United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17, 2004 No. 34

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, March 22, 2004, at 12 noon.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17, 2004

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 17, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES F. BASS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord, be with the American people as they pray today for all who witness for You in this world.

We ask You to be with all those who serve the public in roles of government, military service, homeland security, and neighborhood protection.

May all leaders of religious faiths, businesses, communities, and families be blessed with courage, perseverance, and hope.

May teachers, preachers, scientists, and artists bring the light of wisdom into the darkness of this age.

Remove evil from the sight of children. Calm every fear.

Fill everyone with the knowledge of Your presence here, now, and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

IRAQ LIBERATION HAS BROUGHT THE HOPE OF FREEDOM TO MILLIONS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this Friday the historic liberation of the Iraqi people from Saddam Hussein's vicious tyranny began. Thanks to the leadership of President George W. Bush and the courage of our military with coalition partners, Iraqis no longer fear Saddam's torture chambers and executions. Instead, millions enjoy the hope of freedom and democracy.

Today, Iraqi women have the freedom to participate in government and children are going to newly renovated schools. Decades of neglect by Saddam are being reversed in record time as health clinics, water sources, electricity and sanitation are being restored throughout the country.

Most importantly, the world no longer lives under the constant threat of a madman who harbored and supported terrorists.

After World War II, we helped rebuild Germany to assist it from becoming a breeding ground for communists, and we were successful. Today we are rebuilding Iraq to assist it from being a breeding ground for terrorists, and we will be successful in protecting American families.

In conclusion, God bless our troops. And we will never forget September 11.

U.S. POLICY IN IRAQ DEFINED

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the House is about to consider H. Res. 561, which represents another missed opportunity for this body. The war in Iraq defined and drove United States' policy for the last 2 years. While there are legitimate questions about whether we are as a world safer today than we were a year ago, this resolution ignores the real question of how safe the world would be, if we had done it right.

While there was never a doubt about the U.S. winning the war, this administration ignored the cost of winning the peace. Our young men and women in

Printed on recycled paper.

uniform pay the price every day in Iraq for that failure.

Yes, we need to support; yes, we need to unify; yes, we need to indicate our appreciation for our troops; but more important, we need to learn from this experience. How do we improve our intelligence and our military execution so that our soldiers are not unnecessarily put in harm's way in the future? Our families at home and our troops overseas deserve for us to do it right.

THE TOTALITARIAN GULAG IN CUBA

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 year ago, taking advantage of the attention of the world on the liberation of Iraq where U.S. Armed Forces and coalition forces eliminated a dangerous madman from power, that formerly oppressed country, the Cuban dictator 90 miles from the United States utilizing that cover of attention on Iraq, commenced a campaign to throw dozens of peaceful pro-democracy activists, librarians and economists and journalists and students and workers and others into the totalitarian gulag where they joined the thousands of others who languish as political prisoners in that enslaved island.

Mr. Speaker, each day we must remind the world of the existence of the totalitarian gulag 90 miles from the United States. We must demand the release of each and every political prisoner on that island. We must not rest until they are all free.

REGARDING IRAQ RESOLUTION

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about the Iraq resolution that I will vote ''no'' on today.

Republicans would like us to say America is safer. I wish that were true, but it is not. We have only to look at what happened in Spain to be reminded. Terrorism threatens America today just as much as terrorism threatened America before we invaded Iraq.

Make no mistake, I wholeheartedly support the U.S. soldiers. My support does not stop at the Iraq border, nor is my support bounded by political party. I regularly visit troops at Walter Reed Hospital, and I urge every Member to do so. They are the best soldiers and they make America proud.

I would like to pass a resolution praising our soldiers, but this Republican resolution is meant to legitimize a position the administration cannot defend at home or abroad. Look at the Spanish election. We have lost soldiers. We continue to lose them. We have lost credibility. And we have found nothing.

This is not worthy of a victory lap. I will not sing the praises of the Bush doctrine.

SHALLOWATER HIGH SCHOOL STATE CHAMPIONS

(Mr. NEUGEBAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Shallowater High School State champion boys and girls basketball teams. Within the span of 1 week, the Shallowater boys teams followed the girls in an elite list of State basketball championships. This is an unprecedented victory for the school which can only be attributed to pure hard work and dedication.

In a rare moment in Texas State championships, both the girls and boys basketball teams won a State title. The Mustangs from Shallowater executed a 47–45 overtime victory over Argyle, thus winning the class 2A boys championship game. Just a week earlier, the Fillies, the girls team from Shallowater, triumphed over Aubrey with a dramatic 44–37 win and captured the girls 2A State championship game.

This is no small feat for a rural community high school like Shallowater to achieve what it has in this past week. These students have shown exemplary performance and proven what a commitment can do.

Shallowater is the home of champions. The players, Coach Chuck Darden, and Coach Ray Morris will go down in history as the folks who put their town in the spotlight through determination and hard work.

SALUTE TO THE GREY BERETS

(Mr. ISAKSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to all of our men and women in harm's way in Iraq and our Operation Iraqi Freedom, but in particular to focus on the Grey Berets Special Operation Forces Weathermen.

Although the war had not commenced as of this date a year ago, already for weeks on the ground many brave soldiers from these forces had infiltrated Iraq, had set up meteorological operations and were communicating to our pilots, to our Air Force, to our Navy, our Marines and Army the critical weather information necessary for a safe, a death-free, as much as possible, and a successful invasion of Iraq and the liberation of the Iraqi people.

Tonight, the Weather Channel Network will feature a 1-hour special on these brave men and women who went into harm's way before battle began, who hid, who worked, who got the data, and made sure our pilots, our Navy, our Marines, and Air Force had the information they needed.

I commend these brave Grey Berets. I commend the Weather Channel Network for paying special tribute to them on this day.

IRAQ'S INTERIM CONSTITUTION

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on the 1-year anniversary of the war in Iraq, I rise to applaud the Iraqi civil leaders who last Monday on March 8 signed the interim constitution, the Transitional Administrative Law. With the adoption of this law, the governing council has taken a historic step forward towards a democratic Iraq. It took only 12 months, Mr. Speaker, to defeat Saddam Hussein and transition to an interim constitution.

Now, my colleagues, it took 6 years for the first State in the Union, Delaware, to ratify our Constitution, and several more years before the original 13 finally ratified.

Iraq is moving at a much faster pace. One year ago, the naysayers said we did not have enough forces in place to defeat Iraq's military. Naysayers said we could never find Saddam Hussein; and naysayers doubted that we could get Kurds, Shia, and Sunni Muslims to agree on anything.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year later the naysayers are wrong.

IRAQ REPLACES NEW HAMPSHIRE IN PRIMARY

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am so excited by what I just heard that I expect that we will fully see Iraq replace New Hampshire on the Presidential primary circuit before long.

PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND ON HOUSE RESOLUTION H. RES. 557, RELATING TO LIBERATION OF IRAQI PEOPLE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include extraneous material during the House debate on the Iraqi resolution later today.

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

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING AGRICULTURE IN WESTERN IOWA

(Mr. KING of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only because of St. Patrick's Day but because it is also National Agriculture Week. Iowa ranks number one in the Nation in corn, soybean, pork and egg production, and second in total

agricultural exports. We have a fertile State with some of the richest and most productive soil in the world. And we use this resource to provide the safest food supply in the world.

This week I am asking Iowans to celebrate our rich heritage of agricultural production; but I also want us to look with anticipation to the future of agriculture, value-added agriculture, and our youth. Iowa agriculture is no longer just about growing commodities that we ship away by truck, train, or barge. Farmers in western Iowa have realized that if we do all of our business this way our small towns and cities will lose its youth, a very precious resource.

As I look at the youth of my district, I want them to have all the benefits of growing up in a farming community. And I want to see them in our communities making a difference, choosing to raise their families in western Iowa for years to come. There is no better place if we can continue to be innovative in agricultural development.

Our farmers and community leaders have led the charge to develop this new generation of agriculture because we think differently in Iowa. Let us use National Agriculture Week to thank them not only for rich heritage of agriculture production but for looking to the future and building a foundation for a new rural western Iowa.

□ 1015

COMMEMORATING NATIONAL WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH AND STOP VIOLENCE WEEK

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand this morning to commemorate National Women's History Month and Stop Violence Week. This year's theme is Women Inspiring Hope and Possibility.

We are delighted, if you will, to reflect upon the history that women have made in the United States, but we also recognize that we must stand against violence and sexual assault. We know that both sexual and domestic violence and victims fear reporting is one of the greater challenges of women today in America.

In my State of Texas, nearly 2 million adult Texans, almost 13 percent of the State population, have been sexually assaulted. This is number one in the minds of many women. In Texas, every 2 minutes someone is sexually assaulted, and 2 women are killed each week by their intimate partner, and approximately 31 percent of sexual assault victims reported that a family member also had been sexually assaulted. An estimate of 82 percent of rapes and sexual assaults go unreported because of shame, fear, and hurt and anger, and nearly 80 percent of those raped know the person who raped them.

We realize in working with the Texans Against Sexual Assault and the Texas Council on Family Violence that we have a challenge before us.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saluting women for the progress they have made, but also reminding us as we work towards this very challenging problem, we must also include the women of Iraq who need to have their rights protected along with the children of Iraq as well.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

(Mr. PORTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are still some asking why Congress added a prescription drug benefit for seniors under Medicare. The reason is simple. Before we passed this law, the Medicare program operated like it was still back in 1965, when surgeries and hospital stays, rather than prescription drugs, were the primary means of treating and managing disease. Today, prescription medications not only treat illness, they can prevent them.

Prior to the changes in law, Medicare would pay an average of $5,000 for a person's hospitalization for heart failure, for instance, but not pay the $67 per month for Lipitor which is a cholesterol-lowering drug which can prevent heart failure. This is bad medicine and that is why we needed to add a prescription drug benefit.

Mr. Speaker, adding a benefit to Medicare was an important first step for providing seniors with quality and affordable health care. The benefit is entirely voluntary. The senior who does not want to take the benefit, they do not have to.

The prescription drug benefit is simple. It provides seniors relief from the high cost of prescription drugs, and it focuses that relief on those who need it most. Those who have low income, 12 million seniors get the benefit for the low-income seniors and those with high drug costs who can benefit from the new catastrophic insurance benefit.

Mr. Speaker, the new Medicare law provides seniors a choice and control with their drug plans, and it is good for our seniors.

PAYING THE DEBT OF HONOR

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, we are told if you owe debts, pay debts; if honor, then honor; if respect, then respect. And today, appropriately, we will commend and pay the debt of honor that we owe to American forces, our allies, and the brave people of Iraq in the success of Operation Iraqi Freedom begun one year ago.

But, sadly, we do so against the backdrop of tragedy and retreat amidst an ally in Europe, and so as we celebrate the victory in Iraq today, let our enemies nonetheless hear this today, Mr. Speaker, that this President, this Congress, and the good people of the home of the brave will never cower, will never relent, and will never retreat in the war on terror until the threat of terrorism is lifted from our people and the people of the free world, so help us God.

HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

(Mr. CANTOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, in the historic Medicare prescription drug bill, Congress created health savings accounts to give individuals greater choice over their health care decisions, radically expand access to health care, and drive down rising costs.

According to the National Association of Health Underwriters, one of the most important ways to address the rising cost is through encouraging purchasers of health insurance to become better consumers. HSAs will do that.

HSAs are providing real savings. A family of four in my district used to pay $532 a month for health care and now pays only $245 a month after establishing a HSA plan.

HSAs will give Americans more choices, better access to health care, and empower them to save money.

QADDAFI WANTS TO BE ON THE WINNING SIDE

(Mr. CHOCOLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, later today we are going to have a debate about a resolution of Iraq, and we will hear a lot of debate about whether America is safer because of our successes in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, there really is no debate, and I saw the proof with my own eyes when I recently traveled to Libya and met with Muammar Qaddafi, and I heard Muammar Qaddafi say with my own ears that he did not want to follow the path of Saddam Hussein and that is why he had decided to dismantle his weapons of mass destruction and abandon supporting terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, some of my friends on the other side of the aisle do not understand that we are winning the war on terror, but Muammar Qaddafi understands it perfectly clear, and he wants to be on the winning side.

SUPPORTING OUR TROOPS

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, Columbus did not discover the trade route,

but I am glad he made the journey. We did not find the weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, which we were so sure were there. Even JOHN EDWARDS and JOHN KERRY, Bill Clinton, and many of the leading Democrats who are so critical of this administration said 2 years ago there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

But aside from that, what we did find is nearly 400 mass graves of citizens who had disappeared from their families. We found women who had been raped, husbands and brothers who had disappeared, forced to join an Army or had their tongue cut out for saying the wrong thing. We found a very oppressed people. We have liberated those people.

I believe what we have done in Iraq, we made the right decision, and I am very proud of the soldiers that are over there and the ones who have come home have done the job.

I am proud to represent the 3rd Infantry that was so much a part of the campaign in the Euphrates River last year. I believe the worst thing we can do in Washington now, in the name of partisan politics, is to try to erode this victory in order to gain the White House.

I hope we will all come together today and support this very important resolution in support of our troops.

MARKING THE ONE-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as true as my friend from Georgia has just said, we are about to begin consideration of a very important resolution. It is one which I believe should, in fact, enjoy strong bipartisan support. It is noncontroversial in that it is designed simply to, as the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) said last night before the Committee on Rules, provide commendation to our troops and to the Iraqi people and to the coalition forces for the fact that a year ago this week they began this effort to bring about the liberation of the people of Iraq, and there has been tremendous success.

We often hear of the negatives, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is important, as Secretary Donald Rumsfeld has pointed out time and time again, we are seeing schools rebuilt. We are seeing all kinds of very, very positive developments, even though we deal with some serious challenges.

So, Mr. Speaker, my message as we prepare for consideration of this rule, which will be debated for an hour and then we will have 4 hours of debate which will allow for a wide range of views to come forward, I hope that at the end of the day, the United States House of Representatives will stand firmly behind our troops and this effort which we mark the anniversary of right now.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 557, RELATING TO THE LIBERATION OF THE IRAQI PEOPLE AND THE VALIANT SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AND COALITION FORCES

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 561 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 561

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 557) relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces. The resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to final adoption without intervening motion except: (1) four hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations or their designee; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of House Resolution 557 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the resolution to a time designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Fort Lauderdale (Mr. HASTINGS) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, our brave servicemen and -women began a military operation that brought freedom for tens of millions, toppled one of the most despicable regimes in the history of the world, and strengthened the national security for the American people.

Operation Iraqi Freedom was, and continues to be, a military success of the highest order. Within 4 weeks from the start of operations on March 19 of last year, the U.S. military had won unqualified victory. Saddam Hussein and his Baathist regime could no longer terrorize the Iraqi people who were finally free to act, do and say as they pleased for the first time in decades.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that Saddam Hussein endangered world security. He posed a threat to his people, his region and the international community. Trusting the intentions of a man who started two wars, gassed his own people, and supported international terrorism would have been grossly irresponsible.

As weapons inspector David Kay has said, we know Saddam Hussein wanted weapons of mass destruction, we know he was attempting to resuscitate his illicit programs, and we know with certainty who he viewed his greatest enemy to be.

In a world where Iran can buy its way to a nuclear program with assistance from Pakistan's top nuclear scientist, combined with Saddam's access to illicit oil revenue, the fact that weapons of mass destruction have not yet been found in Iraq is hardly proof that Saddam Hussein did not want to severely hurt our country. Moreover, American national security has been solidified by the military action that was undertaken last year.

Mr. Speaker, does anyone really believe that Iran would be cooperating with international nuclear inspectors today if we had not launched this military operation? Does anyone really believe that North Korea would be engaged in six-party talks over the future of their nuclear program if the United States had not deposed Saddam Hussein? Does anyone really believe that Muammar Qaddafi, as recalcitrant in his defiance to the international community as ever a dictator has been, would have willingly come to the United States and Britain and declared that he wanted to end his illicit weapons programs had the American military not marched into Baghdad?

Mr. Speaker, Operation Iraqi Freedom sent an unmistakable signal to the rest of the world's tyrannical leaders: Either play by the rules or face the consequences.

Now, the events of September 11 taught us that we cannot allow threats to arrive on our shores before we combat them. If other Nations wish to keep their head in the sand about the dangers of proliferation and terrorism, that is their prerogative, but we cannot and could not afford to take that chance.

To those who complain of the cost of war and its aftermath, I simply will note that estimates of the cost of containing Saddam and his successors, as some have argued we should have done, are upwards of six times the dollar amount we have spent on war and reconstruction thus far, and significantly higher in terms of human lives lost.

Because of the heroic action of our military, the Iraqi threat has been mitigated efficiently and a new dawn has begun for the people of Iraq.

Earlier this month, Iraqi leaders signed the transitional administrative law into effect. It establishes an Iraqi law, a bill of fundamental human rights and paves the way for Iraqi democracy.

Perhaps more important than the signing of the law itself, was the agreement of Suni, Shiite, and Kurdish leaders to sign the document. While differences amongst them remain, and the road ahead will be difficult, it is clear they are acting with the best interests of the new Iraq and its people firmly in mind.

I should say our colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is going to, in her remarks today, tell a

very moving story about the fact that these very, very disparate groups have been able to come together sharing this pursued goal.

The Iraqi people themselves are clearly enjoying their newfound freedoms under the transitional government. Poll results released just yesterday demonstrate that not only do a significant majority of Iraqis feel they are much better off than they were under Saddam Hussein's reign, but the extremely high level of participation in the poll demonstrates their desire to exercise their right to speak their minds, something that was unthinkable under the tyranny of Saddam Hussein.

□ 1030

Such progress has only been possible because of the tireless commitment of our Armed Forces and those of the 34 nations assisting us to provide security on the ground in Iraq.

It is dangerous territory; and the forces of evil, whether they be Ba'athist remnants or infiltrated al-Qaeda sympathizers, are a constant threat. In the past year, we have lost over 550 of our best and brightest Americans, with another 3,190 wounded. That number, as it is in any conflict, is too high. Without question, we owe the soldiers we have lost, the soldiers who remain, and their families, an enormous debt of gratitude. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what this resolution marking this first anniversary is designed to do. If there is any solace, it is knowing that because of their actions, America and the world are safer places today with Saddam Hussein's regime dismantled.

Because of our military, the people of Iraq have a bright future, where Sunni, Shiite, and Kurd alike can dream of being treated equally, of electing their representatives, of owning a prosperous business, and being free to say, worship, and read what they want.

