

RECOGNIZING SPIRIT OF JACOB MOCK DOUB AND EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT "NATIONAL TAKE A KID MOUNTAIN BIKING DAY" SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED IN JACOB MOCK DOUB'S HONOR

SPEECH OF

**HON. RICHARD BURR**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 5, 2004*

Mr. BURR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution, and do so on behalf of the 400 members of the International Mountain Bicycling Association in North Carolina, as well as the 1,500 members of affiliated cycling clubs.

It is appropriate that the House is considering this resolution today. On Saturday, I.M.B.A. brought together kids and adults across the country to hold the first "National Take A Kid Mountain Biking Day."

According to the Surgeon General, the percentage of youth that are overweight has nearly tripled in the last twenty years. Forecasts predict that the current generation of our children could actually have a shorter life expectancy than their parents. Childhood obesity is reaching epidemic proportions. Overweight adolescents have a 70% chance of becoming overweight or obese adults. NIH research indicates that the large increase in childhood obesity rates can be traced to overeating and a lack of exercise.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, was drafted in memory of Jack Doub, an avid teenage mountain biker who had a passion for introducing others to the sport. Jack saw the need for kids to get off the couch, get outside, and get some exercise. After being introduced to mountain biking at age 11 near Grandfather Mountain, North Carolina, he won almost every cross-country race he entered for two years. Between the ages of 14 and 17, he became a top national-level downhill and slalom competitor. He actively encouraged others—particularly kids—to ride bicycles. He was a leader in every sense of the word.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

UNIVERSAL NATIONAL SERVICE  
ACT OF 2003

**HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 6, 2004*

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 163, a bill to re-instate the draft. I oppose the draft and do not want to see it brought back.

I added my name to this bill in order to promote an open, honest public discussion of the personnel crisis facing our military today, and in that sense I welcome today's vote. It is unfortunate, however, that H.R. 163 is being brought to the floor with only a few hours notice, depriving the American public of the extended exploration this problem deserves.

It is not a coincidence that today's vote is taking place as public uneasiness is rising with regard to the draft. It is obvious to everyone

that the demands of military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan are narrowing the Administration's options. Our regular divisions and brigades are stretched to the limit. The Reserve and National Guard are being drawn upon to the point where they now comprise nearly half of all U.S. troops in Iraq. Stop loss is the order of the day, holding servicemen and women in uniform past their discharge dates. We're even dipping into the Individual Ready Reserve, calling up people who have completed not only their active duty obligations, but their active reserve obligations as well. Under these circumstances, the growing suspicions of the Administration's intentions in regard to a draft are well-founded.

In fact, I have found confirmation of those suspicions. KITV television news of Honolulu reported last night on a February 11, 2003, Selective Service System document which was provided to me recently and which I have shared with several of my colleagues. Judging from its contents, it appears to be a memo prepared for a meeting between the Acting Director of the Selective Service, the Principal Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, and other senior Defense and Selective Service officials. The document takes note of critical shortages of military personnel with certain skills and raises the idea of drafting them to alleviate the shortages.

Features of this "bring back the draft" memo include:

—Draft registration for women as well as men;

—Registration of all citizens and resident aliens between the ages of 18 and 34;

—Require registrants to submit periodic updates of their skills and education up to the age of 35;

—Draftees would be sent not only into the military, but also to the Department of Homeland Security, state, and municipal government agencies; and

—Suggests the House and Senate Armed Services Committees be asked to pass legislation to bring back this expanded draft.

The public deserves the chance to fully consider and discuss these radical ideas and participate meaningfully in any decision to adopt such drastic steps to address the very real personnel needs of our military forces stemming from the demands of multiple deployments to Iraq, Afghanistan, and beyond. Bringing H.R. 163 to the floor for a vote without hearings, without warning, deprives the Nation and the Congress of an opportunity for that full consideration and discussion.

Right now we have a back door draft, euphemistically called stop loss orders, that keeps troops in uniform even after their enlistments are over. At the same time, we are putting our National Guard and Reserve under intolerable strain, keeping them on active duty far longer than they or their families could have anticipated.

One of the most frustrating aspects of these problems is that they were foreseeable. General Eric Shinseki, then Army Chief of Staff, accurately predicted we would need far more troops than the Administration was willing to commit to occupy Iraq. He was publicly condemned by the Administration for telling the truth. I voted against the Iraq war because, among other reasons, it was clear the Administration was unwilling to send enough troops to pacify that country after the initial military

attack. Paul Bremer, the former chief of the Coalition Provisional Authority, just confirmed that fact in a speech yesterday.

If we are to meet this troop strength crisis, a serious and open discussion needs to take place involving the public, elected leaders, and senior national security officials. The Administration wants to operate in secret in order to hide that discussion from the public. Bringing H.R. 163 to the floor for a vote is a partial victory for public discussion, a reflection of the public's insistent concern over the issue. On the other hand, the furtive way in which it was brought to the floor is a partial victory for those who want to keep the issue in the shadows.

We have been dealing with this matter for years in the Armed Services Committee. During the 14 years that I have served on the Committee, the questions have never been as urgent as they are now:

—What happens if a quick victory in Iraq is elusive, and we remain there for years to come?

—What troop strength levels and mix of active, National Guard, and Reserves will be needed in the coming years?

—Can the all-volunteer military keep its ranks filled?

—If not, what options does the nation have?

—How can we get better pay, benefits, and quality of life improvements to attract and retain enough troops and their families?

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I work on a daily basis with my colleagues and military leaders in the search for answers. It is a long and often difficult process. Its worth is measured in improvements in the lives of our fighting men and women, their families, and our veterans.

I was proud to vote for badly needed equipment like Humvee armor protection and stronger body armor for troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. I have championed better military family housing for troops based in my home state of Hawaii and around the globe. I was one of the authors of the Tricare for Life bill, which provides military retirees with the health coverage they were promised when they enlisted.

What solutions are offered by those who want to pretend we don't face a military personnel crisis? Do they support the Administration's covert moves—despite public denials—to restart the draft? What do they have to say about the stop loss orders that deny thousands of troops and their families the post-service opportunities they were led to expect? How do they propose to deal with our over-reliance on the National Guard and Reserves, which are already strained to the limit? Most importantly, will they discuss these issues fully and openly, or do they want them decided in secret?

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE FRANK  
FOX

**HON. DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN**

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 6, 2004*

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, today in the U.S. Virgin Islands, on my island of St. Croix, residents from all walks of life will gather to remember and pay tribute to Frank J. Fox.