

show you a picture. I do not have this one blown up. It is a picture of orphans looking out of an orphanage. You can see their emaciated bodies. The German physician, a few years back, who was going around and treating some people in North Korea snuck out pictures very similar to this—not very happy. What about the thousands of refugees who flee to China, many of whom are trafficked into the sex slave trade, while others get repatriated back to North Korea by Chinese authorities to face torture, execution, or a trip to Camp 22? These are issues that by law must be addressed in these negotiations under the North Korean Human Rights Act, signed under this administration, which declares it so.

Furthermore, does anyone really believe we can trust Kim Jung Il to be truthful with these declarations that he is handing us when he has no qualms about treating his own citizens in such a barbaric way? There is a report in the Washington Post that the documents he handed over to us about plutonium and their plutonium plant actually had traces of uranium on the very documents themselves—on the documents.

So while we are dealing with plutonium and we are delisting them as a State sponsor of terrorism, the documents they hand over to verify this have traces of uranium on the documents. Is that mind boggling? We are saying we are going to delist you because you dealt with plutonium, but we are not going to require anything on uranium and we are going to waive the Glenn amendment, push the Congress to waive the Glenn amendment for you detonating a nuclear device, when you built a nuclear reactor in another state-sponsored terrorism country of Syria. We are not going to require anything on that, and we are going to waive these sanctions of Trading with the Enemy Act when you are giving missile technology to Iran which has missiles pointed at Israel and other allies of ours in that region and possibly, in the future, to have range to the United States.

I am stunned. The things we are saying and doing are absolutely counter to the facts on the ground.

I am happy we are dealing with plutonium, but for what we are giving up—“axis of evil” member to be scratched from the list—and we don’t have anything on uranium. We don’t have anything on human rights. We don’t have anything on missile technology being shipped out to Iran, of all places; we don’t have anything on the nuclear reactor that was built in Syria, and we are going to waive all of these things? Meanwhile, the people die.

This seems like a very bad deal to me, but that is not the biggest reason I am mad. The biggest reason I am mad is because of people still getting killed and we end up with blood on our hands when we have the chance to be able to deal with this differently.

I hope we will start to take into consideration this picture of these or-

phans. I hope we start to take into consideration uranium and what is happening in Iran, what is happening in Syria, and that we don’t invite North Korea back into the fair standing of countries with what they continue to do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEBB). Without objection, it is so ordered.

DELAY OF IRAQI PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, last February, the Iraqi Government set October 1, 2008, as the date for provincial elections to occur. These elections are critical to U.S. and Iraqi efforts to bring about reconciliation in their country. For instance, those elections will give members of the Sunni community, many of whom did participate in the previous rounds of provincial elections, a chance to vote for fair representation in Iraqi’s provincial councils. Unfortunately, the provincial elections law, which is the enabling legislation needed for these elections to take place, remains stalled in the Iraqi Council of Representatives and will likely delay provincial elections by at least several months.

The administration’s silence on the Iraqi Government’s failure to adopt election laws that were promised in February—and which set a date of October 1 for those elections—is disturbing, and it is the exact wrong way to send a message to the Iraqi leaders. Many of us have tried repeatedly to get this administration to shift responsibility to the Iraqi leaders for their own future, since there is a broad consensus that there is no military solution and only a political settlement among the Iraqis can end the conflict. The administration, however, has repeatedly missed opportunities to shift this burden to the Iraqis and appears willing to miss another opportunity.

President Bush indicated in February that he was confident that the Iraqi Government was “going to continue to work to make sure that their stated objective of getting provincial elections done by October of 2008 will happen.” And after meeting the Iraqi leaders in Baghdad in April, Secretary Rice said, “They know that provincial elections need to be held before October 1, as has been the announcement.” The administration is well aware that the failure of the Council of Representatives to pass a provincial elections law in the near future is likely to cause the previously established October 1 date for Iraqi provincial elections to be postponed.

