyer of Indiana; Congressman Chris Cannon of Utah, thank you all for coming.

The bill I sign today helps secure this country, and it sends a clear message: This Nation is patient and decent and fair, and we will never back down from the threats to our freedom.

One of the terrorists believed to have planned the 9/11 attacks said he hoped the attacks would be the beginning of the end of America. He didn't get his wish. We are as determined today as we were on the morning of September the 12th, 2001. We'll meet our obligation to protect our people, and no matter how long it takes, justice will be done.

When I proposed this legislation, I explained that I would have one test for the bill Congress produced: Will it allow the CIA program to continue? This bill meets that test. It allows for the clarity our intelligence professionals need to continue questioning terrorists and saving lives. This bill provides legal protections that ensure our military and intelligence personnel will not have to fear lawsuits filed by terrorists simply for doing their jobs.

This bill spells out specific, recognizable offenses that would be considered crimes in the handling of detainees so that our men and women who question captured terrorists can perform their duties to the fullest extent of the law. And this bill complies with both the spirit and the letter of our international obligations. As I've said before, the United States does not torture. It's against our laws, and it's against our values.

By allowing the CIA program to go forward, this bill is preserving a tool that has saved American lives. The CIA program helped us gain vital intelligence from Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and Ramzi bin al-Shibh, two of the men believed to have helped plan and facilitate the 9/11 attacks. The CIA program helped break up a cell of 17 southeastern Asian terrorist operatives who were being groomed for attacks inside the United States. The CIA program helped us uncover key operatives in Al Qaida's biological weapons program, including a cell developing anthrax to be used in terrorist attacks.

The CIA program helped us identify terrorists who were sent to case targets inside the United States, including financial buildings in major cities on the east coast. And the CIA program helped us stop the planned strike on U.S. marines in Djibouti, a planned attack on the U.S. consulate in Karachi, and a plot to hijack airplanes and fly them into Heathrow Airport and Canary Wharf in London.

Altogether, information from terrorists in CIA custody has played a role in the capture or questioning of nearly every senior Al Qaida member or associate detained by the United States and its allies since this program began. Put simply, this program has been one of the most vital tools in our war against the terrorists. It's been invaluable both to America and our allies. Were it not for this program, our intelligence community believes that Al Qaida and its allies would have succeeded in launching another attack against the American homeland. By allowing our intelligence professionals to continue this vital program, this bill will save American lives. And I look forward to signing it into law.

The bill I'm about to sign also provides a way to deliver justice to the terrorists we have captured. In the months after 9/11, I authorized a system of military commissions to try foreign terrorists accused of war crimes. These commissions were similar to those used for trying enemy combatants in the Revolutionary War and the Civil War and World War II. Yet the legality of the system I established was challenged in the court, and the Supreme Court ruled that the military commissions needed to be explicitly authorized by the United States Congress.

And so I asked Congress for that authority, and they have provided it. With the Military Commission Act, the legislative and executive branches have agreed on a system that meets our national security needs. These military commissions will provide a fair trial, in which the accused are presumed innocent, have access to an attorney, and can hear all the evidence against them. These military commissions are lawful; they are fair; and they are necessary.

When I sign this bill into law, we will use these commissions to bring justice to the men believed to have planned the attacks of September the 11th, 2001. We'll also seek to prosecute those believed responsible for the attack on the USS *Cole*, which killed 17 American sailors 6 years ago last week. We will seek to prosecute an operative believed to have been involved in the bombings of the American Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, which killed more than 200 innocent people and wounded 5,000 more. With our actions, we will send a clear message to those who kill Americans: We will find you, and we will bring you to justice.

Over the past few months, the debate over this bill has been heated, and the questions raised can seem complex. Yet, with the distance of history, the questions will be narrowed and few: Did this generation of Americans take the threat seriously, and did we do what it takes to defeat that threat? Every Member of Congress who voted for this bill has helped our Nation rise to the task that history has given us. Some voted to support this bill even when the majority of their party voted the other way. I thank the legislators who brought this bill to my desk for their conviction, for their vision, and for their resolve.

There is nothing we can do to bring back the men and women lost on September the 11th, 2001. Yet we'll always honor their memory, and we will never forget the way they were taken from us. This Nation will call evil by its name. We will answer brutal murder with patient justice. Those who kill the innocent will be held to account.

With this bill, America reaffirms our determination to win the war on terror. The passage of time will not dull our memory or sap our nerve. We will fight this war with confidence and with clear purpose. We will protect our country and our people. We will work with our friends and allies across the world to defend our way of life. We will leave behind a freer, safer, and more peaceful world for those who follow us.

And now, in memory of the victims of September the 11th, it is my honor to sign the Military Commissions Act of 2006 into law.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:35 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. S. 3930, approved October 17, was assigned Public Law No. 109–366. The Office of the Press Secretary also released a Spanish language transcript of these remarks.

Remarks at a Swearing-In Ceremony for Mary E. Peters as Secretary of Transportation

October 17, 2006

Thank you very much. Good afternoon. We are here to congratulate Mary Peters on

becoming our Nation's 15th Secretary of Transportation.

Mary is a dedicated public servant, an experienced leader, and one of our Nation's most innovative thinker on transportation issues. Mary brings more than two decades of knowledge and skill to her new post. She also brings to her position the love and support of her friends and her family. I want to thank her family for being here, especially Mary's husband, Terry.

I appreciate my Chief of Staff, Josh Bolten, who is here to administer the oath. Presidents can't administer the oath—[*laughter*]—so I tapped my man, Josh. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Maria Cino, who is the Deputy Secretary, Acting Secretary. I thank you for your service and your friendship.

I appreciate my friend Secretary Norm Mineta. I got some other stuff to say about you here in a minute. [*Laughter*] I do want to thank Rodney Slater for joining us, former Secretary of Transportation, as well as Jim Burnley. Thank you both for coming. I'm proud you're here, and I know Secretary Peters appreciates it as well.

The job of Secretary of Transportation is one of the most important in our Federal Government. The American people rely on the Department of Transportation to maintain a safe, reliable, and efficient transportation system. And the future of our growing economy and changing infrastructure depend on the decisions made by the Secretary that will be put into action by this Department.

The Secretary of Transportation also plays an important role in our Nation's coordinated efforts to guard against terrorist threats to our aircraft, seaports, and infrastructure. For the past 6 years, these responsibilities have been carried out by Norm Mineta, who served our country with distinction, integrity, and dedication. Norm is our Nation's longest serving Secretary of Transportation, and he served at a time of great consequence for our country.

I remember after the attacks of September the 11th, when Norm led the successful effort to bring tens of thousands of passengers aboard commercial aircraft to safe landings. He grounded quite a few planes, including the ones my mom and dad were on. They've always thanked you for that, Norm. [*Laughter*]

After Hurricane Katrina, Norm and his team helped quickly repair and reopen the major—area's major highways, airports, seaports, and pipelines. He offered incentive-based contracts and used other innovative ideas, and as a result, the Department of Transportation was to get critical infrastructure in place faster than usual. I want to thank you for your leadership, Norm, and I want to thank you for your lifetime of service to our country, and I wish you all the very best. And I want to remind you, Maria made you look pretty good while you were in office. [*Laughter*]

Mary Peters is the right person to succeed Norm as the Secretary of Transportation. She worked for several years with Secretary Mineta, and she understands the fine legacy she has to live up to. She also knows firsthand the skills and dedication of the men and women who work here at the Department of Transportation. She's going to be a fine boss. She understands that to maintain our Nation's competitiveness and to sustain our growing economy, we need a Secretary who can see the challenges and be willing to confront them.

Mary Peters will provide strong leadership. She has spent a lifetime working on transportation issues in both the private and public sectors. Most recently, she has served as senior executive for transportation policy at a major engineering firm. For 4 years before that, she led the Federal Highway Administration. Before coming to Washington, she served in the Arizona Department of Transportation. For more than 15 years, she rose through the ranks to become director in 1998.

At both the State and Federal level, Mary Peters has worked to improve safety and security on roads and bridges. She's worked to reduce traffic congestion and modernize America's transportation infrastructure. As Secretary of Transportation, Mary will work closely with Federal, State, and local leaders to ensure that America has a state-of-the-art transportation system so that we can meet the needs of our growing economy.

In her new position, she will face important challenges. Next year she will lead the

Department's efforts to reauthorize our Nation's aviation programs. Our Nation is outgrowing our aviation capacity. More people are flying every year, and so we must modernize our airports and our air traffic control.

We also face the challenges of reducing congestion in our surface and maritime transportation systems. To accomplish these tasks, America needs creative thinking and innovative solutions, and I believe Mary Peters will provide them.

As Mary works to build a better transportation system, she will be a careful steward of the people's money. She brings to her new position a reputation for fiscal discipline and integrity. As head of the Federal Highway Administration, Mary introduced better fiscal oversight and accountability. She improved management for the largest transportation projects. She worked closely with her department's inspector general to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse. She's going to carry this kind of diligence into her new job.

She understands the importance of a modern infrastructure and good management. And I'm pleased she has agreed to serve her country once again. As she takes on this important position, she has my full trust and my confidence. Mary, I look forward to working with you as the new Secretary of Transportation. Congratulations.

It's now my honor to witness the swearing-in of Mary Peters.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:16 p.m. at the Department of Transportation. In his remarks, he referred to Terryl "Terry" Peters, Sr., husband of Secretary of Transportation Peters; and former Secretary of Transportation James H. Burnley IV. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of Secretary Peters.

Remarks Following Discussions With Prime Minister Ivo Sanader of Croatia

October 17, 2006

President Bush. It's been my honor to welcome the Prime Minister of Croatia here. Mr. Prime Minister, welcome.

Prime Minister Sanader. Thank you very much.

President Bush. We just had a very lengthy and interesting discussion, which is what you would expect friends to do. I consider the Prime Minister a friend; I consider Croatia a friend as well.

We talked about foreign policy issues, issues of peace. I thank the people of Croatia for their support in Afghanistan of the young democracy. I also believe it's in the world's interest that Croatia join NATO as well as the European Union. And to that end, when I go to Riga, I will make the case that Croatia should be admitted. It seems like a reasonable date would be 2008.

We talked about bilateral relations. We talked about investments, investment opportunities in Croatia. We talked about the need to enhance trade and commerce. The Prime Minister has invited me to come. I've heard unbelievably great things about your country, Mr. Prime Minister. I hear it's one of the most beautiful places on the face of the Earth. I'd love to come sometime. I've got to clear it first with my wife. [*Laughter*]

But nevertheless, all in all, it's been a very good meeting. And I welcome you here, and thank you for coming.

Prime Minister Sanader. Thank you, Mr. President. I've been touched by the warmth of this reception during this visit and of the interest and understanding you have shown in Croatia and the challenges facing Europe today.

About the only question we disagreed was whether Croatia or the United States had the most beautiful coastline.

President Bush. That's right. [*Laughter*]

Prime Minister Sanader. I will let you and Mrs. Bush judge for yourselves when you visit Croatia, where you certainly will be most welcome, Mr. President.

The President and I, we discussed a range of issues of bilateral concerns, especially of the preparations of my country to join EU and NATO. And I expressed my gratitude to the President for his constant support for Croatia on its way.

I also—we discussed a range of issues of—regarding our region of southeastern Europe: final status of Kosovo; Georgia; Ukraine; Moldova. We are very active. Croatia is not forgetting that we are in the region

where we still need a strong U.S. and European cooperation. We believe strongly in transatlantic partnership. There is no alternative to this. I think that President Bush and the United States of America, along with the EU, have still to be very, very closely cooperating in a couple of issues in Europe.

So thank you very much, Mr. President, for warm reception and very fruitful discussion.

President Bush. Thank you, sir. I appreciate it. Good job. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:16 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Statement on Signing the Northern California Coastal Wild Heritage Wilderness Act

October 17, 2006

Today, I have signed into law H.R. 233, the "Northern California Coastal Wild Heritage Wilderness Act." The Act strengthens protection of certain lands in California.

Section 4(i)(2) of the Act purports to give binding legal effect to guidelines in an appendix to a report issued by a congressional committee, which was not incorporated into the Act and for which presentment was not made. Consistent with the bicameral approval and presentment requirements of the Constitution for the making of a law, the executive branch shall, in carrying out the Act, take appropriate account of the guidelines as a matter of comity between the executive and legislative branches.

George W. Bush

The White House,
October 17, 2006.

NOTE: H.R. 233, approved October 17, was assigned Public Law No. 109–362.

