

(4) extends warm congratulations and best wishes to the people of Israel as they celebrate the 58th anniversary of the independence of Israel.

SENATE RESOLUTION 464—DESIGNATING JUNE 7, 2006, AS “NATIONAL HUNGER AWARENESS DAY,” AND AUTHORIZING THE SENATE OFFICES OF SENATORS GORDON H. SMITH, BLANCHE L. LINCOLN, ELIZABETH DOLE, AND RICHARD J. DURBIN TO COLLECT DONATIONS OF FOOD DURING THE PERIOD BEGINNING MAY 8, 2006, AND ENDING JUNE 7, 2006, FROM CONCERNED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND STAFF TO ASSIST FAMILIES SUFFERING FROM HUNGER AND FOOD INSECURITY IN THE WASHINGTON, D.C., METROPOLITAN AREA

Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 464

Whereas food insecurity and hunger are a fact of life for millions of low-income citizens of the United States and can produce physical, mental, and social impairments;

Whereas recent data published by the Department of Agriculture show that almost 38,200,000 people in the United States live in households experiencing hunger or food insecurity;

Whereas the problem of hunger and food insecurity can be found in rural, suburban, and urban portions of the United States, touching nearly every community of the Nation;

Whereas, although substantial progress has been made in reducing the incidence of hunger and food insecurity in the United States, certain groups remain vulnerable to hunger and the negative effects of food deprivation, including the working poor, the elderly, homeless people, children, migrant workers, and Native Americans;

Whereas the people of the United States have a long tradition of providing food assistance to hungry people through acts of private generosity and public support programs;

Whereas the Federal Government provides essential nutritional support to millions of low-income people through numerous Federal food assistance programs, including—

(1) the federal food stamp program, as established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.);

(2) child nutrition programs; and

(3) food donation programs;

Whereas there is a growing awareness of the important public and private partnership role that community-based organizations, institutions of faith, and charities provide in assisting hungry and food-insecure people;

Whereas more than 50,000 local community-based organizations rely on the support and efforts of more than 1,000,000 volunteers to provide food assistance and services to millions of vulnerable people;

Whereas a diverse group of organizations have documented substantial increases in requests for emergency food assistance during the last year; and

Whereas all citizens of the United States can help participate in hunger relief efforts in their communities by—

(1) donating food and money;

(2) volunteering; and

(3) supporting public policies aimed at reducing hunger: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 7, 2006, as “National Hunger Awareness Day”;

(2) calls on the people of the United States to observe National Hunger Awareness Day with—

(A) appropriate ceremonies, volunteer activities, and other support for local anti-hunger advocacy efforts and hunger relief charities, including food banks, food rescue organizations, food pantries, soup kitchens, and emergency shelters; and

(B) the continued support of programs and public policies that reduce hunger and food insecurity in the United States; and

(3) authorizes the offices of Senators Gordon H. Smith, Blanche L. Lincoln, Elizabeth Dole, and Richard J. Durbin to collect donations of food during the period beginning May 8, 2006, and ending June 7, 2006, from concerned Members of Congress and staff to assist families suffering from hunger and food insecurity in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 93—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO ACCOMPLISHING THE MISSION IN IRAQ

Mr. HARKIN submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 93

Whereas the members of the United States Armed Forces have served honorably and courageously in Iraq;

Whereas Congress and the people of the United States owe a debt of gratitude to those members of the Armed Forces who have died fighting for their country; and

Whereas Iraq will have established a free and democratic government once it completes its constitution-making process: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should not maintain a permanent military presence or military bases in Iraq;

(2) the United States should not attempt to control the flow of Iraqi oil; and

(3) United States Armed Forces should be redeployed from Iraq as soon as practicable after the completion of Iraq’s constitution-making process or December 31, 2006, whichever occurs first.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, Monday, May 1, marked the 3rd anniversary of President Bush’s speech on the flight deck of the USS *Abraham Lincoln*. On that occasion, with a giant banner behind him proclaiming “Mission Accomplished,” the President said triumphantly that “major combat operations in Iraq have ended.” But, 3 years later, 133,000 troops remain on the ground, and the President has signaled that the U.S. military occupation in Iraq is open-ended and of indefinite duration.

This has given rise to suspicions that the United States has long-term designs on Iraq and its oil. And it has deprived the Iraqi government of incentive to resolve its internal divisions and stand on its own feet. With the war

in Iraq now in its 4th year, it is clear that the President’s course is not a strategy for success; it is a strategy for continued stalemate and stagnation.

It is time to chart new course. To that end, today, I am offering a concurrent resolution that does three things: 1. It states that “the United States should not maintain a permanent military presence or military bases in Iraq. 2. It states that “the United States should not attempt to control the flow of Iraqi oil. And 3. It states that the “United States Armed Forces should be redeployed from Iraq as soon as practicable after the completion of Iraq’s constitution-making process or December 31, 2006, whichever comes first.” A companion to this concurrent resolution has been offered in the other body by Representative MIKE THOMPSON of California.

The capable and courageous men and women of our Armed Forces have completed the tasks they were sent to Iraq to accomplish: Saddam Hussein’s dictatorship has been deposed; we are certain that Iraq does not possess weapons of mass destruction; and the Iraqi people have a constitution and a democratically elected government. To our troops’ great credit, they have achieved these things despite a series of disastrous decisions by their civilian leaders in Washington.

Today, the question is: Why are U.S. forces still in Iraq? Our commanders have acknowledged that Iraq’s remaining challenges cannot be resolved by the U.S. military, as they are mostly political. As GEN John Abizaid, head of U.S. Central Command, said recently, the situation in Iraq is “changing in its nature from insurgency toward sectarian violence”—I would add, with U.S. troops caught in the crossfire.

Given these realities, President Bush’s call to “stay the course” is a slogan, not a strategy for success. Indeed, I fear that “stay the course” really means “stay forever,” and this sends exactly the wrong message. It stokes the insurgents, who believe that the U.S. wants a permanent military presence in Iraq. And it takes away any incentive for the Iraqi government to resolve its internal divisions and stand on its own feet.

As GEN George Casey, our commander in Iraq, told the Senate last September, “Increased coalition presence feeds the notion of occupation, contributes to the dependency of Iraqi security forces on the coalition, [and] extends the amount of time that it will take for Iraqi security forces to become self-reliant.”

BG Donald Alston, the chief U.S. military spokesman in Iraq, put it this way: “I think the more accurate way to approach this right now is to concede that . . . this insurgency is not going to be settled . . . through military options or military operations. It’s going to be settled in the political process.”

I would add that the Iraqi people also believe that a redeployment of U.S.