Mr. Speaker, it would be all too easy for the United States to leave Iraq now and let the Iraqi people fend for themselves. Avoiding conflict is the path of least resistance and is always politically expedient. But unlike previous conflict, terrorism cannot be contained. It has no boundaries. It has no rules. One day it strikes Baghdad, the next Madrid. The only recipe for success in this war is our resolve to defeat threats where we see them and promote democracy where we can.

Mr. Speaker, true success in the war on terror is taking place right now on the ground in Baghdad and Kabul. By supporting, securing, and strengthening the democratic governments of Iraq and Afghanistan, we are promoting greater equality within those countries as well as providing forums for those who feel disaffected to air they grievances without picking up arms. As open and transparent governments spread throughout the world, the precursor ingredients for terrorism, anger, and fanaticism will dissipate. That will be the continuing legacy of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this rule and the underlying resolution, which not only affirms the actions that the United States undertook a year ago, but provides every Member of this body the opportunity to reaffirm their own personal commitment to winning the war against terrorism, our commitment to democracy in Iraq, and, most important, to our troops in the field.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this resolution will enjoy strong bipartisan support. That is our goal. I also hope, Mr. Speaker, that as soon as we pass this resolution that we will immediately have it translated in Arabic so that Saddam Hussein can read it in his cell and be reminded constantly of what we and the victims are regularly reminded of. Thanks to our military, Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein does have time to read that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, my very good friend, that I thank him for yielding me this time, and had it been intended that this would be a bipartisan resolution, then Members in the minority would have been included in drafting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I truly wish that I could support this rule. National security is a bipartisan, or actually a nonpartisan, issue. And when we commend the troops, all of us, all of us have a stake. Every congressional district has a stake in commending the troops.

As a matter of fact, small town and rural America have furnished 46 percent and 43 percent of the deaths in Afghanistan and in Iraq. So all of us, whether we are from small towns or large cities, have a stake in a resolution commending the troops, and we should have been consulted about it. I am sorry for that.

Now, more than that, while we commend the troops, I would also have, had I been consulted, recommended that we do our best to protect our troops by including more body armor and extra up-armored Humvees, of which we still do not have enough in Iraq. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I received from the United States Army a letter indicating that there are unfunded requirements for the extra up-armored Humvees and the body armor, which is so necessary.

I would also have recommended that we have complete, timely, and high-quality health care to treat the wounds and injuries for those who have served, and to recognize those who pay the sacrifice, whether it be in wounds, injuries, or, sadly, deaths.

I would also have recognized the contributions of and the sacrifices of the families of our servicemen and -women, particularly in the Guard and Reserve. I would have recognized the efforts to improve our intelligence gaps that our troops need and so that they be better protected in the future. And I would have recognized and recommended the sufficient up-front funding for our military operations so we can ensure the safety and well-being of our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I would also have included the fact that there should have been better planning for the postwar period. I sent two letters to the President, one on September 4, 2002, and another 2 days before the attack on Iraq, both of which I include in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I think that all of us should have been at least brought to the table and all of us had an opportunity to write this resolution. I am so proud of our troops, whether they be from Missouri or Maine or wherever they are from. This is the best military our country has ever seen. And I think every Member of Congress, both sides of the aisle, should have had the opportunity to say thank you, we are proud of you, and God bless you.

Mr. Speaker, here follows the letters to which I referred earlier in my comments:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, September 4, 2002.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you for inviting me to the briefing this morning. I share your concern about the continuing threat posed by Saddam Hussein and his efforts to produce weapons of mass destruction (WMD). I would like to offer my assistance as the administration considers how to deal with this threat.

Before Congress can authorize any military action that might be part of the administration's plan, we must have answers to more questions than were able to be raised at today's meeting. Our constitutional duty requires us to ensure that all implications of such action are considered in advance. The case has not yet been fully made as to what the threat is, why military force is an appropriate way of addressing the threat, and why action must occur now. In short, Congress and the American people must be clear on your strategic vision before we can authorize a specific course of action. I believe, like Clausewitz, that in strategy there is an ''imperative . . . not to take the first step without considering the last.''

Your strategy for dealing with Iraq must address the fundamental questions of the threat, the method of acting, and the timing. Furthermore, any strategy to eliminate Iraqi WMD must also address several component issues, each of which raises critical questions.

1. How to manage Iraq's transition to a stable post-Saddam regime

As I mentioned to you this morning, this is a crucial question for administration strategy to answer in advance of any military action. I have no doubt that our military would decisively defeat Iraq's forces and remove Saddam. But like the proverbial dog chasing the car down the road, we must consider what we would do after we caught it.

As Sun-Tzu said in the classic strategic treatise, The Art of War, ''To win victory is

easy; to preserve its fruits, difficult.'' Military planners and political leaders alike new this in World War II. Planning for the occupation of Germany and Japan—two economically viable, technologically sophisticated nations—took place well in advance of the end of the war. The extreme difficulty of occupying Iraq with its history of autocratic rule, its balkanized ethnic tensions, and its isolated economic system argues both for careful consideration of the benefits and risks of undertaking military action and for detailed advanced occupation planning if such military action is approved.

Specifically, your strategy must consider the form of a replacement regime and take seriously the possibility that this regime might be rejected by the Iraqi people, leading to civil unrest and even anarchy. The effort must be to craft a stable regime that will be geopolitically preferable to Saddam and will incorporate the disparate interests of all groups within Iraq—Shi'a, Sunni, and Kurd. We must also plan now for what to do with members of the Baath party that continue to support Saddam and with the scientists and engineers who have expertise born of the Iraqi WMD program.

All these efforts require careful planning and long-term commitment of manpower and resources. The American people must be clear about the amount of money and the number of soldiers that will have to be devoted to this effort for many years to come.

2. How to ensure the action in Iraq does not undermine international support for the broader war on terrorism

In planning for military operations in Iraq, we cannot ignore the lack of international support to date. Pre-emptive action against Iraq is currently vocally opposed by many of our allies and friends throughout the world and particularly in the Middle East.

When we are seen as acting against the concerns of large numbers of our friends, it calls into question the ''humble'' approach to international relations you espoused during the presidential campaign. More than that, it has several potentially damaging long-term consequences. First, it risks losing the large number of partners needed to prosecute the global war on terrorism. To ferret terrorists groups out of their many hiding places, we must have broad allied support. Second, it risks seriously damaging U.S. moral legitimacy, potentially providing states like India and Pakistan with a preemptive option that could drive long-standing conflicts beyond containable bounds.

Finally and perhaps most dangerously, actions without broad Arab support may inflame the sources of terrorism, causing unrest and anger throughout the Muslim world. This dynamic will be worse if Iraq attacks Israel—perhaps with weapons of mass destruction—and draws them into the conflict. Iran, which has the potential to seize a reformist path, may well move away from the United States in the face of attacks that could next be taken against them. Together, these dynamics will make achieving peace in the Middle East more difficult and may well provide the rationale for more terrorist attacks against Americans.

These concerns do not make military action in Iraq untenable. They do, however, highlight the depth and importance of the issues to be addressed before we strike. We need to ensure that in taking out Saddam, we don't win the battle and lose the war.

3. How to ensure that the United States can execute this operation successfully as well as its other military missions

As you are well aware, Mr. President, the consideration of military action against Iraq comes at a time when U.S. forces are actively engaged throughout the world in a range of missions. Given the operational pressures these forces currently face, we must ask what the risks and trade-offs will be of defeating Iraq, particularly if Iraqi forces mass in Baghdad for urban operations. How many casualties must the American people be prepared to take in a worst-case scenario? What will the impact of sustained operations be on so-called high-demand, low-density assets? What military operations might we have to forego because of continued demands in Iraq? Will we still be prepared for the range of other threats that might emerge throughout the world? With little allied support and contributions, will we still be able to maintain military spending on transformational technologies and on sound quality of life for our forces if we are bearing a huge wartime cost alone? What will be the impact on the domestic economy of these resources drains and of the long-term costs of reconstructing Iraq? These questions must be answered before any military action commences so that the American people understand the risks and the sacrifices involved.

I ask these questions only to highlight the complexity of the undertaking and the need for Congress, the American people, and our friends around the world to understand exactly what is at stake and why we must act now. Only such a comprehensive strategic approach will ensure that we commit U.S. troops consciously and with full knowledge of the range of challenges we face—both in the initial campaign and in the long aftermath to follow. Even a strategy that has military action as its centerpiece will require great diplomatic efforts to ensure its success. I look forward to hearing the administration's answers and to working with you to find the best course of action.

Sincerely,

IKE SKELTON,
Ranking Democrat.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, March 18, 2003.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is a critical week for our nation and for the world. As you prepare to make the most difficult decision of sending our troops into combat, the thoughts and prayers of all Americans are with you. My colleagues here in Congress have many different views on the wisdom of action in Iraq and the severity of its consequences. But we are united in our support for all the men and women who serve this nation.

There is no doubt that our forces will be victorious in any conflict, but there is great potential for a ragged ending to a war as we deal with the aftermath. I appreciate the efforts that members of your administration have made to keep me informed about plans for the administration and reconstruction of Iraq following military conflict. Your team has thought about many of the things that will need to be done.

Secretary Rumsfeld frequently talks about the list he keeps of things that could go wrong in an Iraq war. I have kept my own list—of things that could go wrong after the war is over. This list below is indicative of this broader list. My hope is that this will be helpful to members of your administration as you continue to plan for all possibilities. These are not complete scenarios but rather a series of possible problems that could occur in some combination.

INTERNAL DIVISIONS AND EXTERNAL INFLUENCES IN IRAQ

Without access to Iraq through Turkey, U.S. troops are not present in northern Iraq in large numbers. Turkey enters northern Iraq to establish a buffer zone and fighting breaks out between the Turks and Kurds. A significant U.S. military force is needed to separate the groups, complicating the governmental transition and international support.

An uprising in Kirkuk leaves the Kurds in control of areas of the city and surrounding area. This triggers a large Turkish invasion to protect the Turkmen minority and to prevent Kurdish control of oil resources. Again this would require U.S. military resources with all the attending effects.

In the event that Turkey crosses into Iraq, Iran may do the same, ostensibly to stem the refugee flows from southern Iraq and to protect Shi'a interests. Shi'a populations in the south rebel and undertake attacks against Sunnis. U.S. troops must step in to protect the Sunnis and restore peace. These tensions resurface during attempts to build a federal and representative government.

Urban fighting in the south brings Shi'a into conflict with Sunnis. The resulting devastation causes a refugee crisis as Shi'a make for the Iranian border. The results of Saddam's policy of forced Arabization of areas like Kirkuk yield dangerous consequences. Groups like the Kurds flow back into these areas seeking to reclaim their former homes and land, sparking conflict with Iraqi Arabs.

Attempts to fashion a federal government in Baghdad prove difficult. Iran is able to establish proxies for its influence among the Shi'a representatives. Once in Iraq, infighting breaks out among members of the former Iraqi opposition in exile. The United States is unable to transition the administration of Iraq effectively and has to remain in place, with significant military backing.

The war involves lengthy urban combat, particularly in Baghdad. Most infrastructure is destroyed resulting in massive humanitarian problems. The emphasis on humanitarian aid distracts from efforts to establish a new government. Once established the government faces massive political pressure from the sustained humanitarian crisis.

WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Saddam uses biological and chemical weapons against advancing U.S. troops, but also inflicts substantial civilian casualties. Efforts to stabilize cities and to establish a government are complicated by the need to deal with the large number of dead and to decontaminate affected areas.

Saddam uses biological and chemical weapons directly against civilian populations or against another Arab country and seeks to affix blame for civilian suffering to the United States. Over the period of occupation, this resentment complicates U.S. efforts to maintain support for reconstruction efforts.

U.S. troops are unable to quickly find all of Saddam's capabilities, requiring a long, labor-intensive search and anxiety as to when the task is complete.

Regional leaders, for money or to gain influence, retain caches of WMD and transfer some to terrorist groups.

Saddam attacks Israel with missiles containing weapons of mass destruction. Israel retaliates. Arab countries, notably Saudi Arabia and Jordan, come under intense political pressure to withdraw their support from the U.S. war effort. U.S. forces are forced to reposition operational centers into Iraq and Kuwait, complicating reconstruction and transition efforts.

OIL RESOURCES

Saddam sabotages a significant number of wells before his defeat. Current estimates indicate he may already have wired up to 1,500 of these wells. The damage takes years to contain at great economic and environmental cost and removes a major source of reconstruction funding.

Internal groups, such as the Kurds, seize oil-rich land before American troops reach the area, causing internal clashes over these resources. Militant Shi'as seize other wells in the South.

INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT

The United States takes immediate control of Iraq's administration and of reconstruction. The United Nations can't agree on how involved to get given the divisions among the Security Council about the need for conflict. The lack of UN involvement in the administration makes the European Union and others less likely to give. This situation delays reconstruction and puts more of the cost on the United States and a smaller number of partners.

U.S. reconstruction efforts that give U.S. corporations a great role at the expense of multilateral organizations and other participation—as was detailed in yesterday's Wall Street Journal—spur resentment and again limit the willingness of others to participate.

AMERICAN COMMITMENT

Stabilization and reconstruction prove more difficult than expected. U.S. troop requirements approach 200,000—the figure General Shinseki has mentioned—for a sustained period. This puts pressure on troop rotations, reservists, their families, and employers and requires a dramatic increase in end-strength.

Required funding reaches the figure suggested by a recent Council on Foreign Relations assessment—$20 billion annually for several years. During a period of economic difficulty, the American public calls for greater burdensharing.

It is my hope that none of these eventualities comes to pass. But as you and all military leaders know, good planning requires considering the range of possibilities. It also requires advance preparation of the American people. You have regularly outlined the reasons for why the United States must disarm Iraq. I urge you to do the same in explaining why we must stay with Iraq for the long haul, even with the economic and military burdens this will entail.

As always, I am willing to help in any way I can to make this case to my colleagues and the American people.

Sincerely,

IKE SKELTON,
Ranking Democrat.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. I want to engage my colleague from Missouri in a colloquy.

There is no Member of this House who is more highly regarded in the area of national security than our friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON). I am privileged to be a native of the Show Me State, and he has done us all very proud.

I know at the end of the day he will want to support this resolution, Mr. Speaker, because this resolution does exactly, exactly what my friend just stated in his closing remarks: recognizing our troops.

Now, we had no intention of offending anyone in drafting the resolution. In fact, we thought it was so noncontroversial that it would be an appropriate thing to move it forward.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I would have thought it a mere courtesy of saying, Would the gentleman from Missouri like to read this over and add or make recommendations? I would love to have been there in order to support the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I completely understand that he would like to have had input; and that is one of the reasons we, in fact, did provide an opportunity, which is unusual, in consideration of this rule, for a motion to recommit for Members of the minority, if in fact that was the case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Atlanta, Georgia (Mr. LINDER), my very good friend and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Technology and the House of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of this rule and urge my colleagues to join me in approving this resolution.

H. Res. 561 will allow the House to work its will on the underlying resolution. It is an appropriate procedure, given the nature of H. Res. 557, which is a simple resolution. H. Res. 557 was introduced to recognize the Iraqi people's suffering under Saddam Hussein, the significant advancements being made in Iraq since last March, and the courage of U.S. and Coalition Forces as they strive to bring order and stability to the country.

The media is accurate in its reports of the difficulties that still face U.S. and Coalition Forces in Iraq. But there are also positive events taking place every day that deserve recognition and are largely ignored by the media. Probably the greatest accomplishment is that the Iraqis are returning to their lives and are enjoying freedoms that never could have existed under Saddam Hussein. Under his regime, the Iraqi lived in terror on a daily basis. Now, the people of Iraq have an opportunity to shape their history as they choose. The Iraqi people recently took their first step in shaping their future with the recent signing of the Iraqi interim constitution into law.

Other notable advancements in Iraq over the last year include the rise in oil production to roughly pre-March 2003 levels, the circulation of the new Iraqi currency, and the repair of critical infrastructure and roads. Additionally, the electricity supply has become more stable, and many Iraqi hospitals are up and running.

The number of Iraqis that have joined the Iraqi police force, border patrols, and army has also increased, allowing Iraqi citizens to participate in protection of their very own infrastructure.

Iraq is still a dangerous place, not only for Iraqi citizens but also for U.S. and Coalition Forces. I commend the U.S. and Coalition Forces for their dedication, sacrifice, and service in Iraq; and I salute them for helping to make our world a safer place.

The task of rebuilding Iraq will be no easy feat, and it will certainly take time. However, I am encouraged by the positive events of the last year, and I believe it is in the U.S.'s interest and the world's to persevere and create a stable and democratic Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we may proceed to debate the underlying legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this closed rule because it works against the values and principles for which American citizens are risking their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan on this very day.

We are fighting for democracy abroad, but we will not allow democracy on the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States. The fact of the matter is, if this had not been a political document, every Member of this House would follow the line, ''Commends the members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition Forces for liberating Iraq and expresses its gratitude for their valiant service.'' But that is not all that is in this resolution.

This is not about stopping consideration of the underlying resolution. It is a pleasure to take the time to pay tribute to the men and women who distinguish themselves daily in selfless service to this Nation. I do this, as do all Members on both sides of the aisle, at every available occasion. But there are other important matters that are not addressed in this resolution. And the fact that we were not included in its drafting allows them to be pronounced during the course of opposing this rule as well as in general debate.

We have not, for example, recognized the efforts of our National Guardsmen and Reserves, who have left friends and families and civilian jobs to serve in Iraq. But this completely closed rule does not give all Members of the House of Representatives the opportunity to commemorate the outstanding service of all those who have served in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Once this institution was considered one of the world's greatest deliberative bodies, and its Members were statespersons rather than professional self-promoters. Once Members of Congress were brimming with ideas befitting a proud democracy. But no more, Mr. Speaker. To all of my colleagues who showed up last night at the Committee on Rules with amendments that they thought could strengthen this resolution, I apologize to you for the majority's disdain for your contributions.

Actually, I had an amendment to this resolution that urged the President to provide Congress a straightforward and honest assessment of our past and future commitments in Iraq, as well as recognizing the selfless acts of the men and women in our service, who we all love and adore and applaud for their courage on a daily basis.

□ 1045

These are some of the many questions for which we are all seeking answers from the administration. Even

more, there are questions to which Congress has a constitutional responsibility and obligation to raise and demand answers.