Statement on Signing the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007

October 17, 2006

Today, I have signed into law H.R. 5122, the "John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007" (the "Act"). The Act authorizes funding for the defense of the United States and its interests abroad, for military construction, for national security-related energy programs, and for maritime security-related transportation programs.

Several provisions of the Act call for executive branch officials to submit to the Congress recommendations for legislation, or purport to regulate the manner in which the President formulates recommendations to the Congress for legislation. These provisions include sections 516(h), 575(g), 603(b), 705(d), 719(b), 721(e), 741(e), 813, 1008, 1016(d), 1035(b)(3), 1047(b), and 1102 of the Act, section 118(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 1031 of the Act, section 2773b of title 10 as amended by section 1053 of the Act, and section 403 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) as amended by section 403 of the Act. The executive branch shall construe these provisions in a manner consistent with the President's constitutional authority to supervise the unitary executive branch and to recommend for the consideration of the Congress such measures as the President deems necessary and expedient.

The executive branch shall construe sections 914 and 1512 of the Act, which purport to make consultation with specified Members of Congress a precondition to the execution of the law, as calling for but not mandating such consultation, as is consistent with the Constitution's provisions concerning the separate powers of the Congress to legislate and the President to execute the laws.

A number of provisions in the Act call for the executive branch to furnish information to the Congress or other entities on various subjects. These provisions include sections 219, 313, 360, 1211, 1212, 1213, 1227, 1402, and 3116 of the Act, section 427 of title 10,

United States Code, as amended by section 932 of the Act, and section 1093 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) as amended by section 1061 of the Act. The executive branch shall construe such provisions in a manner consistent with the President's constitutional authority to withhold information the disclosure of which could impair foreign relations, the national security, the deliberative processes of the Executive, or the performance of the Executive's constitutional duties.

The executive branch shall construe as advisory section 1011(b)(2) of the Act, which purports to prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from retiring a specified warship from operational status unless, among other things, a treaty organization established by the U.S. and foreign nations gives formal notice that it does not desire to maintain and operate that warship. If construed as mandatory rather than advisory, the provision would impermissibly interfere with the President's constitutional authority to conduct the Nation's foreign affairs and as Commander in Chief.

The executive branch shall construe section 1211, which purports to require the executive branch to undertake certain consultations with foreign governments and follow certain steps in formulating and executing U.S. foreign policy, in a manner consistent with the President's constitutional authorities to conduct the Nation's foreign affairs and to supervise the unitary executive branch.

As is consistent with the principle of statutory construction of giving effect to each of two statutes addressing the same subject whenever they can co-exist, the executive branch shall construe section 130d of title 10, as amended by section 1405 of the Act, which provides further protection against disclosure of certain homeland security information in certain circumstances, as in addition to, and not in derogation of, the broader protection against disclosure of information afforded by section 892 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 and other law protecting broadly against disclosure of such information.

George W. Bush

The White House,
October 17, 2006.

NOTE: H.R. 5122, approved October 17, was assigned Public Law No. 109–364.

Statement on the Population of the United States Reaching 300 Million

October 17, 2006

For more than two centuries, America has been a beacon of hope and opportunity for people around the world, millions of whom came here to live in freedom and make better lives for themselves and their families. Today we celebrate a significant milestone—the population of the United States has now reached 300 million. Our continued growth is a testament to our country's dynamism and a reminder that America's greatest asset is our people.

America is built on a shared love of freedom and a belief in the dignity and matchless value of every human being. Our confidence in our people has carried us to ever greater achievements in all areas of human endeavor and allowed us to remain the world's most vibrant and innovative country. And so long as we insist on high standards in education, place our trust in the talents and ingenuity of ordinary Americans, and protect our freedoms, we will remain the land of opportunity for generations to come. We welcome this milestone as further proof that the American Dream remains as bright and hopeful as ever.

Remarks at Waldo C. Falkener Elementary School in Greensboro, North Carolina

October 18, 2006

Thank you very much, Madam Secretary. I've known Margaret, as she said, a long time, and I'm very proud of the job she's doing. She knows what she's talking about when it comes to the schools in America, and she and I are going to work to make sure that every child gets an excellent education.

I want to thank the good folks here at Falkener for inviting the President to come. As you can tell, it's not an easy thing—[*laughter*]—to host the President. It's like, the entourage is pretty big, a lot of security. And so for the school folks here, thank you very much for accommodating us. I've come because I appreciate the example you set.

One of the things I like to do is to herald excellence. So the first thing I want to say is, congratulations to the principal and the teachers and the parents for working hard to make this a fantastically interesting place for our children to go to school.

I want to thank—you know, they say to me, "What do you want from the schools?" I don't know if you recognize this, but we just had six Nobel Prize winners recently announced—America had six Nobel—all of whom went to public schools in America. And my hope as I travel through the halls of these schools—like this one—I'm meeting Nobel Prize winners of the future. It's a noble aspiration for all of us to aim for. And so I want to thank you for letting me come.

I'm going to talk about No Child Left Behind. I think you're about to find out I am a passionate advocate of this important law, because I know it can save children's lives and I know it can help us meet a national objective, and that is, every child getting a good education in every school throughout the country.

I bring greetings from Laura. Most people say, "I wish Laura had come and the old boy stayed home." [*Laughter*] She's actually in El Paso, Texas, today—I think she's in El Paso, Texas, today—I'm confident, I think that's what she told me—where a new school out there is opening up the Laura Bush Library. And well deserved, I want you to know, because she has a great passion for making sure that every child can read. So I bring—as best I can—her passion here to this important school.

I'm proud to be here with Senator Richard Burr from the great State of North Carolina. Thank you for working on us—with—on educational excellence. I appreciate Virginia Foxx, the Congresswoman, who joined us as well. Amy Holcombe is the principal.

You might remember, I was a Governor of a State. And I used to say, education is to a State what national defense is to the Federal Government. And so I took my role as Governor and being involved in public school—just like Guy Hunt did—we overlapped as Governors, and we prioritized public education. And so I spent a lot of time with schools in Texas, and I learned one thing, that these little centers of excellence always depended upon having an aggressive principal, a principal who is willing to set high standards and not allow for mediocrity to set in. So, Amy, I want to thank you for your leadership and thank you for your hospitality.

I met Josette Hamrick, who is the teacher of the year. I congratulate you, Josette, for setting a good example. I think Josette is here somewhere—there she is. Thanks for being here. I also have recently gone to Mary Helen Parson's third grade school—third grade class. And Tom "Ned"—Tom Niedziela—he is a—both of whom are dedicated teachers. And so I want to say something about teaching. It is a noble profession. It is a necessary profession for this country. And for those of you who are teachers, I congratulate you and thank you for serving our country.

I oftentimes say to people that are asking me about—do you have any recommendations for what I should be doing, and my answer is, teach. And to parents I say, remember, you're the child's first teacher. As a matter of fact, schools succeed when a parent understands that teaching begins at home, and it makes the job of the classroom teacher so much easier. But I want to thank the teachers who are here, and thank you for setting a good example.

I want to thank the school board members who are here. I told the head of the school board and the other man on the school board, I said, "It's a pretty tough job to be on the school board." [*Laughter*] One fellow said, "Do you want to switch jobs?" I said, "You know—I don't think so." [*Laughter*] But thank you all for serving. Local control of schools is important in order to achieve educational excellence, and I'm going to talk a little about that in a minute.

I also landed today and met a lady named Michelle Gilmore. Michelle is—there you are. Thanks for coming. Michelle and her

husband, Tiran, are here. Michelle volunteers as a mentor. If you are concerned about the future of North Carolina or concerned about the future of our country and you want to make a difference, become a mentor. It's amazing what happens when an adult takes time out of her life, in this case, to say to a child, "I care about you, and I want to help." The true strength of the United States of America lies in the hearts and souls of our citizens. And the amazing thing about our country is that there are millions of acts of kindness that take place on a daily basis, and it hasn't required one government law.

And the reason I mention Michelle and the reason I welcomed her to Air Force One is because I want to, one, thank you as an individual, and remind people that you can serve America by loving a neighbor just like you'd like to be loved yourself. And I appreciate you being here, Michelle. Thanks for coming.

I like the fact that this—we're at a school named for a civil rights pioneer. I happen to believe reading is a modern-day civil right; that if you cannot read, you cannot realize the great promise of the United States of America. That's what I believe. And so I've come to this school because I believe schools should set high standards and insist upon results, like teaching a child to read. I don't think it's too much to ask in schools around the United States of America. I know what happens when a child can't read at grade level. I know the despondency that can be caused if a child is just simply shuffled through a school.

Falkener is a magnet school. In other words, it's a school that—I equate that with educational entrepreneurship. It means people are willing to try things differently. This school is one that, interestingly enough, has got a international baccalaureate program inherent in its curriculum. And that's important because international baccalaureate programs are programs that set high standards for children in later years. So in other words, it's kind of a pre-international baccalaureate experience—all aimed at making sure that a child who goes from here has a chance to even have a greater skill level than anticipated. So it's interesting to be in a school that's a magnet school, that has got a pre-international baccalaureate program.

We support magnet schools at the Federal level. First, let me just tell you my theory. Most education needs to be funded at the State and local level. I believe that is the proper role between the Federal Government and the State government. And yet there are incentive programs that come out of Washington—Title I money, for example, is an incentive program. We also have put money in our budget for magnet schools. As a matter of fact, the budget next year I've asked for has got about $100 million for magnet schools. I think magnet schools are interesting concepts to—that the local folks ought to decide to use. And so there's a little incentive from the Federal Government to encourage you.

I'm a—also understand, and I hope you do—I know those of you involved with public schools understand that we're now living in a global economy. North Carolina understands that about as much as any State. What happens abroad affects the lives of our students in the near future. If a child in China gets a good engineering degree and a child in America doesn't, it means China is likely to be more competitive in the 21st century. In other words, we've got to get education right not only because it's a national responsibility but because we're in a global world. Whether we like it or not, there is competition for jobs of the future that are going to—that will take place. And therefore, it's important that we make sure that our children get a solid foundation early in order—so that our country can be competitive, as well as our children.

Now, let me talk about No Child Left Behind, because I'm really here to make clear to people in Congress, not only who are here but around the country, that the reauthorization of this important bill is going to be a top priority of mine. And it's not only just the reauthorization; it's the strengthening of the bill, and not the weakening of the bill.

There's been a lot of talk about No Child Left Behind Act. First, you've got to understand, it was a bipartisan effort. I readily concede that's a rare occurrence in Washington, DC, but nevertheless, Republicans and

Democrats came together to get this important piece of legislation passed.

It said, "We'll spend more money at the Federal level, but in return, we expect results." It seems like a simple concept, but nevertheless, it was not inherent in the education programs out of the Federal Government. We just never really asked; we just assumed everything was fine. As a matter of fact, in many schools around the country, that's the way it was. If people said it was fine, it was fine.

You know, I remember, one time, going to a school in Houston, Texas, and I said to the teacher, "How's everything? Thanks for teaching." She said, "My kids can't read." I think it was ninth or tenth grade. It was a shock to the Governor. It should be a shock to everybody when you hear a teacher say, my kids can't read by the time they get to high school. Something was wrong.

The point was made to me—and this is when Margaret and I started working on this concept of measurement—that if you don't measure, you don't know. And the only way to prevent kids from just getting shuffled through schools—until the point where the high school teacher says they can't read—is to measure early. And so part of the No Child Left Behind Act says, "We expect results, and you measure."

I believe in local control of schools. I do not believe the Federal Government should be telling the people in North Carolina how to run their schools. I think that would be a mistake if that were the case. I don't think the Federal Government ought to design the test; the people of North Carolina should design the accountability tests. I do think the Federal Government ought to ask, "Can a child read?"

Look, I understand kids—I understand the debate; you know, "They're teaching the test." No, you're teaching a child to read so they can pass a comprehensive test. And if they can't pass a comprehensive test, something is fundamentally wrong. You know, "All we do is test." No, what you do is, you teach so that the accountability system—when you do test, a child is proficient. You know, if you don't test, you don't know. And if you don't know, you can't correct. Active schools, schools that are meeting excellence are those that find problems early and solve the problems early, before it's too late. That's why I'm at this school. This school sets high standards.

And by the way, if you set low standards, guess what happens in schools? You get bad results. If you walk into a classroom full of the hard to educate and not have high standards, the hard to educate remains hard to educate. So the law says: "Set high standards; use curriculum that works; you can determine what works by measuring whether or not students are meeting certain standards; and correct problems early, before it's too late." That's what No Child Left Behind is all about.

