ADDITIONAL VIEWS

While we are supportive of H.R. 5122 and some of its significant efforts to help our men and women in uniform, we also are disappointed that the majority on the committee chose not to support an amendment by Mr. Skelton that would have reduced the pharmacy cost shares for our military personnel and their families from those proposed in the mark. While the pharmacy proposal included in the mark was a good faith effort to ensure a robust prescription benefit for military families, the rejected amendment would have retained the current, lower pharmacy cost shares.

As it currently stands, military beneficiaries who purchase their drugs through a retail pharmacy currently pay $3 for generic drugs and $9 for brand name pharmaceuticals. The mark would raise those prices to $6 and $16, respectively. While this may not sound like much to most people, for a junior enlisted family who is living on a limited income, the proposed increase may be distressing. Take for example a family with several children. Often times, when one child gets sick, so do the others. So imagine a military family that has to go to the pharmacy and pick up several prescriptions. It does not take long before that increased $16 co-pay becomes a significant dent in that family's monthly income.

In addition, the current proposal unfairly penalizes those who will not be able to get their drugs through mail order. For example, if a child is suffering from an acute infection and needs antibiotics, that child's parents are not going to wait days for the medicine to arrive through mail order. It is neither practical nor realistic.

We find it difficult to understand why such a burden would be placed on our military families during a time of war. Military families already face uncertainty and stress from having a loved one deployed. Given the high tempo of deployments, with the attendant financial burdens, we must do everything we can to support military families. The increasing drug costs of drugs should not be an additional worry. As we know too well, we recruit an individual, we retain a family.

We should not be placing the burden of higher health care costs within the Department of Defense upon the backs of our military personnel and their families. It is premature to increase the pharmacy cost shares until we have had an opportunity to review the entire spectrum of health care costs and develop a comprehensive plan to address the growing health care costs of the Department. We are disappointed that the majority failed to recognize these concerns and to adopt the Skelton amendment.

We are also disappointed that the committee failed to adopt the Israel amendment to perfect Section 590 which addresses a military chaplain's prerogative to "pray according to the dictates of the chaplain's own conscience, except as must be limited by military necessity. . ." Mr. Israel's amendment sought to clarify that chap-

lains "shall demonstrate sensitivity, respect and tolerance for all faiths present on each occasion at which prayers are offered". We believe this language should have been accepted.

The underlying provision shifts the emphasis from the rights and needs of the service member to those of the chaplain. Military chaplains occupy a unique role in the Armed Forces. As commissioned officers they are representatives of the government and thus must not be perceived to violate the "establishment" clause of the Constitution, nor impinge on the free exercise of religion by members of the Armed Forces. Military chaplains must often minister to those of their own faith, but are also called upon to the support the activities of service members and their families who come from many diverse religious beliefs and backgrounds.

We must recognize the context of this provision. The military services, and in particular the Air Force Academy, have recently encountered problems with respect to religious tolerance. The documented problem was not the restriction of the chaplains' ability to practice their faith, but the belief by cadets of the lack of sensitivity, respect and tolerance of other faiths by fellow cadets, chaplains, and senior officers. As a result the Air Force reviewed its policies and practices and reemphasized the purpose of the chaplaincy and the issue of command responsibility.

This is why the chaplaincy programs are commanders' programs. Commanders have a responsibility to provide comprehensive religious support to all individuals. This command responsibility models positive, ethical leadership and provides an example of this nation's rich heritage of strength through diversity.

This is a critical moment in our history. We should be cautious in proceeding to legislate in this area. We must recognize the reason for the existence of the military chaplaincy and the religious diversity of our military personnel who are currently engaged in fighting overseas to establish and preserve democracy and tolerance. The majority should not only be protecting the rights of chaplains to pray according to their conscience. They should also be promoting efforts to ensure respect and tolerance for the very people chaplains have taken an oath to serve—our service members.

We are concerned that the committee is sending the wrong signals to our men and women in uniform who have volunteered to serve their nation. Our responsibility is to ensure that we support them every step of the way.

IKE SKELTON.
STEVE ISRAEL.
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ.
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER.
ADAM SMITH.
G.K. BUTTERFIELD.
LORETTA SANCHEZ.
SILVESTRE REYES.
JOHN SPRATT.
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO.
ROBERT E. ANDREWS.
MARK UDALL.
NEIL ABERCROMBIE.
MARTY MEEHAN.
JIM LANGEVIN.
SUSAN DAVIS.
VIC SNYDER.
TIM RYAN.
RICK LARSEN.
JIM MARSHALL.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF JEFF MILLER OF FLORIDA

I strongly support Chairman Hunter's language concerning the Active Carrier Force Structure and look forward to the Secretary of Defense's report, due March 1, 2007. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 set a minimum carrier force structure of not less than 12 operational aircraft carriers and any possible changes to the law need to be carefully considered. Furthermore, it is important that the Secretary of the Defense and the Navy fully explain the potential national security impact of reducing the carrier force to 11 operational aircraft in the classified annex directed by Chairman Hunter.

The Chairman's mark also includes language desiring the Secretary of Defense to explore options for maintaining the USS *John F. Kennedy* either within or outside the U.S. Navy. Exploring these possibilities is important and I strongly encourage the Secretary of Defense and the U.S. Navy to include in their report to the defense committees a section addressing the possibility of the USS *John F. Kennedy* being maintained in a reduced operating status as a permanent naval aviation training platform.

JEFF MILLER.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REP. JIM MARSHALL

I submit additional views on two issues, the Committee's decision to remove the current restraints upon the ability of the Air Force to retire C–5A transport aircraft and the Air Force effort to centralize personnel services as it affects the large civilian work centers ("LCCs" which include Wright-Patterson, Robins, Tinker, Hill and Bolling Air Force Bases).

The Committee's bill removes the current prohibition upon retirement of C–5A aircraft. By this action, the Committee does not intend to recommend or encourage the retirement of C–5As. The Air Force's 2001 C–5 upgrades Report to Congress, which included the Institute for Defense Analysis's C–5 Modernization Study, clearly shows that modernizing the entire C–5 fleet is an essential component of any cost-effective strategy to meet future airlift needs. With modernization, the availability and capability statistics for C–5A and B aircraft should fall within five percentage points of the newer C–17 platform.

The Committee's bill requires a minimum airlift fleet of 299. By this action, the Committee indicates its belief that the recently published Air Mobility Study (AMS) underestimated future airlift needs. The AMS totals assume certain specifically listed future contingencies. These won't all come true. In addition, the AMS recommends additional studies be conducted, including a review of intra-theatre use of the C–17. Yet another study is not needed to conclude the obvious: Central Command's intra-theatre use of the C–17 far exceeds the levels assumed in the AMS. The 299 figure set in the Committee bill is truly a minimum. That figure will increase in future years. More C–17s are needed.

Pursuant to a 1993 DoD directive, the Air Force has sought, with varying levels of enthusiasm, to centralize personnel services in one location, largely removing them from the on-site control of the base commander. Unlike most AF instillations, the success of the mission at its large civilian work centers (Wright-Patterson, Robins, Tinker, Hill and Bolling AFBs, the "LCCs") depends upon a complicated civilian workforce numbering in the tens of thousands with hundreds of job classifications. So AF rightly delayed removing major personnel functions from the LCCs, centralizing only those personnel services that might easily be provided by email or telephone (e.g. some IT support, responding to routine employee inquiries about benefits, etc.).

Aware that Air Force was balking, DoD sought to use the recent BRAC process to advance total centralization of the Air Force personnel functions. But the BRAC Commissioners rejected DoD's proposed BRAC language on this subject. Instead, for the LCCs, the Commissioners directed that each LCC "retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services, the non-transactional functions, necessary to support . . . the

civilian workforce." For each LCC, the Commissioners directed that only the "transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office" would be moved to Randolph AFB, the currently planned site for centralization.

There exists uncertainty within the Air Force concerning the proper interpretation of the BRAC Commissioners' directive with regard to these five AFBs. By focusing upon the terms "transactional" and "non-transactional," I, along with Mr. Cole (OK), Mr. Bishop (UT), and Mr. Turner (OH) proposed an amendment to guide the Air Force as it complies with the BRAC language. As such, our amendment furthered the BRAC Commissioners' goal of assuring that these five AFBs "retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services . . . necessary to support . . . the civilian workforce," a goal that is vitally important to mission performance at each LCC.

We withdrew our proposed amendment after receiving assurances from the Air Force staff that no substantial reorganization would be implemented before the 2008 authorization bill process and that the Air staff would work with us, AFMC and the LCC Commanders to assure that any reorganization will improve the cost/quality bottom line at the LCCs. This understanding is evidenced by an email exchange May 1–3, 2006, between myself and the Honorable Michael Dominguez, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs. Copies of these e-mails are available from the committee's records or my office. What follows is the first e-mail.

Honorable MICHAEL DOMINGUEZ,
Asst. Sec. AF for Manpower and Reserve Affairs.

MR. SECRETARY: Thanks so much for the time you gave me by telephone Friday afternoon. I am very much in agreement with your summary of how the Air Force should proceed with CPO reorganization for the large civilian work centers ("LCC's"). Your suggested policy directive is both timely and needed. And it will be very well received by AFMC military and civilian leadership if it heads things in the direction you summarized, assuming I got your thoughts straight.

What follows is what I understood you to say. Please correct me if I am mistaken.

(1) This reorganization is intended to improve, not diminish, the quality of personnel management services for the LCC's.

