

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 415

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 415, and my name be added to H.R. 414.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman's name will be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 415.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The primary sponsor of H.R. 414 will have to add the gentleman's name as a cosponsor.

□ 1645

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SMART SECURITY AND FUNDING
PRIORITIES

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, between the \$81 billion supplemental appropriations bill passed by the House yesterday and the outrageous budget resolution that came on the floor today, the Bush administration's funding priorities are dangerous, dishonorable, and downright hazardous to the safety of our Nation. The \$81 billion supplemental and the fiscal year 2006 budget will do little more than continue the President's arrogant foreign policies, particularly his shameful misadventures in Iraq which have made Americans much less safe over the past 2 years by creating a new generation of terrorists whose common tie is their hatred of the United States.

The supplemental appropriations bill that passed the House yesterday underscores the lack of planning and arrogance that have characterized this war. \$200 billion will have been appropriated for Iraq after this latest bill clears through the Senate. That is about \$675 for every man, woman, and child.

The most disturbing thing about the President's request for more Iraq funding is the lack of accountability. Why did Congress approve another check for a mission that has been so badly botched? Who is being held accountable for the misuse of the \$150 billion we appropriated over the last 2 years? By once again funding the war in Iraq

through a supplemental spending bill, the Bush administration is continuing to pull a fast one on the American people. Instead of spending billions to build permanent bases in Iraq, our funds should go towards the National Guard and Reserve forces who have left their families and their homes to serve their country and who have been abandoned as sitting ducks in Iraq.

Despite the President's solemn promise to fight terrorism, the Bush administration has overwhelmingly concentrated the country's resources on developing bigger and more expensive weapons at the expense of other more suitable security tools which will truly keep Americans safe. Even Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld has stated that there is \$22 billion of waste in the Pentagon's budget every year.

The fiscal year 2006 budget that passed the House today is just the latest example of questionable Republican spending priorities. This budget wastes billions of dollars in outdated Cold War-era weapons systems that fail to address America's true security needs. We do not need millions of dollars for the outdated F-22 fighter jet which the military no longer relies on during combat. We do not need millions of dollars for a new generation of nuclear weapons, the so-called "bunker buster bomb," and we certainly do not need another \$8 billion for a missile defense system that has never been proven to work.

The proper response to the supposed threat of a missile attack from North Korea is not to build a multibillion-dollar missile defense system. We should be addressing this situation through aggressive diplomacy and country-to-country talks. Certainly the nonmilitary approach will not cost the United States taxpayers \$8 billion a year, and ultimately the non-\$8 billion approach will keep America safer. In fact, if the Bush administration spent even 1 percent of the time on diplomacy that it does on trying to develop a missile defense shield, we would probably be on good terms with Iran and North Korea by now.

We need a new approach to security that places a greater emphasis on non-military security. Only by shifting our spending priorities accordingly will we be able to address today's true security challenges. That is why I have developed a SMART security platform for the 21st century. SMART is a Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. SMART security will ensure that our spending priorities match the security threats that we face.

Madam Speaker, this Congress needs to stop signing blank checks to a fiscally reckless administration. If we are going to spend billions and billions of dollars, let us at least spend it on the people who deserve it, the brave troops in the field who have sacrificed so much for their country. Let us spend it on our Nation's veterans, like 24-year-old Tim Goodrich who came to my office yesterday and shared stories about

his service in Afghanistan. One of Tim's friends was supposed to come with him, but he was so troubled by his experience in Iraq that he was not able to make it to our meeting because he has trouble sleeping at night.

Let us spend it on the 32-year-old naval officer who was in my office who had no prior experience in rebuilding war-torn regions before he was put in charge of the reconstruction of an entire city in Iraq.

This officer told me he couldn't in good conscience recruit Iraqis to work on his projects, because he knew their lives would be in danger if they worked with the American military.

It's time we honor the commitment of young veterans like Tim and others by providing them the resources they need and deserve, and by promising not to send our military in harm's way unless the very security of our nation depends on it. It's time to refocus our fiscal priorities on the true security needs of the American people.

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

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

IN DEFENSE OF CHAIRMAN
GREENSPAN

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

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today to bring up a subject that is of great concern to me and that is the tarnishing of a gentleman's reputation in this town and that is Alan Greenspan, the head of the Federal Reserve. I do not always agree with Alan Greenspan; but over the last couple of days, he has been called a political hack, he has been called a lot of things, and I think it is important to come to the floor to defend somebody's credibility in this town that has been largely responsible for the tranquil waters we find ourselves in on the financial markets.

Alan Greenspan has been reappointed by Republican and Democratic Presidents because of his ability to manage our national economy, his ability to see through problems that have cropped up around the world, his ability to intervene at times when it has saved the countries that we have assisted; and now because he has disagreed, or at least ventured an opinion on private accounts relative to Social Security, he has now come under scrutiny, ridicule, and been called things like political hack. Senator REID made these comments on TV recently. Senator CLINTON made the comments recently. Senator CLINTON, I would remind her that her husband reappointed Alan Greenspan to this post.

I think it is important to note that how dare anybody disagree with the