Mr. Speaker, I asked myself last night as the Committee on Rules Republicans passed yet another closed rule, and 11 have been closed, 1 has been open this year, which stifles debate and shuts off meaningful contributions from all of the Members of this Chamber, I asked myself, What is the problem? The problem is that the majority has introduced this resolution for political reasons. C–SPAN will broadcast today's speeches and Fox News will run stories professing the patriotism of those on the other side of the aisle. Thus, the Republican majority hopes to disguise the neglect and misdirection they have shown in governing by not making this a bipartisan effort.

The Republicans have not established a record which helps all Americans, and are relying on photos ops and waving the American flag to get themselves reelected. It would be much more patriotic to address the perennially underfunded veterans affairs health care system. By the Bush administration's own estimate, their policies will exclude approximately 500,000 veterans from the VA health care system by 2005. This is shameful. President Bush also proposed an increase in pay fees and copayments in an effort to shift the burden onto the backs of veterans and drive an additional 1 million veterans from the system. It is shameful.

Our troops should be taken care of when we send them into battle, and be given the respect they have earned when we bring them home. America's veterans fight and fought for our freedoms, they should not have to fight for their benefits.

As the Republicans continue to protect the wealthy and act like show horses in front of the cameras, Democrats are working for the men and women in uniform and our veterans today as well as in the future. We will continue to applaud them.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is true that the United States of America has had a bipartisan foreign policy. This resolution is not about foreign policy. This resolution is not about foreign policy, this is a resolution that is simply designed to congratulate our troops. I do not understand why there is any controversy on it. As I said earlier and as I said in the Committee on Rules last night, we are sorry if anyone was offended over the fact that Members of the minority were not offered a chance to have input. I said to a number of my colleagues, that is one of the reasons that we have in fact made in order a motion to recommit that will allow the minority at the end of the bill an opportunity to cast a vote on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) who has done a phenomenal job of focusing on the rights of women. She chairs our Republican Conference and the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process Reform for the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I stand before Members to strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution for freedom and democracy in Iraq.

Life under Hussein's ruthless regime was unlike anything we have ever experienced. His cronies, in order to get information out of men, would rape their wives and their sisters and mothers. Women in Iraq frequently lost their husbands to ''the law,'' never knowing what happened to them, where they went or why they were arrested. These same women, forbidden to go to work to support their families, were left to starvation.

The Iraqi women under Saddam Hussein's regime were someone's mothers, wives, and sisters, and they suffered tremendously. I led a women's delegation to Iraq and heard these atrocities firsthand from the women who now are free. They no longer dread the strong arm of Saddam Hussein's injustice. Coalition forces are now protecting the newly acquired rights of all Iraqis. I learned of the story of these two women who were protesting.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago they would have been executed for protesting. They were protesting to get the rights of women included in the Iraqi constitution. One of these women was waving her husband's death certificate saying, we have not waited all these years to be denied freedoms. A reporter, an Islamic reporter, went up to ask, Are you Sunni or Shiite? These women said, We may be one of each, but it is none of your business, we are Iraqis now.

That is what this is all about. This is what freedom stands for. This is what it means to two women, one who lost her husband and had no way of knowing what happened to him. This is what we are celebrating today. This is what has been accomplished by our Armed Forces, by the will of this administration.

Saddam Hussein, the ruthless murderer, is now in jail. He will be tried by his own people in his own country, and he will get his just rewards, and these two women, despite the fear and dread and horror of their past, will live in freedom. We should be very happy today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) who has fought aggressively for open rules on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the undemocratic, completely closed rule, and in opposition to House Resolution 557.

Mr. Speaker, like all of my colleagues, I have tremendous respect for the men and women of our Armed Forces who are bearing the burden of this military action in Iraq. My support and my commitment to them and their families are unwavering. I will work to ensure that they remain the best trained, the best led, and the best equipped military force in the world. I am grateful and humbled by their courage, endurance and sacrifice, and I honor them not just today but every day, and I only wish this House was considering today a truly bipartisan resolution that properly honored our troops.

Unfortunately, once again this House is claiming to honor our troops without devoting the necessary resources for their safety or for their support. House Resolution 557 will do nothing to ensure that every one of our military personnel, including our National Guard and reservists serving on the front lines in Iraq will be fully equipped with the latest body armor. Instead, many families of our troops are buying and shipping that protection overseas to their loved ones, out of their own pockets with no hope for reimbursement. This is unacceptable, and we should fix it.

This resolution will do nothing to close the pay gap for our reservists and National Guard members who have been called away from their civilian jobs to serve in Iraq. Their families are struggling, going into debt as a result of their patriotic service. Yet the leadership of this House, unlike the other body, resists funding commonsense solutions to the problems caused by these overlong activations. This is unacceptable, and we should fix it.

This resolution contributes nothing towards fully funding our military construction needs so that all our military personnel have decent housing and facilities in which to live, train, and work. This is unacceptable, and we should fix it.

Mr. Speaker, I support our troops. I want to help the suffering people of Iraq live and prosper in a safe and secure nation. I want them to have the opportunity to choose their own government, one where every Iraqi may worship as he or she chooses, and every man, woman and child can live out their lives. But 1 year and $120 billion later, we face continuing hostilities in Iraq, with no end in sight.

This resolution fails to mention that the war in Iraq was justified by this administration on the threat of weapons of mass destruction. Why? Because just like the experts tried to tell us for months before the war, we now know there are no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

I do not believe we needed to send over 150,000 American troops to Iraq to confirm that fact. Mr. Speaker, 566 soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines have died, and over 3,200 more have been wounded. Thousands of Iraqi men, women and children have perished, and scores of other civilians and nationals have been killed since we entered Iraq. There is no mention, no remembrance for them in this resolution.

Today the American taxpayer is still paying for almost all of the cost of Iraq without the least idea of how much the war has cost to date or how much it will cost in the future. In fact, the operations in Iraq are not even included in the President's budget. We still do not have a truly independent commission to provide a full accounting of the events leading up to the war and the nature of the intelligence of policymaking that led the Bush administration to go to war.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year later the United States is more isolated than ever in the world. Terrorist networks are proliferating, including new networks in Iraq and Europe. And our troops abroad and our first responders at home are overstretched, underfunded, and overburdened.

I am glad Saddam Hussein no longer has the power to torment the Iraqi people, but unlike the claim made in this resolution, I do not believe that the world is a safer, less dangerous place than it was 12 months ago.

This resolution is more about what the Republican leadership wants us to forget about the past year: the costs, the bloated contracts, no weapons, no ties to al Qaeda, the flawed intelligence, the wounded and the dead.

I urge all my colleagues to remember and vote against this undemocratic rule and vote against this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to simply say that again, we did not have a goal of offending Members on this. This is not about foreign policy, this is about commending our troops.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is 2½ pages long, okay. I am going to share with our colleagues the resolved clause.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives

(1) affirms that the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq;

(2) commends the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of unspeakable oppression and brutality inflicted on them by Saddam Hussein's regime;

(3) commends the Iraqi people on the adoption of Iraq's interim constitution; and

(4) commends the members of the U.S. Armed Forces and coalition forces for liberating Iraq and expresses its gratitude for their valiant service.

That is what this resolution is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), the very distinguished Chair of the Republican Study Committee.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

September 11, 2001, is a day that should be etched in the mind of every American, because that is the day that terrorists chose to attack America and that threat is still here. The primary function of our Federal Government is to protect our citizens and we are doing our best to see that happens.

It is now 1 year since the coalition forces entered Iraq to free those people from Saddam Hussein's rule of terror. Freedom is flourishing and the Iraqi people know they are better off. However, terrorists are still doing everything they can to interrupt that and see that does not happen. The Iraqi people are in control of their destiny for the first time, and we are here today to encourage them in that effort, and we are here today to say thank you to our troops, all those men and women who have served in the past in this effort and who are serving now over there, giving of themselves and giving their lives so they can protect these freedoms that we all enjoy. We know the world is safer today without Saddam Hussein.

We must never forget 9/11 and that we are fighting over there so we do not have to fight the terrorists here at home. And no matter what the terrorists try to do, they need to be reminded that these colors do not run.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, if this is not about foreign policy, then how is it that the chairman of the jurisdictional foreign policy committee brought it to the Committee on Rules? If it is not about foreign policy, why is the language for the Iraqi Liberation Act of 1998 referenced in this resolution? If it is not about foreign policy, why is the mention of the 16 previously adopted United Nations Security Council resolutions in this matter? If it is not about foreign policy, why is the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution 2002 referenced in this resolution? The other side of the aisle is trying to defend the indefensible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, who may be able to tell us why it is not about foreign policy.

□ 1100

Mr. LANTOS. I want to thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote it down. I deeply regret that this resolution was not handled in a bipartisan manner. The Democratic side was not consulted on this resolution, and the Republican leadership bypassed its consideration before the Committee on International Relations. It is simply unacceptable that not a single amendment was made in order, no substitute is allowed; and there is no other way we on our side can offer improvements to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the country is at war. The men and women who serve are Democrats and Republicans and Independents. The men and women who are wounded are Democrats and Republicans and Independents. And, yes, Mr. Speaker, the men and women who die are Democrats and Republicans and Independents. The families grieving are Democrats and Republicans and independents. Many of us have tried very hard for a long time to work towards a bipartisan foreign policy decades ago and certainly since September 11. The manner in which this resolution was crafted and the way in which it is being considered under this rule is a slap in the face of all those who have tried to conduct a bipartisan foreign policy in the national interest. You on your side have neither a monopoly on wisdom nor a monopoly on patriotism. You should have come to the Democrats to craft a resolution honoring our troops, which would have passed this body unanimously. You have created divisiveness at a time when we need cohesion and unity. You have created divisiveness for no reason except illusory partisan advantage. This is a flawed resolution, flawed in its presentation, flawed in its procedure, flawed in its partisanship. This is not a Republican tax bill to be handled only by Republicans. This is a bill of national importance. Democrats, Independents, and Republicans have a right to have an input, to say how much we admire the courage and patriotism of our troops. You have failed, and you have failed miserably.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the rule and to come forward with a reasonable resolution supported across the political spectrum in this body.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that my friend from California is one of the greatest patriots in this institution. I hold him in the highest regard. I believe very strongly in the need for us to pursue a bipartisan foreign policy. Let me just say that, again, we had no intention of offending anyone in the crafting of this resolution, and it should be a nonpartisan resolution itself. At the end of the day because we found that controversy came forward in the Committee on Rules last night beyond the request that was made by Chairman HYDE, we did in fact offer a motion to recommit for members of the minority.

But I do believe again that this resolution is designed to do nothing more than commend the troops and the people of Iraq. That is what it is designed to do. It has nothing to do with our foreign policy. This here marks the first anniversary of this very, very successful effort. I think that what we are trying to do here is, in a bipartisan way, acknowledges that.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend from Miami, Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART), an able member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time. I think it is appropriate on the 1-year anniversary of the liberation of Iraq

that we focus on that monumental and extraordinary event on the floor of this House today. The resolution before us congratulates the valiant men and women of the United States Armed Forces and the Coalition for having liberated the people of Iraq, and it states that because of that heroic effort by the Armed Forces of the Coalition and principally the United States, the world is safer today. The world is safer, Mr. Speaker.

Each time a dangerous madman is removed from power anywhere in the world, the entire world is safer because there is one less madman kidnapping power in a country and holding the entire people of that country hostage and linking with terrorist groups throughout the world. Saddam Hussein was not the only dangerous enemy of freedom and peace in the world; but he was a dangerous enemy of freedom and peace in the world, and the entire world is safer because Saddam Hussein is gone from power and facing justice. I would ask the people of Iraq if they feel safer after having seen the regime deposed or if they do not feel safer.

The entire world is safer and especially, I believe, Mr. Speaker, the people of Iraq are safer. Just like we can ask the people of Albania if they feel safer because Hoxha is no longer in power or in Romania because Ceausescu is no longer in power or in Russia because Stalin is no longer in power. I think that we should ask all those peoples if they believe that they are safer or not safer because their former totalitarian despots are no longer in power. Or ask the people in Cambodia if they feel safer because Pol Pot is no longer in power.

Each time a madman is removed from power, not only the people that that madman had kidnapped and was torturing and oppressing are safer, the entire world is safer. Or is it that when we talk about Iraq, Iraq is not on planet Earth? The entire world is safer, but especially the people of Iraq are safer and the American Armed Forces are the primary liberators of that people. They deserve the commendation and the admiration of the entire world and most especially of this House. That is why I thank the authors for having brought it forward at this important occasion, the 1-year anniversary of the liberation of Iraq.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The Chair will remind Members to refrain from trafficking the well while another Member is speaking.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say to my distinguished friend from Florida that I do not believe that the families of the people of Spain or Morocco or Turkey where bombs have gone off feel safer. So maybe they are in this world.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 3½ minutes to my good friend from California (Ms. HARMAN), the distinguished ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence with whom I work regularly.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding me this time and commend him for his service in this Congress and particularly his excellent service on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate to consider a resolution on the eve of the Iraq war anniversary. I agree that the world has much to be glad about with the fall of Saddam Hussein and the end of his despotic regime. And I certainly hope that the Iraqi people will create a transparent, democratic form of government for the first time in their history, a chance that they have now that Saddam Hussein is no longer in power. I for one, and I believe this entire Congress, will stand by them and must stand by them and support them as they make this transition. We must stay the course.

But there is more to this subject on the first anniversary of the Iraq war than H. Res. 557 acknowledges. Much more. On the anniversary of our military action in Iraq, we need to be talking about more. That is why many of us wanted an open rule and certainly an open process so that we could contribute to the language contained in this resolution.

As ranking member of one of the key committees with jurisdiction over this subject, that is, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I would have welcomed the opportunity to share some of my ideas to fashion a great resolution which I believe would have passed this body unanimously. I consider myself a passionate bipartisan on questions of defense, national security, and intelligence; and I think that my ideas, if I had had a chance to communicate them, would have been accepted.

For example, I am one of many Members here who has visited Walter Reed to see the wounded from Iraq. These are very courageous kids. Thousands have been wounded. I would have liked us to acknowledge them and their courage.

I visited the families in my district who have lost family members in Iraq. I would have liked to acknowledge those losses and those families.

I have visited Iraq twice. Some have been there more. In addition to acknowledging our troops, I would have liked to acknowledge the intelligence community personnel who take such risks on our behalf and the civilians working selflessly there.

I worked in 1999 and 2000 as a member of the National Commission on Terrorism chaired by Jerry Bremer, Ambassador L. Paul Bremer. I might have liked to acknowledge him and his selfless service in Iraq.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me, and I will address this along with other Intelligence Committee members later in the debate, that I would have liked to acknowledge the important role that intelligence products play in force protection now in Iraq and why those products need to be better. In my view, Mr. Speaker, and I think many would share this, good intelligence is a force protection issue.

And so it seems to me on the first anniversary of our action in Iraq that we should acknowledge the need for better intelligence products and the need for this administration to fix right now, not next year but right now, the way we source and analyze intelligence. That is a suggestion I also would have made on a bipartisan basis if I had been permitted to participate.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that as we commemorate the first anniversary of the action in Iraq, we need actions and not just words.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who also had an amendment that would have strengthened this matter had it been permitted by the Committee on Rules.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me just thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time and for his strong leadership on each and every committee on which he has served.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and this resolution. This resolution really is an affront and an insult to our troops. I tried to offer an amendment to this very deceptive resolution. My amendment just basically expressed deep sorrow and real support for all of those who have been killed in this war and we extended support for their families in my amendment.

As the daughter of a career military officer, Mr. Speaker, I know how important this is and what this means. This resolution as it is written never even mentions the over 550 Americans who have died. How insulting and insensitive. It does not even mention the Iraqi civilians and all of our international friends who have died in this war. My amendment also stated that the war in Iraq has undermined our alliances, it has cost hundreds of Americans and unknown numbers of Iraqi lives and billions of dollars, and it has made the world a more dangerous place rather than a safer place. The evidence speaks for itself on that. We are not voting on my amendment today because once again the Republican-controlled Committee on Rules did not allow any amendments, not only my amendment but zero, none, they did not allow. Once again true debate is being stifled. What a shame and disgrace. As an officer of the Congressional Black Caucus, we continue to stand in full support of our troops, in support of our veterans and their health benefits, and in support of their economic security. This resolution does none of this. None of this.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule. I urge them to vote ''no'' on this resolution. Remember, this is part of a pattern of deception which we have

seen from day one. We are talking about not only the intelligence information that was not there but really a whole host of deceptive measures that have come before this body that we have voted on. I hope we vote ''no'' on this resolution. It is wrong. It is terrible.

□ 1115

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Brentwood, Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), a very able new Member of this body.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule because I think it is a fair rule for a worthy resolution. And like a lot of my constituents, I have spent time reflecting on what September 11 and the war in Iraq has meant to our country, how terrorism affects our lives, and what all of this means in the context of our world community, and I have come to the conclusion that as complicated as our world is and as tangled as the diplomacy surrounding our economic and military ties with the rest of the world become, I know that there are certain basic truths. And one of the great basic truths is the constant struggle between good and evil. And there are times in our history when the struggle is very clear, and today we are at one of those moments of such clarity. The lines are drawn, and we know who is aligned on each side.

America leads a fight that we did not seek against a movement founded on distorted religious views and failed nations. This resolution marks a victory for good, and it is so very important that when good triumphs and advances that we celebrate that victory.

This resolution honors our men and women in uniform. They have made the world a safer place for our children, and there are fewer greater gifts than that. And today we are welcoming the Iraqi people into the community of free nations. The resolution says to the world that America was willing to take on this fight to dedicate the fruits of her labor to free a horribly, horribly oppressed people a world away. Iraqi success in rebuilding and being free is our greatest weapon against terrorism. Terrorism seeks to destroy. Freedom builds. And that is why we are in Afghanistan and why we are in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our troops, I thank our families, and the communities that have supported them. And may God bless America.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is going to be a motion for an adjournment vote here, and I just wanted to, before we proceed with that, inquire how many speakers the gentleman has remaining for the debate as we prepare to go into this.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Three and possibly four, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 36, noes 377, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

AYES—36

Abercrombie
Allen
Capuano
Conyers
Cummings
DeGette
Delahunt
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Emanuel
Filner
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Holt
Johnson, E. B.
Kilpatrick
McDermott
McGovern
Miller (NC)
Olver
Owens
Payne
Pelosi
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Shimkus
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Waters
Wexler
Woolsey

NOES—377

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Majette
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sandlin
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Clay
Frank (MA)
Frost
Hoeffel
Hunter
Israel
Jefferson
King (NY)
Kucinich
Lynch
Maloney
Quinn
Reyes
Reynolds
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Tauzin
Walsh

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1142

Messrs. SIMPSON, WICKER, MCCOTTER, GREEN of Texas, SHAYS, WELLER, SHUSTER, LUCAS of Oklahoma, NEUGEBAUER, KINGSTON, SULLIVAN, HEFLEY, LARSON of Connecticut, CALVERT, JOHN, WOLF, LUCAS of Kentucky, and EHLERS, and Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. HART, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mrs.