(2) To further this intent, AFPC will agree with AFMC, its customer, concerning verifiable service delivery standards to be met by AFPC.

(3) Before removing additional AFMC personnel functions or slots, AFPC will demonstrate by its actual performance rendered to others that it can and will meet the agreed upon service delivery standards to the satisfaction of AFMC.

As you know, I met this morning in my office with LTG Brady and Mr. Blanchard. I appreciate the time they gave me as well, and I am providing them with a copy of this email for their review and comment. We discussed the above three points along with a host of other things. I understood LTG Brady to say the above

three steps were "quite reasonable," again assuming I have fairly summarized them.

I frankly think point one is easy to say but will be difficult to deliver. So items (2) and (3) are very critical. Obviously the LCC's must cooperate in setting fair and reasonable standards and in evaluating AFPC performance. They cannot be permitted to use the agreement contemplated in (2) or the evaluation in (3) to simply undermine all attempts at change. Overcoming the natural tendency of LCC bureaucracies to defend their existence and resist change will take leadership from their Commanders with, perhaps, COS guidance.

That very inertia and resistance to change, however, is why item (3) is essential. The LCC's should not be used for personnel management experiments. Once LCC slots and functions are moved, they are unlikely to be recovered even if AFPC is falling short of the agreed upon performance standards. AFPC is no exception to the rule that bureaucracies defend themselves with the benefit of inertia.

Like you, for several reasons, I and my Congressional colleagues prefer to avoid imposing legislative language to mandate what should simply be internal policy for the Air Force. If my above-described understanding of your intention is correct, then I will recommend to my colleagues that we hold off on any legislation while we see how this develops over the next year.

So, could you let me know as soon as possible (preferably today) whether you think my brief summary here is an accurate description of how the Air Force will proceed? I think it helpful for me to also share this with Gen. Carlson so he can follow (and join if he chooses) our discussion.

Very truly yours,

JIM MARSHALL.

Secretary Dominguez responded by an e-mail saying, "Thank you for your email. I think you have captured our discussion quite accurately. I would like to elaborate somewhat, if I might." In his elaboration concerning item #2, Secretary Dominguez included a couple of "elaborating" sentences that prompted this e-mail reply from me.

MR. SECRETARY: One good turn deserves another. May I "elaborate" on two sentences of your elaboration regarding item (2)?

Those sentences are: *These, of necessity, will be Air Force-wide service level agreements—the same for every command and every Airman everywhere. It would be an unreasonable burden on AFPC, and unacceptable to AF Commanders, to have different product quality standards at different Air Bases.* You and I discussed these sentences by telephone this afternoon. In part, I draw my comments from our conversation.

Missions and activities have different levels of value and importance. Some are critical. Some are not. For example, a brief interruption of IT service for one activity (landing aircraft?) might cause grave problems while elimination of IT service altogether for another (scheduling lawn service?) might be no big deal. Besides such differences in criticality, the cost or practicality of delivering services will vary for different missions and activities. I mostly ate c-

rations as an infantryman in the bush in Vietnam while those in the rear had cafeteria food. I understood why. Feeding me and my fellow grunts was probably a more critical service. (We thought so.) But the cafeteria service standard wasn't practical or cost effective. (So we just grumbled and dissed REM*s.)

So as we discussed, you and AFPC intend that service levels meet or exceed the needs of the individual installations and missions being supported. It is laudable but typically impractical and wasteful to try to accomplish this by providing the highest level of service for all. But if there is to be just one level of service provided AF wide to all commanders and bases, then it must be the highest level or AFPC will have failed those installations and missions with the most sensitive or critical needs. So AFPCs service delivery targets will have to vary among installations and missions. There is no other practical, cost effective alternative. AF Commanders worthy of the title both accept and understand that. In all walks of life—business, government, education, even pastoring—uniform provision of services is the exception, not the rule.

By postponing centralization of the Civilian Personnel Offices of the AF large civilian work centers ("LCCs"—Bolling, Hill, Robins, Tinker and Wright Pat), AF has already treated them differently from other commands. The BRAC Commissioners also singled out the LCCs for special treatment, and their policy directive is now the law of the land.

My concern is that AFPC has not sufficiently internalized that fact. The LCCs are different. Their missions are civilian driven. Productivity of their civilian workforce is critical. The BRAC Commissioners have made that clear. I appreciate your sensible approach to the task of reorganizing, streamlining and improving AF personnel management services. The LCCs will have to be given special treatment, as they already have, in this process.

I also appreciate your observation that the LCC Commanders organize their workforce to assure the best cost for a quality product and that AFPC can and will do nothing to upset this since doing so would cause POM reverberations and budget challenges throughout the AF. But LCC Commanders can only demonstrate direct quantitative connections to productivity for a few of the personnel functions that, in part or whole, might be proposed for centralization. Speed filling vacancies is one of these. For others, frankly, it is a judgment call to what extent the particular personnel function affects productivity.

On these judgment calls, I believe AF should defer to the LCC Commanders. They are equally interested in the bottom line and do not have a dog in the fight over what is the appropriate personnel service delivery concept. Cost for quality is their bottom line just as it is AFPCs and the AF. Although others may have greater experience specifically with personnel delivery systems, the LCC Commanders have identical cost for quality motivations and a better perspective for how to get this done at the LCCs. They should be treated like the traditional corporate customer in a large conglomerate—offered, but not compelled to accept, different ideas for how to improve their cost/quality bottom line.

Enough said about all that. I appreciate your final observation that only the COS, SecAF or some higher authority could force the

AFMC Commander to accept a given AFPC proposal for service delivery to the LCCs.

Very truly yours,

JIM MARSHALL.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF CONGRESSWOMAN CATHY MCMORRIS

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to thank you and Ranking Member Skelton for your hard work in crafting H.R. 5122, the FY 2007 National Defense Authorization Act. We can be proud of this bill that reinforces the strong commitment we have made to our troops. This bill also proposes critical expansions to TRICARE pharmacy plans while still maintaining fiscal responsibility.

Providing quality and affordable health care for our service men and women is a crucial element of the task that we have as a Committee and a Congress in return for the sacrifice of all who served our country. I know that members of this committee join me in the continued fight to protect programs like TRICARE. H.R. 5122 strengthened TRICARE by zeroing out generic and formulary prescriptions for participants in the TRICARE pharmacy mail-order program. The Committee also maintains its commitment to serving our military personnel by adding $735 million to restore DoD cuts to the Defense Health Program.

The Chairman's mark also demonstrates unwavering support of our men and women actively serving our country around the world. It is important that we provide our troops with state-of-the-art equipment and technology to enable them to win the war on terror. We have increased by $930 million our investment in rapid production of enhanced body armor including Small Arms Protective Inserts that have guarded the lives of numerous soldiers and Marines from IED blasts. The bill also adds $635.5 million for the purchase of up-armor Humvees to equip our troops to meet new threats.

As the National Guard has been called on to play an unprecedented role in the Global War on Terror, we have responded by giving the Guard greater resources. This bill supports the decision by the Army Secretary and Chief of Staff to request an Army National Guard end strength of 350,000. In addition, H.R. 5122 would increase Army National Guard full-time support personnel by nearly 2,300. To support the additional manpower, H.R. 5122 would increase Army National Guard funding by $471 million.

On April 21, 2004, the 92nd Air Refueling Wing, from Fairchild Air Force Base in Eastern Washington, delivered the one billionth gallon of fuel in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Colonel Scott Hanson and 130 fellow airmen from Fairchild will be returning from a four-month deployment later this month, and we will be glad to have them back.

I applaud the Committee for moving forward with the process of replacing the aging KC–135 fleet by allowing the conditional retirement of 29 E models, many of which this Committee learned earlier this year, have been grounded for safety reasons. Thanks to the air supremacy made possible by these gas stations in the sky, our

country has not lost an Army ground soldier to enemy aircraft since 1953. This will allow continued transformation of our military to meet new challenges that threaten our country with the tools they need.

The task of the Chairman has not been an easy one, working within an ever-decreasing top-line and balancing many indispensable priorities. I thank the Chairman for his efforts and express my strong support for this bill.

CATHY MCMORRIS.

DISSENTING VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE CYNTHIA A. MCKINNEY

President Theodore Roosevelt said, "To announce that there must be no criticism of the president, or that we are to stand by the president, right or wrong, is not only unpatriotic and servile, but is morally treasonable to the American public."

As I have in the past, I raise my voice to dissent to the annual Defense Authorization Acts that are proposed by this House Armed Services Committee, in this case for FY07. War never truly creates peace, but always leads to more war. This endless cycle of violence wastes human potential, makes a priority of funding military expansion, weapons and wars over the increasingly critical needs created by lack of education, illness, poverty, and the endangered environment.

As we enter a fourth year of war in Iraq, and a fifth year in Afghanistan, and with projections from the Vice President of "a war that won't end in our lifetime," our military budget continues to grow to unprecedented levels along with the deficits it is creating. We now have a larger and more lethal military force, and a more expanded intelligence budget and consolidation than we did at the height of the Cold War, when we faced the perceived threat of a continent armed with nuclear weapons and said to desire expansion across the globe into many countries and regions. That threat has ended, but the threat of unconsolidated and ill-equipped terrorist groups has been used to expand the funding of huge corporate contracts for weapons and war while denying the human suffering and needs that face us. The solution of the latter has more potential to make us safe and secure and to spread democracy and good will to the world than any budget this Committee has approved or even considered in recent years.

According to Pentagon figures, we are spending $9 billion a month to wage the wars on Iraq and Afghanistan. That comes to $300 million a day, $12.5 million an hour, over $200,000 a minute, and $3,500 a second.

