

Enduring Freedom. Our legislation was never considered. Instead, House Speaker DENNY HASTERT directed the construction of a modest memorial listing names of the fallen in the foyer of the Rayburn House Office Building.

Because we consider the listing of names to be an insufficient way to honor the lives of our fallen servicemembers, I, along with other Members of Congress, began to display more proper memorials outside of our own office areas.

To fully appreciate the loss of a military hero, I believe it is important to see the face of what might have been the fathers, the mothers, the sons, the daughters. Hundreds of visitors from my district, and others, have stopped to view the faces of fallen marines from Camp Lejeune displayed outside my office door, and they have been impacted deeply by this memorial.

Madam Speaker, on one occasion, a mother from Minnesota came into my office with tears in her eyes and thanked me for displaying the picture of her son, who had been killed while serving our Nation.

I know that Speaker PELOSI understands the importance of honoring the men and women who have died in service to our country. I am very grateful that the Speaker has honored my request and the request of others that the House observe a moment of silence each month in honor of those killed or wounded in Iraq or Afghanistan.

As another sign of appreciation for these military heroes, I am hopeful that Speaker PELOSI will support those of us who wish to continue displaying memorials outside of our congressional offices in honor of the men and women who made the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

With that, Madam Speaker, I close by asking God to continue to bless our men and women in uniform and ask God to bless the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Iraq.

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

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

GLOBAL POVERTY

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

Mrs. CAPP. Today, I rise to speak about global poverty, and specifically to share my experiences as part of the House Democracy Assistance Commission Congressional Delegation visit recently to six African countries. This Commission supports the development of Democratic governments around the world by establishing peer-to-peer relationships with emerging Democratic legislatures.

There is one striking feature in most of the nations we visited on this trip, and they included Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mauritania, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Liberia. In each of these countries, at least half of the population lives on less than \$2 a day.

You know, in so much of the Continent of Africa, a continent vibrant and rich with resources and wonderful people, it's overwhelming to see up close and in very personal ways the fact that adults regularly die from preventable disease and children so horribly malnourished.

In fact, according to UNICEF, even in today's modern world, with all the technology that is available, over 26,000 children under the age of five die every single day due to poverty. Just think of it. Twenty-six thousand lives lost each day.

This number, more than any other, brings home to me with cruel immediacy the absolute desperate needs of the world's poor. As we know, poverty is not only the result of economic and social policy shortcomings, it also thrives on war. This scourge is the means by which incredible gender and minority inequality flourishes.

I am thinking now of women in the Democratic Republic of Congo who, even as we speak, are enduring unspeakable acts of sexual violence and degradation. The lives of so many of the world's people are horribly short and difficult because we have all failed to properly distribute the abundant resources of Mother Earth.

These facts are reprehensible and would seem to leave us without hope in the future. But wherever poverty may have taken hold in Africa, it has failed to take hold of the African spirit.

In Malawi, a country where 62 percent of the population lives on less than \$2 a day, and where an estimated 15 percent of the adult population is HIV positive, we visited health programs that are a tribute to what is possible when we unite to help each other.

As a nurse, I took special note of our visits to orphan and health care programs run by the Global AIDS Interfaith Alliance, as well as Direct Relief International. These are local, non-profit agencies that are supported directly by many constituents of mine in my congressional district, and I was honored and humbled to see where these gifts of my friends and neighbors at home, where these gifts are being used so fruitfully in these countries to support and nurture and nourish the lives of orphan children and women suffering with HIV and AIDS.

From HIV prevention, school tuition, and transport to pediatric HIV treatment centers, as well as caring for the ill, these organizations, and there are many of them, and the incredible people that work for them and with them, are helping to bring change to the lives of Malawian children and families.

The African spirit was also thriving in countries like Kenya and Liberia, both of which are working very hard to

maintain and strengthen their Democratic institutions, countries where we enjoyed democracy building with their parliaments. It was a team effort. And it was a real honor, again, to be there on behalf of our U.S. Congress.