CAPITO changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. PAYNE changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 557, RELATING TO THE LIBERATION OF THE IRAQI PEOPLE AND THE VALIANT SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AND COALITION FORCES

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Lemoyne, Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), a very able Member.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of the rule and the resolution.

Obviously, much has happened in Iraq since the war began a year ago. The military occupation of Iraq was amazingly swift and efficient, taking only a few weeks. Since then much has been accomplished, and I would like to point out just a few things that I think are noteworthy.

More than 200,000 Iraqis are now involved with security operations. U.S. troops have been reduced by 20,000. Most importantly, an interim constitution has been approved, including a bill of rights. The gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) and I have formed an Iraqi Women's Caucus, and we are pleased to see that Iraqi women will be given an active role in new government, after experiencing years of brutal oppression, with at least 25 percent representation. More than 17,000 reconstruction projects have been completed. The 240 hospitals are open, and I think something else worthy of note, health care spending has been increased 26 times higher than under Saddam. Ninety percent of the children are now immunized. Electricity and water are being rapidly restored and improved. Oil production has increased dramatically. Schools and universities are operating following a massive infusion of school supplies. Private enterprise is increasing dramatically. Seventy percent of Iraqis now say that things are going well, and they see a brighter future.

I just came from a meeting downstairs where we met with seven Iraqis who are over here as part of a delegation. One of those gentlemen saw three of his brothers executed and his father executed; their heads were chopped off. They talked about people who had been buried alive. I guess it is one thing to stand here and to debate and to talk; it is another to meet with people who have really experienced the pain and the suffering that was imposed by Saddam Hussein and to understand the gratitude that these people have for the military operation that has been going on in Iraq.

Reconstruction has certainly been difficult. There have been bumps in the road, as has been true throughout history. Reconstruction is much further along right now than it was for Germany and Japan following World War II, and I think we need to not lose track of these accomplishments.

There should be no disagreement, I believe, in this body that American troops are doing a remarkable job and deserve our total support. Also, I feel that there should be no disagreement, that we must see this conflict through to a successful resolution. It is important that we present a unified front in this body. I think recent events in Spain will indicate the danger of being fractionated, of sending mixed messages to terrorists. So I am hopeful that we can demonstrate a unified position.

As a young captain told me on a recent visit to Iraq in Afghanistan, it is better to fight terrorists here than in the United States. I agree wholeheartedly. Support the resolution and the rule.

□ 1145

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, who has absolutely no peer in the House of Representatives in being in support of the troops in Iraq and the armed services before and during and after Iraq.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I am indignant, I am insulted, and I am embarrassed that no one came to me and asked me about this resolution. Nobody said, Do you have any input? Nobody has supported this war. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and I put a bill on this floor that only 16 people voted against. And I am embarrassed that my colleague would come up with a partisan resolution saying whatever was said without any consultation to the Democrats, particularly me, who has voted so strongly for the defense of this country.

I go home and people criticize me for my position on the war. One fellow said to me, Never in history have so many been misled by so few. And, unfortunately, he was talking about me. He believed that I had misled him. I believed there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. I believed there was imminent danger to this country. And the reason we go to war is because there is a core danger to our national security. We do not go to war because they drained the swamps in Iraq.

I do not think anybody needs to question the Congress who supports the troops in Iraq or anyplace else. We voted continuously and overwhelmingly for the troops. We have tried to make sure they had what they needed, even though there were mistakes made in the original deployment.

There were many shortages that we saw. And we made sure when we went over there, a number of us went over there, we found those shortages, reported them to the Department of Defense; and we started to rectify those shortages.

We know there were changes that before our subcommittee an Under Secretary of Defense came forward and said this war will cost nothing. This war will be paid for by the oil revenues of the Iraqis. We know that in the last war our allies came up with $60 billion. We know that this time we have come up with $150 billion to pay for this war from the United States. We are paying much of the expense of the allies in this war.

This is not the time to divide the country. We are talking about we have got the lowest level of support internationally than we have ever had. All the polls indicate that overseas we are discredited. We are discredited because they do not believe what we say.

It is hard to comprehend. I read not long ago where Dean Acheson went to France and he went to France to talk about the Cuban missile crisis. And when he went to France, he said, I have got proof. He talked to President de Gaulle, and President de Gaulle was not one of our best supporters. He said, I have got photos here which will show you that we have missiles in Cuba. This was during the missile crisis. President de Gaulle said, I do not need to see those photos. I will take the word of the President of the United States.

Now, that is the problem we face. We need to come together. I hope that this resolution will be withdrawn and that we will change a few words in it that would make it unified for the whole country.

For instance, is it safer today in Spain? Is it safer in the Middle East? These are the things that I worry about. Just by putting something on paper you cannot say it is safe. It is just like the President, I am sure he thought the war was over when he said the war is over. I am sure when he made the announcement he thought the war was over, but that does not make it over. And putting it on paper does not mean that we are out of this with this conflict.

We need the support of allies. We need the support, the solid support of this Congress. This is a long-term fight. I had members of the State Department over before with me in my office and they were telling me about the transition. This is going to be a very, very difficult transition. I do not say it was a shotgun wedding, but I would say we put together something where it is going to be very difficult to get the Iraqi people to agree when you have the divisions that you have in Iraq.

So we are going to need everybody's support, not only in Congress; but we are going to need the people of the world's support because it is such a difficult issue for us to face.

I am in it for the long run. Any money that they need, any equipment

they need, anything they need, I am going to be there in front, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and I, and all the rest of the committee and all the rest of the Members of Congress. Because everybody wants to support the troops. But you put it on paper, it does not mean that the troops are safer.

Now, I had two young women come to my office. Both of them had lost their husbands. One had two children, one had one child. I have lost six from my district. And they are from a very poor family. And they came in and they went to Walter Reed and they took gifts out to the wounded at Walter Reed.

Many of us have been out there. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has been out there; the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has been out there. All of us have been out to Walter Reed. And this one young woman, 22 years old with a child said, You know, I got married, I got pregnant. Then my husband was deployed and I had a baby. He was killed and I had a baby. She said, I should not have to live my whole life in one year.

We support the troops. All of us support the troops. But we cannot get up here and divide the Nation at this time. This should be a bipartisan resolution. And I would hope we will be able to work that out so that everyone can vote for a resolution that shows this great country is united.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the very distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on Rules and, more importantly, the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think this debate is about the rule, and that is what we are going to be talking about in order to have more chances to articulate the sentiments as were just expressed so articulately by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

And I have the highest feelings of praise also for Mr. MURTHA and his very strong record on behalf of our defense forces, our troops. He knows the subject, and he attends to them very well. And I am sorry that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) is aggrieved by the procedure today.

I need to tell you that I was not consulted either. This is a leadership resolution that is simply designed after 1 year of fighting the war on terror, the chapter in Iraq of the book on the war on terrorism for 1 year and all the extraordinary success and work that has happened over there. It is entirely appropriate to commend our troops who are working so hard and the members of the Coalition. That is the main thrust of this resolution.

Now, I admit it also says that we are commending and acknowledging and recognizing the courage and the accomplishment of the Iraqi people to go through very difficult days. And it is entirely appropriate to do that. It is no mean thing to come up with an interim constitution in the operational climate that those folks are operating.

And I think it is entirely appropriate for the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the people's House, to say we sympathize with them, we understand what they have been through. And we are very grateful that they have got the patience to go forward with it and the commitment to do this hard work.

This is a democracy-building exercise in an area where democracy has had many false starts and very little success. This is good news. It is entirely appropriate for us at the end of the year to celebrate the good news.

There has been some concern, as we saw last night in the Committee on Rules, about whether or not we should be declaring that we are better off without Saddam. And the language that was used was that the world is safer without him. We did not say the world is safe. We are in the middle of a war on terror. And everybody needs to know that.

And we need the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and all his good works and everybody's good works in this body to support the war on terror because the war on terror will not be won without commitment. We know how these people work, and we have to be smart enough to resist the temptations, the wedges they drive, the propaganda they put out, apply our capabilities and get the job done. It will take all of us.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the last speaker, who is my good friend and the chairperson of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the ranking member of the Committee on Rules on which he and I serve, just made the comment that he was not consulted. I say to my good friend that he is an original cosponsor of the legislation: the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Now, that said, my good friend had the privilege that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) did not have, and that was even to be original co-sponsors even if they were not consulted.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking for a ''no'' vote on the previous question because I feel this totally closed rule is just plain wrong. There is not one single opportunity for any Member of the House to offer an amendment to this resolution, not even on the motion to recommit.

Oddly enough, when the current House Republican leadership was in the minority, a motion to recommit without instructions was one of the things they complained most about. Now, here they are doing the very thing they said was so wrong and offensive at that time. Where will the sanctimony end?

The war in Iraq is one of the most serious issues facing our Nation today. Anything that speaks to this matter on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives should be done, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) said, in a way that allows all responsible viewpoints to be considered. That is what democracy is all about.

This rule simply gags that process. Ironic, do you not think, when we are exporting democracy to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about stopping consideration of the underlying resolution. I am not aware of one single Member of this body who does not support and praise the incredibly brave men and women who are in harm's way in Iraq.

□ 1200

I believe we can all agree wholeheartedly on supporting our soldiers, but there are other important matters that are not addressed in this resolution, issues that many in this House want to include in this resolution.

Therefore, if the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the motion to recommit to contain instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question a description of the motion to recommit that will be offered if the previous question is defeated and the rule is amended to allow instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that my friend, the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, looked at that resolution and was so proud of it that he immediately joined as a cosponsor, as I believe everyone in this House should.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, obviously everyone in this House should be in support of a resolution which affirms that the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq; that commends the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of unspeakable oppression and brutality inflicted upon them by Saddam Hussein's regime; that commends the Iraqi people on the adoption of Iraq's interim constitution and commends the Members of the U.S. Armed Forces and coalition forces for liberating Iraq; and expresses its gratitude for their valiant service. That is what we are doing here today. Everyone should be in support of it.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 561 RULE FOR H. RES. 557—IRAQ RESOLUTION

Amendment in nature of substitute:

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 557) relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces. The resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to final adoption without intervening motion except: (1) four hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. During consideration of House Resolution 557 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the resolution to a time designated by the Speaker.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT WITH INSTRUCTIONS

M. _____ moves to recommit the resolution H. Res. 557 to the Committee on International Relations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike ''affirms'' and insert ''acknowledges the belief''.

Page 2, line 4, strike the semicolon and insert '', and the belief that a final judgment on the value of activities in Iraq cannot be made until Iraq is stable and secure;''.

Page 3, line 5, strike ''and''.

Page 3, line 9, strike the period and insert a semicolon.

Page 3, after line 9, insert the following:

(5) urges the President—

(A) to take all steps necessary to ensure that all members of the United States Armed Forces serving in Iraq receive the best force protection equipment available, including protective body armor and extra-armored wheeled vehicles capable of providing better protection against explosive devices;

(B) to ensure that all members of the Armed Forces who suffer wounds or other injuries, or who incur illness, while serving in Iraq receive complete, timely, and high-quality health care to treat the short-term and long-term consequences of such wounds, injuries, and illnesses;

(C) to recognize the key contributions made by members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and their families, in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and, in consultation with Congress, to address immediately the disparity that exists for many Reserve and Guard personnel between the pay they receive in civilian life and the military compensation they receive when ordered to active duty;

(D) to acknowledge that there were serious deficiencies in United States pre-war intelligence on Iraq, particularly in light of the failure to find any evidence of significant weapons of mass destruction stockpiles, and to take steps now to improve intelligence so that United States troops are better protected and future United States national security strategies are better informed;

(E) to request sufficient funding immediately to fully support United States military operations in Iraq and the surrounding region in order to ensure the safety and well-being of United States troops deployed to Iraq and the surrounding region;

(F) to obtain far-reaching international participation in the securing, reconstruction, and political development of Iraq, including the protection of women's and children's rights; and

(G) to take steps to correct the failure of the United States Government to plan adequately for the post-war occupation of Iraq, including the failure to integrate internal United States Government studies and outside expert opinions that predicted the onset of guerrilla activity and described how to promote effective reconstruction, democratization, and civil society development activities, and the failure to apply those studies and opinions today in order to improve current United States reconstruction efforts in Iraq;

(6) expresses deep sorrow and regret for the deaths of more than 550 and the wounding of more than 3,500 members of the United States Armed Forces in Iraq and extends support to their families; and

(7) expresses sorrow and regret for the deaths in Iraq of United States civilians, United Nations personnel, unknown numbers of Iraqi civilians, and other noncombatants.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 197, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—217

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiberi
Toomey
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—197

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Majette
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—19

Barton (TX)
Bereuter
Gibbons
Hoeffel
Israel
Kirk
Kucinich
Leach
Lynch
Maloney
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (WA)
Souder
Tauzin
Tiahrt
Turner (OH)
Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1220

Ms. WOOLSEY changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a personal explanation of the reason I missed rollcall vote No. 62, On Ordering the Previous Question for H. Res. 557. At the time the vote was called, I was seated at a House Armed Services Committee hearing and had just completed a question to which one of the witnesses was offering a long response.

I respectfully request that it be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that if present, I would have voted: Rollcall vote No. 62, on Ordering the Previous Question—''yea.''

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 62 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 62 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 195, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

AYES—228

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—195

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—10

Hoeffel
Israel
Kaptur
Kucinich
Lowey
Maloney
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Smith (WA)
Tauzin

□ 1231

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

COUNTER-TERORIST AND NARCO-TERRORIST REWARDS PROGRAM ACT

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3782) to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to increase the maximum amount of an award available under the Department of State rewards program, to expand the eligibility criteria to receive an award, to authorize nonmonetary awards, to publicize the existence of the rewards program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3782

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Counter-Terrorist and Narco-Terrorist Rewards Program Act''.

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF STATE COUNTER-TERRORIST AND NARCO-TERRORIST REWARDS PROGRAM.

(a) DISRUPTION OF FOREIGN TERRORIST FINANCING NETWORK.—Subsection (b) of section 36 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2708) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5) by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6) by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) the disruption of financial mechanisms of a foreign terrorist organization, including the use by the organization of illicit narcotics production or international narcotics trafficking—

''(A) to finance acts of international terrorism; or

''(B) to sustain or support any terrorist organization.''.

(b) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF REWARD.—Subsection (e)(1) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking ''$5,000,000'' and inserting ''$25,000,000'';

(2) by striking the second period at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Without first making such determination, the Secretary may authorize a reward of up to twice the amount specified in this paragraph for the capture or information leading to the capture of a leader of a foreign terrorist organization.''.

(c) CLARIFICATION OF EXISTING AUTHORITY.—Subsection (e) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) FORMS OF REWARD PAYMENT.—The Secretary may make a reward under this section in the form of money, a nonmonetary item (including such items as automotive vehicles), or a combination thereof.''.

(d) MEDIA SURVEYS AND ADVERTISEMENTS.—Such section is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (i) and (j) as subsections (j) and (k), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (h) the following new subsection:

''(i) MEDIA SURVEYS AND ADVERTISEMENTS.—

''(1) SURVEYS CONDUCTED.—For the purpose of more effectively disseminating information about the rewards program, the Secretary may use the resources of the rewards program to conduct media surveys, including analyses of media markets, means of communication, and levels of literacy, in countries determined by the Secretary to be associated with acts of international terrorism.

''(2) CREATION AND PURCHASE OF ADVERTISEMENTS.—The Secretary may use the resources of the rewards program to create advertisements to disseminate information about the rewards program. The Secretary may base the content of such advertisements on the findings of the surveys conducted under paragraph (1). The Secretary may purchase radio or television time, newspaper space, or make use of any other means of advertisement, as appropriate.''.

(e) PLAN OF ACTION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a plan to maximize awareness of the reward available under section 36 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2708 et seq.) for the capture or information leading to the capture of a leader of a foreign terrorist organization who may be in Pakistan or Afghanistan. The Secretary may use the resources of the rewards program to prepare the plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes changes and modifications to the long-established U.S. State Department rewards programs to deal with the growing links between illicit drugs and the financing and support of terrorism.

The State Department Rewards Program has clearly prevented acts of terrorism in the past, has helped to bring to justice long-sought terrorists, such as the individual who fled to Pakistan after assassinating our CIA employees in Virginia, and has served as a valuable intelligence tool in the global war on terrorism. The Rewards Program could do even more, if we enact this bill, with its reforms.

It is time for renewed, expanded reward authority in the State Department, one which tackles and contends with the growing links, as recently reported in the press, of the illicit drug trade and the financing and supporting of terrorism. Our terrorist enemies may very well be changing their methods and means, and we mean to be even more flexible and creative than they are.

H.R. 3782 would clarify that any information provided which could be used to disrupt terrorist financing networks, including information related to illicit narcotics production or international trafficking, is eligible for reward moneys. It provides clarification of the authority for the Secretary of State to give rewards other than money for information related to terrorism and narcoterrorism, such as vehicles, appliances, commodities and other goods and services. It clarifies the authority of the Secretary of State to conduct media surveys and create or purchase advertisements for the Rewards Program. It requires the administration to submit a plan to the Congress that maximizes the publicity surrounding the reward for Osama bin Laden's capture. It raises the statutory maximum amount of terrorist and narcoterrorist rewards from $5 million to $25 million, and it provides the Secretary of State the authority to raise the reward for the capture of Osama bin Laden to double the amount of the current authorized reward.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill will improve our ability to fight terrorism and I urge Members to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. This legislation assists the war on terrorism in two ways: speeding financial incentives to people who help the United States capture narcotics traffickers who are linked to terrorism, and raising the limits on reward for the capture of terrorist leaders.

Mr. Speaker, these legislative changes are long overdue. Under current law, the State Department's reward money is not being spent in the most effective way. In Afghanistan, where profits from heroin sales finance groups such as al Qaeda and the Taliban, informants in successful seizure and capture operations receive financial rewards from the Drug Enforcement Agency.