And it's working. It's working. You know, the first year this school was tested under No Child Left Behind, it didn't meet standards—like, it just wasn't good enough. This school decided to do something about it. See, they recognized they had a problem, and so they used Federal funding to pay for new laboratories, teacher collaboration, research on what was going right and what was going wrong. There's a new focus on results; there was frequent testing; they set up a Saturday Academy for children with low test scores that needed extra help. And the results have been impressive. Four years ago, about 46 percent of third graders at this school were reading at grade level. That's okay if you're a parent of one of the 46 percent. It's not okay if you're a parent of one of the 54 percent. And the principal and the teachers understood there was a problem, and they took steps to change the status quo. And today, 76 percent are reading at grade level.

That's what No Child Left Behind does. It can't do the teaching; it can't be the leader; but it can help people who care deeply about the lives of a child—the life of a child to succeed, to recognize problems, address the problem, correct the problem, and teach a child to read. And that's what's—that's why I'm at Falkener. This is a school that has gone from mediocre to excellent, because they've used the tools of the No Child Left Behind Act.

In the fifth grade, about 68 percent of the students were reading at grade level 4 years ago; today, 88 percent of the students are reading at grade level. I cannot thank you

enough for taking advantage of a law that really was living up to its name—no child being left behind. Here's what your principal said: She said, "Falkener has greatly benefited from this legislation. Our test scores tell our story of success."

I met Tom Ned—you call him "Ned," right? Niedziela. He focused on reading comprehension and vocabulary, and his class made the largest reading gains in the fourth grade. One girl whose first language is Spanish—see, if the child's first language is Spanish, that child generally is what we call hard to educate. And sometimes that label becomes a self-fulfilling prophesy. Inner-city kids tend to be labeled hard to educate, so all that mattered in the past was, if you're 10, you're supposed to be here; and if you're 11, you're supposed to be there. It's unacceptable for this country, by the way. That type of attitude is unacceptable.

This child started the year reading at the second grade level. Thanks to Mr. Ned, she now reads at the sixth grade level. I met her. There's nothing more than helping a child's self-esteem than to—teaching a child to read, just giving that child the basic skills necessary to succeed in a hopeful society.

Here's what Mr. Ned said: He said, "I told them, if you want to be good at something, you've got to practice. If you want to play football, you have to go to football practice. If you want to be good at reading, you have to practice reading." And he said, "I've never had a class work so hard." I want to thank Mr. Ned; I want to thank the students. There's nothing more heartwarming than to know that standards are being met.

We see the results in No Child Left Behind across the State of North Carolina. I don't know if you know this or not, but your State has been an innovative State. Your State has been one that has not shied away from accountability. In other words, you didn't use excuses about testing. You said, "Look, we want to test because we want to know." Your State was the first in the Nation to establish an accountability system and one of the first to have the testing plans approved under No Child Left Behind. In other words, your State led. And I congratulate the State leaders and those involved with education for being bold on behalf of the children of your State.

Your test scores are encouraging. The percentage of fourth graders with basic math skills rose 10 points between 2000 and 2005. The percentage of eighth graders with basic math skills rose about six points between 2000 and 2005. African American fourth and eighth graders in North Carolina achieved some of the highest math scores in the Nation. How do we know? Because we measure.

It's got to make you feel good to hear African American kids are scoring some of the highest tests in the Nation. Can you imagine if the President came and said, "By the way, your kids are scoring the lowest scores in the Nation"? I suspect you'd want to be doing something about that. At least I would hope you would.

There are good results of No Child Left Behind across the Nation. In other words, we're measuring—each State measures, and you're able to norm to determine how States do relative to each other. In reading, 9-year-olds have made the largest gains in the past 5 years than at any point in the previous 28 years. That's good. In math, 9-year-olds and 13-year-olds earned the highest scores in the history of the test.

We have an achievement gap in America that is—that I don't like and you shouldn't like. It's the difference between reading of African American students and Latino students and White students. The gap is closing, and that's incredibly important for the United States of America, to see that achievement gap close. How do we know? Because we're measuring.

Inherent in No Child Left Behind are some interesting reforms. First, if we find a child falling behind early, there is extra Federal money to help that child. Think about that. For the first time, the Federal Government has said, "Not only do we want you to measure, but when we find a child falling behind, there is extra money to be used in either the private or public sector."

See, measuring encourages parental involvement. If you measure and a parent finds out that his or her child is not succeeding, most parents are going to say, "Do something about it." And what the Federal Government has said, "Here's some extra money to help

you, to get tutoring, to get you back up to grade level."

If a school continues to fail—in other words, a school doesn't make progress—I believe parents ought to be liberated from that school district if they so choose and go to another public school. In other words, there has to be a consequence at some point in time for a school that won't—is not teaching and won't change, if you expect there to be concrete results.

This school started off with low scores, set high standards, and has achieved the objective. I suspect not many parents, even if they could, would want to leave, because you're meeting—you're doing the job. There are schools around the country that are not doing the job, and that is unacceptable to society. It ought to be unacceptable to school boards and parents and teachers.

In DC, we started something interesting. We said that if the school fails, continue to—if there's persistent failure, that a child ought to be able to go to not only a public school but a private school. We provide what are called opportunity scholarships. We work with the mayor to enhance—it's an interesting opportunity—said, if you fail, and the school won't change, then the DC came up with a scholarship that said this scholarship could be redeemed at a public school or a Catholic school, for example.

There is a debate going on about whether we ought to reauthorize the No Child Left Behind Act. I think you can get a sense for where I'm coming from. Not only do I think we ought to reauthorize it; I think we ought to strengthen it. I think it would be a huge mistake for the United States Congress not to reauthorize this important piece of legislation. And the reason I say that is that it's working. In other words, there's just more than words there; we have achieved concrete results.

I'm not suggesting the law shouldn't be improved; it should be improved. For example, we ought to make sure that scores are tested early, particularly for big districts, so that people understand what the results are. Oftentimes in—I don't know how many big districts, Margaret—but I've heard complaints from school districts where the test scores get posted for the parents after the school year begins, which is like—it doesn't work. So the bureaucracy, frankly, has got to be a little more facile in getting the results out, and Margaret understands that.

I think we ought to continue doing what we call the Teacher Incentive Fund. This is a further reform. It allows States and school districts to reward teachers who demonstrate results for their students. If this school board decides they want to provide incentives for teachers based upon results, the Federal Government will provide money to help you do that. I like the idea. You may not like it, and that's fine. You got elected a school board member; I didn't. But, nevertheless, I do believe we ought to make sure that school boards and school districts have the option.

I also think there ought to be incentives for teachers who make the decision to teach in some of the needier school districts, tougher schools—to provide an incentive. We have got a program I'm going to work with Congress on to encourage math and science professionals to come into classrooms. And the reason why is, in order for us to be competitive in the future, our students have got to be proficient in math and the sciences, and we have to have more emphasis on math and science. And there's no better way to encourage a child to take math and science than to have a professional come in the class. We call them adjunct professors.

Margaret and I, one time, went over to a school in Maryland, and there were some people from NASA there, two science guys from NASA that could talk the language of science. And their message was: It's cool to be a scientist. Some pretty cool guys that were there, but they were saying to eighth grade kids, "Science is interesting for you." Sometimes it takes somebody in the field to be able to lend practical knowledge to convince children to continue to focus on science and math and engineering.

I talked to you about how to make sure parents get better information. I do believe we ought to fund a national opportunity scholarship program to make sure parents have choices—particularly poor parents have choices beyond just public school choice.

I'm worried about high school, and I think the new law ought to focus a lot on high

school. Four out of every—one out of every four ninth graders in America does not graduate from high school on time. That's a problem. If we live in a global world that's highly competitive, our kids have got to get out of high school, and they got to head to community college or college, if we're going to be competitive. And so we need to bring the same standards to our high schools that we have brought thus far to elementary and junior high schools.

We need to test. If it's okay to test in the third grade, it ought to be okay to test in high school to determine whether or not curricula works, whether or not teaching methodology is working, and whether or not our children are learning.

Again, I told you about the international baccalaureate program. It feeds into another way for us to enhance the competitiveness of this country, and that is to encourage AP programs—Advanced Placement programs—throughout classrooms all across America. One of the bottlenecks is—a bottleneck is the number of teachers that are capable of teaching AP. I think it's a good use of your taxpayers' money to train teachers in Advanced Placement; 70,000 teachers—is our initial goal to train in Advanced Placement, so that teachers have the skills necessary to teach AP. But it works.

It's amazing what happens when you set high standards and give people the tools necessary to effect those standards. And so these are ideas and ways to strengthen No Child Left Behind. We'll continue to listen to good ideas. We, of course, will listen to Members of Congress from both parties.

This is a State that had a good idea. They were deeply concerned about how to make sure that the accountability system would measure progress without—in an accurate way. And so Margaret worked with the State leaders, worked with the Senator to provide flexibility for the accountability system, without undermining the whole concept of measurement. And so in other words, we'll be rational and reasonable, but what we will not do is allow schools to lower standards. And what we will not do is allow people to get rid of accountability systems, because I believe the accountability system is the first step in making sure no child is left behind.

I understand what it means for public schools to guess whether or not a child can read and write and add and subtract, and I understand fully the consequences of a system that guesses. I also understand the consequences of a system which measures, and a system which measures and corrects problems is a system which will help meet the great promise of this country.

I want to thank you for giving me a chance to come and talk about something I feel strong about, deeply passionate about. I'm looking forward to getting these elections behind us and start working on the reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act, for the good of every child in the United States of America. God bless.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:07 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to former Gov. James Baxter Hunt, Jr., of North Carolina; Alan W. Duncan, chairman, Guilford County Schools Board of Education; and Mayor Anthony A. Williams of Washington, DC. The Office of the Press Secretary also released a Spanish language transcript of these remarks.

Remarks Following a Tour of Victory Junction Gang Camp, Inc., in Randleman, North Carolina

October 18, 2006

The President. You know, it's a remarkable place. I can't tell you how thrilled I am to be with the Pettys and the champion race car drivers who have heard a call to help people who need help. And I wish our fellow citizens could see the physical layout here; and if you were here, you'd also feel a great sense of compassion. And, you know, the Petty family has been well known for a long time in America. And they've been known as great athletes—now they will be known as great humanitarians as well.

And so we really thank you.

Kyle Petty. Thank you, sir.

The President. This is a place that's in honor of their son, Adam. They have made a conscious decision to turn a tragic event into a loving event, and that's what I feel here. And you guys did a good job. Thanks for having me.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:56 p.m. in Adam's Race Shop. In his remarks, he referred to NASCAR driver Kyle Petty and his wife, Pattie, founders, Victory Junction Gang Camp, Inc.

Proclamation 8072—50th Anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution

October 18, 2006

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

On the 50th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution, we celebrate the Hungarians who defied an empire to demand their liberty, we recognize the friendship between the United States and Hungary, and we reaffirm our shared desire to spread freedom to people around the world.

The story of Hungarian democracy represents the triumph of liberty over tyranny. In the fall of 1956, the Hungarian people demanded change, and tens of thousands of students, workers, and other citizens bravely marched through the streets to call for freedom. Though Soviet tanks brutally crushed the Hungarian uprising, the thirst for freedom lived on, and in 1989 Hungary became the first communist nation in Europe to make the transition to democracy. The lesson of the Hungarian experience is clear: liberty can be delayed, but it cannot be denied. Today, this beautiful country has held democratic elections, established a free economy, and inspired millions around the world.

The United States is grateful for the warm relationship between our countries and for Hungary's efforts to expand freedom and democracy around the world in places such as the Balkans, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Cuba. By spreading the blessings of liberty, Hungary is helping to lay the foundation of peace for generations to come.

As we celebrate this anniversary, we also recognize the many ways Hungarian Americans have enriched and strengthened our country. Their spirit and hard work have contributed to the vitality, success, and prosperity of our Nation, and we continue to be inspired by their courage and conviction.

Now, Therefore, I, George W. Bush, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim October 23, 2006, as a day of recognition in honor of the 50th Anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution. I encourage all Americans to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eighteenth day of October, in the year of our Lord two thousand six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and thirty-first.

George W. Bush

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 20, 2006]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 23.

Remarks at a Reception for Congressional Candidate Don Sherwood and the Pennsylvania Victory Committee in La Plume, Pennsylvania

October 19, 2006

Thank you all very much. Please be seated. I'm glad to be back again. Thanks for welcoming me. I am pleased to be here with Don Sherwood. He is the right man to represent the people of the Tenth Congressional District from the State of Pennsylvania.