The recent GAO report, entitled “Securing, Stabilizing and Rebuilding Iraq,” paints an even bleaker picture. According to that GAO report, it is likely to take 4 to 8 months to prepare for elections after a provincial election law is passed. That means that even if this law was passed next week, the October 1 deadline is unlikely to be met.

Ambassador Crocker said on April 10:

The way forward for a stable Iraq lies as much through successful elections, in my view, over the long term, as it does through the necessary application of force against those who resist the state.

Where is the pressure on the Iraqi Government to keep their commitment to an October election? Where is the administration’s message of disappointment? Iraqi leaders are likely to read the administration’s silence on their failure to act as a shrug of our shoulders.

We have made some security gains in Iraq, but progress is spotty on most political benchmarks set by the Iraqis for themselves, including provincial elections. The administration’s silence on this issue needs to end. It needs to make clear to the Iraqi Government that further delay in passing the provincial election law is totally unacceptable.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on Friday, July 4, the United States will conduct the 232nd celebration of Independence Day. On this day, we commemorate the signing of the Declaration of Independence in 1776. Flags will fly and rousing music will be heard before the faint whiff of gunpowder and thunderous boom of fireworks reminds us of the great struggle that took place to set our Nation upon its course through history.

Amid all the parades, fireworks, and backyard barbecues, it is worthwhile to consider the document itself. The Declaration of Independence is an amazing and powerful manuscript. Phrases in its opening paragraphs are familiar to most Americans: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.” That line may well be the most recognizable sentence in American political history. It is certainly among the top 10.

As famous as the phrase “Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness,” is, however, it is not the first sentence of

the Declaration. The lead sentence reads: "When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation." This sentence sets the stage for the body of the Declaration, which lists in some detail the abuses of power that drove the Founders to a war of secession.

Unlike the philosophical goals of life, liberty, and happiness, which Americans today readily understand and revere, the complaints listed in the Declaration rarely fire the popular imagination. But they should. The abuses of the King listed in the Declaration are the very issues that the Constitution strives to prevent. They are the issues that the Bill of Rights specifically protects us against. They are issues, and battles, still being fought today, as the recent debates and court actions over the rights of detainees and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA, demonstrate.

Reading the list of the colonists' grievances paints a vivid picture of life in those times. One can readily imagine the frustrations of a people trying to build a working society, ruled by laws, that welcomes new settlers and that promotes trade and commerce but is continually set back by contempt and indifference. The colonies' governments are dissolved or are forced to meet in out-of-the-way, uncomfortable places or at times that discourage part-time legislators from attending. Laws are arbitrarily suspended until the King, can rule on them, but he never does provide a ruling. New courts cannot be established unless the King, thousands of miles and months of travel away, will agree to them. Judges depend on the King's favor for their jobs and their salaries, so they rarely rule against him, anyway. New taxes and new rules from Britain are continually imposed upon the colonists, from stamp taxes to tea taxes, and their complaints about them are met with silence or violence. Large armies are camped among the colonies and take what they demand from the colonists, but they are immune from prosecution for any wrongs they commit. Mercenaries are brought in, and colonists are seized and forced into military service on behalf of the King.

The colonists complain, but the King does not care. The Declaration concludes, therefore, "A Prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people." In the Constitution to come, the Founding Fathers will design a government that limits the power of the executive in order to prevent tyranny by one man, and will protect the rights of the indi-

vidual against the state. Courts will be independent, and taxes must be levied only by the representatives of the people.

Our Government was expressly designed to prevent anyone from having to live under the same conditions suffered by the colonists. As Thomas Jefferson wrote, "In questions of power then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

Ultimately, the colonists declared in their Declaration of Independence that "... these united Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States . . . Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown . . ." and held Britain, "... as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends."