It will not be easy to turn the tide of poverty in Africa. But, working together, progress is being made. I implore my colleagues to keep this continent, the cradle of life, at the forefront of our minds on this House floor.

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

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

□ 1730

BLOCKADE OF IRAN

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

Mr. PAUL. A couple of weeks ago, there was a resolution introduced in the Congress, H. Con. Res. 362, that quickly got 220 cosponsors. I want to talk a little bit more about that resolution because there are some Members of Congress now having second thoughts about invoking a blockade on Iran.

Take, for instance, here's a quote from Congressman ROBERT WEXLER of Florida. He says, "Given my growing concerns regarding this resolution, including its failure to advocate for direct American engagement with Tehran and open language that could lead to a U.S. blockade of Iran, I will lead an effort to make changes to this resolution before it comes to the Foreign Affairs Committee for a vote."

The chairman of the Financial Services Committee, BARNEY FRANK, had this to say: "I am all for stricter sanctions against Iran, but the blockade part goes too far. I am going to call the sponsors and tell them I am changing my vote."

I would like all Members of Congress to reconsider, because this I consider a very dangerous sense of congress resolution and that it is going to lead to trouble.

There is a new pro-Israeli lobby established called J Street, and they had some comments about this legislation as well. Their comments are this: "We as a group oppose preemptive military action by either the United States or Israel and we support stronger U.S. diplomacy. To us, it is common sense that saber rattling and constant threats are counterproductive. What better way to unite Iran behind its most hawkish leaders than threatening to attack? What better way to empower the Iranian hardliners' case for nuclear weapons development than to talk of a military attack?"

Today, I had three young Iranians in my office, and they verified that next year there will be an election and Ahmadinejad, who is in political trouble over there, is being enhanced by our militant conversation we have here, threatening of blockades, and with this plan or possible plan to actually bomb Iran. But the other side argues, well, no it is all the Iranians' fault. They are testing missiles.

The testing of missiles came after there were war games by Israel testing whether or not they had the manpower and the airplanes to travel that particular distance. So the saber rattling is not one-sided, and we cannot say that it is all the Iranians' fault.

This H. Con. Res. 362, the authors claim it is not a blockade. But what it does, it demands inspection of all imports of petroleum products, vehicles, ships, planes, trains and cargo. They use word "prohibit" and impose stringent inspection on all of these items.

Now, the question I would like to pose here for our Members is this: How would we as Americans and how would we as a government react if a strong government came and did that to us? What if another government came and said we are going to restrict the importation of petroleum products and we are going to inspect all vehicles, ships, planes, trains and cargo? We wouldn't know what that would mean. How could they do that without an embargo? This is militant language, it is just looking for trouble, and it will not help solve the situation.

There is nothing wrong with talking to people. We talked to the Soviets in the midst of the Cold War. They had 40,000 nuclear weapons. Now they are talking about, well, maybe the Iranians might get a weapon later on.

Quite frankly, this talk about this violation, the Iranians were asked by IAEA not to resume enrichment. They had voluntarily stopped enrichment for peaceful purposes. They have every right under the Nonproliferation Treaty to enrich for peaceful purposes. In the last year, there have been nine unannounced inspections of the Iranian nuclear sites. They have never once been found in violation.

This does not make them angels. This does not make them not want to desire to defend their country. But think about it: How many countries have nukes around them? Pakistan has nukes, India has them, Israel has them, the United States has them, China has them, the Soviets have them. And they are being threatened. War games are being practiced, with the potentiality of us being a participant in bombing them.

Madam Speaker, it is time for us to take a deep breath and reassess our position.

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

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

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

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to discuss two very important national issues that are unrelated.

First, I consider national defense to be one of the most important and most legitimate functions of the National Government. Yet even I am astounded at sometimes the waste and inefficiency of the Defense Department, and I think the primary reason is that almost every defense contract is some sort of sweetheart or insider type deal.