He has got a record of accomplishment. He has been a strong supporter of those brave men and women who wear our Nation's uniform. He has been a supporter of the Tobyhanna Army Depot. He's a strong supporter of Pennsylvania's dairy farmers. When it came time to make sure highway money was available for Pennsylvania, he did his job that you expect him to do. He's a person who has been working hard to increase jobs here in this part of the world. He's worked to cut taxes on the working people. He understands it's important to keep the people of the district safe. I strongly believe the people in this part of Pennsylvania need to send Don Sherwood back to the United States Congress.

And I'm glad Carol is here with us today. I read Carol Sherwood's letter to the citizens of this congressional district. I was deeply moved by her words. Carol's letter shows what a caring and courageous woman she is. I'm delighted to be here with Carol and their daughter, Maria. Thanks for coming.

I am not Sherwood's first choice to be here at the fundraiser—[*laughter*]—both he and Carol wanted Laura to come. [*Laughter*] But she sends her very best to the Sherwoods, and she, like me, strongly believes Don Sherwood ought to be reelected to the United States Congress.

I want to thank Dr. Ned Boehm, the president of Keystone College—and Regina. Regina told me she broke her foot playing golf. [*Laughter*] In 2½ years, I'm going to try that out myself. [*Laughter*] But thank you very much for letting us use this facility on this beautiful campus, and thanks very much for being involved in higher education. I appreciate your leadership, and I know the people of this part of the world do as well.

I thank very much Rob Gleason, who's the chairman of the Republican State Committee for Pennsylvania, and Bob Asher, who is the national committeeman. The reason I bring up these folks is that a lot of politics depends upon the capacity of the grassroots to do their job. So first, I want to thank you very much for raising the money, filling the hat. It's important for Don Sherwood's campaign to be able to advertise, and he will continue to do so. But in order for him to win, we got to turn out the vote. And so for those of you who are involved with grassroots politics, I want to thank you in advance for what you're going to do to get people to the polls come November.

I also want to thank my friend Bill Scranton, who's with us today. Bill and Maryla are fine citizens of this part of the world, and I'm proud to call him friend. And I really want to thank you for being here. Thanks for coming.

It's a big campaign coming up, and I like being out on the campaign trail because I like sharing with the people what I believe. And I'm looking forward to working with Congressman Sherwood the next time Congress convenes in—not in a lameduck session. We got a lot to do. One thing we got to do is make sure we become less dependent on foreign sources of oil. You know, I understand the price of gasoline is dropping, but that should not obscure the fact that we have a national security problem when it comes to relying upon oil from parts of the world that don't like us.

And so I want to continue to work with Congressman Sherwood to make sure we promote new technologies, new ways to power our automobiles. I envision a day when ethanol becomes more widespread, where Pennsylvania farmers are actually providing the fuel necessary to run our cars. For the sake of economic security and for the sake of national security, we must continue to diversify away from foreign sources of crude oil.

No, we'll work together on issues like health care. I appreciate the fact that he was a strong supporter of Medicare modernization. For the seniors who are on prescription drugs here in this part of the district, they understand that this new Medicare bill is a good bill. No longer do poor seniors have to choose between medicine and food, thanks to people like Congressman Don Sherwood.

But as this campaign gets closer to the stretch, you will hear a lot of rhetoric and a lot of partisan charges coming from the other side. Their goal is to distract you from the two main issues in this campaign, and they are these: Which party will keep your taxes low, and which party will take the steps necessary to defend the United States of America?

My administration, our party, and Don Sherwood have clear records on both these issues. Let me first start with taxes. Republicans have a clear philosophy: We believe that the people who know best how to spend your money are the people that earn that money, and that is you. The Democrats believe that they can spend your money better than you can. So we worked hard to ensure that the working families in this district and all around the country kept more of their paychecks when we enacted the largest tax cuts since Ronald Reagan was President of the United States.

Our record is clear, and so is the record of the Democrats in Washington, DC. When we cut taxes for everybody who pays income

taxes, the Democrats voted against it. When we reduced the marriage penalty, Democrats voted against it. When we cut taxes on small businesses, Democrats voted against it. When we lowered taxes for families with children, the Democrats voted against it. We put the death tax on the road to extinction; the Democrats voted against it time and time again. When the Democrats had a chance to deliver tax relief for the American people, they voted no. This is a party that is genetically hostile to tax relief. [*Laughter*]

With every vote they have cast, they make clear to the American people, higher taxes are part of the congressional Democrats' DNA. When we passed tax relief over the Democrat objections in 2003, the minority leader in the House called it a tragedy and predicted it would not create jobs or grow our economy.

And here are the actual facts: The tax cuts we passed put more than a trillion dollars in the hands of American workers and families and small businesses and farmers, and the American people have used that money to fuel a strong and growing economy. The United States economy is the envy of the industrialized world.

Since overcoming the recession, the terrorist attacks, war, hurricanes, corporate scandals, this economy has had 37 straight months of job growth, since August of 2003. And since that day, we've added 6.6 million new jobs. The national unemployment rate is low. The progrowth economic policies that Don Sherwood supported have made this economy strong, and we intend to keep it growing.

As well, because of growing our economy, which increases tax revenues into the Federal Treasury, and being wise about how we spend your money, we met our goal of reducing our Federal deficit in half 3 years ahead of schedule. Democrats may call this a tragedy; we call it success.

And now you're going to hear that same old, tired rhetoric—Washington Democrats talking about how they're going to raise taxes only on the rich. You know, they say they're for fairness and they're for tax relief for the middle class. But we've heard this before, and the American people shouldn't be fooled by this kind of rhetoric.

You might remember, back in 1992, the Democrats campaigned on a tax cut for the middle class. They won, but when they took office, the middle class tax cut they promised turned out to be the largest tax increase in American history. The moral of the story is that when you hear Democrats talk about fairness, there's a pretty good chance they're going to try to get in your pocket and raise your taxes.

There is no doubt in my mind that the key issue in this campaign, as far as domestic politics is concerned, is: Who is going to keep your taxes low, and who will raise your taxes? The Republican Party and Don Sherwood will make sure the working people have more money in their pocket.

Our most important job is to protect America. The most important job of the Federal Government is to use all our assets to protect the American people from an attack. We are still under threat. I wish I could report otherwise. I wish I could tell you everything was fine in the world and the enemy wasn't around that would come and try to harm us again. But I wouldn't be doing my job if I reported that. An enemy still plots and plans to attack the American people. These people are nothing but coldblooded killers. They're not religious people. I don't believe religious people kill innocent men and women and children. I believe the President must call these people by what they are: They are evil. And our most important job is to protect the American people from further attack.

You can't negotiate with these people. You can't hope to have a treaty with these people. The best way to defend America from an attack is to defeat them overseas so we do not have to face them here at home.

There are major differences between the political parties on the issue of how best to protect the American people. You know, the enemy has got to be right once, and we've got to be right 100 percent of the time to protect you.

And that's why I thought it was very important to institute a program that would enable our professionals at the Central Intelligence Agency to question people that we captured on the battlefield in order to be able to gain

information necessary to do our most important job, which is to protect the American people.

And recently we had a vote on a program in the House of Representatives. When it came time to stand up and be counted, Don Sherwood voted to support the professionals at the CIA. And that cannot be said for most of his Democrat colleagues in the House. The American people must understand that nearly 80 percent of the House Democrats voted to take away this vital tool, which is necessary to protect the American people from further attack.

The other clear example is the PATRIOT Act. This good bill tore down the wall that made it impossible for law enforcement and intelligence to share information. I know that's hard for you to believe, that when intelligence had information, they couldn't share it with those who were responsible for protecting you. But that's what happened. Over time, there was a wall. And so I called for the Congress to pass the PATRIOT Act that enabled us to share information so we could break up terrorist cells, which we have—in California, in Texas, in New Jersey and Illinois and North Carolina, Ohio, New York, Virginia, and Florida. The tools inherent in the PATRIOT Act have been vital and necessary to enable us to do our job, which is to protect the American people from further attack. When this important piece of legislation came up for reauthorization, Congressman Don Sherwood supported this vital law, but more than 75 percent of the House Democrats voted to block it.

There's a fundamental difference of opinion all across the Nation about which party understands the stakes in this war on terror. After 9/11, I decided it was essential that if Al Qaida or an Al Qaida affiliate was making a phone call into the United States of America, we needed to know why in order to be able to do our job and protect you. Recently this bill came up for a vote in the United States Congress. The United States Congressman from the Tenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania voted to support our professionals who are doing everything we can to protect you, but almost 90 percent of the House Democrats voted against it.

Rarely has a single series of votes summed up the difference between the two parties so clearly. If the House Democrats had their way, the PATRIOT Act would have expired; the CIA interrogation program would have been shut down; the terrorist surveillance program would have been discontinued. And that is the record the Democrats have to run on, and it is no record to be proud of in a time of war. We Republicans understand that we must give our professionals all the tools necessary to protect the American people.

Iraq is an important issue in this campaign. I strongly believe that Iraq is a central front in the war on terror. Oh, I know some of them in Washington are saying Iraq is a diversion from the war on terror. That's not what Usama bin Laden thinks. That's not what the number-two man in Al Qaida thinks, Mr. Zawahiri. It's important to listen to the words of the enemy. Both of those men have said that it's just a matter of time for America to lose her nerve and to leave Iraq. And that's what they want to do, so they can have a safe haven from which to plot and plan and to attack America again.

These extremists are bound by a common ideology of hate, and their objective is to establish that ideology throughout the Middle East. Their objective is to topple moderate government. Their objective is to use energy as a resource to bring the West to its knees. And Iraq is a central part of this war against them.

On this question, the Democrats have been all over the place. Most leading Democrats argue we should pull our troops out of Iraq—some, "Right away," others, "In just a few months," even if the terrorists have not yet been defeated. Others recommend moving our troops to an island some 5,000 miles away. Nineteen House Democrats introduced legislation that would cut off all funds for our troops in Iraq. All these proposals have one thing in common: They would have our country quit in Iraq before the job is done. For the sake of the security of the United States of America, we must defeat the enemy in Iraq. For the sake of world peace, for the sake of peace for our children, we must not let the extremists have their way in this vital front in the war on

terror. So America will stay; we will fight; and we will win in Iraq. [*Applause*] Thank you.

This summer, we saw what happens when a Democrat rejects his party's doctrine of cut-and-run. Senator Joe Lieberman, a three-term Democrat from Connecticut, supports completing the mission in Iraq, supports victory in Iraq. And for taking this stand, he was purged from his party. Think about what that means. Six years ago, the Democrats thought Joe Lieberman was good enough to run for Vice President of the United States. Now, because he supports victory in Iraq, they don't think he's fit to be in their party. There's only one position in the Democrat Party that everybody seems to agree on: If you want to be a Democrat these days, you can be for almost anything, but victory in Iraq is not an option.

The stakes in this war couldn't be higher. The security of the United States is at stake, and we have no illusions—it's tough. The fighting is tough, because an enemy understands what a defeat in Iraq would mean for their ambitions. We are a nation at war, and we must do everything in our power to win that war.

Our goal in Iraq is clear and unchanging: Our goal is victory. What is changing are the tactics we use to pursue that goal and defeat our enemies. In Iraq, we face adversaries who are brutal, and they are sophisticated. Our commanders on the ground are constantly adjusting to stay ahead of the enemy. We have a strategy that allows us to be flexible and to adapt to changing circumstances. We will continue to make the changes necessary to support our troops, and to support those 12 million people in Iraq who want to be free, and to support the new democracy in Iraq that represents the unity of that country. There is one thing we will not do: We will not pull out our troops from Iraq before the terrorists are defeated. We will not pull out before Iraq can govern itself, sustain itself, and defend itself.

I'm going to make it clear to the American people what a policy of retreat would mean. Retreating from Iraq would allow the terrorists to gain a new state—new safe haven to replace the one they lost in Afghanistan. Retreating from Iraq would dishonor the service of our brave men and women who have sacrificed in that country and have given their lives in that country, which would mean their sacrifice would be in vain. Retreating from Iraq would crush the hopes of the millions of people who just simply want to live in peace, if America were to retreat. Retreating from Iraq would embolden the terrorists and make our country more vulnerable to new attacks. If we were to leave Iraq before the job is done, the enemy would follow us here to America.

We know this because that's what the terrorists tell us. Usama bin Laden states that early American withdrawal from places like Beirut and Somalia are proof that the United States does not have the stomach to stay in this fight. The terrorists are trying to wait us out. They're hoping we will lose our nerve and retreat in disgrace. If we were to follow the Democrat's prescriptions and withdraw from Iraq, we would be fulfilling Usama bin Laden's highest aspirations. There can be legitimate disagreements on the best way to win this war, and there are. But we should at least be able to agree that the path to victory is not to do precisely what the terrorists want.