But the State Department does not contribute to this effort due to a false distinction between narcotics trafficking and terrorism. Presumably that distinction lets agencies like the Pentagon and the Department of State avoid the complexities of interagency collaboration to carry out a unified strategy that attacks both issues at the same time. For the struggle against terrorism to succeed, our government must be unified, not divided.

This bill ensures that money from the State Department's rewards programs can be given to informants when their assistance leads to drug shipments or drug labs, or otherwise disrupts narcotics trafficking as long as such actions are likely to disrupt terrorist financing. Any interruption of the drug trade that takes money out of the pockets of terrorists may well prevent tragedies.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department Rewards Program has been a useful tool in the past to capture wanted terrorists. Our resolution makes it easier for the Secretary of State to double the current reward of $25 million for ring leaders of foreign terrorist organizations, including Osama bin Laden. I strongly support this legislation, and urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3782.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for this legislation. This bill comes to the House as U.S. Armed Forces today go into battle as part of Operation Mountain Storm.

Operation Mountain Storm is an allied military operation in Afghanistan and Pakistan designed to kill or capture Osama bin Laden. This bill provides immediate aid and assistance to those critical operations now ongoing in the eastern provinces of Afghanistan and the frontier autonomous tribal area of Pakistan.

This bill comes in part from a mission I conducted to Pakistan's frontier in January. Joined by Michele Lang, Jon Scharfen, John Mackey, David Fite and Lieutenant Kevin Fernandez,

we found a great need to reenergize the State Department's Rewards Program in Pakistan. The Rewards Program has a long and successful history. As a staffer, I drafted reforms which lifted the rewards from $5 million to $25 million, and made the arrest of U.N. war criminals eligible for the reward. We arrested or killed two-thirds of war criminals in the Balkans using this legislation. We also arrested Aimal Khan Kasi in Pakistan using the authorities of this bill. Kansi killed several Americans outside of the CIA gate. He was arrested, tried, and executed for those trials.

Today this bill makes a crucial link between drug dealing and terrorism. We found that one Afghan is providing 2,000 kilograms a month of heroin to Osama bin Laden. At the Pakistani price, that provides bin Laden with an annual income of $38 million to fund his terror operations. This bill makes the link between funding terror and funding drug profits, and we want to make sure that we cut off Osama bin Laden's new supply of cash, which is coming not from donations, but from the sale of heroin.

The bottom line, Osama bin Laden in the frontier autonomous region of Pakistan has become one of the world's number one sellers of heroin. This bill makes that link very clearly, and lifts the reward for the arrest of Osama bin Laden to $50 million.

It also makes one other key reform. In many of these areas, most of the people are illiterate and could not even read a reward poster or one of the matchbook covers used to arrest Aimal Kasi. This bill allows the State Department to be more flexible in publicizing the reward effort, and it allows the State Department to use noncash rewards which in a rural community can be much more effective. Beyond a $25 million or $50 million reward, the provision of a truck or feed or farm animals can make all the difference for a rural community which seeks to provide information on the arrest of Osama bin Laden.

This bill makes it much more flexible and much more capable. I urge its adoption and thank the committee for moving it so quickly to the floor as Operation Mountain Storm is ongoing.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3782, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING MORE THAN 5 DECADES OF STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE MARSHALL ISLANDS

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 364) to recognize more than 5 decades of strategic partnership between the United States and the people of the Marshall Islands in the pursuit of international peace and security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 364

Whereas on November 20, 2003, Congress, recognizing our Nation's historical responsibilities over the Former Trust Territory of the Marshall Islands and its successful transition from Trust Territory status to full independence in free association with the United States beginning in 1986, approved the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act, which was signed into law by President Bush on December 17, 2003, becoming Public Law Number 108–188;

Whereas the Compact of Free Association, as amended by Public Law 108–188, embodies and extends the close political, economic, and social partnership, as well as the strategic mutual security alliance, between the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the United States under the terms of the bilateral association between our nations;

Whereas this partnership for peace and alliance for the security of our nations and the world began in 1944, when the heroic armed forces of the United States and its allies, with the courageous assistance of the people of the Marshall Islands at the risk of their own safety, liberated the Marshall Islands from Japanese military occupation;

Whereas the friendship and cooperation between the United States and the people of the Marshall Islands that began during World War II continued during the next 4 decades, during which the United States exercised powers of government in the Marshall Islands under a Trusteeship Agreement with the United Nations;

Whereas during the Marshall Islands trusteeship era the aim of the United States was to promote international peace and security through its nuclear weapons testing program which was viewed as a critical element to the success of United States global leadership during the Cold War;

Whereas the United States testing program conducted in the Marshall Islands and the strategy of nuclear deterrence sustained by the United States and its allies, was carried out in the hope that understanding its destructive power would be the strategy for which we could arm the world with reasons for peace among nations;

Whereas from 1946 to 1958 the United States detonated 67 atmospheric nuclear weapons in the Marshall Islands, representing nearly 80 percent of all the atmospheric tests ever conducted by the United States, and enabling atmospheric tests in the continental United States to be terminated and relocated at the greatest possible distance from large cities and densely populated areas;

Whereas on March 1, 1954, the hydrogen weapons test code-named Bravo yielded explosive power approximately 1,000 times greater than the weapon used in the 1945 wartime nuclear attack on Hiroshima, Japan;

Whereas the Bravo test created a mushroom cloud 25 miles in diameter, and produced a crater 6,000 feet in diameter, vaporizing 6 islands at the Bikini Atoll;

Whereas the Bravo test and the 12 year nuclear testing program has been the defining experience of the modern era for the people of the Marshall Islands, and these momentous events created a common bond between the people of the Marshall Islands and the United States military and civilian personnel who shared hardships and suffering with the people of the Marshall Islands during the testing program, as well as the United States citizens in areas affected by the mainland testing programs and weapons production industry;

Whereas the people of the Marshall Islands, having learned first hand the dangers of nuclear weapons, freely chose in United Nations observed acts of self-determination in 1982 to enter into the Compact of Free Association in order to become a sovereign nation allied more closely with the United Sates than any other nation under any other alliance;

Whereas from the time of choosing self-determination, the Marshall Islands worked closely with Congress and the executive branch to bring about a strong understanding of the unique relationship between their islands and the other United States insular areas;

Whereas the United States nuclear testing program put the people of these remote islands on the front line in the Cold War struggle to preserve international peace, promote nuclear disarmament, support nuclear nonproliferation, and provide facilities critical to the development by the United States of a deployable missile defense system to reduce the risks of nuclear missile attacks; and

Whereas as a member state in the United Nations, the world body that once had oversight of United States stewardship of the trusteeship for the people of the Marshall Islands and their island homelands, the Republic of the Marshall Islands has an unmatched record of working in conjunction with the leadership of the United States in the pursuit of international peace and security, the rights and well-being of the peoples of the world, and in the War on Terrorism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress recognizes as an historic achievement of friendship more than 5 decades of strategic partnership between the United States and the people of the Marshall Islands in pursuit of international peace and security, and recognizes with solemn regard for the cost of preserving peace, the importance of the nuclear weapon test code-named Bravo at Bikini Atoll in the Marshall Islands on March 1, 1954.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material

on the concurrent resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), chairman of the Committee on Resources, for introducing this timely resolution which commemorates the more than five decades of friendship and strategic solidarity that the United States has shared with the people of the Marshall Islands.

March 1 marked the 50th anniversary of the Bravo test, the largest of the 67 atmospheric nuclear tests that the United States conducted in the Marshall Islands. Those massive detonations, which represented significant sacrifices by the Marshallese people, were critical to the credibility and reliability of our nuclear deterrent during the Cold War. They are perhaps the most vivid, visual examples of a strategic partnership that stretches back to the Pacific campaign of the Second World War.

Most recently, the United States reaffirmed and extended aspects of its unique relationship with the Republic of the Marshall Islands in the amended Compact of Free Association, which the Congress considered and approved last year. That agreement continues and deepens our strategic cooperation, both by reaffirming our mutual defense obligations and by significantly extending United States access to our missile defense testing facility at Kwajalein Atoll.

As we commemorate the anniversary of the Bravo test, it is fitting to recall the mutual sacrifice that our peoples have shared during the last half century and to committing ourselves to maintaining our special friendship in the decades ahead.

I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I first would like to commend the authors of this resolution, the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) and the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA). We are grateful for their leadership on matters related to the Pacific.

This resolution recognizes the 50th anniversary of the Bravo nuclear weapon test which occurred in March 1954. It reaffirms the strong relationship between the United States and the people of the Marshall Islands. The timing of this resolution is particularly appropriate as Congress last year approved legislation renewing the Compact of Free Association. This compact is the guiding document for our relations with the Marshall Islands and with Micronesia.

Mr. Speaker, the beginnings of our Nation's close relationship with the people of the Marshall Islands are etched in history. In 1944, we joined with the Marshallese people to liberate the people from Japanese military rule.

At the end of the Second World War, the United States began a decades-long trustee relationship with the Marshall Islands, culminating in Marshallese independence in 1982.

□ 1245

During the trusteeship period, the United States conducted 67 atmospheric nuclear tests in the Marshall Islands, the largest of which was Bravo, which occurred in March 1954, a half a century ago. This test yielded approximately 1,000 times greater explosive power than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. Our nuclear testing program did enormous, long-term damage to the health of the Marshallese and the environment of the islands. Yet rather than turning away from the United States, the people of the Marshall Islands sought a close political, strategic, and social relationship with our Nation. As we speak, Mr. Speaker, Marshallese soldiers are serving with our troops in Iraq.

The Compact of Free Association amendments recently enacted into law will further solidify U.S.-Marshallese ties by ensuring that the U.S. contributes to the economic and educational development of the Marshallese people for the next 2 decades and that we continue to operate the Kwajalein test facility on the islands.

So as we remember the 50th anniversary of the Bravo test, we also celebrate 6 decades of friendship and amity between the American and Marshallese people. I urge all my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 364.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO).

Mr. POMBO. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 364, which I introduced recently to formally recognize a political, social, and strategic relationship that is very unique to the history of the United States. The House Committee on Resources has witnessed this relationship over the years and has a unique understanding of the issues that affect the insular areas, having oversight over all of the former United Nations trust territories.

Today we consider this legislation in light of both the strong history between the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the United States as well as the common ties that will keep our nations closely connected for decades to come. For over 50 years, the United States has enjoyed a mutually beneficial relationship with the citizens of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands. In 1984, President Ronald Reagan proposed a new status for the trust territories of the Pacific through negotiated Compacts of Free Association. After having status as a United Nations trust territory for many years, in 1986 these islands chose to become sovereign states. Starting in 1986 when Congress passed the Compact Act, we made the agreement to strive to continue to maintain both economic and political stability in this region, including working to advance economic self-reliance in these islands. Congress also strongly endorsed the continuation of this relationship when we passed H.J. Res. 63, the new Compact of Free Association, by a strong bipartisan vote last year with the help of the House Committee on International Relations and numerous other House committees.

About 2 weeks ago, the citizens of the Marshall Islands, as well as many others, recognized a moment in time that was significant in American history and was a part of the daily lives of Marshallese citizens from 1946 to 1958. During this period, the United States was performing nuclear tests in the Marshall Islands that would prove primary to the success of our country during the Cold War. The contributions of the Marshall Islanders during these years further helped bring a positive and peaceful end to the Cold War that saw true democracies established across the globe.

In particular, H. Con. Res. 364 points to the significance of the nuclear weapons test that was code-named Bravo and its role in the half-century relationship that still exists between our countries. On March 1, 1954, the United States tested this weapon at Bikini Atoll in the Marshall Islands. It was the largest nuclear weapon ever detonated by our country. Its explosive power was nearly 1,000 times greater than the weapon used in 1945 in our attack on Hiroshima, Japan. This event and the success that came from our nuclear testing program will forever link the United States in history with the Marshall Islands. But the Marshallese continue to show their support for our country, as seen in 80 of their citizens serving in the U.S. Armed Forces. Our common pursuit of peace through working closely together through political, diplomatic, and strategic ties continues to this day.

I was fortunate to have recently been able to travel to the Marshall Islands with Department of Interior Secretary Gale Norton, as well as other members of the House Committee on Resources. The openness and kindness with which we were received will not be forgotten, as we were able to talk to some of the survivors of these nuclear tests and comprehend better the level of understanding that remains between the Marshallese and our government to this day. In fact, two Bikini citizens are here with us today to see this legislation move to the House floor: the Mayor of Bikini, Mr. Eldon Note, and Senator Juda from Bikini as well.

This bond should not be understated. I hope that other Members of this body will also show their recognition of this alliance in supporting H. Con. Res. 364 today. We continue to work with the Marshallese in both a socioeconomic and national defense standpoint. Be it the new schools being built with Compact of Free Association moneys or the critical work being done at the Ronald Reagan ballistic missile defense test site, our mutual ties founded in democracy and freedom can, with this legislation, be properly acknowledged.

I would like to thank the House Committee on International Relations for their help in bringing this legislation to the floor of the House in such an expeditious manner and look forward to the strong bipartisan support of this concurrent resolution by my colleagues.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, over 7,000 miles due west from our Nation's Capitol at a location roughly 2,700 miles southwest from the Hawaiian Islands and 2,000 miles southwest from Guam lies a nation of more than 50,000 people. The Republic of the Marshall Islands comprises 30 atolls and 1,152 islands, an area that in total land mass represents roughly the equivalent in size of Washington, D.C. but straddles an area of about 770,000 square miles of the western Pacific Ocean.

Today the people of the Marshall Islands, their culture, their history, their special relationship with the United States, which this resolution seeks to appropriately recognize, is largely unknown and overlooked by most Americans. Their special relationship with the United States is embodied in a Compact of Free Association and the unique partnership the compact establishes between our two nations.

Last year, we as a Congress renewed this compact with the Marshalls for another 20 years, and we take this opportunity today to recognize the beginning of a new era in our strategic partnership. I am proud to have taken part in the compact's renewal and in the work on this legislation as a Member of this House. As our colleagues from Hawaii stated last year when the compact legislation was brought to this floor, this may be an issue of little note for many of the Members of the House. It would be easy, he said, to say that the compact represents an area of forgotten people, of the never noticed, perhaps lost in the vastness of the world's largest ocean, a people, a culture, an area that was undiscovered by the Western World until the Spaniards arrived in 1529 seeking a western route for trade. Over the centuries, their culture has flourished and the world has now taken notice.

The United States' relationship with the Marshallese began 5 decades ago during World War II. Allied forces, led by the U.S. Navy and Marines, drove the Japanese Imperial forces from their islands. Following the war, U.S. naval bases were established on the atolls of Kwajalein and Majuro. In 1946, Bikini Atoll was the site for Operation Crossroads, the first postwar atomic weapons tests. Fifty years ago this month, the United States detonated the historic Bravo shot, a 15-megaton hydrogen bomb 1,000 times more powerful than the atomic bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima. For 12 years, the United States detonated more than 67 nuclear weapons in the Marshalls during the development of our Nation's strategic arsenal. The testing in the Marshalls left a legacy that we continue to address to this day. We recognize the important contributions of the Marshalls in our national security programs, and we know that the Free World owes a debt of gratitude to them for their role in the development of our national strategic deterrent. I am hopeful that we will soon address all these issues that the testing era brought for the benefit of our strategic partnership and special relationship.

In January, I was fortunate to have participated in a congressional delegation led by the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO). I was very grateful that he decided to visit the Marshalls as well as other Pacific islands. While in Majuro, we met with President Kessai Note and elected officials from other islands, as well as with the Nuclear Claims Tribunal. This visit was important given the recent renewal of the compact, the anniversary of the Bravo blast, and the security issues facing our world today.

The people of the Marshall Islands have made tremendous sacrifices and contributions on behalf of the United States in the pursuit of peace and freedom around the world. Today, the Marshall Islands are among the United States' greatest friends and most reliable allies. I want to recognize and congratulate the Marshalls' Ambassador to the United States for his efforts in strengthening the relationship between our governments, the Honorable Banny de Brum. I also again want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), and the Secretary of Interior, Mrs. Norton, for their leadership in recognizing the value of the strategic partnership with this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I urge its unanimous adoption by this House.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I appreciate the chairman of the Committee on Resources for bringing this forward. I had the good fortune to travel to the Marshall Islands a couple of months ago on the CODEL with the Secretary of the Interior and some of my colleagues. We were able to meet with President Note and the elected leaders of many of the surrounding atolls. It was our good fortune to go to Kwajalein, to be able to watch what we are doing there at the Ronald Reagan test site, to see how important our relationship is with the Marshall Islands.

The U.S. nuclear testing program put the people of these remote islands in the front line of the Cold War. For many, many years testing went on. From 1946 to 1958, the U.S. detonated 67 atmospheric nuclear weapons in the Marshall Islands. Most Americans have no idea the contribution that the people of the Marshall Islands have made to our peace and our security. Hopefully, this resolution will go some distance in expressing our gratitude and our appreciation for that relationship. We have an obligation to the people of the atolls that were affected by these tests that we are still carrying through. I was pleased to support the Compact of Free Association, or the extension of it. This is a good start. It represents a good foundation for a continued strong relationship. We ought to appreciate strongly the Marshall Islands for their support for our position in the United Nations. No nation on this Earth, I think, supports us more, more frequently and is with us more than the Republic of the Marshall Islands. For that we should be grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this resolution, and I am glad to speak on this topic.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 364, a resolution to recognize the decades of strategic partnership between the United States and the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

In 1947, the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) became one of six entities in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands established by the United Nations with the United States as the Trustee. This began a decades long relationship between the United States and RMI that has proven to be resilient and enduring.

In particular, I'd like to highlight the United States nuclear testing program in RMI which began in 1946. Over the years, the United States detonated 67 nuclear weapons on the islands of Bikini and Enewetak. These tests comprise 80 percent of all atmospheric tests conducted by the United States and allowed a majority of all tests to be conducted as far from densely populated areas as possible. This testing includes the detonation of Bravo, the most powerful hydrogen bomb ever tested by the United States, on Bikini Atoll. Radiation from the test forced the evacuation of Marshallese and U.S. Military personnel on Rongelap, Rongerik, Utirik and Ailinginae.

Over the years, the Marshallese have faced very serious consequences as a result of the nuclear testing. The health and property effects have proved to be extensive and in many cases, immeasurable. The United States has recognized this and set up a fund to compensate those affected by the testing. However, the consequences of this testing, especially the health of the Marshallese people, continue to be impacted.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that our countries will continue to work on this issue and find a resolution. I also have no doubt that the relationship between our governments will continue to be productive and mutually beneficial.