Just yesterday in the Washington Times, I would like to read a portion of a story that the Times carried yesterday. It says: "Similarly, Edward C. 'Pete' Aldridge, Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics at the Pentagon, left the agency to join the board of Lockheed Martin, the Pentagon's largest contractor. Weeks before he left the Pentagon, Mr. Aldridge approved a \$3 billion contract to build 20 Lockheed planes. That decision was made after he criticized the plan and threatened to cancel the contract. While serving on the Lockheed board, Mr. Aldridge was picked in 2004 to chair the Commission on the Implementation of U.S. Space Exploration Policy, a decision that drew criticism only from Senator JOHN MCCAIN of Arizona, now the presumptive Republican Presidential nominee, who said Lockheed was one of NASA's biggest contractors and called for Mr. Aldridge's removal because of a conflict of interest. His criticism went unheeded."

Madam Speaker, the problem is that all of the defense contractors hire all the retired admirals and generals, it has been referred to as the "revolving door at the Pentagon," or all the high level Pentagon employees, and then they come back to these same people and they get these multi-billion dollar contracts. In this example, this man awarded Lockheed Martin a \$3 billion contract, the same contract he criticized at one point. But then, surprise, shock of all shocks, he approved this contract, and then a short time later joined the board of Lockheed Martin.

This is just one example. I could give examples day after day of similar types of things. All of these defense contracts going to companies that hire all the re-

tired admirals and generals, and it should be stopped.

The second issue, a very important issue but very unrelated, is the issue of energy and gas prices. I would like to read part of a column by Charles Krauthammer a few days ago. Mr. Krauthammer is very respected by both sides of the aisle.

He said, "Gas is \$4 a gallon, oil is \$135 a barrel and rising. We import two-thirds of our oil, sending hundreds of billions of dollars to the likes of Russia, Venezuela and Saudi Arabia. And yet we voluntarily prohibit ourselves from even exploring huge domestic reserves of petroleum and natural gas."

Mr. Krauthammer continued: "At a time when U.S. crude oil production has fallen 40 percent in the past 25 years, 75 billion barrels of oil have been declared off limits, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration. That would be enough to replace every barrel of non-North American imports for 22 years." That is nearly a quarter century of energy independence.

Mr. Krauthammer said, "The situation is absurd."

George Will wrote a column a few days ago and he said this: "One million barrels is what might today be flowing from ANWR if in 1995 President Bill Clinton had not vetoed legislation to permit drilling there. One million barrels produce 27 million gallons of gasoline and diesel fuel."

And Robert Samuelson, who is not really considered a conservative or Republican columnist, he is a columnist for the Washington Post, he wrote a few weeks ago this. He said, "The truth is we are almost powerless to influence today's prices. We are because we didn't take sensible actions 10 or 20 years ago. If we persist, we will be even worse off in a decade or two. The first thing to do, start drilling."

Madam Speaker, I am one of the very few Members who has been up to Prudhoe Bay in Alaska twice. I have been up there to this frozen tundra. There are millions of acres without a tree or a bush on that entire expanse up there, 19.8 million acres, 36 times the size of the Great Smokey Mountains, part of which I represent. They want to drill on about 2,000 or 3,000 acres of this 19.8 million acre refuge. It takes a survivalist to go in there. In fact, Time Magazine said 4 years ago it only had about 200 visitors a year.

It is ridiculous that we do not drill in an environmentally safe way. Most environmental extremists, I have noticed over the years, they come from very wealthy or very upper-income families. Perhaps they can afford gas to go to \$5 or \$6 a gallon. They have said for years they wanted gas prices to go higher so people would drive less. But I can tell you this: They are hurting a lot of poor and lower-income and working people in this country, and they are shutting this country down economically.

We heard in the Highways and Transit Subcommittee a few weeks ago that