The stakes in this war are high, and so are the stakes in this election. I want to tell you—I want you to imagine what the House of Representatives would look like if the Democrats get their way this November. The chairman of the House Ways and Means would be a Congressman who suggested cutting off funding for our troops in Iraq. The Speaker of the House, the official third in line for the Presidency, would be a Congresswoman who voted against renewing the PATRIOT Act, against creating the Department of Homeland Security, against removing Saddam Hussein from power, against continuing the terrorist surveillance program, and against questioning terrorists in the CIA program. The Speaker would be a Congresswoman who has called liberating 25 million Iraqis a grotesque mistake. The Speaker would be a Congresswoman who said catching Usama bin Laden would not make America any safer. No wonder she says this election should not be about national security. [*Laughter*]

Given the Democrats' record on national security, I understand why they want to change the subject. I don't want to change the subject. I'm going to keep talking about this subject until election day. The most important job of the government is to protect you.

We'll win. We will protect the American people by staying on the offense. There's just a different attitude in Washington, if you really listen carefully to the debate. Some believe that we should respond after attack. I understand the consequences of attack, and so do you. We must take threats seriously before they fully materialize.

We got a fantastic group of men and women who wear our uniform. They are motivated; they are skilled; and Don Sherwood and I will make sure they have all the tools necessary to protect the American people.

And we have one other asset at our disposal to protect the American people, and that is the power of liberty. You know, there's an interesting debate in the world about whether or not liberty is universal or not. I believe it is. I believe there's an Almighty, and I believe a gift of the Almighty to each man and woman and child in this world is the desire to be free. That's what I believe. I'm not surprised when 12 million people defied car bombers and said, "We want to live in a land of liberty."

You know, I was amazed that they defied the car bombers, but I'm not surprised, because I believe everybody wants to be free. I believe people have a deep desire to live in peace, and I know that liberty can help yield the peace we want for generations to come. We're in an ideological struggle between those of us who love liberty and extremists who can't stand the thought of liberty. And it's the call of our generation. It's the challenge of our time. But I have great confidence that our generation will rise and meet the challenge like previous generations of Americans.

You know, I was reminded of that, and one of my favorite stories to share with our fellow citizens is my trip down to Memphis, Tennessee, to Elvis's place, with former Prime Minister Koizumi. He was sitting Prime Minister at the time. People say, "Why did you go down there?" I say, "Well, I had never been to Elvis's place, and I thought it would be kind of fun to go down there." Koizumi wanted to go to Elvis's place because he's an Elvis fan. But I also wanted to tell an interesting story about the power of liberty to our fellow citizens.

See, I find it very interesting that an 18-year-old George H.W. Bush volunteered to fight the Japanese. After all, they were the sworn enemy of the United States of America. And then his son is on an airplane, Air Force One, flying down to Memphis, Tennessee, talking about the peace; talking about how we can work together to convince the leader in North Korea to give up his nuclear weapons ambitions; talking about why it was important for Japan to have a thousand troops helping that young democracy in the heart of the Middle East.

See, Koizumi understands what I know, that democracy will be a defeat to an ideology of hatred in the long run. I found it interesting that my dad fought the Japanese and his son is talking about the peace with the Prime Minister of the former enemy. Something happened, and what happened was, Japan adopted a Japanese-style democracy. Democracies yield the peace we all want. Someday, an American President will be sitting down, talking about the peace with duly elected leaders in the Middle East, and generations of Americans will be better off. That's the stake in the election. [*Applause*] These are the stakes in this election.

I want to thank you for supporting Don Sherwood. I want to thank you for being involved in the process. Now go out and turn out the vote, and he's going to win.

May God bless you, and may God bless our country.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:04 p.m. at Keystone College. In his remarks, he referred to Regina Boehm, wife of Edward G. Boehm, Jr., president, Keystone College; Pennsylvania gubernatorial candidate Bill Scranton, and his wife, Maryla; Usama bin Laden, leader of the Al Qaida terrorist organization; former President Saddam Hussein of Iraq; former Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi of Japan; and Chairman Kim Jong Il of North Korea.

Remarks at a Reception for Senatorial Candidate George Allen in Richmond, Virginia

October 19, 2006

Thank you all. Thank you for coming. Thanks for the warm welcome, and thank you for supporting George Allen to be reelected United States Senator of the great State of Virginia.

I'm proud to be here with him. He's a man who has earned the confidence of the people of this State as a delegate, as the Governor—and a very successful Governor—as a United States Senator. He's the kind of fellow who says he's going to—what he tells you on the campaign trail, he does in office. He doesn't need a poll or a focus group to tell him what to think or what to say. George Allen is a man of strong principle; he is a leader; he is the right man to be the United States Senator from the State of Virginia.

And he married well, and so did I. See, we got something in common—we're both named George, and we both married smart, beautiful women. Laura is very fond of the Allens. She understands that they are honorable, decent people—honest, good folks. We're proud to call them friends, and I know the people of Virginia are proud to call George Allen United States Senator.

I appreciate the Lieutenant Governor—Lieutenant Governor Bill Bolling and his wife, Jean Ann, and the family are with us today. Governor, thanks for coming. Speaker Bill Howell is with us. Appreciate you being here, Mr. Speaker.

I had the honor of meeting an interesting fellow at the airport today—as a matter of fact, he was at the steps there when I got off of Air Force One, and we traveled throughout his senatorial district a little bit because we went and bought some pumpkins. [*Laughter*] His name is State Senator Benny Lambert. See, the Allen campaign understands that you reach across party line. He did that as the Governor of the State of Virginia; he has done that as the United States Senator. There's no doubt in my mind this good man will win by getting the votes of Republicans, discerning Democrats, and wise independents.

I really want to thank you all for coming. I appreciate you contributing to his campaign, and I want to thank the grassroots activists who are here for what you're fixing to do. See, we're getting close to voting time. We're coming down the stretch. And for those of you who are going to be putting up the signs and making the phone calls and going to your houses of worship or community centers urging people to do their duty as an American citizen and voting for George Allen, I want to thank you. A lot of times the grassroots folks don't get the thanks that you deserve. I'm here giving you thanks; I know the Senator gives you thanks. Work hard. We need him in the United States Senate, for the good of the United States of America.

I'm looking forward to continue to working with Senator Allen to diversify our energy. I'm looking forward to promoting ethanol and new technologies so that we can change our habits and become less dependent on foreign sources of oil. For the economic security of the United States and for the national security of the United States, we need to get off oil.

I'm looking forward to continue to work with Senator Allen to make sure that patients and doctors make the decisions for health care, not for people in Washington, DC. Now, there's a lot of domestic issues that I look forward to working with Senator Allen on, but there's no bigger issue than what we do with the people's money—no bigger issue.

There's a lot of rhetoric in these campaigns, a lot of needless noise in a campaign. A lot of time it's to obscure the fundamental issues facing the people of Virginia and the people all across our Nation. And the two biggest issues in this campaign, in any campaign across the country, is which party will take the steps necessary to protect the American people and win the war on terror, and which party is going to keep your taxes low to keep this economy growing.

George Allen and I have made our position very plain. Nobody has to guess where we stand. We got a clear record on taxes, and our philosophy is easy to understand. It says: We trust the people. See, we understand it's your money, not the government's money. We think the best people to spend the hard-

earned dollars that you make is you. We understand the economy grows when you have more money in your pocket to save, spend, or invest.

And therefore, we worked together to deliver the greatest tax cuts since Ronald Reagan was the President of the United States. We said, if you're going to have tax relief, then everybody who pays taxes ought to get relief. So we reduced the marriage penalty as well. We doubled the child tax credit. We understand that an economy grows when the small-business owners are growing. And so we cut taxes on small businesses; we cut taxes on capital gains and dividends to promote investment and jobs. And to reward family businesses and farmers right here in the great State of Virginia for a lifetime of hard work and savings, we put the death tax on the road to extinction.

Our record on cutting taxes is clear, and the Democrats in Washington, DC, have a record of their own. The trouble is, they don't want you to know about it. [*Laughter*] It's interesting that recently the top Democrat leader in the House of Representatives made an interesting declaration. She said, "We love tax cuts." Given her record, she must be a secret admirer. [*Laughter*] It's just not the so-called "tax cuts for the rich" she opposes.

When we cut taxes for everybody who pays income taxes, she voted against it. When we reduced the marriage penalty, she voted against it. When we cut taxes on small businesses, she voted against it. When we put the death tax on the road to extinction, she voted against it. Time and time again, she and her party voted against tax cuts. Time and time again, when she had an opportunity to show her love for tax cuts, she voted no. If this is the Democrats' idea of love—[*laughter*]—I wouldn't want to see what hate looks like. [*Laughter*]

But, by the way, this view of taxes extends beyond the House of Representatives. Democrats in the United States Senate had the same point of view. I remember when we cut the taxes in 2003. See, we were coming out of a recession, and we were dealing with the effects of a terrorist attack, and we were dealing with the effects of corporate scandal. And we knew that in order to recover, we had to let the people have more of their own money.

And one Democrat in the Senate said these tax cuts would do nothing to create jobs. One of his colleagues called the tax cuts the wrong prescription for our economy. Those were the predictions, and here are the results: The tax cuts we passed have put more than a trillion dollars in the hands of American workers and families and small businesses—including millions of families living right here in Virginia. And the amazing thing is, the people did a much better job with your money than the Government did or could have done.

Since August 2003, our economy has had 37 straight months of job growth. Since August of 2003, we added 6.6 million new jobs. Small businesses are flourishing. Homeownership is up. This economy is strong, and we intend to keep it that way.

You know, I'm sure you've heard the line that the Democrats are just going to raise taxes on the rich. They say it every time. But I want the people here in Virginia who are listening to the debate on taxes to remember what happened back in 1992, after the Democrats campaigned on cutting the taxes for the middle class. Well, they won, and they came to power, and the middle class tax cut they promised turned out to be one of the largest tax increases in American history.

We just have a different view of the world when it comes to taxes. We believe you can spend your money well. The Democrats want the Government to spend your money. No, the best way to make sure that this economy stays strong is to make the tax cuts we passed permanent. And the best thing the Virginia citizens can do to make sure taxes stay low is to send George Allen back to the United States Senate.

It's interesting, if you look at the history of tax cuts, the Democrat Party always—didn't always feel the way they feel today. Back in the sixties, the Democrats understood that our economy grows when Americans keep more of what they earn, when Americans make their own decisions about how to save, spend, or invest. You might remember, when President John F. Kennedy became President, he proposed across-the-

board tax cuts for American families and small businesses, including tax cuts on capital gains.

In his message to the Congress in 1963, he explained that cutting taxes across the board, in his words, "would help strengthen every segment of the American economy and bring us closer to every basic objective of American economic policy." John F. Kennedy was right in 1963, and George Allen and I are right in 2006.

Next month, the people of this State and people all across the United States have a basic choice to make: Do we keep taxes low so we can keep the economy growing, or do we let the Democrats in Washington raise taxes, which will hurt our economic growth? And I'm convinced, when people sift through all the noise and listen carefully to the debate, the people of this State and the people across the United States will choose low taxes and strong economy policy and growth, and that means reelecting George Allen to the United States Senate.

The biggest issue we face is protecting the American people. It's the most important job of government. I learned that lesson on September the 11th, 2001, and so did George Allen and a lot of other good folks. And we learned that fateful day that our most important responsibility is to protect you, and this is a fundamental issue in this campaign: What candidate or what party has got the right policies to protect the American people from further attack?

We face a brutal enemy—an enemy that uses murder to achieve political objectives. You can't negotiate with these people. There's no such thing as a peace treaty with these kind of killers. The best way to protect the American people is to stay on the offense and bring them to justice before they hurt America again.

And the best way to protect America is to give our professionals the tools they need to protect you from attack. We recently had a debate—a series of debates in the House and the Senate that clarified the two political parties' position on the war on terror on how best to protect the American people.

I believe strongly that our CIA professionals should have authorization to question people we pick up on the battlefield, to determine whether or not they have information that is necessary to protect you. We're at war with a group of killers. We pick people up off the battlefield, and I believe that it's necessary to learn what they know so that we can anticipate attacks before they occur.

This bill came up before the—in front of the United States Senate, and one of the strongest advocates for making sure our professionals had the tools necessary to protect you was Senator George Allen of the State of Virginia.