Can you imagine the effect on our country and the world if we had begun a program after 9/11 to grant $200,000 each minute until the present to a worthy community need or program, simple technology and medical assistance in communities abroad, local alternative energy technology, environmental protection, countering poverty one city at a time, or encouraging cross-cultural communication and travel around the globe?

And at the same time it would have de-funded the tens of thousands of people in Iraq and Afghanistan as well as thousands of U.S. soldiers whose lives are already lost to these wars, stopped the destruction of infrastructure and environment in those countries where depleted uranium weapons alone continue to cause high levels of birth deformations and make our own troops ill. Funding

would have been cut for repressive regimes that carry out regular violations of human rights abuses and support paramilitary activity and for privatized forces that brutalize and kill any popular dissent against corporate agendas or government excess.

In my district outside Atlanta, Georgia, the median family paid $2,000 in federal taxes, and $570 went to the military budget and war. That means 29 cents out of every dollar. This reflects a 70% increase in military costs since 2000, and a 20% rise in its share of the tax dollar. Just think what that amount would mean to each family in my district annually, or to social programs that could assist them at the federal level.

And the coffers of those who profit from war would not contain the windfall they have gotten from flawed weapon systems and unaccountable contract management. They would not have been used to create programs of pre-emptive strike and intervention that have soured our relations with long-time international allies and the United Nations. Most importantly, these funds would not have been spent making us thousands of new enemies in countries where the majority were our friends, and whose outpouring of sympathy after the 9/11 attacks has been squandered. Just imagine.

The wars and military operations we are funding through this Defense Authorization Act are based on a simple Use of Force authorization passed by this Congress in October of 2001, which was to have been linked to the provisions of the War Powers Act of 1973. However, no regular review of that authorization has taken place, and it has been cited by the President to justify pre-emptive war, creation of a dual legal system and military tribunals, imprisoned "enemy combatants," without due process rights, abandonment of the Geneva Accords and UN principles relating to war, extralegal secret renditions and prisons abroad, torture and illegal methods of interrogation, expanded secrecy and attacks on civil liberties at home.

The funds authorized by this bill apparently also cover an expanding number of covert wars abroad, with the secret but increasing use of Special Operations Command teams sent into 20 countries in the Middle East, Asia, Africa and Latin America on missions that do not even seek approval by the U.S. Ambassador in those countries. The SOC budget has increased by 60% since 2003, to $8 billion, using 13,000 special forces to carry out 100-page operation plans developed over the last three years to fight those they identify as terrorists abroad under military regional commands. These include post-attack plans if terrorists strike within the U.S. again, when the military will "take the gloves off."

Domestically, the role and use of the military have been changing as well. The increased use in the last decade of reserve troops abroad not only created severe financial hardships for their family members, but also left communities in Louisiana, Florida, Mississippi, Alabama and Texas short on state National Guard troops to respond to hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Militarization of the society as a whole is increasing, invading privacy with Pentagon surveillance and recruiter access to personal records of students.

There are repeated calls to abandon the principle of Posse Comitatus, the bright line between police and military functions. During the recent panic over the possibility of the Asian Bird Flu be-

coming a human pandemic, President Bush began to call for use of U.S. military forces to set up and enforce quarantines and establish martial law in response. Privatized security forces, paid for by the Pentagon have not only built bases and been used in combat zones abroad, but Blackwater and DynCorp provided "security" in Louisiana after Katrina during crisis conditions, and Halliburton is being paid to build containment centers for large numbers of immigrants under FEMA's End Game plan for a national round-up of undocumented workers.

While this $512.9 billion bill may have enjoyed broad support in the Committee, the policy it implements faces eroding support around the country and the world. Current news reports find that 62% of survey respondents in this country disapprove of Bush's approach to the war on Iraq and that 15% believe that the U.S. is very likely to have success in Iraq; whatever success is supposed to look like. The majority sentiment among the people of the United States and a growing sentiment inside this Congress want to end these wars on Iraq and Afghanistan and bring the troops home. To date, over one million reserve and National Guard forces have deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan in these wars, and the majority have passed the maximum involuntary service limit of two years, yet the war is not scheduled to end before 2009 at the end of the President's period in office. I supported Rep. Murtha's bill to redeploy US forces outside Iraq, and the unopposed amendment offered to the Supplemental funding by Barbara Lee that no funds be expended on the building of permanent bases in Iraq, and would have made those amendments to this bill save that other Committees of the House may require sequential referrals.

High-ranking retired officers from several branches are now beginning to speak out about the flawed assumptions and prosecution of this war by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, and have called for his resignation.

It is time for these wars to end and for alternative military budgets that reduce the waste and wasted spending on flawed weapons systems to be produced by this Committee. Sadly, the flawed spending contained in this bill has marked Pentagon spending since its inception, but more so in this administration than ever before. Our current military budget is larger than the budgets of every other major country in the world combined, both allies and perceived enemies. Our obsolete nuclear arsenal and other weapons systems are maintained and defended while new systems with no legitimate utility are designed and promoted each year. Sadly, this Committee approves them.

This Committee consistently fails to address the pressing and simple issues of those it claims to represent and to serve, the American people and our people in uniform. Unchecked fraudulent recruitment, failed retention, violation of rights and regulations, stop-loss policies and over-rotation, lack of adequate protection for combat troops, protection of rights of conscience, diminished medical care for troops and their families, decreases in veterans benefits, environmental damage done by the manufacture, storage and use of military weapons, falsified benefits and bonuses, and privatization of functions all remain inadequately addressed by the passage of this bill, and in some cases they are worsened.

This is a military that relies on economic conscription or a Poverty Draft to fill its ranks, and the primary focus of recruiters is in poor communities of color. The new White House press secretary, Tony Snow, recently broadcast his opinion that those who "have committed themselves to a view that blacks are constantly victims, have succeeded in creating in the United States the most dangerous thing that we've encountered in our lifetime; which is an underclass that doesn't seem to be going anywhere." For those who blame Black people and the poor for their own problems, pushing them into the military and war is no solution, either.

Despite the attachment of psychiatric support teams on the field to every combat unit, nearly 30% of veterans of current wars will suffer from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and many will bring the violence of war home. Rep. Murtha said recently that would mean 50,000 PTSD veteran cases, with a VA not yet equipped to handle the physical wounds. While some 2,400 official combat deaths are listed from the war on Iraq to date, 8,500 are also wounded physically or psychologically severely enough that they cannot return to battle. Suicides are on the rise, and there is not adequate counseling or support available for the transition back to civilian life. In a recent development, wounded soldiers are also fighting off bill collectors and veterans are having their credit ratings ruined by military pay errors.

A new GI Bill to provide comparable college funding for young people who have served in AmeriCorps, Peace Corps, or other national civilian service programs has been proposed to reward and encourage such service. The current promise of Montgomery GI Bill college funding to veterans is in reality a misleading one, since many are disqualified on separation, only 35% of those eligible actually use the matching funds, and only 15% of those who do actually graduate from college. The current amounts promised pay for only 54% of the tuition at a community college, not a full university education. Other benefits promised to veterans in exchange for service are being cut as well.

In recent polls on the ground, a majority of troops said they did not approve of the war or the way it is being handled. Growing numbers are going absent and veterans are speaking out in increasing numbers on their return home, in opposition to continued US involvement. As they did in Vietnam, these soldiers may force us once again to choose between a willing military force and a bad war. Retired Lt. Gen. Greg Newbold, the former operations director for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said "I now regret that I did not more openly challenge those who were determined to invade a country whose actions were peripheral . . . they knew the plan was flawed, saw intelligence distorted to justify a rationale for war."

We are fighting with a military designed, not for defense, but for empire—with a military still focused on the Cold War model of combat and with the intent to create global military dominance. We are fighting with a military now exhausted by the policy and method of combat in these wars, led by those who have never fought in them.

My votes for a peaceful world last year included votes for ending the war in Iraq, withdrawing American troops, and upholding America's commitment to human rights. I voted against using for-

eign aid as a blackmail to get U.N. votes, using preemptive military strikes against any country, supplying weapons to Colombia, putting weapons in space, funding the Iraq war, and any use of torture by the United States.

ALTERNATIVE BUDGETS AND WEAPON SYSTEMS

Eliminate pork and waste

There is a pressure within each state and district to maintain lucrative military contracts because they create a certain level of employment in the community and bring in commercial activity and taxes. However, it has long been known that military contracting is not labor intensive and that the same funds put into the civilian sector would create many more jobs. Because of this pressure and a good deal of lobbying, certain projects that are wasteful are voted for anyway and alternatives are not explored. In the end, an economy built on the existence and continuation of war is counter-productive to both peace and real security and prosperity.

Eliminating these wasteful contracts, especially around weapons production and equipment, would potentially save $5 billion tax dollars.

I challenge and want to stop the practice of raiding the Operations and Maintenance budget of the DoD to fund pork projects annually, which potentially hurts troops in the field. We can eliminate waste and inefficiency and save $5–9 billion.

I have seen a proposal to commission an independent study and establish a Defense Savings Caucus in Congress to consider alternative budgets and report to appropriate committees in advance of authorization or allocation of defense budget funds annually. These alternatives would cut waste and pork, support real security and defense, cut deficits and restore critical funds to social support programs.