Last year, this body worked on reauthorizing the Compacts of Free Association, an agreement between the United States and RMI, to continue our defense and economic alliance that has benefited both countries for 17 years. As a result of this work, the United States and RMI will continue this alliance for another 15 years.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing our relationship with RMI and commend their dedication to international peace and security.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in grateful support of this resolution, which I am proud to have cosponsored.

This resolution is about three things. First, re-acknowledgement of that region of our world in which the present and future of our Nation and so many others lie: the Pacific and Asia. Second, recognition of a proud people and culture whose future lies now not only in their home islands, but in our own country. Third, responsibility for our actions which, like the consequences of those actions, will extend down through the generations.

On re-acknowledgement, as a product of the Pacific, I confess to a Pacific-centric view of our world. But can anyone doubt that our own future is inextricably tied to that of the Pacific? And as we look to the Pacific, we cannot overlook its island nations, whose strategic value and loyalty to democratic principles are unquestioned.

Foremost among these nations is the Republic of the Marshall Islands, with a proud history and culture dating back thousands of years. We celebrate in this resolution the mutually beneficial relationship we have enjoyed for more than half a century.

We also celebrate its people, who at home are striving to build a modern and sustainable island nation. And the emigration of many to new lands and new opportunities, especially in our country, are strengthening communities beyond their homeland.

My own state has especially benefited, with a Marshallese community of some 5000 strong poised for a major breakthrough into the mainstream of political, economic and social participation in Hawaii's affairs.

And, of course, we cannot forget that the Marshallese and their counterpart Pacific nations today have their sons and daughters serving with our armed forces in Iraq and Afghanistan, and lying grievously wounded defending our joint freedoms in military hospitals.

And lastly, this is a resolution of remembrance, of the dire consequences to a whole people and their aina, or land, of 66 nuclear tests, virtually all open air, from 1946 through 1958, including, 50 years ago, BRAVO, the world's first hydrogen bomb. Few of us, even today, can imagine the force and devastation released by just one such device, much less 66.

I have my own recollection, as a boy of just six, sitting on my grandparents' porch on the Island of Kauai, on a dark night, watching the entire sky light up from a single explosion 2,300 miles away. But the Marshallese lived through it, and they are still living through it, and will live through it for generations to come.

These stories are being told elsewhere, by Beverly Keever, in a February 25, 2004 article in the "Honolulu Weekly," and by James Matayoshi, Mayor of Rongselap, in recent remarks on BRAVO day. I append these for the RECORD and commend them to your attention.

But today, we simply remember what happened and recommit ourselves to remedy that which must be remedied.

Mr. Speaker, there are lots of people to be thanked for this resolution. Chair POMBO and Ranking Member RAHALL, for their commitment, Chair HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS for bringing this to the floor, and Chair LEACH and Ranking Member FALEOMAVAEGA for their advocacy. But mostly, we thank the people of the Marshall Islands, for their friendship and support. We will not forget.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following articles for insertion into the RECORD in connection with H. Con. Res. 364.

SUFFERING, SECRECY, EXILE: BRAVO 50 YEARS LATER

(By Beverly Deepe Keever)

[From Honolulu Weekly, Feb. 25, 2004]

Almira Ainri was 10 years old when she was catapulted into the atomic age.

In June of 1946, as the U.S. Navy readied the first atomic bomb in peacetime—just the fourth in history—Ainri and about 100 other inhabitants of Rongelap Atoll, in the Marshall Islands, were sent south by ship to Lae Atoll, where it was thought they would be safe from the effects of the explosion 100 miles away, at Bikini Atoll.

Eight years later, in 1954, Ainri and other Rongelapese weren't as lucky.

Fifty years ago this week, on Bikini Atoll, the U.S. detonated the Bravo shot, a 15–megaton hydrogen bomb 1,000 times more powerful than the bomb it dropped on Hiroshima.

The most powerful bomb in U.S. nuclear history, Bravo had a radioactive cloud that plumed over 7,000 square miles, an area about the size of New Jersey. A hundred or so miles downwind, near-lethal fallout powdered at least 236 inhabitants of the Rongelap and Utrik atolls, contaminating their ancestral homelands. The Bravo-dusted islanders entered history as unique examples of the effects of radioactive fallout on humans.

Ainri, who now lives in Honolulu, is one of 118 survivors of the Bravo shot. For her and other islanders, the bomb's detonation set off a chain reaction of events over the last half century. They became unwitting subjects in secret U.S. research on the effects of nuclear fallout and ultimately were forced to leave their idyllic homeland, which remains uninhabitable to this day due to radioactivity.

Archeological finds on Bikini Atoll suggest that the first Micronesians likely arrived in the Marshall Islands between 2,500 and 4,000 years ago. Germany annexed the islands in 1885. Japan captured them in 1914. Allied forces captured and occupied them in World War II; the war's end left them in U.S. hands. The U.S. began nuclear testing there the next year.

The Marshall Islands were declared a Trust Territory by the United Nations in 1947, with the U.S. as the administrator, an arrangement that did not end until 1991. The following treatment of the irradiated islanders raises doubts about the behavior of the U.S. government:

U.S. officials failed to evacuate Ainri and other islanders before the Bravo shot and then delayed their removal for more than 50 hours after the fallout.

On March 7, 1954, six days after the Bravo shot, Project 4.1, "Study of Response of Human Beings Exposed to Significant Beta and Gamma Radiation due to Fallout from High Yield Weapons," established a secret U.S. medical program to monitor and evaluate islanders exposed to radiation, turning them into experimental human subjects without their consent.

Ainri and other islanders were allowed to return to their irradiated homeland in 1957. It was later deemed unsafe for human habitation.

Marshall Islanders were injected with or fed radioactive tracers without their consent, contrary to medical recommendations made by U.S. medical officers six weeks after the Bravo shot that the islanders should receive no more exposure to radioactivity in their lifetimes.

The research projects arising from Bravo were begun just seven years after war crimes tribunals convicted German medical officers for their horrific experiments with concentration camp inmates during World War II. Those tribunals led to the Nuremberg Code, an international standard for experiments involving human subjects, which stipulated that the voluntary consent of the subject "is absolutely essential." The U.S. Atomic Energy Commission established similar standards, requiring the consent of human subjects and the expectation that an experiment would benefit the subject, but they had little distribution or effect in the U.S. bureaucracy.

Did U.S. bureaucratic bungling and operational obstacles cause the mistreatment of the islanders or, as so many islanders and others say, did U.S. officials make the islanders guinea pigs to study the effects of radioactivity?

LIKE NEEDLES OVER MY WHOLE BODY

At about 6 a.m. on March 1, 1954, Almira Ainri was awakened by the brightness and noise of an inferno as hot as the core of the sun. Ainri was 18 then, married, and pregnant with her first child.

The island shook, she recalled. The air was gray. Snowlike particles fell from the sky.

A day later, U.S. soldiers with Geiger counters arrived and found people of Rongelap weak and vomiting. Fifty hours and more after Bravo's detonation, the 236 inhabitants on or near Rongelap and Utrik atolls were evacuated to the military clinic at Kwajalein Atoll. There, they were scrubbed every day with special soaps. The pressure of the water on Ainri's blistered skin felt "like needles over my whole body," she said—"like I was burning."

After the blast, Ainri gave birth to a son, Robert. His thyroid glands were so damaged that he became dwarfed. The glands were later removed, consigning him to a lifelong regimen of medication. Ainri got pregnant again and gave birth, she said, to "a bunch of grapes, that had to be pulled out of me." Twice more Ainri got pregnant, she said, and gave birth to children who appeared normal but died several days later. Another son, Alex, survived, but again with damaged thyroid glands. Ainri herself has thyroid problems; two new growths recently appeared there.

The suffering of Ainri and her family is hardly unique. Within a decade of the Bravo shot, more than 90 percent of the children who were under 12 years old at the time of the explosion developed thyroid tumors. Today, Marshall Islanders have one of the world's highest rates of abnormalities of the thyroid, which often result in cases of retardation, cretinism and stunted development.

For these and other conditions that the U.S. government presumes were caused by its nuclear weapons testing, the U.S. pays compensation. Those with leukemia or cancer of the esophagus, stomach, small intestine, pancreas or bone are awarded $125,000. Islanders with severe growth retardation due to thyroid damage get $100,000.

By the end of 2002, a U.S. trust fund had paid about $79 million to 1,808 islanders, but because the trust fund could not cover all its obligations, 46 percent of affected islanders

died before they were fully paid for their injuries.

Rongelap Atoll comprises 61 islets with a combined land mass of about three square miles and a lagoon of 388 square miles. Because it is still too radioactive for humans, its former residents are scattered. In Honolulu, Ainri lives in a home where her pandanus floor mats mingle with a caller-I.D. phone and a television set.

Under a 1996, $45–million agreement with the U.S., projects are underway to prepare for the return of Rongelapese to the five southernmost, least-contaminated islets of the atoll. A glisteningly white church has been refurbished, complete with striking lapis trim. An airstrip, desalinization plant, field station, power plant and docks have been constructed or installed. Phase 2 calls for the construction of 50 four-bedroom homes, a dispensary and a hospital, school building, residences for doctors and teachers, a library, a town hall and a municipal building. All that is missing is a date when the resettlement will occur.

THE THREE SURPRISES

Corporal Don Whitaker hardly could have imagined the worldwide surprise his letter home would create. Writing to his hometown newspaper, in Cincinnati, in March 1954, Whitaker told of seeing distraught Marshall Islanders arrive at a navy clinic on Kwajalein after the Bravo shot. It was one of three surprises that shocked the world, and members of President Eisenhower's administration.

The first surprise was the magnitude of the Bravo bomb's blast. Its 15–megaton yield was more than twice what U.S. officials had expected. Set off from Bikini Atoll, it vaporized three of the atoll's 23 islets. The test was expected, however.

Whitaker's letter was the next surprise. In it, he revealed the evacuation of islanders that U.S. officials had tried to keep secret. Published March 9, eight days after the blast, Whitaker's letter prompted the Atomic Energy Commission to issue a press release the next day, masking the magnitude of the Bravo shot and its radioactive effects with a bland announcement. But Bravo was hardly the ''routine atomic test'' the release described, and the phrase ''some radioactivity'' did not come close to describing the islanders' dosage, which was the equivalent of the amount received by Japanese citizens less than two miles from Ground Zero at Hiroshima, lawyer-historian Jonathan M. Weisgall writes.

Twenty-eight years later, the U.S. Defense Nuclear Agency would call the Bravo shot ''the worst single incident of fallout exposures in all the U.S. atmospheric testing program.''

The third surprise came just days after the AEC had assured the public that the irradiated islanders were fine. A Japanese tuna trawler, the No. 5 *Fukuryu Maru* (''Lucky Dragon''), was 112 miles east of Bikini Atoll at the time of the Bravo explosion, well outside the danger zone announced by U.S. officials. Yet Bravo's staggering detonation powdered the boat's 23 crew members with what is known in Japan as shi no hai—''ashes of death.'' When the *Fukuryu Maru* reached its home port of Yaizu, about 120 miles south of Tokyo, on March 14, the crew was suffering from a radiation sickness that stunned the world.

The crewmen's sickness and the subsequent panic over radioactive tuna in the U.S. and Japanese fish markets led to an international furor. The Japanese government and people dubbed it ''a second Hiroshima'' and it nearly led to severing diplomatic relations. A U.S. government doctor dispatched to Japan blamed the Japanese press for exaggerating the condition of the fishermen, who, he predicted, would recover completely in about a month.

Six months later, Aikichi Kuboyama, the 40-year-old radio operator of the *Fukuryu Maru*, died. He was ''probably the world's first hydrogen-bomb casualty,'' said The New York Times.

It was this triple-play of surprises—Bravo's tremendous force, Whitaker's letter and the plight of the *Fukuryu Maru*—that chinked the U.S. government's usual policy of secrecy. Instead, the word fallout entered the world's lexicon. For the first time, people in Japan and Russia, London and Bonn, New York and Milwaukee, were aware of a danger that could not be smelled, seen, felt or heard.

THE SUN RISING IN THE WEST

The Bravo shot was the first U.S. hydrogen device that could be delivered by airplane. It was designed to catch up with the Soviets who, in August 1953, had exploded their first hydrogen bomb deliverable by aircraft.

The Bravo shot was so dangerous that it could not be detonated in the continental United States. Nor could it be set off at Enewetak Atoll, where the U.S. conducted nuclear blast tests from 1948 to 1958, for fear it would wipe out the extensive U.S. equipment and installations there. So it was tested at Bikini Atoll.

Even before the Bravo shot, experts knew that the radioactive dust of atmospheric nuclear weapons explosions was invisibly and unknowingly powdering the continental United States and touching others worldwide. The U.S. government's failure to move the Rongelap and Utrik Islanders in advance of the Bravo shot is painfully ironic because Almira Ainri and other Rongelapese had been moved before the first peacetime atomic test, in 1946—and Bravo was 1,000 times more powerful. Yet the islanders were not moved in 1954 because of ''the high cost and logistic problems . . . in supporting such an operation,'' according to U.S. medical officers.

Six hours before Bravo, U.S. officials knew that the winds had shifted, putting Rongelap and Utrik Islanders in the path of fallout, but they proceeded with the detonation anyway. That knowledge, coupled with the lag of several days after the detonation before islanders were evacuated, led to speculation that the U.S. deliberately used the islanders as guinea pigs.

A month after the Bravo shot, Atomic Energy Commission chair Lewis Strauss told reporters that allegations that the evacuation of the Marshall Islanders had been deliberately delayed were ''utterly false, irresponsible and gravely unjust to the men engaged in this patriotic service.'' He also said that he had just visited the islanders at the Kwajalein clinic and they ''appeared to me to be well and happy.''

Bravo was detonated at 6 a.m. Within four hours, the 28 U.S. weathermen on Rongerik Atoll, in the Marshall Islands, saw a mist from the blast. Seven hours later, the needle of their radiation-measuring instrument went off the scale. They were evacuated the next day.

Clouds of snowlike particles moved over Alinginae, Rongelap, Utrik and Ailuk atolls. The clouds deposited radioactive fallout on the people below and irradiated them with doses of ''cloud shine,'' radiation produced by the blast itself, which Rongelapese described as being like ''the sun rising in the west.''

About two-thirds of the Rongelapese were nauseated for two days, according to a U.S. medical officer who examined them a week after Bravo. Roughly one in ten were vomiting and had diarrhea. Some had itching, burning skin that turned into black-pigmented areas and lesions, some of which became ulcerated and infected. Hair fell out. Blood counts fell.

The Bravo-dusted islanders disappeared from the news for the next year, because of the AEC's clampdown on information. But if they were not making news, they were making medical history.

GUINEA PIGS

Within days of the Bravo shot, irradiated islanders were unwittingly swept into a top-secret effort to research the effects of radioactive fallout on humans. ''Never before in history had an isolated human population been subjected to high but sub-lethal amounts of radioactivity without the physical and psychological complexities associated with nuclear explosion,'' said scientist Neal O. Hines. Islanders would not learn the true nature of the experiment for 40 years, until 1994, when President Clinton ordered thousands of documents declassified in the wake of a national scandal involving human radiation experiments.

Four months before the Bravo shot, a then-secret U.S. document listed research Project 4.1 among 48 tests to be conducted during and after the explosion. ''(D)ue to possible adverse publicity reaction, you will specifically instruct all personnel in this project to be particularly careful not to discuss the purposes of this project and its background or its findings with any except those who have a specific 'need to know,''' the document said.

The purpose of Project 4.1 was to study the effects of fallout radiation on human beings.

Three days after Bravo, Project 4.1 began to unfold in Washington, D.C., where top medical officials decided that the victims of its hazardous debris would be appropriate research subjects. A week after the blast, 25 officials of the AEC's medical program arrived at Kwajalein Atoll. Six weeks after the blast, Project 4.1 workers recommended a lifelong study of the affected islanders. After thyroid nodules began to appear on Rongelapese and Utrik islanders in 1963, they were studied every year.

They began to complain that they were being treated like guinea pigs rather than sick humans needing treatment. A doctor who evaluated them annually came close to agreeing when he wrote, 38 years after Bravo, ''In retrospect, it was unfortunate that the AEC, because it was a research organization, did not include support of basic health care of populations under study.''

RETURN TO RONGELAP

In 1957, U.S. officials assured Rongelapese that their homeland was safe and returned them there. Upon their return, U.S. medical officers shifted the emphasis of their study to what researchers who studied the documents released in the 1990s described as ''the formation of an integrated long-term human environmental research program to document the bioaccumulation of fallout and the human effects of this exposure.'' In sum, U.S. officials knew they were placing the Rongelapese in a radioactive environment, even though the islanders had already sustained more than a lifetime's worth of radiation.

A 1982 U.S. Department of Energy report indicated that some inhabited areas of Rongelap were as contaminated as the parts forbidden to humans. It was the first report prepared for the Rongelapese in their own language and it shocked them. ''All we needed to see was the center fold-out and our worst fears were confirmed!'' Marshall Islands Senator Jeton Anjain told the U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources in 1991.

Rongelap, their principal island of residence since their 1957 return, had been assigned a level ''3'' of contamination, meaning it was unsafe for human habitation.

In 1984, Rongelapese representatives asked the U.S. to evacuate them. The U.S. refused.

The next year, the Rongelapese left anyway. ''It was by no means an easy decision, for our people knew that it might mean they and their children would never again know life on their ancestral homeland of the last 4,000 years,'' Anjain told the U.S. Senate committee.

''But the safety of our children and the unborn was more important.''

After living on radioactive Rongelap for 28 years, 70 islanders were moved by Greenpeace to Majetto Island, 100 miles away. Confirming their fears, a 1988 study authorized by the U.S. government and subsequent official testimony recommended that part of Rongelap Atoll be considered ''forbidden'' territory and that the remaining part would be safe only if inhabitants ate imported food for the next 30 to 50 years.

THE ONLY THING I COULD THINK OF WAS NAZI GERMANY

Residents of Rongelap and Enewetak atolls were also used in human radiation experiments involving radioactive tracers of tritiated water and chromium-51 injections, Marshall Islands Foreign Minister Phillip Muller told the U.S. Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs in 1996.

The U.S. Department of Energy withheld critical information about the adverse effects of U.S. weapons tests from the U.S. Congress and Marshallese officials, Muller said, and medical research without the consent of Marshallese subjects continued.