The same cannot be said for his Democratic Senate colleagues. More than 70 percent of the United States Senators from the Democrat Party voted to take away this vital tool in the war on terror. We just have a different point of view, a different look at the world.

You know, another clear example of the difference of opinion came when we voted for and reauthorized what we call the PATRIOT Act. There was a wall that existed between law enforcement and intelligence gathering in the United States. I know that's hard to conceive, but it's true. In other words, intelligence officers could not speak with law enforcement officers. In this new war on terror against these extremists we have to have good intelligence. And that good intelligence must be shared with professionals all throughout government, in order to be able to protect you.

Right after September the 11th, when people were deeply concerned about attacks and future attacks, George Allen voted yes on the PATRIOT Act, as did 97 of his colleagues in the Senate. And yet the bill needed to be reauthorized years later. And so I called upon the Senate. I said, "There's still a threat; we still face a threat." And yet Senate Democrats filibustered the bill, the reauthorization of a bill that would tear down the walls between intelligence and law enforcement. Filibuster means they don't want it to pass, so they talk a lot. [*Laughter*] It happens quite a bit in Washington. [*Laughter*] The Senate Democratic leader bragged, "We have killed the PATRIOT Act." Think about that. The main Democrat in the United States Senate said, "We killed the PATRIOT

Act." He was asked later by a reporter whether killing the PATRIOT Act was really something to celebrate, and he answered, "Of course it is."

There's a fundamental difference of opinion between Democrats and Republicans on this issue. They voted for it right after 9/11; they tried to kill it 5 years later. Kind of sounds familiar, doesn't it? [*Laughter*] They voted for it right before they voted against it. [*Laughter*] You don't have to worry about George Allen being steadfast and making sure our folks have the tools necessary to protect you. A fundamental issue in this campaign is—who best to protect the United States of America. Our record is clear, and you need to send George Allen back to the United States Senate so we can do our duty, so we can assume the responsibilities of this era and protect you from further attack.

A big issue in this campaign, of course, is Iraq. Iraq is a central front in the war on terror. Iraq is a part of defeating an enemy that would like to hurt us again. Oh, I know—I've heard all the rhetoric; I'm sure you've heard it too, that people say Iraq is just a distraction from the war on terror. That's what a lot of Democrats believe. Well, if you're out there listening and you're worried about who to vote for and worried about which party has the clearest vision about how to protect the American people, don't take my word for whether Iraq is part of the war on terror, listen to Usama bin Laden—or Mr. Zawahiri, he's the number-two man in Al Qaida.

These two killers have made it clear that Iraq is an important part of their campaign to establish a totalitarian form of government across the Middle East. They have made it clear in their words that they believe America is weak, that it's just a matter of time; if they murder enough people, that we will withdraw.

And they want us to withdraw. They want us to withdraw so that they can establish safe haven from which to launch attacks. They want us to withdraw so they can topple moderate governments. They want us to withdraw because they got designs on energy. They would like nothing more than to blackmail the free world with the fear of running up the price of energy; blackmail the free world to abandon our alliance with Israel; blackmail the free world to continue to force the West to cater to their needs and their dark vision of the world.

When you couple all that with the possibility of Iran having a nuclear weapon, you begin to understand the stakes in the war on terror. You begin to think about how important it is that when we confront the enemy, we defeat the enemy.

I fully understand—[*applause*]—we have a fundamental disagreement in Washington, DC, on this central front in the war on terror. Most Democrats—most leading Democrats argue we should pull our troops out of Iraq—some, "right away"; others, "in just a few months," even if the terrorists have not been defeated. Others recommend moving our troops to an island 5,000 miles away. Nineteen House Democrats introduced legislation that would cut off funds for our troops in Iraq. All these programs have one thing in common—they would have our country quit in Iraq before the job is done. That's why they are the party of cut-and-run.

The United States of America will support our allies in Iraq. We will stand with the 12 million people who demanded freedom at the ballot box. Our goal of Iraq that can defend itself and govern itself and sustain itself and an ally in the war on terror is an important goal. We will give our commanders the flexibility they need to continue to change the tactics to achieve that goal. We will fight; we will stay; and we will win in Iraq.

And I want to thank Senator Allen's stand. This is tough; this is a tough fight. It's a tough fight when we see carnage on our television screens. It's a tough fight when somebody you know has volunteered to serve the United States and doesn't come home. It's tough, but it's tough for a reason: because the enemy understands the stakes in Iraq. They have ambitions. And it's up to this generation to stand with our troops, to put forth a strategy for victory, to not abandon those voices in the Middle East—the millions of people who simply want to live in peace. This is the calling of our time.

You know, the Democrat Party made a clear statement about the nature of their party when it came to how they dealt with Senator Joe Lieberman. He's a three-term

Democrat from Connecticut who supports completing the mission in Iraq. He took a strong, principled stand, and he was purged from the Democrat Party. Think about what it means. Six years ago, the Democrats thought that Joe Lieberman was a good enough man and a good enough politician to run as the Vice Presidential candidate. Now, because he supports victory in Iraq for the sake of security in the United States, they don't think he's fit to be in their party. There's only one position in the Democratic Party that everybody seems to agree on: If you want to be a Democrat these days, you can be for almost anything, but victory in Iraq is not an option.

These are serious times. It requires steadfast leadership, strong determination. People like George Allen need to be reelected—to stand strongly with our troops, the voices that desire peace. We'll stay on the offense; we will keep the enemy on the run. We will do the hard fight now so a generation of Americans can grow up in peace. We've got fantastic assets on our side. We've got a military that will get all the support and training they need to defend the American people.

We also have the power of liberty. Freedom is a powerful force. You know, I like to tell people about an interesting experience I had. That's when I went to Elvis's place—[*laughter*]—with the then sitting Prime Minister of Japan. I went down there. I'd never been to Elvis's place. I thought it would be interesting to go there. [*Laughter*] Prime Minister Koizumi wanted to go to Elvis's place because he loves Elvis. [*Laughter*]

But I wanted to tell a story, and I'm going to tell it to you right quick, the reason I went. You might remember, my dad, and I know some of your relatives, fought the Japanese as a sworn enemy. There was a lot of kids in the early forties that signed up to fight the Japanese. They had attacked us, and this country was going to defend ourselves.

I find it amazing, and I hope you do too, that the son of Navy pilot George H.W. Bush, the sitting President of the United States, is on Air Force One, flying down with the Prime Minister of the former enemy talking about the peace. We're talking about North Korea and how we can work together to convince the leader in North Korea to give up his nuclear weapons ambitions. We're talking about the fact that Japan had 1,000 troops in Iraq because Prime Minister Koizumi and I know that freedom is how you defeat an ideology of hatred; that we understand that when you encourage liberty to flourish where it hadn't flourished, it provides hope. It helps defeat those who prey on hopelessness.

It's an amazing conversation—I've had several with him. But every time I have sat down with him, I find it interesting fact of history that my dad fought the Japanese, and today, his son is working to keep the peace. Something happened. Japan adopted a Japanese-style democracy. It's—the example is, liberty has the capacity to change an enemy into an ally. Liberty has the capacity to turn a region of hate into a region of compassion. Someday, an American President will be sitting down talking about the peace with duly elected leaders from the Middle East, and a generation of Americans will be better off.

God bless.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:33 p.m. at the Science Museum of Virginia. In his remarks, he referred to Susan Allen, wife of Senator George Allen; Usama bin Laden, leader of the Al Qaida terrorist organization; former Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi of Japan; and Chairman Kim Jong Il of North Korea.

Notice—Continuation of the National Emergency With Respect to Significant Narcotics Traffickers Centered in Colombia

October 19, 2006

On October 21, 1995, by Executive Order 12978, the President declared a national emergency pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701–1706) to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States constituted by the actions of significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia, and the extreme level of violence, corruption, and harm such actions cause in the United States and abroad.

The order blocks all property and interests in property that are in the United States, or within the possession or control of United

States persons, of foreign persons listed in an annex to the order, as well as of foreign persons determined to play a significant role in international narcotics trafficking centered in Colombia. The order similarly blocks all property and interests in property of foreign persons determined to materially assist in, or provide financial or technological support for or goods or services in support of, the narcotics trafficking activities of persons designated in or pursuant to the order. In addition, the order blocks all property and interests in property of persons determined to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, persons designated in or pursuant to the order. The order also prohibits any transaction or dealing by United States persons or within the United States in property or interests in property of the persons designated in or pursuant to the order.

Because the actions of significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia continue to threaten the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States and to cause an extreme level of violence, corruption, and harm in the United States and abroad, the national emergency declared on October 21, 1995, and the measures adopted pursuant thereto to deal with that emergency, must continue in effect beyond October 21, 2006. Therefore, in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), I am continuing for 1 year the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia. This notice shall be published in the *Federal Register* and transmitted to the Congress.

George W. Bush

The White House,

October 19, 2006.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 1:14 p.m., October 19, 2006]

NOTE: This notice was published in the *Federal Register* on October 20.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Continuation of the National Emergency With Respect to Significant Narcotics Traffickers Centered in Colombia

October 19, 2006

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the emergency declared with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia is to continue in effect beyond October 21, 2006.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on October 21, 1995, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The actions of significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States and to cause unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm in the United States and abroad. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain economic pressure on significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia by blocking their property and interests in property that are in the United States or within the possession or control of United States persons and by depriving them of access to the U.S. market and financial system.

Sincerely,

George W. Bush

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Richard B. Cheney, President of the Senate.

Remarks to Reporters at a CVS Pharmacy

October 20, 2006

Medicare Reform

The President. Secretary Leavitt and I are pleased to be here at this counter where seniors come to buy prescription drugs. And one of the interesting things that happens at this counter is that these decent folks are constantly reminding seniors that there is a cost-saving benefit, Plan D in Medicare, available for them. It's a new plan; it just started last year. The Health and Human Services helped implement the plan, and millions of seniors are benefiting. Our seniors are saving money. They're getting better coverage. It's a plan that I'm real proud of.

We will continue to work to make it as good as it possibly can be. I really do want to thank these kind-hearted souls who say to a senior that you no longer—poor seniors, particularly—you no longer have to choose between food and medicine, because there's a new way forward. Our compassionate approach to health care is working for America's seniors. And I want to thank you—you want to say anything about the enrollment process?

Secretary of Health and Human Services Michael O. Leavitt. On November 15th, people can go through an open enrollment period. Eighty percent of seniors who are on this plan are satisfied with their plan, and if they're satisfied, they don't need to do anything. But over 80 percent will be able to find a plan that's cheaper, if they want to, or that may, in fact, fit their particular situation.

We'll have people available at 1–800–MEDICARE. There will be people at pharmacies and at senior centers—and others that can help them around the country. This has been a big success, and we're going to get better at it. We're getting better at it every year. It'll be better this year than it was last, and it will be better the year after that, just like Medicare was in 1965. This is a very important American success story that we'll now build upon.

The President. Thank you all very much. Appreciate it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:04 a.m.

Remarks at a National Republican Senatorial Committee Reception

October 20, 2006

Thanks for coming. Please be seated. I appreciate you being here. On the way down, Mr. McConnell said, "Keep it short; they haven't had their food yet." [*Laughter*]

But I want to thank you all for coming. As you well know, we're heading down the stretch here in this important political season. I want to thank you for helping our Senate candidates. It means a lot. I don't know about you, but I am absolutely confident that Mitch McConnell will be the leader of the United States Senate in 2007.

I appreciate Mitch's leadership, and I appreciate the leadership of Elizabeth Dole as well. These are two of the finest United States Senators we have.

Laura sends her best. She is a patient woman. [*Laughter*] She is doing just fine. I'm real proud of her. She is a fabulous First Lady.

Oh, there's going to be a lot of noise here at the end of the campaign. There always is. And sometimes it's all meant to obscure the main issues. Sometimes folks don't really want to talk about the core issues that will affect the future of this country. I think there are two big issues that we need to stay focused on and I know our candidates are talking about, and they're issues in which there are big differences of opinion. And the first issue is taxes.

There is a difference of opinion between—what we ought to be doing with your money, see. There are people in the Democrat Party who think they can spend your money far better than you can. And we believe that you're plenty capable of spending your own money. As a matter of fact, we believe that when you have more of your own money in your pocket to save, invest, or spend, all of us benefit; that the economy grows; that hope expands; that the entrepreneurial spirit is invigorated.