Decommission Cold War Weapons

A first step would be to de-fund or reduce excessive and outdated Cold War era weapons systems or unworkable weapon systems like these:

a. Missile Defense Weapons—$10 Billion;
b. Virginia Class Submarines—$4 Billion/year;
c. Nuclear Warheads—reduce to 1,000;
d. F–22 A Raptor—$23.5 billion/100 planes;
e. Tilt Rotor V–22 Osprey $28 billion;
f. DD(X) Destroyers;
g. F–35 Joint Strike Fighter;
h. C–1307 Cargo planes;
i. Future Combat Systems;
j. Research & Development; and
k. Force Structure and size.

Proposed by Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities, Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power in Space and Center for Defense Information.

Unified Security Budget

A Unified Security Budget for FY 07 suggests: One of neo-conservatism's leading theorists, Francis Fukuyama, has now declared that his movement's problem lies principally with its over-militarized approach to achieving its foreign policy ends. He writes of the enormous "structural imbalance" in global power derived from U.S. "defense spending nearly equal to that of the rest of the world combined." The principal solution, in his view: "we need to demilitarize what we have been calling the global war on terrorism and shift to other types of policy instruments."

This report shows how this can be done. It identifies nearly $62 billion in cuts to the regular defense budget, mostly to weapons systems that have scant relevance to the threats we face, and therefore can be eliminated or scaled back with no sacrifice to our security. The war in Iraq is funded by supplemental appropriations. And it identifies $52 billion to be added to the budgets for the tools of defense and prevention. This shift would partially demilitarize our national security strategy by turning the current six-to-one military-to-non-military balance into a better balance of three to one. That is, it would double the proportional amount our government devotes to its non-military security tools. It would bring our spending more in line with the rhetoric of the president's own national security strategy.

Key finding: The recent flare-up of concern over foreign management of U.S. ports creates an opening for the real issues of port security to be given the attention they deserve. Though the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) has concluded that weapons of mass destruction are most likely to enter the United States by sea, we will spend four times more deploying a missile defense system that has failed most of its tests than we will spend on port security.

Key finding: Hurricane Katrina displayed how under-prepared the United States is for protecting critical domestic infrastructure and mitigating the effects of a catastrophic event. Yet remarkably, the administration's budget decreases funds to cities and states for critical infrastructure protection and first responders by 26 percent.

Key finding: The Sept. 11 commission concluded that "preventing terrorists from gaining access to weapons of mass destruction must be elevated above all other problems of national security." The Bush administration's budget for threat reduction and nonproliferation, at approximately $1.3 billion, falls far short of this standard.

Key finding: One benchmark for improvement cited in last year's version of this report has been met. The administration's budget request funds the account for Diplomatic and Consular Affairs slightly higher than its account for Foreign Military Financing. However, total foreign military assistance—more than $8 billion—outstrips the combined totals for diplomatic affairs and Embassy security, construction and maintenance, at $6.2 billion.

Key finding: Favoring its own programs over collective approaches that coordinate the work of international donors, the administration has cut its contribution to the Global Fund for AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, while increasing funding for the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR). Yet the Global Fund delivers assistance to eight times as many countries, includ-

ing those with the fastest rising infection rates. PEPFAR also prohibits the use of generic drugs, which means that fewer people will be treated, at higher cost.

This proposal comes from the Center for Defense Information, Foreign Policy in Focus, Security Policy Working Group and a broader Task Force that includes other organizations addressing alternatives to war and massive military funding.

A Realistic Defense—Korb Report

The Korb Report—A Realistic Defense by Lawrence Korb, a former Asst. Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Reserve Affairs, Installations and Logistics, proposes a budget that would reduce spending in FY07 by $60 billion by the following:

Reduce the nuclear arsenal to 1,000 warheads—$14 billion;

Eliminate unworkable missile defenses; continue research—$8 billion;

Terminate or cut back on Cold War weapons systems, F–22A Raptor, Virginia Class Submarine, DD/X Destroyers, V–22 Tilt Rotor Ospreys, C–130J Cargo Transports—$28 billion;

Reduce excess forces structure in Navy and Air Force—5 billion; and

Cut waste using new model for current warfare—$5 billion.

Overview: These cuts will make our forces stronger, divert funds back to personnel who need them, cut pork, waste and outdated or unworkable weapons that make the US weaker. Is cutting the defense budget in wartime a paradox? Right now the costs of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq are not coming from the overall defense budget but from $400 billion in supplemental funding to date, including $100 billion in 2005 and $115 billion in 2006. Despite the war on terror, the Department of Homeland Security budget is $43 billion, which is only 2% of the defense budget. $111 billion of the regular budgets pay for 1.4 million active duty and 800,000 reservists, with all mobilizations of those troops paid by the supplemental funding. $154 billion goes to Operation and Maintenance and civilian employee costs. $24 billion to the Department of Energy to maintain 10,000 nuclear warheads, $174 billion is spent on new weapons, research and development, and facilities and bases.

The proposed FY07 budget is $483 billion and $3 trillion projected over five years. This is more than all the other military budgets of the world combined. It is an increase of $20 billion over FY06 levels and $150 billion over Clinton era budgets. In addition, our allies are spending a total of $300 billion on their military forces. Russia and China combined are spending $100 billion, and all other rogue states or perceived enemies are spending a total of $50 billion.

MILITARY PERSONNEL

Recruitment, privacy rights and discharges

Joint statement to HASC July 19, 2005.—"To make matters worse there are now confirmed reports of recruiters lying, forging reports, and threatening jail time in order to sign new recruits this past May. Army recruiters in Colorado were caught on audio and video tape advising a potential recruit on how to go about getting

a fake high school diploma, as well as where to purchase a special concoction to drink in order to pass the drug test. Another Army recruiter in Texas was also recorded leaving a message for a potential recruit threatening them with an arrest warrant and jail time if they didn't show up for a scheduled meeting with a recruiter. These high-profile cases of recruiter misconduct have forced the Army to cease recruiting operations nationwide on May 20, and reinforce the high standards in honesty and integrity the Army holds for it's recruiters. One report released by the New York Times showed 480 cases of recruiter misconduct that have been investigated in the Army in 2005. Of those 480 cases, 90 have been substantiated, 98 recruiters have been punished, and eight recruiters have been relieved of duty. Recruiters are reportedly feeling the strain as well, often working long hours with little rest and poor results. The recruiting environment, recruiters say, has been especially hard ever since the "war on terror" began. Since October 2002, 37 Army recruiters have gone AWOL, many have requested other assignments and one had even applied for a conscientious objector discharge."

"Rough Road for Recruiters", The Objector, CCCO, 2005.—I continually receive complaints from parents that their children are being targeted for recruitment to the armed forces by recruiters.

These high school children are being visited at their homes by recruiters. This is wrong.

In addition, I remember litigation concluded by this Administration against the Greatest Generation veterans saying that recruiters back then didn't have the authority to offer health care for life, but the offers were made and recruits joined, believing that they would have health care for life. The courts ruled against the veterans. This amendment addresses misconduct on the part of military recruiters who are under pressure to meet quotas.

Residents of my district in Georgia have been calling a national GI Rights 800 hotline number for help when they realize they have been wrongly or fraudulently enlisted or given false promises by a recruiter.

This early enlistment program of 16 and 17 year old children accounts for more than 90% of all recruits, after graduation from high school.

Minors who reached the age of 18 before complaining, or anyone who failed to make a timely claim within 180 days was said to have "constructively enlisted" despite recruiter misconduct.

There have also been press reports of disciplinary actions taken against a string of recruiters involved in raping their prospective enlistees. Army Times reports a 40% increase in the reported assaults in 2005, over 2,300 incidents.

The number of recruiters punished or demoted for these violations has been far less than those reassigned for failing to meet their quotas.

In this Committee I failed to secure passage of an amendment that would have required an impartial witness to be present when the enlistment agreement is signed. Within the 180 days of entering duty, any enlistee who could make a convincing case of recruiter impropriety could have the contract revoked without punishment or any characterization as a discharge. The Secretary of

the branch would review the claim, and if there were insufficient evidence in rebuttal from the recruiter, the recruit would be released and provided transportation to the member's home of record or point of enlistment.

My suggested grounds for revoking an enlistment contract are simple, clear and fair:

No witness or no copy of a full contract;

Coercion, threats or intimidation to enlist or keep a recruit in the Delayed Entry Program;

A recruiter misrepresents benefits, educational funds, bonuses, assignments, or the likelihood of being exposed to combat or regaining custody of any children while in;

A recruiter interferes with criminal justice proceedings, fines or convictions, or enlists anyone pending legal charges, fines, confinement, or on probation or parole;

A recruiter omits, conceals or falsifies any disqualifying condition or creates false documents.

Under this amendment, all recruits would have been given notice of their rights under these rules to revoke any defective enlistment contract. The Secretary of Defense would provide annual statistical reports to Congress on the number and type of recruitment improprieties and the rates of disciplinary action or prosecutions begun and their final dispositions.

This revision would have gone a long way towards ending the damaging practices of recruiter misrepresentation and creating the conditions for a truly voluntary military that keeps its promises to enlisted members and does not recruit those who clearly do not qualify for duty.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND/NO CHILD LEFT UN-RECRUITED

Student privacy

This Authorization also failed to protect the privacy of students in secondary schools under provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act that allow military recruiters to request phone and address contact lists from schools, but allows parents and students to refuse release. It should have required that parents or student's opt-in and request release to recruiters and assumed that privacy is protected otherwise. Rep. Honda on which I am a co-sponsor has introduced a bill to this effect. (Language of HR 551 in Appendix)

Recruiter campus access

Since the recent Supreme Court decision [Rumsfeld v FAIR] and current laws require that speech forums be set up as equal access for military recruiters to all colleges, universities and high schools that accept federal funding, that forum requires another point of view.