Marshallese Senator Tony de Brum told the committee that U.S. doctors 50 years ago pulled healthy as well as unhealthy teeth of islanders without their consent, for use in cesium, strontium or plutonium studies. Even in the mid–1990s, islanders were unsure whether they were being cared for or studied by U.S. medical personnel, de Brum said.

In 1999, Muller's allegations of human radiation experiments were confirmed by the Department of Energy, the successor agency of the Atomic Energy Commission. Declassified documents showed that U.S. officials included the irradiated islanders under the umbrella of its extensive biological program. Its worst known cases included x-raying the male organs of Oregon and Washington state prisoners, feeding radioactive fallout materials to university students, giving small doses of radioactive iron to pregnant women and feeding Quaker Oats laced with radioactive traces of iron and calcium to supposedly mentally retarded boys in a Massachusetts state home. Upon first learning about these kinds of experiments in 1993, Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary said, ''The only thing I could think of was Nazi Germany.''

WHO WILL PAY?

Under the U.N. Trusteeship, the U.S. government was to prepare the people of the Marshall Islands for self-government. In 1986, President Reagan signed the Compact of Free Association after its ratification by the Marshall Islands government and Congress. Its provisions expired in 2001. New provisions for the compact were agreed upon earlier this year, but they are silent on U.S. funding that has since become inadequate to cover the spiraling claims of those harmed by U.S. nuclear weapons testing, including Bravo's fallout.

There may be a ray of hope for the Marshallese, however. The compacts say that nuclear testing damages to persons or property discovered after the original 1986 agreement can be covered in a new request to the U.S. Congress with documentation that circumstances have changed.

One changed circumstance is that the U.S. government did not disclose to the Marshallese government the yield of 44 of the 66 U.S. nuclear weapons tests detonated in its republic until 1993. The next year, a comprehensive list of 1,054 U.S. nuclear weapons tests worldwide and their yields was made public by the Department of Energy. It shows that the yield of 82 tests in the U.S.-administered Bikini, Enewetak and Johnston Atolls and Pacific waters from 1946 to 1962 was at least 128,704 kilotons. That's the equivalent of 8,580 Hiroshima-sized bombs, or 1.47 such bombs per day for 16 years.

A second changed circumstance is that the personal-injury and property claims arising from nuclear weapons testing have exceeded the capacity of the $150 million trust fund established to pay them.

The people of Enewetak and Bikini have been awarded just over $1 billion for property damages, radiological cleanup, loss of use and hardship and suffering, but as of the end of 2002, less than one percent of that money could be paid. And class-action damage claims for the people of Rongelap and Utrik are still pending.

About 5,000 claims seeking a combined $5.75 billion for radiation-related damages arising from U.S. weapons testing in the Pacific have been pressed. The U.S. has paid $759 million.

In 2000, invoking the ''changed circumstances'' provision of the compact, the Marshallese government asked the U.S. Congress for more funds and services to meet health costs and property damages. (Its petition can be viewed online at www.rmiembassyus.org—click ''nuclear'' and then ''petition.'')

In November 2001, the Marshallese government's petition was resubmitted to a new U.S. Congress and President Bush. As of early this month, the U.S. has yet to take any action.

REMARKS OF MAYOR JAMES MATAYOSHI, BRAVO DAY, MARCH 1, 2004

Today I stand before you as mayor of Rongelap, but more importantly, I stand before you as a son of Rangelap—a true son of the ''survivors''. You are here because you have determined that today, as we commemorate the terrible and terrifying event of March 1, 1954, it is important that you come. We are grateful to you for being here.

We are especially proud to welcome our friends from the World Councils of Churches, our friends from Japan, Europe, and America. We know of friends here from as far away as New Zealand and Puerto Rico. We thank you all. We welcome you all.

Some of you are from the islands which have born this tragedy for 50 years and more. . . . Some of you represent organizations and communities of people who feel strong ties to those of us who survived Bravo. Some of you represent governments and important organizations from throughout our world. Many of you have come to show solidarity with us today when we take a solemn pause to memorialize events of the past. . . . Events which forever changed our lives, and by the fact that you are here, your lives as well.

Throughout this day, and as you interact with each other during these commemorative services, you will undoubtedly hear various accounts of events surrounding Bravo. From this long list of stories and anecdotes, you will witness the horror of the bomb, hear the multitude of reasons why this or that happened, and draw your own conclusions as to what to believe. Of course, you will hear from the apologists who will try as they always do to explain away our suffering and sorrow as byproducts of the cold war. The ''accident'' theorists will tell you about sudden shifts of wind and stronger yields than expected. Others will write of us as allies just bearing their share of the burdens of the cold war.

Local witnesses will tell you personal versions of what they saw and felt from the eyes and the understanding of human beings and not scientists or soldiers or politicians. They will tell you of how as children they ran and cried, then played in the milky dust that fell on them. They will tell you of confusion, of fear, of thinking that the world had ended.

Leaders will tell you how they tried to do all they could do to deal with the matter. Representatives of governments will try to assure you that all that could be done to bring the matter to closure have been done. They will tell you that Washington no longer sees these islands on their radar screen and therefore our quest for fairness and justice is all in vain.

I wonder if they will tell you about project 4.1: The Study of Humans Exposed to Radiation. We began learning more about this program when previously classified documents pertaining to the testing program were released to us in 1994 under the Clinton administration. Among the thousands of documents declassified we discovered this frightening program plan. Drawn in 1953 for the planned 1954 Castle Nuclear Test Series, Project 4.1 contemplated the study of exposed human beings months before Bravo.

Throughout the years our people have had misgivings about the annual medical examinations they were subjected to by scientists from the United States. Our discovery of these descriptions of project 4.1 have reinforced our conviction that we were being studied, not treated by the scientists who examined us. If project 4.1 was conceived, planned and funded prior to March 1, 1954, where were the study subjects supposed to come from?

We have pictures showing ''subjects'' of the 4.1 study as early as March 16, 1954. Could this project have been put in place in a matter of 2 weeks without requisite technical and logistical planning? American doctors have testified that they were treating our injuries and that the studies were an integral part of the treatment. Yet it was general knowledge from the beginning that they would not treat conditions which they considered unrelated to the tests and would refer such patients to the Trust Territory medical authorities.

We have documents pertaining to studies where certain radioactive materials were given to subjects both ''exposed'' and ''unexposed.'' This resulted in previously unexposed subjects being exposed for the purpose of comparison and exposed persons getting even more radiation than they had been getting from the bomb. If project 4.1 was not a study why were there ''control groups''?

Many documents pertaining to the tests have yet to be released. Others, like the photographs in the Office of the District Administrator here in Majuro were removed and set on fire by agents of the United States Government. Several other fires involving medical records of Marshallese exposed to radiation have been reported through the years.

Sufficient information regarding weather conditions surrounding Bravo has been gathered to convince us that there was no unexpected change in weather that caused radioactive fallout to reach inhabited areas. The generals and scientists in charge of the testing chose to ignore weather studies and forecasts which predicted unsafe conditions for the testing.

On earlier occasions, people were moved for safety reasons for prior tests with much smaller expected yield. For Bravo, there was no such precautionary relocation. People were left where they were, unaware that

they were in harm's way, totally at the mercy of the most powerful nuclear device ever detonated by man.

For all these years under American guidance, we have learned principles of democracy and human rights under which all men aspire to live. Yet, when we seek to be treated with honor and dignity, we are denied the means to assure that fairness and justice is guaranteed to all. The United States continues to be less than forthcoming in its handling of information and dissemination of facts pertaining to the testing program.

Here we are, 50 years after Bravo, and the people forcibly removed from their homes for the atomic tests, with the exception of Utrik, have yet to return home. The question of exposure as it affects other atolls of the Marshalls has yet to be fully addressed. Many claims are still being prepared. Adjudicated claims have not been paid in full as agreed upon by the United States. Medical and monitoring programs, promised by those who exposed us, have been severely curtailed or abandoned. Making ''non-exposed'' Marshallese responsible for the medical needs of ''exposed'' Marshallese is not a just solution. America must own up to the problems it created.

Bravo is not over. The people of Kwajalein, who sacrificed their home and society for America's nuclear ambitions, still live in squalid conditions on Ebeye, unable to live in peace and comfort in their own homeland. They have been subjected to many of the same treatments the islands of the tests suffered: displacement, loss of traditional skills, social disruption, and the contamination of their lands and seas.

We became dependent on the U.S. because the U.S. claimed the power to govern us. We did not ask for it, but when it happened we came to understand the choices we had. After decades of living with the good and the bad under American rule, we decided that the greater good would be to cast our lot with the U.S. under the compact of free association.

Today we are America's allies in the war on terrorism. We are America's allies in the development of the missile systems. We are allies in the U.N. and vote with you when all your other allies abandon the U.S. on issues of great importance. We do that of our own free will, without the exercise of extra ordinary U.S. powers under the compact.

For all these reasons, I can say we appreciate and understand America. We understand what Fourth of July means to Americans. We understand what Ford Theater and December 7, 1941 mean to America. We understand what November 22, 1963 means to America. We understand what September 11 will always mean to America.

What we are here today to ask is that America understand us as well as we understand it. For our people, for the Marshall Islands, March 1, 1954 is the defining moment in world history.

That is the Fourth of July, the assasination of President Lincoln and Kennedy, Pearl Harbor and 9/11 all wrapped into one.

That is the day the world stood still and also changed forever. That is the day we went from being an occupied nation to becoming a dependent nation. That is the day we went from being survivors of the World War to victims of the Cold War.

March 1, 1954, is the day that defines a legacy that would not end when the testing ended. This on-going legacy is recognized under Section 177 of the Compact of Free Association. The ''full and final settlement'' under Section 177 is not limited to the number of dollars deposited in the nuclear claims trust fund. The full and final settlement includes the on-going political and legal process recognized under the Section 177 agreement as the path to reach truth and justice. That includes the Article IX changed circumstances process as a matter left to be resolved by the U.S. Congress. It also includes the adjudication of additional claims under law by the Nuclear Claims Tribunal.

So what we ask today on this 50th anniversary is not just that we remember the past. We ask that the U.S. remember its commitments. We ask Americans to understand us as well as we understand them. We think they do. We think the U.S. is a great Nation that can do the right thing.

It is too simple to say that the wrongs done to us were justified by the good that the U.S. has done for the Marshall Islands and the world. There must also be justice for our people.

We believe it is significant that former U.S. Attorney General Dick Thornburgh independently concluded the Nuclear Claims Tribunal operated by the U.S. judicial standards. And we are pleased that Senator DOMENICI announced during hearings on the compact renewal that the U.S. Senate will hold hearings on the nuclear testing legacy.

At a time when the U.S. is spending billions to study nuclear clean up at mainland weapons production sites, and hundreds of billions to make the world a safer place, the U.S. has a legal and moral obligation to finally resolve the legacy of nuclear testing in the Marshall Islands. A democratic ally on all fronts in the current war that asks for nothing except just compensation for judicially determined claims.

That is all we ask. We respect and trust the United States to do what is right when it has the facts. Now is a moment in history when the facts can come out. The truth can be told. Our story needs to be told and the American people need to hear it.

So today, I tell you my friends—Bravo lives on. The terrible disruption it wreaked upon the lives of the people of Rongelap and the Marshall Islands still haunts us. But we shall not let that dampen our hopes or our determination to seek justice wherever we shall find it. We have survived the greatest weapon of war man has ever devised. We will survive whatever is before us and we shall not rest until our quest for justice is found. That is our promise. That is our goal. With your help, and the help of free people everywhere, with the blessing of God, we shall prevail.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in my capacity as the ranking Democrat of the Committee on Resources to support H. Con. Res. 364; recognizing more than five decades of strategic partnership between the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the United States.

Historically, the Committee on Resources held oversight jurisdiction of the former Trust Territory of the Marshall Islands when the United States first took responsibility for the islands and her people shortly after World War II as part of a United Nations trusteeship agreement.

Though we prevailed in war, our country was still healing from the pain and suffering associated with battle. Yet we were mindful that the security of our Nation, and that of the world, depended on our understanding of the destructive nature of our nuclear arsenal.

It is within this context that the people of the Marshall Islands made a sacrifice that is unimaginable for us Americans. On islands where their ancestry could be traced back thousands of years; where their culture flourished, and where they lived in relative peace; the people having been convinced it was ''for the good of mankind'' voluntarily left their homes.

On military ships we loaded their canoes and personal belongings and moved them hundreds of miles away to other islands, safe from nuclear fallout.

Our nuclear testing program commenced and lasted for twelve years, between 1946 and 1958. Within that time, we detonated 67 nuclear devices. One of the 67, detonated on March 1, 1954, in the Bikini Atoll, was the largest ever explosion to occur. Code-named BRAVO, the hydrogen bomb was 1,000 times greater than the weapon used against Japan in 1945.

Shifting winds in the Marshall Islands caused those that were placed out of harm's way to be exposed to nuclear fallout. We have continuing responsibilities for their care and rehabilitation. We continue to work with the Marshall Islands government to resolve issues of healthcare, environmental remediation, and eventual resettlement of atolls still contaminated by nuclear fallout.

After the U.S. nuclear testing program, we continued to assist the trust territory in their political, economic, and social development, consistent with the United Nations trusteeship agreement.

In the mid-1980's, in an act of self-determination, the Marshall Islands chose to become a sovereign nation in free association with the United States. This political partnership fulfilled the U.N. trusteeship agreement and built upon the relationship established during the trust territory period. It continues to this day.

In November of last year, Congress continued our Nation's relationship with the Marshall Islands by approving amendments to our existing Compact relationship. The term of the amended Compacts is for the next 20 years. However, given our history, I imagine that our political partnership will outlive such timeline.

We may never fully understand the personal hardships our nuclear testing program caused to the people of the Marshall Islands, and more specifically those directly affected communities from the atolls of Bikini, Enewetak, Rongelap, and Utrok.

And we should always remember the sacrifices made by the good people of the Republic of the Marshall Islands to strengthen our Nation and make the world more secure.

I thank Chairman POMBO for working with me to recognize the U.S. relationship with the Marshall Islands and to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the BRAVO test with this resolution. I also thank the Committee on International Relations for expediting this resolution so that it could be considered by the House.

I urge all my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 364.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 364 which recognizes more than 5 decades of strategic partnership between the United States and the people of the Marshall Islands in the pursuit of international peace and security.

During World War II, the Marshall Islands were a strategic battleground. In 1944 and as a result of the heroic efforts of U.S. Armed Forces as well as the courageous assistance of the people of the Marshall Islands, the islands were successfully liberated from Japan's oppressive regime and a new cooperative partnership between the United States and the Marshalls was forged.

By 1947, the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) became one of six entities in the

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI) established by the United Nations and administered by the United States. This alliance obligated the United States to foster the development of self-governance and promote economic, social, and educational advancement of the people of the RMI.

However, on March 1, 1954, at 6:45 a.m., at the Bikini Atoll in the Marshall Islands, the United States detonated the Bravo shot, a 15 megaton hydrogen bomb 1,000 times more powerful than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. Acknowledged as the greatest nuclear explosion ever detonated, the Bravo test vaporized 6 islands and created a mushroom cloud 25 miles in diameter.

While U.S. servicemen on Rongerik Atoll were evacuated within hours of the blast, Marshallese residents of Utirik and Rongelap were left behind for at least a day, resulting in their exposure to significant radiation. At the time of their removal, the people of these atolls were already suffering burns and loss of hair.

Also returned prematurely to their atolls, the people of Rongelap and Utirik received additional exposure causing many to believe that they were used to study the effects of radiation on human beings. Recently declassified information contains strong indications that human experimentation using the people of the exposed atolls was indeed part of the nuclear testing program in the Marshall Islands.

These tests exposed the people of the Marshalls to severe health problems and genetic anomalies for generations to come. Yet the United States has not made good on its promise to compensate citizens of the Marshall Islands for loss or damage to property and person resulting from the nuclear testing program which the Government of the United States conducted in the Marshall Islands between June 30, 1946 and August 18, 1958.

From 1946 to 1958, the United States detonated 67 nuclear weapons in the Marshall Islands, representing nearly 80 percent of all atmospheric tests ever conducted by the United States. If one were to calculate the net yield of these tests, it would be equivalent to the detonation of 1.7 Hiroshima bombs every day for 12 years.

Conducted in peacetime, the effects of the U.S. nuclear testing program in the Marshall Islands continues to be devastating and funds provided by the United States under the Compact of Free Association are grossly inadequate to provide for health care, environmental monitoring, personal injury claims, or land and property damage. I believe the survivors of U.S. atomic tests conducted in the Marshall Islands deserve just compensation and I am pleased that at a minimum H. Con. Res. 364 recognizes the historic contribution the people of the Marshall Islands have made in the cold-war struggle to preserve international peace and promote nuclear disarmament.

Today, the RMI provides use of its islands for the United States to develop a deployable missile defense system to reduce the risks of nuclear missile attacks and this is just another example of the RMI's unmatched record of working in conjunction with the leadership of the United States in pursuit of international peace and security. I commend the people of the Marshalls for their commitment to the rights and well-being of the peoples of the world and I recognize with solemn regard the sacrifices they have made so that you and I and future generations may live in peace.

I commend Chairman RICHARD POMBO of the House Resources Committee for introducing this legislation of which I am an original cosponsor. I thank my good friend for his leadership and for recently leading a congressional delegation to the Pacific Territories where we met with island leaders, including those from the Marshall Islands. Chairman POMBO invited Secretary Gale Norton to accompany us on this visit and I commend both the Secretary and the chairman for traveling to the Pacific Territories to see firsthand the difficulties we are facing in the region.

As the ranking member of the House International Relations Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, I also want to thank Chairman JIM LEACH of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific for sponsoring this legislation and for working with Chairman POMBO and me to move this legislation to the International Relations Committee for mark-up. I also thank Chairman HENRY HYDE and Ranking Member TOM LANTOS of the International Relations Committee for their support.