And so in times of economic difficulty, I worked with Members of the United States Senate and the United States House to pass

the largest tax relief since Ronald Reagan was President of the United States. We didn't think the Tax Code ought to penalize marriage, so we reduced the marriage penalty. We cut taxes for small businesses. There's a reason why we cut taxes for small businesses—because we understand that 70 percent of new jobs in America are created by small-business owners.

We cut the taxes on capital gains and dividends, because we wanted to encourage investment. We understand that when people invest, it means that someone is more likely to be able to find a job. We cut the taxes on—we doubled the child tax credit. In other words, we cut the taxes on families with children. We put the death tax on the road to extinction. We don't think it's fair to tax you twice, once while you're living and once after you're dead. As a matter of fact, we cut taxes on everybody who pays taxes. [*Laughter*] We don't believe in this selective tax cutting. We said, if you're going to pay income taxes, you ought to get relief.

And we had a spirited debate about whether or not the tax cuts made sense. A lot of the Democrats in the United States Senate said, "These tax cuts are going to make the economy worse." They went around the United States saying tax cuts don't make any sense, but they did make sense.

We've created 6.6 million new jobs since August of 2003. This week a new report showed that real wages grew 2.2 percent over the past 12 months. That's faster than the average for the 1990s. Because of our progrowth economic policies, this economy is strong. People are working. The entrepreneurial spirit is up. People are buying homes. Our plan works, and our candidates have something to run on coming this November.

There's a difference of opinion here in Washington, and I'm going to continue reminding people of the clear difference of opinion in this campaign. Let me tell you what the recent—the top leader, the Democrat leader in the House of Representatives said recently. This is a person who aspires to be the Speaker of the House. She said, "We love tax cuts." She actually said that. Given her record, she must be a secret admirer. [*Laughter*] Over the past 5 years, she and her Democrat colleagues voted against every major tax cut that we passed. Time and time again, when she had her opportunity to show her love for tax cuts, she voted no. If this is the Democrats' idea of love, I wouldn't want to see what hate looks like. [*Laughter*]

Now they're trotting out their old lines. I'm sure Elizabeth and Mitch will tell you what they're hearing out there. They're saying, "Listen, we're just going to tax the rich." It is the same old, tired excuse for raising taxes. It sounds good, but that's not what they believe. Look at the record. In 1992, when they took over the White House and they campaigned on middle class tax cuts, when they got the capacity to deliver on their promises, they passed one of the largest tax increases in American history.

Raising taxes is what the Democrats want to do; make no mistake about it. If they take over the Senate, they will run up your taxes. Raising your taxes would hurt our economy. Raising our taxes would diminish the entrepreneurial spirit. Raising taxes would be bad for small-business owners. Raising taxes is a Democrat idea of growing the economy, and it won't work. The best way to keep this economy strong is to make the tax cuts we passed permanent.

The other issue in this campaign is which party, which group of leaders can keep America safe. We are at war, and it's a tough war, but it's a war that is necessary to protect you. Our most important job, the solemn responsibility of those of us who are honored to serve you in Washington, DC, is to do everything in our power to protect the American people from further attack.

There is an enemy which—[*applause*]—we face a coldblooded enemy. You can't negotiate with these people. You cannot hope for the best, because they are ideologues bound by the desire to inflict damage on nations which love freedom. They will murder the innocent. They have no conscience. And they murder to achieve an objective, and that's what's important for our fellow citizens to understand. It may sound farfetched to some Americans out there, but this group of ideologues wants to establish a caliphate, a governing body, a—they want to spread their ideology of hate from Indonesia to Spain. That's what they have so declared. And they

recognize in order to do that, they must inflict serious damage on America to the point where we're willing to retreat from the Middle East—so they can topple moderate governments.

Imagine a world in which radical extremists not only topple moderate governments so they can have territory from which to plan, plot, and attack America and our allies but they have the capacity to control oil resources, which they would be more than willing to use in order to blackmail America and our allies into further retreat. You can imagine a circumstance in which these radicals say, "We'll run up the price of oil by denying oil on the markets unless you abandon your allies such as Israel, or unless you further withdraw from the world." And compound that with a nuclear Iran, and the world 20 or 30 years from now is going to say, "What happened to them in 2006? How come they couldn't see the threat? What blinded these people in order that they did not do their job?"

One of the key issues in this election is who best sees the future and who best has the plan to deal with it? I firmly see the threats we face, and the best way for America to protect ourselves is to go on the offense and to stay on the offense. [*Applause*] Thank you all.

However, going on the offense is not going to be enough to protect you. It's a part of a comprehensive strategy. You know, we've got to be right 100 percent of the time in protecting this homeland from those who still want to attack, and the enemy has got to be right one time. And therefore, I felt it was vital that our professionals who are in charge of protecting you have all the tools necessary to do so. And so right after September the 11th, we worked with Congress, in some cases—and in some cases, we felt like we didn't need to—to put tools in the hands of professionals.

One such tool was to tear down a wall that prevented law enforcement from talking to intelligence. I know that's hard to believe, but that's the reality of what had happened in our country; that's what grew up to be the case. How can you protect our country when you've got people gathering intelligence and they can't tell the law enforcement who are in charge of protecting you what they know?

And so after September the 11th, I went to the United States Congress and said, "Let's pass what we call the PATRIOT Act." It was a chance to make sure that we gave our folks on the frontlines of protecting you all the tools necessary to do so. Right after September the 11th, both the House and the Senate overwhelmingly passed the bill, but the bill needed to be reauthorized some years later. And when it came up for reauthorization, Democrat Members of the United States Senate tried to kill the bill—they, what we call here in Washington, filibustered. They didn't want to give that tool necessary to those who protect you.

There's just a difference of opinion. We believe we're at war and we should give all the folks protecting you the tools necessary to do so. Evidently, Democrats don't. As a matter of fact, the Democrat leader, the person who aspires to be the majority leader in the United States Senate, when asked about his filibuster, he said—he proudly proclaimed he killed the bill. And a reporter gave him a chance to recant—he said, "No, I'm proud of that."

I don't think that's the kind of attitude that is necessary—we can afford if the biggest job we have in Washington, DC, is to protect you. Fortunately, cooler heads prevailed, and I was able to sign the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act, thanks to people like Mitch McConnell and Elizabeth Dole.

I felt it was important that our professionals at the Central Intelligence Agency questioned people we picked up on the battlefield, in order to find out what they know, see. If you're at war, you need to make sure that you get as much information as possible, in order to protect you. It's a different kind of war. We can't measure the size of an infantry against these people; we don't go out and count the number of airplanes they have. This is a war that requires precise intelligence, good information, if the task is to protect you before an attack comes.

And so, yes, sir, I set up a program that gave our CIA professionals the opportunity to question people like Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the person our intelligence officials

think is responsible for the killings on September the 11th—the mastermind. You could imagine my thought processes—they tell me they captured Khalid Sheikh Mohammed; my first question was, "What does he know? Does he know anything else that we need to know?"

And so as a result of a Supreme Court ruling, I took this bill to the United States Senate. The Court said, work with the Senate to set up a military tribunal. I felt it was important for us to give these killers the justice that they had denied others. But as a result of that bill, we also worked with the Senate to put legislation in place that would make it clear to our professionals that they could interrogate.

I view this as a clarifying moment for the country, a chance for Republicans, Democrats, and independents to learn firsthand the differences of opinion we have in Washington, DC, because 70 percent of the people in the United States Senate who call themselves Democrat voted against giving our professionals the tools necessary to question people so we can prevent attacks. These are fine people; they're patriotic people; but they're wrong. They don't understand the stakes in the war on terror. In order to protect America, we must stay on the offense against the enemy and give our professionals the tools necessary to protect you.

It is interesting what's happened to the Democrat Party. I'm reading a lot of history these days, and I read about Franklin Roosevelt, who was strong in his confrontation of Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan. His strength of character, his vision helped set the course for victory in World War II—strong wartime leader. It was a Democrat, President Harry Truman, who confronted the rise of Soviet communism, and he set the course for victory in the cold war. John F. Kennedy declared America's commitment to, in his words, "pay any price and bear any burden" in the defense of freedom. These Presidents understood the challenges of their time and were willing to confront those challenges with strong leadership. And at the same time, they had great faith in the power of liberty and freedom.

And then something began to change. In 1972, the Democrats nominated a Presidential candidate who declared, "I don't like communism, but I don't think we have any great obligation to save the world from it." It was a—it began a slow shift of philosophy in the Democrat Party. A few years later, at the height of the cold war, a Democrat President told the country that America had gotten over, quote, "inordinate fear of communism." In the mid-1980s, a Senator from Massachusetts, whom Democrats would later choose as their Presidential nominee, declared that Americans should, quote, "abandon the kind of thinking that suggests we can gain a meaningful advantage over the Soviet Union in the nuclear arms race."

In other words, this is a different attitude. The philosophy of that party began to shift. Fortunately, in the 1980s, America had a Republican President who saw things differently. Ronald Reagan declared, "My theory of the cold war is that we win and they lose."

By this time, the Democrat Party did not share his optimism or his strategy for victory. See, they'd gotten to the point where they didn't think that we could win. Many of their leaders fought the Reagan defense buildup; they fought his strategic defense initiative; they opposed the liberation of Grenada; they didn't like America's support for freedom fighters resisting Soviet puppet regimes; they heaped scorn on him; they mocked him when he called the Soviet Union an "evil empire." Despite all the opposition that the President faced from the Democrats, he didn't waver. He stood for what he believed, and history will remember Ronald Reagan as the man who brought down the Soviet Union and won the cold war.

And now we're involved in what I have called the great ideological struggle of the 21st century. It's a struggle between the forces of liberty and the forces of a tyrannical vision that does not believe in freedom. It's a struggle between moderates who want to live in peace in the Middle East and extremists and radicals who will use murder to achieve their objective.

This is going to be a long struggle, but in order to prevail, it requires perseverance and determination and a strong belief in the power of liberty to conquer the ideology of hate. The Democrat Party that has evolved

from one that was confident in its capacity to help deal with the problems of the world to one that is doubting today still has an approach of doubt and defeat. They believe that the war in Iraq is a diversion from the war on terror. I believe the war in Iraq is a central part in defeating the terrorists, in order that we protect ourselves.

If you don't believe me and if the citizens of our country don't believe me, then they ought to at least listen to Usama bin Laden—[*laughter*]—and the number-two man in Al Qaida, Mr. Zawahiri, both of whom have made it perfectly clear that Iraq is a central part of their strategy to establish their caliphate. They believe America is weak, and it's just a matter of time before we will lose our nerve and abandon that young democracy in the heart of the Middle East. That's what they firmly believe, and they have said so and stated it clearly.

The same Democrats that doubt and don't believe this is a part of the war on terror also argue that we should pull out our troops before the job is done. The person I ran against for President said there ought to be a date certain for withdrawal. That means it doesn't matter what's happening on the ground; it just means, get out. You've had a leader in the House say, "Well, the best way to deal with this is to put our troops on an island some 5,000 miles away from Iraq." There's all kinds of difference of opinions, but none of them are, "Let's do the hard work necessary to secure America."

We have a difference of opinion. And that's why I have said that the Democrat Party, the party that—where some leaders have said we shouldn't spend another dime on Iraq; others have said, get out now; others said, get out in a couple of months—that's why they are the party of cut-and-run.

It's a difference of opinion, but it's a fundamental issue in this campaign. The voters out there need to ask the question, which political party will support the brave men and women who wear our uniform when they do their job of protecting America? Which political party is willing to give our professionals the tools necessary to protect the American people? Which political party has a strategy for victory in this war on terror?

Listen, I fully understand it's a tough fight in Iraq. I know it; you know it; and our troops know it. Last week—or earlier this week, I spoke with the Prime Minister of Iraq, Prime Minister Maliki, and we discussed the violence in his country. I told him I was amazed at how tough the Iraqis are when it comes to violence. Think about that. They haven't abandoned their hopes for a government of, by, and for the people; 12 million people voted; they still long to live in a free society. Yet they're putting up with unspeakable violence.

There's a reason why the violence is increasing. One reason is that our forces, coalition and Iraqi forces, are focused on operations to bring security in Baghdad. In other words, we're on the move. We're confronting those who would like to sow sectarian violence. We're confronting the criminals who are taking advantage of the situation. We're confronting the militias who are harming innocent people. We're operating in some of the city's most violent neighborhoods to disrupt and bring to justice Al Qaida and IED makers and death squad leaders. We're engaging the enemies, and they're putting up a tough fight.

Another reason why is, the terrorists are trying to influence public opinion around the world and right here in the United States. They carry video cameras, film their atrocities, e-mail images and video clips to Middle Eastern cable networks like Al-Jazeera and opinion leaders throughout the West. They operate web sites where they say their goal is to, quote, "carry out a media war that is parallel to the military war."