This Authorization should have provided equal access for information about realities of military life and service, statistical information on treatment and discharge of women and people of color, combat experiences, stories from veterans and military family members, and alternative ways to fund college, learn job skills, apprentice or attend trade school and other alternatives to enlist-

ment. This would have required equal or the same access for alternative information, as recruiters will now have.

Authority to administer oaths of enlistment

There is a section of this Authorization that needs some clarification as to its purpose. Sec. 551 concerns the military enlistment oath and who may administer it. It specifically amends Section 502 and Section 1031 of title 10, United States Code by striking 'This oath may be taken before any commissioned officer of any armed force.' And inserting 'This oath may be taken before the President of the United States of America, Vice-President, Secretary of Defense, any commissioned officer or other person designated under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.'

Since there is a regulated process for taking enlistment oaths at special processing centers or as a result of commissioning as an officer, it is not clear why officials at the level of the President, Vice President and Secretary of Defense would be involved in such procedures, or why any "other person" than a commissioned officer would be designated to administer such an oath.

Is this a response to a perceived emergency in which such a select group of people would be forced to administer such oaths? Does it set up a process or capability of administering such oaths outside the regulated military process or procedures, or in secret?

Clarity on this should be provided to Congress before such a provision is voted on and signed into law.

CO study and Sgt. Kevin Benderman.—Sgt. Kevin Benderman is a man of principle who is being punished for standing up for his beliefs. Sgt. Benderman served in the first Gulf War therein learning the reality of war by taking part in it. He saw things that disturbed his conscience, things he never wanted to see or be a part of again.

Sgt. Benderman re-enlisted and served his country honorably in Afghanistan, when the United States entered combat and Iraq, he realized he had to make a decision. He searched his own conscience and talked to his family, and decided to file for discharge as a conscientious objector. Sgt. Benderman knew that he could no longer be part of a military at war.

He followed the legal procedures in filing his claim of conscience, but the unit officers responsible for processing that claim did not. A chaplain refused to make time for his interview, which is required before he can be evaluated. Once his command was alerted to his intention to be discharged he faced hostility, but he continued to perform his duties professionally and well. The delay in hearing his claim lasted until he had been reassigned to a unit ready to deploy to Iraq, and due to conflicting orders he missed the unit movement while he worked on his discharge claim.

Over the long months of waiting for a hearing, Sgt. Benderman began to speak out more publicly about his feelings regarding war and the conditions in his unit and the military. These statements were used to question his claim's sincerity. Instead of being properly evaluated according to regulations and rules by impartial officers, Sgt. Benderman was harassed and then denied his claim. Instead of being honorably discharged and having his Constitutionally protected beliefs respected, Sgt. Benderman was given

multiple charges and sent to the Army prison at Ft. Lewis, Washington where he is serving an 18 month sentence.

Our country owes more than this to Sgt. Benderman for his combat and for his continued honorable service. We owe more than that to his conscience and to that sacred principle that led President John F. Kennedy to say that he "longed for the day when the conscientious objector will hold the same status in society that the warrior does today." We owe more than that to those who serve our country and inform our conscience and theirs in the crucible of war. We owe more than this to the veterans who have returned from wars only to realize they have violated the deepest parts of themselves without knowing it at the time.

I introduced a successful amendment to this Authorization Act to commission a Government Accountability Office study from 1989 to the present on the treatment of military conscientious objectors, in order to determine the total number of all applications (even if not acted on), number of discharges or reassignments to non-combatant duty, processing of claims, average time for consideration, assignment to non-combatant duty while claims are pending, reasons for approval or disapproval, effect of Stop Loss provisions in first Gulf war and since, and pre-war statistical comparisons.

This amendment was offered with Sergeant Kevin Benderman, and his wife Monica, in mind. I offer this amendment for him and the millions of others who might be similarly situated if the Vice President is right and the American people experience war for the next generation.

This 180-day study will reveal the total number of applications for re-assignment or discharge as a conscientious objector filed in each of the military branches, by active and reserve forces, since January 1, 1989 through December 31, 2006.

Ours is a country of laws and beliefs, and we have a Constitution that separates religious beliefs and the rule of law and government. Every major religious faith recognizes the primacy of conscience in relation to war.

Conscience is not cowardice; conscience is clarity. I hope this study will give us the needed information to institute a sound policy regarding rights of conscience in the military. (Amendment 1 in appendix)

UCMJ

We have an outmoded system of military law and justice. Other industrialized nations allow military unionization and have abandoned internal military judicial systems and courts during peacetime. Our biased system results in conviction rates at courts-martial of over 90%. Everyone involved in the trial is a member of the military and judicial, witness, jury and defense independence is compromised.

This Authorization should have adopted the long-ignored findings of the influential Cox Commission relating to the UCMJ or should have abandoned it in favor of civilian courts for all but battlefield offenses or crimes in a distant theater of war where no other option is available.

COX COMMISSION REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE—MAY 2001

These are the primary recommendations of the Cox Commission:

A. Modify the pretrial role of the convening authority in both selecting court-martial members and making other pre-trial legal decisions that best rest within the purview of a sitting military judge.

B. Increase the independence, availability and responsibilities of military judges.

C. Implement additional protections in death penalty cases.

These proposals, however, do not exhaust the need for reform within the military justice system. Additional matters worthy of further consideration include:

A. STAFF JUDGE ADVOCATES

The impression that staff judge advocates (SJAs) possess too much authority over the court-martial process is nearly as damaging to perceptions of military justice as the over-involvement of convening authorities at trial. The broad authority granted some staff judge advocates creates a number of unwanted, contradictory images of courts-martial: that over-zealous prosecutors can pursue charges at will and are rewarded for aggressive prosecution, that convening authorities routinely disregard the legal advice of their SJAs in order to pursue unwarranted or even vindictive prosecutions, and that lawyers, rather than line officers, control the military justice apparatus. Staff judge advocates, which act as counsel to commanding officers and not as independent authorities, should not exert influence once charges are preferred, should work out plea bargains only upon approval of the convening authority, and deserve a clear picture of what their responsibilities are.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES

The Commission's focus is on military criminal justice, but we would be remiss in ignoring the impression of unfairness created by the growing use of administrative discharge action in lieu of court-martial. While the services must be afforded considerable latitude to manage their personnel, there is no denying that administrative action, from non-judicial punishment to administrative withdrawal of qualifications, certifications, and promotion opportunities, can have a devastating effect on an individual's enlistment or career.

The misuse, or the perception of misuse, of these administrative processes subverts the fundamental protections of the UCMJ, destroying the notion of fundamental fairness that is so critical to a professional military force. The Commission recognizes that an aggrieved service member may seek administrative redress at either the appropriate military administrative appeal board or in federal court, but in most instances these processes cannot make these individuals whole. Rarely can service members be returned to normal career tracks once they have been unfairly administratively sanctioned and fallen behind their career peer groups. Thus, the Commission recommends an overall review of the military disciplinary

system should consider, and, where necessary, reform, the administrative disciplinary and sanctioning process.

Three aspects of the current system in particular concern the Commission:

First, the manner in which discharges are characterized is a relic of the past and should be updated to reflect contemporary realities.

Second, the current system encourages disparate treatment of service members.

Finally, the current system does not provide ready access to the federal courts or other appellate review. Consideration should be given to providing for military appellate review of administrative discharges.

C. FERES DOCTRINE

The Commission believes that a study of this doctrine is warranted. An examination of the claims that have been barred by the doctrine, and a comparison of service members' rights to those of other citizens, could reform military legal doctrine in light of present day realities and modern tort practice. Revisiting the Feres Doctrine would also signal to service members that the United States government is committed to promoting fairness and justice in resolving military personnel matters.

D. SENTENCING

The Commission believes the sentencing process at court-martial deserves further review. Suggestions for reform have ranged from the use of sentencing guidelines to making military judges responsible for all sentencing. An anomaly of the court-martial sentencing process is that a military accused may request to be sentenced by military judge alone only if he or she elects to be tried without court members. The Commission urges Congress to authorize a military accused to permit the military judge to pass on a sentence even if a trial has proceeded before court members. Further, the Commission recommends that serious consideration and study be given to making military judges responsible for all sentencing in all cases, and to granting military judges the authority to suspend all or part of a court-martial sentence.

E. INSTRUCTION ON CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION

The armed forces' current management of conscientious objectors is hindered by inadequate trial instructions and administrative shortcomings, both of which the Commission believes should be addressed. Protecting the rights of conscientious objectors is a particular concern at court-martial, where an individual who has professed principled opposition to military service is judged by persons who have embraced that very service. Military judges should issue clear instructions explaining the legal status and responsibilities of a service member who has made a claim of conscientious objection but is awaiting a decision on his or her status. The services should also study ways to coordinate better the criminal and administrative processes in these cases, particularly when criminal charges are brought against a service member whose discharge for conscientious objection is pending.

F. JURISDICTION OF THE MILITARY APPELLATE COURTS

In the aftermath of the Supreme Court's decision to limit the authority of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces in Clinton v. Goldsmith, the Commission believes that further study to clarify the jurisdiction of appellate courts should be undertaken. However, if the authority of military judges were enhanced as suggested above in III.B., the question of appellate jurisdiction would begin to resolve itself, since military appeals courts clearly possess authority under the UCMJ to review the rulings of military judges at trial.