On this Independence Day, the current generation can look back upon those strong, resolute words with pride and gratitude. We would do well to remember the abuses that finally compelled our Founding Fathers to declare war, so that we never let the freedoms that were won for us to be lost. Remember the words of John Adams, who warned that "The jaws of power are always open to devour, and her arm is always stretched out, if possible, to destroy freedom of thinking, speaking, and writing." He further wrote, "Be not intimidated . . . nor suffer yourselves to be wheedled out of your liberties by any pretense of politeness, delicacy, or decency. These, as they are often used, are but three different names for hypocrisy, chicanery and cowardice." Those are the words of experience, speaking across the ages. This Independence Day, we best honor our legacy by caring for it with the same passion and vigilance that John Adams did.

Mr. President, I wish you, and everyone listening, a happy Independence Day.

DEATH OF NICOLE SUVEGES IN IRAQ

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have just learned of the death in Iraq of an extraordinarily brave woman from my State of Illinois who died this week in a bombing in the Sadr City section of Baghdad. Nicole Suveges was a civilian assigned to the 3rd Brigade Combat Team for the 4th Infantry Division.

She was a political scientist from Illinois and a doctoral student at Johns Hopkins University. She was participating in a program that embeds academics into military units to help personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan navigate difficult local environments.

She chose to go to Iraq for her employer, BAE Systems, because she was interested in learning how people make the transition from an authoritarian society to freedom; that was the focus of her doctoral dissertation. She hoped she might use her knowledge to help Iraqis develop the habits and institutions of democracy.

When she died in a bombing on Tuesday, she was helping local officials mediate disputes in Sadr City. Also killed in the blast were two U.S. soldiers and a State Department Foreign Service Officer.

Iraq was not the first war zone Nicole had worked in. She served as an Army Reservist in Bosnia in the 1990s.

Nicole graduated from the University of Illinois in Chicago in 1992. She was 38 years old. She was one of more than 180 American civilians to die in the war in Iraq. Their deaths are in addition to the 4,113 members of the U.S. military who have lost their lives in Iraq.

Nicole Suveges represented what is best about America. She used her considerable courage and knowledge to try to help heal a badly scarred nation and help Iraqis create for themselves a freer, more secure future. Her death is a loss to Iraq, to America, and to the world.

We extend our condolences to her husband and family, and her friends and colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that a CNN account of Nicole Suveges' life and work be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN GRAD STUDENT DIES IN IRAQ

An American graduate student who went to Iraq to find ways to help ordinary citizens persevere in a transitioning government was one of two American civilians killed in a Sadr City bombing.

Nicole Suveges' a married political scientist from Illinois, was part of a program that embeds academics into military units to help personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan navigate the local environment, according to her employer, BAE Systems.

Suveges, who started her tour with Human Terrain System in April, had been assigned to support the 3rd Brigade Combat Team for the 4th Infantry Division in "political, cultural, and tribal engagements," a statement from the program said.

She was one of four Americans to die in the Sadr City bombing Tuesday. Two U.S. soldiers and a State Department employee, Steven Farley, who worked with the provincial reconstruction team, also were killed in the blast.

"Nicole was a leading academic who studied for years on how to improve conditions for others," Doug Belair, president of BAE's Technology Solutions & Services, said in a written statement. "She came to us to give freely of herself in an effort to make a better world."

Suveges was the second BAE employee to die in a combat zone this year. Michael V. Bhatia, 31, a social scientist from Medway, Massachusetts, died in a roadside bombing May 7 in Afghanistan, BAE said.

Scott Fazekas, BAE's director of communications, said Suveges and Bhatia were among three dozen social scientists hired by the company and its subcontractors to support the program.

The Johns Hopkins University graduate student was also working toward a doctorate in political science with an emphasis on international relations. The focus of her dissertation was on the transition from an authoritarian regime to democracy and how it affects ordinary citizens, the university said.

"Nicole was committed to using her learning and experience to make the world a better place, especially for people who have suffered through war and conflict," William R.