Our goal in Iraq is clear, and it's unchanging: a country that can sustain itself, a country that can govern itself, a country that can defend itself, and a country which will be an ally in the war against these extremists. Our strategy is threefold: to help rebuild that country, to help the political process move forward, and to help the Iraqis stand up security forces that are capable of defeating the enemy themselves.

Our tactics are constantly changing. I talk to our generals who are in charge of these operations, and my message to them is: Whatever you need, we'll give you; and whatever tactics you think work on the ground,

you put in place. Our goal hasn't changed, but the tactics are constantly adjusting to an enemy which is brutal and violent.

My message to the United States of America is: Victory in Iraq is vital for the security of a generation of Americans who are coming up. And so we will stay in Iraq; we will fight in Iraq; and we will win in Iraq. [*Applause*]

All right. Thank you. Sit down now. Thank you. I'm not through yet. [*Laughter*] I'm almost through. [*Laughter*] The waiter is signaling to me, you know, giving me one of these things. [*Laughter*]

I want to tell you one other thing we believe in, and I believe it's a difference between the philosophies of our parties—is that I believe in the power of liberty to transform regions and countries and yield the peace we want. That's what I believe. I believe this is an ideological struggle, and the way you defeat an ideology of hate is with an ideology of hope. I believe in the universality of freedom. I believe there's an Almighty, and I believe a great gift of that Almighty to every man, woman, and child on the Earth is freedom.

I believe people—I believe America should never condemn anybody to a society that does not embrace freedom. I believe in freedom so much that I wasn't surprised when 12 million people defied car bombers and said, "I want to be free." And I believe free societies yield the peace we want.

A story that I share all the time with people is the story about my relationship with the Prime Minister of Japan—former Prime Minister now, Prime Minister Koizumi. You might remember, the Prime Minister and I went down to Elvis's place—[*laughter*]—in Memphis, Tennessee. I went down there because I'd never been. [*Laughter*] He went down there—and asked me to take him down there because he liked Elvis. [*Laughter*]

But I wanted to tell a story to the American people. You see, my dad fought the Japanese. They were the sworn enemy of the United States. And many of your relatives did the same thing. They attacked us; we responded with the full force and might of the United States. Kids signed up; many didn't come home. They volunteered to fight for our freedom, just like the kids are doing today, volunteering to fight for our freedom.

One of them was an 18-year-old Navy fighter pilot. I find it really interesting that his son was on Air Force One with the Prime Minister of the former enemy, talking about the peace. See, going down to Memphis from Washington, we didn't spend a lot of time analyzing Elvis's songs. [*Laughter*] We talked about North Korea and how Japan and the United States could work together to convince the leader of North Korea to give up his nuclear weapons ambitions. We talked about the fact that Japan had 1,000 troops in Iraq.

See, Prime Minister Koizumi knows what I know, that when you find a young democracy that's battling against extremists, it's in our interests to help that young democracy succeed. It's in the interests of not only this generation, who has got the charge of protecting ourselves from terrorists, but from future generations, to help democracies flourish. He understands what I know, that the reason we're talking about the peace is because something happened between World War II, when Japan was the sworn enemy of the United States, and 2006, when they're flying from Washington to Memphis on Air Force One. And what happened was, Japan adopted a Japanese-style democracy.

The lesson is, liberty has the capacity to change an enemy into an ally. And someday, American Presidents will be sitting down with duly elected leaders from the Middle East talking about keeping the peace, and a generation of Americans will be better off for it.

Thank you for your help. God bless.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:53 a.m. at the Mayflower Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Usama bin Laden, leader of the Al Qaida terrorist organization; Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki of Iraq; former Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi of Japan; and Chairman Kim Jong Il of North Korea.

Remarks Following a Meeting With Organizations That Support the United States Military in Iraq and Afghanistan

October 20, 2006

I've had an uplifting and heartwarming conversation with fellow citizens of all ages from across our country who are supporting our troops. These folks don't really care about politics; what they care about is how best to send a strong message to the men and women who wear our uniform that America supports them.

And so we've had examples of people who started web pages to get different supplies to send to troops who are—who need a care package; to a woman who started a group of people to sew garments to help the wounded recover faster; to a guy who helped start video conferencing capabilities so that loved ones can share big moments in their lives together, even though one is in combat; to a child who started treasure hunts to raise money to help kids go to school. It's a remarkable country when we have people who decide to step up and help men and women who are serving their country in a time of need.

And I want to thank you all for coming, and I appreciate what you're doing. Americasupportsyou.mil is a web site where our fellow citizens can volunteer to help. You can become a part of a group and find out ways that you can support our men and women in uniform. These are brave, courageous people who deserve the full support of the American citizenry.

So I want to thank you all for coming. I appreciate you being here. Thanks very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:35 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

October 14

In the morning, at Camp David, MD, the President had an intelligence briefing.

In the afternoon, the President and Mrs. Bush returned to Washington, DC. He and Mrs. Bush then traveled to Arlington, VA. Later, they traveled to Camp David, MD.

October 15

In the afternoon, the President and Mrs. Bush returned to Washington, DC.

The President declared an emergency in New York and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local response efforts in the area struck by a lake-effect snowstorm on October 12 and continuing.

October 16

In the morning, the President had separate telephone conversations with Prime Minister Manmohan Singh of India and President Nuri al-Maliki of Iraq. Later, he had an intelligence briefing. Then, in the Oval Office, he met with Minister Mentor Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore.

Later in the morning, the President participated in an interview with Bill O'Reilly of FOX News, for later broadcast.

During the day, the President had a briefing on the October 15 earthquake and aftershocks in Hawaii.

The President declared a major disaster in Alaska and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by severe storms, flooding, landslides, and mudslides on August 15–25.

October 17

In the morning, the President had an intelligence briefing. Later, in the Oval Office, he participated in a bill signing ceremony for H.R. 5122, the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, which was assigned Public Law No. 109–364. He then met with United Nations Secretary-General-designate Ban Ki-Moon.

The President declared a major disaster in Hawaii and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the

area struck by an earthquake on October 15 and related aftershocks.

October 18

In the morning, the President had a telephone conversation with President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt. Later, he had an intelligence briefing. He then traveled to Greensboro, NC, where, upon arrival, he met with USA Freedom Corps volunteer Michelle Gilmore.

In the afternoon, at Stamey's restaurant, the President had lunch with community leaders. Later, he toured Waldo C. Falkener Elementary School. He then traveled to Randleman, NC.

Later in the afternoon, the President participated in an interview with George Stephanopoulos of ABC News, for later broadcast. He then traveled to Greensboro, NC, where, at a private residence, he attended a Republican National Committee dinner.

In the evening, the President returned to Washington, DC.

October 19

In the morning, the President had an intelligence briefing. Later, he traveled to Avoca, PA, where, at the Wilkes-Barre/Scranton International Airport, he met with USA Freedom Corps volunteer Naomi Alamar. He then traveled to La Plume, PA.

In the afternoon, the President traveled to Clarks Summit, PA, where he visited patrons at Manny's Ice Cream & Milk. Later he traveled to Richmond, VA, where, upon arrival, he met with USA Freedom Corps volunteer William "Robert" Floyd, Sr. He then stopped by the Pumpkin Patch and visited with owner William F. Gallmeyer.

In the evening, the President returned to Washington, DC.

The White House announced that the President will welcome President-elect Felipe Calderon of Mexico to the White House on November 9.

The President announced his intention to nominate Katherine Almquist to be Assistant Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development (Bureau of Africa).

The President announced that he has recess appointed Richard E. Stickler as Assistant Secretary of Mine Safety at the Department of Labor.

The President announced that he has recess appointed Jeffrey R. Brown as a member of the Social Security Advisory Board.

October 20

In the morning, the President had an intelligence briefing. Later, at the Department of Health and Human Services, he participated in a roundtable discussion on Medicare. He then participated in an interview with Kevin Freking of the Associated Press.

The White House announced that the President will host Secretary General Jakob Gijsbert "Jaap" de Hoop Scheffer of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization at the White House on October 27.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

NOTE: No nominations were submitted to the Senate during the period covered by this issue.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released October 15

Statement by the Press Secretary on disaster assistance to New York

Released October 16

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Tony Snow

Statement by the Press Secretary announcing that the President signed H.R. 138, H.R. 479, H.R. 3508, H.R. 4902, H.R. 5094, H.R. 5160, H.R. 5381, and S. 2562

Statement by the Press Secretary on disaster assistance to Alaska

Released October 17

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Tony Snow

Statement by the Press Secretary announcing that the President signed H.R. 4957 and H.R. 6197

Statement by the Press Secretary on disaster assistance to Hawaii

Fact sheet: The Military Commissions Act of 2006

Released October 18

Transcript of a press gaggle by Press Secretary Tony Snow

Fact sheet: A Day in North Carolina: President Bush Highlights the Success of No Child Left Behind

Released October 19

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Tony Snow

Statement by the Press Secretary: Visit by President-elect Felipe Calderon of Mexico

Released October 20

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Tony Snow

Statement by the Press Secretary: Visit of NATO Secretary General "Jaap" de Hoop Scheffer

Acts Approved by the President

Approved October 13 *

H.R. 315 / Public Law 109–339
To designate the United States courthouse at 300 North Hogan Street, Jacksonville, Florida, as the "John Milton Bryan Simpson United States Courthouse"

H.R. 562 / Public Law 109–340
To authorize the Government of Ukraine to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia to honor the victims of the manmade famine that occurred in Ukraine in 1932–1933

H.R. 1463 / Public Law 109–341
To designate a portion of the Federal building located at 2100 Jamieson Avenue, in Alexandria, Virginia, as the "Justin W. Williams United States Attorney's Building"

H.R. 1556 / Public Law 109–342
To designate a parcel of land located on the site of the Thomas F. Eagleton United States Courthouse in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Clyde S. Cahill Memorial Park"

H.R. 2322 / Public Law 109–343
To designate the Federal building located at 320 North Main Street in McAllen, Texas, as the "Kika de la Garza Federal Building"

H.R. 3127 / Public Law 109–344
Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2006

H.R. 4768 / Public Law 109–345
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 777 Corporation Street in Beaver, Pennsylvania, as the "Robert Linn Memorial Post Office Building"

H.R. 4805 / Public Law 109–346
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 105 North Quincy Street in Clinton, Illinois, as the "Gene Vance Post Office Building"

H.R. 4954 / Public Law 109–347
Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006

H.R. 5026 / Public Law 109–348
To designate the Investigations Building of the Food and Drug Administration located at 466 Fernandez Juncos Avenue in San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the "Andres Toro Building"

H.R. 5428 / Public Law 109–349
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 202 East Washington Street in Morris, Illinois, as the "Joshua A. Terando Morris Post Office Building"

H.R. 5434 / Public Law 109–350
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 South Walnut

* These Public Laws were not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Street in Chillicothe, Ohio, as the "Larry Cox Post Office"

S. 2856 / Public Law 109–351
Financial Services Regulatory Relief Act of 2006

S. 3661 / Public Law 109–352
Wright Amendment Reform Act of 2006

S. 3728 / Public Law 109–353
North Korea Nonproliferation Act of 2006

Approved October 16

H.R. 138 / Public Law 109–354
To revise the boundaries of John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Jekyll Island Unit GA–06P

H.R. 479 / Public Law 109–355
To replace a Coastal Barrier Resources System map relating to Coastal Barrier Resources System Grayton Beach Unit FL–95P in Walton County, Florida

H.R. 3508 / Public Law 109–356
2005 District of Columbia Omnibus Authorization Act

H.R. 4902 / Public Law 109–357
Byron Nelson Congressional Gold Medal Act

H.R. 5094 / Public Law 109–358
Lake Mattamuskeet Lodge Preservation Act

H.R. 5160 / Public Law 109–359
Long Island Sound Stewardship Act of 2006

H.R. 5381 / Public Law 109–360
National Fish Hatchery System Volunteer Act of 2006

S. 2562 / Public Law 109–361
Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2006

Approved October 17

H.R. 233 / Public Law 109–362
Northern California Coastal Wild Heritage Wilderness Act

H.R. 4957 / Public Law 109–363
To direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Tylersville division of the Lamar National Fish Hatchery and Fish Technology Center to the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes

H.R. 5122 / Public Law 109–364
John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007

H.R. 6197 / Public Law 109–365
Older Americans Act Amendments of 2006

S. 3930 / Public Law 109–366
Military Commissions Act of 2006