G. PRE-TRIAL AND TRIAL PROCEDURES

The Commission received a number of suggestions concerning improvements to the actual trial process. For example, many submissions suggested that the Article 32 officer should be either a military judge or a field grade judge advocate with enhanced powers to issue subpoenas, and to make binding recommendations to dismiss charges where no probable cause was found. Others recommended increasing the number of peremptory challenges for both the government and the defense, permitting lawyer voir dire, granting military judges contempt power over both military personnel and civilians during trial, and allowing witnesses to be sworn by either military judges or clerks. The Commission takes no position regarding these suggestions, but believes that like many of the other issues presented, these comments are worthy of further study and full consideration.

Sexual harassment, victim rights

"As if these revelations aren't enough to impact recruiting numbers, perhaps we should consider the conduct of recruiters. It's no secret that sexual assault, rape and violence against women in the military is rampant and out of control; but did you know it's also a problem for military recruiters and potential recruits? A string of sexual assaults of potential recruits by their military recruiters has received absolutely no major media coverage, and no ties have been made between the sexual assaults and the falling recruiting numbers. Stretching from July 2003 to March 2005 there have been five major cases that have caught our attention:

—July 2003: an Army recruiter based in Moreno Valley, CA was sentenced to 16 months in prison for statutory rape of a 17-year-old female recruit.

—January 2004: a Marine recruiter based in Baltimore, MD was convicted of fondling a teenage recruit and was sentenced to probation and ordered to seek counseling.

—May 2004: a Marine recruiter based in Blooming Grove, NY was charged with six counts of rape, the recruit was only 16 years old.

—June 2004: a Marine recruiter based in Riverside, CA was sentenced to five years in prison for raping a 17-year-old high school student.

—November 2004: an Army recruiter based in Riverside, CA was charged with four felony counts of having sex with and providing alcohol to two 17-year-old girls.

—March 2005: a National Guard recruiter based in Castleton, IN faces 31 charges stemming from alleged sexual assaults on seven potential female recruits.

In each of these cases the victims claimed to have met their recruiter in their high schools, and in almost all of the cases claimed the assaults took place either in the recruiting office or in the recruiter's vehicles! It is this type of activity coupled with other factors such as the high rate of female soldiers getting killed or wounded in Iraq, and women being placed in combat positions in direct violation of DoD policy that have contributed to a sharp decline in female recruits. This decline is most notable in the Army where in 2001 women made up 21% of new recruits but this year is accounting for a low 17%."

"Rough Road for Recruiters", The Objector, CCCO, 2005.—The crimes and persistence of sexual harassment and rape seems only to be exaggerated in the U.S. military from recruitment to enlistment and in the military Academies as well. Despite a hostile reporting environment, limited accesses to counseling, confidentiality, medical support or protection, the reported levels are still considerably higher than those in the civilian world.

Despite reassurances by Under Secretary for Defense David Chu recently to the HASC about measures being taken to create a "robust sexual assault prevention and response program," current reports from the Military Academies, the press and statistics only show the problem increasing.

The lack of command authority to take these charges and crimes seriously and their failure to investigate, isolate and charge the perpetrators sends exactly the wrong message in regard to prevention or "zero tolerance" of these crimes. Until that practice changes, women will continue to be at risk and retention and recruitment will be affected, not to mention advancement.

This Authorization, despite limited language about the issue, failed to substantially expand the rights and protection of victims of sexual harassment and abuse in the military and in military families or by veterans. A much more comprehensive approach, similar to those in place in civilian rape crisis facilities and law enforcement procedures, must be adopted as military policy.

These proposals came from Miles Foundation and legislation proposed by Rep. Louise Slaughter.

Cost of TRICARE and drugs

I recognize the hard work of my colleagues and of the Committee staff and their sincere efforts to oversee the Pentagon in order to provide for the common defense. In fact, there are some provisions in this mark-up which I can support. The Subcommittee plan for a 2.7% across-the-board military pay raise—compared to the 2.2% proposed by President Bush, which I believe is a very good step towards supporting our soldiers who have their lives on the line every day. Also the TRICARE program did not receive fee increases, which will be a relief to our military veterans. H.R. 5122 forbids the Department of Defense from raising the fees of TRICARE prime, standard and TRICARE reserve select at least until December 31, 2007. Postponing what now looks to be an evitable increase in the cost of healthcare costs for veterans will give

the Comptroller General and Congressional Budget Office along with other agencies more time to address the issue of sustaining military healthcare over the long term.

The bill also includes a $735 million increase to the Defense Health Program (DHP) to reinstate funding in anticipation of future cost share increases.

It includes coverage for anesthesia and hospital costs for dental care for the young, mentally and physically challenged beneficiaries. It retains the coverage for forensic examinations following sexual assaults and domestic violence.

Although this authorization retained some very beneficial programs for our veterans, one area of vital importance, the cost of prescription drugs was omitted. Rep. Skelton introduced an amendment to keep the military beneficiary drug costs at present levels of $3.00 for generic and $9.00 for brand drugs. This measure was soundly beaten with the majority using the rationale that the measure would take funds away from the war budget. Now, the price of drugs will rise to $6.00 and $16.00 respectively, which will have a devastating effect on lower grades of enlisted men and women who are on a very limited budget.

Plan Colombia and Afro-Colombians

The United States presently commits over $700 million per year to Plan Colombia. As in Iraq, the United States needs an exit strategy from the conflict in Colombia before the level of commitment increases further.

Plan Colombia is supposed to be a counter-narcotics program. But on Good Friday, the Office of National Drug Control Policy at the White House issued a memo in which they conceded that as much coca is being planted in Colombia as before Plan Colombia began, perhaps more, and that across the Andes the coca crop is the highest it has been since 2001. Plan Colombia has failed and is failing. Today Colombia has the world's highest rate of murder and kidnapping, and rather than dousing the fire, Plan Colombia is fanning the flames of violence.

U.S. fumigation of the fields of poor farmers continues to result in the destruction of the health and environment of residents, and the displacement of thousands in the midst of a vicious civil war that has already displaced hundreds of thousands of Colombians.

According to the U.S. State Department, a disproportionate number of internally displaced people are Afro-Colombian. The 10 million Afro-Colombians in Colombia make up nearly a quarter of Colombia's 44 million citizens. These Colombians already face legal and economic inequalities that have persisted since the abolition of slavery in that country.

Afro-Colombians have the lowest per capita incomes, with 80% living below the poverty line in a country where 27 percent of the population must survive on an income of less than $2 per day. They are concentrated in Urabá, stretching along the border of Panama between the Pacific and the Caribbean, and including the states of Chocó and Antioquia.

Chocó has the lowest level of social services in Colombia, and the population is 85% Afro-Colombian. Afro-Colombians have the highest rates of illiteracy, infant mortality, and diseases, many of those

diseases being preventable. They are the forgotten people of Colombia. Plan Colombia's billions of dollars is making life worse for them, not better.

Since 1996, 111 Afro-Colombians and mestizos have been murdered or "disappeared" in Urabá. In response to the violence, Afro-Colombian communities have set up three Humanitarian Zones, which are recognized by the Inter-American Human Rights Court of the OAS as legitimate mechanisms of self-protection. But paramilitaries working closely with Colombia's 17th brigade and large agri-businesses intent on laying claim to Afro-Colombian lands, which were not legally recognized until 1993, are attempting to systematically displace residents in Urabá so that they can set up palm oil plantations and livestock operations. Since January 2005, a quarter million Colombians have been forcibly displaced. Why is the United States of America supporting these violations of property and human rights?

The people of Urabá region have been victims of massacres and other large-scale abuses, but these abuses are not restricted to that region:

On May 2, 2002, in the town of Bojayá, 119 Afro-Colombian civilians were killed by a makeshift bomb thrown by FARC guerrillas during a clash with paramilitary groups with ties to the government.

In August 2004 an economic blockade in the Chocó region by armed groups led to the displacement of over 1,200 Afro-Colombians. USAID reports that in all, an estimated 2.5 million Colombians are currently displaced. According to Michael Deal, the director of the USAID mission in Colombia: "The displaced Afro-Colombian and indigenous communities are truly one of the hemisphere's least recognized tragedies."

In February of 2005, a group of armed men who identified themselves as members of the Colombian military abducted peace leader Luis Eduardo Guerra and his family, including his 11-year-old son in San José de Apartadó in Antioquia, a village set up specifically as a peace community, where over 160 killings have taken place since 1997. Their dismembered bodies, eight in all, were found in graves days later, among them two-year-old Santiago Tuberquia Munoz, age 2, and Bellanyra Areiza Guzmán, age 17.

The massacre at San José de Apartadó led to a suspension of U.S. military aid to Colombia for seven months. Yet abuses continue, including the indiscriminate use of explosives and gunfire in communities, aerial bombardment of villages by the Colombian Air Force, resulting in thousands evacuating, and aerial strafing of civilians using stealth airplanes and Blackhawk helicopters. On October 24, 2005 the body of Orlando Valencia, an Afro-Colombian standing for election as a legal representative for Chocó, was found dead.

In 2001, union leaders and members of the groups SINTRAEMCALI, which had been conducting a campaign against corruption and privatization of the Cali Municipal Corporation (EMCALI), were accused of subversion and consistently harassed, threatened and even killed by police, military forces and private security groups with alleged links to paramilitary groups. Former SINTAEMCALI President, Colombian Congressman Alexander

Lopez Maya of Bogotá, received a hand written death threat letter on October 27th, 2004. Berenice Celeyta Alayón, one of four Colombian recipients of the 1998 Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights Award, received threats and heard sounds of automatic weaponry on her cellular phone. They informed Colombia's Attorney General, and a raid took place on August 25th, 2004 at the residence of Lt. Col. Juilan Villate Leal, of the Third Brigade. The raid revealed that the Colombian Army had provided detailed information about Ms. Celeyta and Rep. Maya and over 175 other names. This evidence directly implicated Lt. Col. Villate in a campaign known as "Operation Dragon" to target and assassinate union leaders, human rights workers and members of the opposition.

The United States has directly funded Colombia's intelligence agency, the Departamento Administrativo de Seguridad (DAS), for cooperative programs with the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) and the Department of Justice (DoJ) in the United States. The DAS reports directly to the Colombian Presidency. Recent charges have been brought against former DAS Director Jorge Noguera for assisting and calling off investigations of paramilitaries and drug traffickers. Noguera is reported to have worked actively with paramilitary leaders to guarantee victories for paramilitary candidates in Northern Colombia. The DAS also gave lists of union leaders, opposition leaders, activists and academics to paramilitaries. Rather than being investigated, Noguera was sent to a post as Consul in Italy.

In late April, the body of Jaime Gomez, Chief of Staff for Senator Piedad Cordoba, was found by some children. Mr. Gomez had been captured and tortured by paramilitary groups in Colombia for 34 days before his murder. His flesh was burnt off with acid and all that remained of him was a skeleton. Dental records confirmed the identity of the skeleton. The skull had been broken or cleaved, suggesting brutal torture. Also found dead in the same week was Miss Liliana Gaviria, sister to the former Colombia President and Organization of American States chief Cesar Gaviria. Senator Cordoba was in Washington during the week of May 1–5, 2006, and was announced during session when Rep. McKinney introduced an amendment to end Plan Colombia on May 3rd. The amendment failed. Steps are being taken to try and ensure Sen. Cordoba's safety.

U.S. involvement in Colombia today readily resembles Vietnam in the early 1960s; it could easily escalate.

Colombia's elite are unwilling to commit their own sons and daughters or their own financial resources to this war, relying upon shady paramilitary groups, soldiers recruited from Colombia's underclass and funding from Uncle Sam. Are we ready to commit large numbers of young Americans to die in a war with no progress toward peace being made on the ground, in a war where it is the poor and the innocent who suffer, as the army, the military and the rebels commit human rights abuses with impunity? Where does it end?

U.S. aid to Colombia should be refocused toward the promotion of human rights and upholding law. We need to strengthen the courts. We should be providing humanitarian assistance and economic development, not promoting military conflict in a country caught in the cycle of violence. The U.S. Embassy in Colombia and

the U.S. State Department should demand a full and impartial investigation of all DAS officials. The U.S. Embassy in Colombia and the State Department should monitor the performance of DAS officials, as well as plans announced by the Colombian government to ensure that the DAS is not working at the behest of special interests. USAID should work with the Ministry of Interior to ensure that confidential information regarding threatened individuals under State protection will not be shared with other agencies. The U.S. State Department should demand that the Colombian government move to immediately disband all paramilitary groups, to put an end to the human rights abuses they carry out with impunity.

Posse Comitatus

This Authorization should also have reaffirmed the principle of Posse Comitatus for military forces, police and contracted security or combat forces. This Constitutional principle creates a bright line between military and police functions.

A call to reconfirm it was made in 2003 as part of the Homeland Security legislation. It is a practice and policy that protects the Constitution military members are sworn to protect, as well as the rights of the American people.

In the wake of the attacks on September 11, 2001, the Bush administration has continued to make widespread and unnecessary changes in laws and administrative powers that undermine the most basic Constitutional principles and protected rights of citizens in a democracy.

Recently, both President Bush and Senator Mark Warner (VA) have renewed calls to undermine or reverse the Posse Comitatus Act of 1867, which re-established the Constitutional principle and practice of separating military and police functions in a democracy. The experience of the founding fathers with the British model that combined the functions was enough to cause them to set that division sharply in administrative powers and civilian command of the military.

The principles began to be eroded in the period following the end of the Civil War, and the effective occupation of areas of the south by federal troops who were holding military tribunals, carrying out executions of citizens and usurping local police and judicial control. Their excesses came to the attention of the post-war Congress and they passed the Posse Comitatus Act to forbid the military being used to enforce laws.

Further erosion followed the end of the Vietnam War, when police departments were increasingly militarized in training and equipment as well as employing a large number of returning war veterans. SWAT teams were created, a clearly militarized police function, getting training on military bases with advanced weapons.

When President George H.W. Bush came into office in the 1980s, his programs made increased use of military troops and equipment in the war against drugs, supporting police and collecting intelligence in regard to civilian crimes. Joint Military Task Forces were created that combined DoD, FBI, SWAT, ATF and local police in sieges at Wounded Knee, Waco, Texas and against MOVE in Philadelphia, using tanks and military explosives.

President Bush has ample authority under provisions of existing laws on disaster response to mobilize and command any and all federal assets, including military forces. State directed National Guard units have always worked in conjunction with federal troops without being put under federal control themselves. Both National Guard and regular military forces are authorized under federal and state laws to use force to protect lives, property and public safety during a declared emergency. Police functions have been wisely left to local police and state National Guard forces, except when the situation was so dire they could not function.

The U.S. Naval Institute reports that failing to yet establish a Department of Homeland Security safe port program that would identify port workers, the administration is renewing powers to the Coast Guard dating back to the 1950s, which were used to screen unionized dock workers and to weed out "Communists." There were, according to union organizations and accepted history, many abuses of this power. This ruling holds the potential for more abuse and yet another violation of the Posse Comitatus principle.

Congress must renew their commitment to the Posse Comitatus Act and support the principle of separation of military and police functions, and the existing laws regarding federalization of resources during emergencies, as they did in 2003. Bush did not need those authorities to move troops and federal assets into New Orleans and the Gulf States in the wake of Hurricane Katrina, and he does not need them for other public health emergencies. Existing law is sufficient, and the Congress needs to investigate the New Orleans response by FEMA and government troops, as well as examine and reject the Bush administration's claims that they need more power than the Constitution envisions or allows.

I have introduced a concurrent resolution in this regard.

Tamiflu, Avian Bird Flu, and Secretary Rumsfeld

"Gilead is fortunate to have had Don Rumsfeld," said Michael L. Riordan, M.D., "who founded Gilead in 1987 and [had] served as Chairman since 1993," . . . "and we are very pleased that he has accepted the Chairmanship. . . . He has played an important role in helping to build and steer the company. His broad experience in leadership positions in both industry and government will serve us well as Gilead continues to build its commercial presence."

Rumsfeld served as Gilead's Chairman of the Board until January 22, 2001. Upon his departure, John C. Martin, Ph.D., Gilead's President and CEO, said "Don Rumsfeld's insight and contributions over the last twelve years have been invaluable as Gilead has evolved from a promising biotech company into the worldwide biopharmaceutical corporation it is today."

G.D. Searle/Pfizer Inc.

"A December 28, 2000 CBS News report on Rumsfeld stated that he was not only serving as chairman of the board of directors of Gilead Sciences, but was also serving "as a member of the boards of directors of ABB (Asea Brown Boveri) Ltd., Tribune Company and RAND Corporation"; was "currently chairman of the Salomon Smith Barney International Advisory Board"; served as a member of the board of directors of Amylin Pharmaceuticals (1991–1996);

chairman and chief executive officer of General Instrument Corporation (October 1990 to August 1993); and "served as a senior advisor to William Blair & Co., an investment banking firm" (1985–1990)."

"As a director for Gulfstream Aerospace, his stock in the company reportedly was valued at $11 million when the company was acquired by defense contractor General Dynamics in 1999. But Rumsfeld scrupulously avoided any direct dealings with defense companies, either serving on boards or purchasing stock, a decision that helped to avoid the appearance of impropriety when he was asked to lead the Defense Department again."

Open secrets

This Authorization also failed to rescind future purchases of the drug Tamiflu or related products in anticipation of a human pandemic caused by the Asian Bird Flu virus. Since the potential of such a pandemic is low, and a natural extract of the Black Elderberry plant is fully effective in countering the virus, this would be a sensible policy.

In 2005, the Defense Supply Center created a contract with Gilead/Roche for $68 million to purchase 2.4 million capsules of Tamiflu in anticipation of its use to curb a potential pandemic among humans of the Avian Bird Flu virus A (H5N1). In addition, an apparently separate contract for $58 million was made with Roche Laboratories in New Jersey for all four branches for Oseltamivir Phosphate Capsules (Tamiflu) to the Defense Supply Center in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

There were plans reported in Fortune to expand to hundreds of billions of dollars in purchases.

The flu strain, which is killing large numbers of birds across species, is slightly zoonetic, in other words it can potentially pass from birds to humans who handle them. However, virologists quoted in the New York Times reveal that many experts feel the possibility of the virus mutating into a form that will pass easily from human to human and create a pandemic is low, and the fear of hundreds of millions of deaths is exaggerated.

Millions of chickens have reportedly been infected in Asia, where many people live with the birds, and only 200 people have been infected. To date, there have been just over 100 deaths from the virus in the last five-year period and no indication it is spreading between humans. Not all infections are fatal, and no one has gotten the virus from another human, even during infection.

At least one medical expert at the National Center for Food Protection and Defense within the Department of Homeland Security, Dr. Michael Osterholm believes that antiviral drugs will only have a minimal effect during a pandemic. "What we don't know is if Tamiflu will work," he was quoted as saying by Fox News. Like other antiviral approaches to the immune system, they often spark mutations in viruses that create resistance to the cure. Nature reported last October that virus samples taken from a Vietnamese woman were resistant to Tamiflu following massive use of the drug in that region. The New England Journal of Medicine makes the same point, reporting that four out of eight human victims died

while taking Tamiflu. The Lancet notes the resistance of this type-A influenza virus to Tamiflu and researchers call it "alarming".

In addition to that, Tamiflu has known negative side effects listed by Roche, the manufacturer. Their consumer literature warns against use by pregnant women, those planning to get pregnant, or breastfeeding, as well as children less than one year of age. Those with kidney disease, heart disease, respiratory or any serious health condition are also told to get a professional opinion. There have been some anaphylactic responses as well. Studies by the European Medicines Evaluation Agency suggest symptoms can include hallucinations and delusions, and may have caused abnormal behavior and suicide leaps by two Vietnamese teens that took the drug.

There are simple and inexpensive natural products that have proven effective in clinical trials and in use in killing the H5N1 virus at a 99% level. No-Germs is a British over the counter hand spray that disinfects and easily stops the spread of the virus. Skinvisible is patenting a clorhexadine hand sanitizer that is similarly deadly to the virus. Another natural product that has been proven for years to work against a wide range of influenza strains is an extract of the black elderberry plant known as Sambucol. In clinical tests reported in Israel and England, it promises to be effective at destroying H5N1 in cell cultures.

Finally, the purchase and stockpiling of Tamiflu, which is ineffective and may have already mutated a resistant strain of the virus, creates profit and high stock dividends. Gilead Science, a company whose board includes Governor Pete Wilson, former Secretary of State George Schultz and until his appointment as Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, who is still a blind investor benefiting from the windfall to Gilead stocks.

I proposed an amendment, which did not pass, to the Committee calling for a sense of Congress that no further funds should be appropriated by the Department of Defense for the purchase or stockpiling of Tamiflu or any related product.

GAO Study on privatization of security

I introduced an amendment to the Committee that also failed to create provisions for a study relating to military contracting by private or corporate security forces or private armies, in order to insure Congressional and legal oversight, legal restrictions and restraints, limits to use of force, proper rules of engagement, assessment of competitive costs, violations of Posse Comitatus, limits on domestic use of such forces, and legal jurisdiction under UCMJ and accountability.

Huge corporations like Halliburton and their subsidiary Kellogg, Brown & Root, Bechtel and DynCorp, MPRI, and private firms like Blackwater and SAIC, have been making headlines since 9/11 by contracting at high cost, low transparency and limited accountability for security and other functions more traditionally carried out by military and police forces both in combat zones and here at home. Often the contracts are no-bid affairs due to "emergencies" and cost overruns, overcharges or loss of excessive unaccounted amounts of funding are acknowledged, but lead to no punishment

or breach of contract. In fact, there is evidence of profitable kickbacks and a pattern of continuing lucrative future contracts.

These firms have provided help for sale in response to conflicts and natural disasters, including building and preparing military base areas in advance of troops, putting out oil fires, creating infrastructure and carrying out security functions during combat in Afghanistan, Kosovo, the Balkans, Liberia, Colombia, the Philippines, and now New Orleans and other parts of Louisiana. This trend has included handing over the rebuilding of Iraq and other areas to these firms as well as meals, cleaning, maintenance, repair and other functions for the troops. Have they become too essential to criticize?

In addition, their employees often operate from a different set of expectations, rules and norms of behavior than are adhered to by the people in uniform trained to work with certain restrictions and under Constitutional and international restraints. These differences range from an unwillingness to go into harms way, as well as endangerment of our troops or lack of adequate support. Lacking clear chains of command and rules of engagement, these firms have participated in activities that violate laws, codes of conduct and limits on behavior. At the very least they have created or supported actions that damage the environment and the social order in other countries and affect their human rights.

My failed amendment required a study, completed in 180 days by the Comptroller General's office of the results and consequences, the costs and contradictions of privatization in the area of security so far. It required an assessment of financial transparency, competitive bidding, discrimination in contracts or hiring, adequate training and background checks of employees, and a comparison to the recruiting, hiring and training process of those who worked in proximity to them.

It sought to determine if clear lines of authority and command under the Department of Defense for all the employees involved were set out and whether employees were adequately trained in the use of force, lethal weapons and rules of engagement that apply to regular forces. It would have explored whether or not these contractors followed the Constitution, the Geneva Accords and human rights principles established by the United Nations.

My changes would also have determined if these contracting entities have been held accountable for any violations, paid any fines or if employees have suffered any reduction in pay, reassignment or termination of employment or faced legal prosecutions of any kind. It would also have examined comparable costs for the same functions performed by our own armed forces and police, excessive gaps in pay or benefits, the long-term health risks of such work, and compare the training, qualification and performance of government and private agencies and employees.

It would have established a rule that in future contract bidding no contractor who is found to have violated the rules of any federal contract will be allowed to be granted additional contracts for a period of 5 years.

This would have gone a long way to making these huge corporations accountable and responsible to the people who pay to hire them, set standards and rules for their behavior, set up clear

chains of command, and require transparency, reporting and consequences to their violations or actions.

Nigeria

This Authorization also failed to address limits on U.S. intervention abroad on behalf of U.S. corporate investments and infrastructure relating to their control of key resources, excessive profits and environmental damage. Nigeria has been a prime example of these abuses by the oil corporations, and they supported a brutal government repression against local people who organized around those issues for change and accountability.

Armed conflict in the Niger Delta has reportedly stalled plans that U.S. military officials have to deploy American Marines to the region, and Pentagon sources confirmed that officials are reviewing an agreement with Nigeria that would have U.S. Marines protect oil facilities in Nigeria because of the growing battle between Nigerian armed forces and insurgents.

Current deployments abroad, reduced enlistment and retention, and depleting equipment and resources reportedly tax U.S. military forces already, and the sovereignty of both countries should be respected by opposing the introduction of any U.S. troops or armed forces into Nigeria.

Homeland Security Wire revealed recently that an Israeli firm, Aeronautics, is being contracted by the government or the corporations to guard oil company infrastructure.

This Authorization should have indicated that Congress opposes current plans to introduce U.S. Marines or other forces into Nigeria to protect oil reserves, or for other purposes.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The United States currently has over 5,500 deployed nuclear weapons and 4,200 more in storage, according to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Each of those weapons is capable of killing over a million people. Fifteen years after the end of the Cold War, the Bush administration is proposing to build yet another generation of new nuclear weapons, the Reliable Replacement Warhead, or RRW.

The RRW will require the construction of a new nuclear bomb plant, called the Consolidated Plutonium Center. That new bomb plant would produce 125 to 200 plutonium "pits" a year for new nuclear warheads. One of the sites being considered for this new, multi-billion dollar bomb plant is the Savannah River Site on the South Carolina-Georgia border, not far from my Congressional district. Instead of building new nuclear weapons, we should be dismantling these Cold War relics. As the chairman of the House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, Rep. David Hobson (R–Ohio), recently said in the Washington Post, "There is not much dismantlement going on . . . The Defense Department never wants to get rid of anything." We are in the ridiculous situation of paying to maintain one nuclear weapon system, the W84 warhead that was built for the Air Force ground-based cruise missile, even though there is no longer a missile on which it can be delivered.

The Energy Department authorization for nuclear weapons work is over $6.4 billion for FY 2007. That spending level is 1.5 times

that spent on nuclear weapons during the Cold War, even adjusted for inflation. At that time, the U.S. was building thousands of nuclear weapons a year.

NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Instead of spending billions of dollars on Cold War nuclear systems, we should be addressing current, real world threats. During the first presidential debate in 2004, President Bush stated: ". . . the biggest threat facing this country is weapons of mass destruction in the hands of a terrorist network." Yet we are seriously under-funding our nuclear nonproliferation programs. Hundreds of tons on nuclear weapons materials are stored at inadequately security facilities in Russia and perhaps 20 other countries. A small amount of nuclear weapons material could be fashioned into crude nuclear weapons that would destroy downtown New York or Atlanta, killing hundreds of thousands of people and costing billions of dollars. A nuclear detonation in any U.S. city would cause devastation that would make the 9/11 attack and the Katrina hurricane pale in comparison.

We should be aggressively funding those nonproliferation programs that secure and destroy nuclear weapons and materials. One such program is the Global Threat Reduction Initiative. The Bush administration requested $107 million and the House Armed Services Committee did increase that amount by another $50 million. However, we should be funding that program at least at $500 million a year. That would improve our real security.

Closing

Congressman John Murtha said that before we go to war, "there should be a threat to national security, we should use overwhelming force, and we should have an exit strategy. All three of these principles were violated in the case of Iraq. I was unable to support our committee's report back to the Floor of the House, for many of the reasons listed above, and expect to oppose this bill on the Floor as well. The reasons for my opposition to this bill are too numerous to list here in the short time allowed for the filing of the dissent. They would include the massive social program cuts in areas such as health and education to pay for an unnecessary war and to pad some of this administration's top officials and friends. It also would include environmental clean-up at the nuclear weapons complex, the unattended toxic dumps scattered on bases across the nation, the military stance on abortion, gay and lesbian rights and discrimination, war powers, using bases to house Katrina survivors, no more permanent bases in Iraq, alternate fuel and on and on.

And until this Congress has demonstrated that we are ready to exhibit leadership for global peace, I will continue to vote against the so-called National Defense Authorization Act and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

CYNTHIA MCKINNEY.