Finally, on behalf of the people of American Samoa, I again recognize with solemn regard the sacrifices our Pacific Island cousins have made in pursuit of international peace and I am hopeful that one day the U.S. Congress will declare March 1 as a national day of remembrance for the survivors of U.S. nuclear tests in the Marshall Islands.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 364.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1410

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

RELATING TO THE LIBERATION OF THE IRAQI PEOPLE AND THE VALIANT SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AND COALITION FORCES

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 561, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 557) relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of House Resolution 557 is as follows:

H. RES. 557

Whereas Saddam Hussein and his regime committed crimes against humanity, systematically violating the human rights of Iraqis and citizens of other countries;

Whereas Saddam Hussein's terror regime subjected the Iraqi people to murder, torture, rape, and amputation;

Whereas on March 16, 1988, Saddam Hussein's regime had and unleashed weapons of mass destruction against Kurdish citizens, killing nearly 5,000 of them;

Whereas as many as 270 mass grave sites, containing the remains of as many as 400,000 victims of Saddam Hussein's regime, have been found in Iraq;

Whereas rape was used to intimidate the Iraqi population, with victims often raped in front of their families;

Whereas the regime punished the Marsh Arabs by draining the marshlands, which created hundreds of thousands of refugees and caused an ecological catastrophe;

Whereas the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–338), passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 360 to 38, made it United States policy to support efforts to remove from power the regime headed by Saddam Hussein;

Whereas with the Iraqi regime failing to comply with 16 previously adopted United Nations Security Council resolutions, the Security Council unanimously approved Resolution 1441 on November 8, 2002, declaring that Iraq ''has been and remains in material breach of its obligations under relevant resolutions, including resolution 687 (1991), in particular through Iraq's failure to cooperate with United Nations inspectors''; and

Whereas on October 10, 2002, the House of Representatives passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107–243) and on March 19, 2003, the United States initiated military operations in Iraq: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) affirms that the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq;

(2) commends the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of unspeakable oppression and brutality inflicted on them by Saddam Hussein's regime;

(3) commends the Iraqi people on the adoption of Iraq's interim constitution; and

(4) commends the members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces for liberating Iraq and expresses its gratitude for their valiant service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 561, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important moment in our history. We are in the middle of a war the like of which has not been seen in recorded history. Everybody is a combatant, and the enemy works by night and works through cowardice. We do not see them. It is not like when Hitler marched through Europe with the blitzkrieg, where you could see the enemy. The enemy extends from New York City to Madrid to Indonesia. And if ever there was a time for this country, the United States of America, to be unified, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) said earlier, it is now.

Now, there are two aspects to this issue that we have here today. One is the procedure by which we got here, and that is controversial and has evoked some harsh words. And the other aspect, the one that I choose to dwell on, is the substance of the resolution.

The resolution, it seems to me, is simple, straightforward and one that everybody can support. It does four things. It congratulates the Iraqi people on withstanding the torture, the brutality, and the oppression that Saddam Hussein has visited on that country for so long.

It affirms that the United States and the world has been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime. And I understand there are some who doubt that and wish to contest that. I would suggest to them that they look at Libya and they consider that Libya has given up its pretenses to have weapons of mass destruction, its capacity to develop nuclear weapons, and is rejoining the community of nations without a shot being fired. And anyone who doubts that that is not a direct result of our intervention in Iraq, seems to me, is not a very good logician nor a student of history.

The other two things the resolution does is commend the Iraqi people on the adoption of an interim constitution. This, Mr. Speaker, is a miracle. You have Sunnis, you have Shiites, you have Kurds who have been at each other's throats for a long, long time. You have them coming together in a period of 9 weeks reaching a constitutional document. Not perfect, but a giant leap forward from where they were. This is an immense contribution towards democratizing the volatile Middle East, and they deserve recognition.

And, of course, this resolution commends the United States Armed Forces and the Coalition for their valor and their courage in the war in the Middle East.

Now, those things, it seems to me, everybody can support. And regardless of our disagreements on process, regardless of our concerns about how we got here, I would ask, in the spirit of, dare I say, patriotism, sticking up for our country, never mind our ruffled feelings, justified or not, let us stand as one with our military people who are fighting this war, this strange, weird, deadly war, where all of us should be Americans, not Republicans and not Democrats.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, the vote in Spain was a great victory for al Qaeda, but it was simply a battle, it was not the war. The war will be a long, long war; and the voices of appeasement are being heard in Europe, but there are other voices, some from the past, voices like Churchill, voices like de Gaulle and voices like Roosevelt that caution resistance, resistance to tyranny. I would ask that Members read the resolution. It is very simple, very straightforward; read it and then put your bruised feelings aside and support it.

If we want to go into bruised feelings, both sides have ample cause, we certainly do, being called, and I say this in sorrow not anger, crooks and liars and having it suggested that the war was started by the President. Those kinds of ideas are not conducive to getting together and embracing each other in the unity that must prevail if we are to win. We do not dare lose this war. What can we do to help win it? I ask Members that, and I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to give it heartfelt thought and support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution we are considering today is deeply flawed. The way it was handled was meant to be divisive, and it has achieved that goal. None of us in this House knows if next January we will have a KERRY administration or a Bush administration, but we do know that whoever is in the White House must ensure the success of U.S. policy in Europe. Success in time of war requires cohesion and unity. We do not need a divisive, partisan resolution. This may be the way to prepare a Republican tax bill, but it is not the way to prepare a foreign policy resolution to win broad bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, the conflict in Iraq should not be a partisan issue. The soldiers who are fighting in Iraq are Democrats and Republicans and Independents. The soldiers who are wounded and killed in Iraq are Democrats and Republicans and Independents. The families who grieve for their sons and daughters who died in Iraq are Democrats and Republicans and Independents. The citizens of this country who are paying for this war are Democrats and Republicans and Independents.

Mr. Speaker, it is totally unacceptable that not a single amendment to this resolution was made in order. This was a Republican resolution, drafted with partisan intent by the Republican leadership. Many of us in this House who have been committed to and who have worked for a bipartisan foreign policy for decades know that this is a slap in our face.

A resolution that commends our troops ought to receive the unanimous support of this body, but this resolution has been written specifically to prevent that result.

Mr. Speaker, war is a time for shared sacrifice, a time when we are all united in a common struggle. This is not shared sacrifice. Some Americans are being killed, some are being wounded, some are asked to leave their families and risk their lives far from home; and some at the very top of the income scale are being asked to accept massive tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution commends the troops, but it does not acknowledge the supreme sacrifice of many who are fighting. This resolution makes no reference to the more than 550 service men and women who have died in Iraq. It makes no reference to the thousands more who have been wounded. It offers no condolences to the families of those who have been killed. It makes no reference to the sacrifices of the families whose members are away from them serving in Iraq for many months or over a year. It makes no reference to the many civilian and humanitarian workers who risk their lives daily. It makes no reference to the contribution of our allies who have thousands of troops in Iraq, and it makes no mention of the death and casualties they have suffered. And it makes no reference to the Iraqi civilians who have lost their lives and suffered injuries, including dozens who were killed today.

Mr. Speaker, there are other serious omissions in this resolution. We should spend our time today debating substantive legislation to fix these problems. The American people have not sent us here just to be an ''amen'' chorus for this administration. There are serious problems, and we should be debating serious solutions.

There is no mention in this resolution of the flawed intelligence that was the basis of the administration's argument for going to war in the first place. We should be debating the establishment of a truly independent commission to examine the shortcomings of U.S. intelligence and the way it was used.

The members of this commission must not be appointed solely by the President, and the commission should make its findings known before Election Day. Only a truly independent investigation, and an investigation that the American people perceive to be independent, can bridge the credibility

gap in our intelligence both here at home and abroad.

The failure of this Congress to deal with the problems facing our intelligence agencies will ultimately harm our national security, the war against terrorism, and our fight against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, we are commending our troops but we are not taking action that we can and should take to make their lives and to make the lives of their loved ones easier. The sacrifices being made by our National Guard and reservists in Iraq and elsewhere are extraordinary. Many National Guard and Reserve families have suffered serious financial losses because of the pay gap between their military pay when they are called up and their private sector pay. With longer rotations, Guard and Reserve families are facing dramatically increased financial burdens while their loved ones risk their lives far away from home. One of the consequences is a serious problem with reenlistments in the Reserves and the National Guard.

My legislation, H.R. 1345, legislation that I introduced 1 year ago this week, would fill that pay gap. My bill would ensure that government and private sector employees can continue to defend our country without being forced to worry about their families facing financial disaster.

Words of support for our troops ring hollow when substantive legislation to improve their conditions is sandbagged by the leadership on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I very much regret that this resolution in its present form is brought before the House today. This should be a time for bipartisan unity and cohesion, not a time for partisanship. This should be a time for us to deal substantively with serious problems we face in Iraq and in our foreign policy. This should be a time for us to take serious action to help our service men and women. All of us join in commending our brave men and women of our Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), a leading member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. Let us review and remember the history of Saddam Hussein, a history of torture, murder and massive abuse of human rights. Saddam was not only an aggressor against his neighbors, but he murdered his own people. This is an outrage against all humanity.

Under Saddam Hussein, torture was widely used. Rape was a standard practice to intimidate and punish families, an outrage against women and all humanity. Murder was common. Truckloads of bodies took away victims. Ethnic cleansing was practiced with precision and effective organization, again an outrage against humanity.

The mass graves he created could barely hide the devastation of Saddam Hussein. Let us remember that Saddam Hussein was known in his own neighborhood, the Middle East, as The Butcher of Baghdad. Back in 1998, Saddam Hussein made a poison cocktail for the town of Halabja, using a combination of nerve agents, mustard gas and conventional munitions to kill 5,000 innocent Iraqi civilians, again an outrage against humanity.

And from 1983 to 1988, he went on an ethnic cleansing rampage against Iraqi Kurds, killing nearly 30,000 and wiping out 60 individual villages.

If you were not marked for death, Saddam Hussein was a master at torture and these were his favorite tools of torture, electric shock, drip acid on victims' skin, gouging out eyes, pulling out fingernails, suspending individuals from rotating ceiling fans, and for those who spoke ill of Saddam Hussein, they ripped out those victims' tongues. This is all an outrage against humanity.

There are over 400,000 unidentified bodies being unearthed in Iraq which call out for justice. I have a photo of a woman searching the remains of a mass grave for a loved one. Tell me this is not a just cause for freeing Iraq from Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress, this President, and our American military men and women had the leadership, the courage, and made the sacrifice to liberate Iraq from the mad, mad man, Saddam Hussein. It was the right step to take for all humanity.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I will support this resolution. I will support it as an expression of our Nation's gratitude and pride in our men and women in uniform who have performed with brilliance and valor in Operation Iraqi Freedom. To date, 565 Americans have given the ultimate measure of devotion to our country in Iraq, including a young soldier from my district, Jason C. Ford who was killed just a few days ago by a roadside bomb, 2 weeks after arriving in Iraq.

We mourn the loss of Jason and all other fallen patriots, and extend our most profound sympathies to their loved ones. We also pray for the full recovery of the more than 3,200 servicemen and -women who have been wounded there.

□ 1430

And to the approximately 110,000 Americans still in Iraq, we must offer this pledge: we will do everything within our power to ensure your success and safe return home.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution should have simply expressed the support of this House for our Armed Forces now in harm's way. Regrettably, however, the majority has handled this resolution in a manner which inevitably led to division. Our troops and the American people expect and deserve better. On a matter of the highest national importance, the majority has undermined the democratic process in this House, treated those who hold different views with disdain, and created a bludgeon where it should have built a bridge. This is the same approach that has guided the current administration's foreign policy and which has undermined our Nation's credibility and driven many allies away from us. This is a time to bring together, to consult, to be unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, I share the view that the Middle East and the world are better off with Hussein in custody and his Baathist regime on the run. But our mission in Iraq has not been accomplished. Even as we speak here, a car bomb has rocked Baghdad and killed more than 20 people. This comes on the heels of attacks on our troops, civilians and even innocent worshipers. Success must be our only exit strategy. And only when our objectives are accomplished can we say with certainty and conviction that the world has been made safer. As today's events in Baghdad and last week's horrific attacks in Spain make clear, this war has not been won. Yet. But we send an unequivocal message to those who perpetrate such madness: we will not retreat from our objective to eliminate the source of terrorism and those who perpetrate it. The legacy of the men and women who have committed the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq demands that we do no less. It should also demand that we do so united, united by common resolve and not divided by efforts to achieve political advantage.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the debate on Iraq today I think confuses the American people. After all, one side focuses solely on parliamentary procedure or when they do on substance they focus solely on the tough times and the challenges that we face, which are very real. But its message all too often is devoid of any mention of progress. Sometimes it even suggests that we are not better off, we are not safer since Saddam's capture. However, the other side, Mr. Speaker, the side that I am on, talks openly of our soldiers' historic victories, how just 1 year after the start of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Saddam is in a dark cell, Osama is in a dark cave, and General Qaddafi is learning to play better with others.

The good news for the American public is that soon they will not have to rely on the media or the politics from either side of the aisle as the troop rotations take place. The public will get to hear from the soldiers themselves, our hometown heroes. And the story that they are going to hear is moving, it is amazing, it is historic. On the sobering side, the public will hear of

mass graves discovered and death cells shut down. On the thrilling side, they will hear about some of the things I saw myself when I was in Iraq just a few months ago. The public will hear of schools and universities that are open and operating, clinics and hospitals that are open and serving, and democratically elected governing councils that are open and governing. They will hear that well over 100,000 Iraqis now serve in the military and the police and that water projects and economic development are well under way. In Mosul when I was there, I saw a sign on the wall of the headquarters of the 101st which read: ''We are in a race to win over the Iraqi people. What have you done to contribute to victory today?'' The answer from our magnificent troops is clear, a lot, an unbelievable amount. And Lord willing, the public is going to hear more each and every day about just what these fantastic brave men have done.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the gentleman from Florida, let me remind the gentleman from Wisconsin that national unity and cohesion are not matters of parliamentary procedure. They are at the core of uniting the United States and the American people at a time of war.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, while I strongly support the brave American soldiers risking their lives to defend security and freedom, I rise in opposition to this politically motivated resolution because it is a farce and anyone who says otherwise is too blinded by politics to see the truth. The truth is Iraq was not an imminent threat to America. There were no chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons; and there was no link between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein. The only mushroom cloud resulting from the war in Iraq is that represented by the Bush administration's barrage of deception and lies. While President Bush considers himself a war President, he is actually a self-made President of war. The President created the pretext for the war in Iraq. He planned for it before September 11, and he misused and fabricated intelligence to sell it to the American people. Instead of debating this empty resolution of praise for President Bush, Congress should investigate the President's unconscionable misuse of power and manipulation of the truth.

Despite this second declaration of ''mission accomplished'' in Iraq, history will tell the true story as it did in Vietnam. The mission is far from being accomplished, and President Bush will be judged harshly for the tragic events of the past year.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as a political refugee from a brutal, sadistic regime, I know of the terrible crimes that dictators commit against their own people. Yet after talking to survivors of Saddam Hussein's regime and speaking with the teams who uncovered Iraq's mass graves, I was left speechless in the face of such atrocities. The Iraqi dictatorship indiscriminately slaughtered Iraqis but the women were among the most vulnerable. The notorious Fedayeen beheaded women in public, dumping their severed heads at their families' doorsteps. According to the September 2001 report of the United Nations Special Rapporteur, at least 130 Iraqi women were beheaded between June 2000 and April 2001, in just 1 year. The regime used widespread rape to extract confessions from detainees and would intimidate members of the opposition by sending them videotapes of the rapes of their female relatives. At times, family members were forced to watch those tapes.

However, Saddam Hussein's legacy of terror knew no boundaries. Even small children were not spared the butchery as evident from the tiny skeletons found in mass graves throughout Iraq. In 1998, the evidence of the Iraqi regime's threatening behavior continued to mount and we as Members of the United States Congress in a unified manner overwhelmingly approved the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998, calling for the regime of Saddam Hussein to be removed from power and replaced with a democratic government. By 2003 after 6 more years of Saddam's oppression, the death toll had reached frightening proportions. The U.S. could not watch idly and do nothing. As a Nation which stands for freedom, democracy and human rights, we were compelled to act. Today as a result of the President's resolve in Iraq and the courageous dedicated service of our troops, the Iraqi people are free.

As Iraq's new female minister of Municipalities and Public Works said last week to us: ''On April 9, 2003, Iraqis were offered the opportunity to begin to dream their future.'' To determine if going to war in Iraq and liberating the Iraqi people was the right decision, just ask Dr. Khuzai, a member of the Iraqi Governing Council and National Council on Women. After being prisoners in their own country for 35 years, she told us: ''For the Iraqi women, the morale is so high that you can't understand it unless you go and see. All the Iraqis are very grateful to Mr. Bush and to the U.S. for liberating us from the dictatorship regime. We will be grateful forever.''

Today, the United States is helping Iraqi women reintegrate themselves into Iraqi society and, indeed, the outside world. Toward this end, the administration has embarked on the Iraqi Women's Democracy Initiative to train Iraqi women in the skills and practices of democratic public life. It has also established the U.S.-Iraqi Women's Network, helping to mobilize the private sector.

This is just the beginning. We will have a better, safer world for the Iraqi people, especially for the Iraqi women, and for all.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the distinguished chairman of the Democratic Caucus and an important member of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I hear my colleagues now talk about human rights and brutality, and there is no question about that; but there is human rights and brutality in many parts of the world, and that has not caused American troops to intervene in those countries. One year after the U.S. invasion of Iraq, it is time to focus on the truth. Yet this resolution leaves out the administration's most important justification for the war in Iraq, weapons of mass destruction. This administration systematically misled the American public and Congress into believing that there were weapons of mass destruction and that we were under an imminent threat. According to the Carnegie Endowment For International Peace recent report, the administration systematically misrepresented the threat from Iraq's weapons of mass destruction by presenting the case as solid instead of expressing the uncertainty that existed in the intelligence assessments, and making the threat seem dire rather than minor by misrepresenting the inspector's findings.

In fact, a report by the minority staff of the Committee on Government Reform found the administration made over 200 misleading public statements on the Iraqi threat.

The truth is that this administration will not have the American people know what really happened with the intelligence until after the November elections, a year from today. Most importantly, this Republican Iraq resolution, crafted with no input from Democrats, makes no mention of the over 565 American men and women who gave their lives in Iraq to date and over 3,500 others who are wounded. I say we should honor those who gave their lives, not ignore them. This resolution should commemorate that ultimate sacrifice.

In the wake of the recent attacks in Spain, it is shameful that Republicans are acting as dividers, not uniters. It is shameful that the Republicans without input from Democrats on a crucial resolution that could express our collective sentiment as we did after September 11 seek partisan gain out of what should be a national embrace.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS).

(Ms. HARRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARRIS. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 557, which reaffirms the morality and justice of Operation Iraqi Freedom. One year ago, our brave men and women in uniform began to liberate a proud and resilient nation from an unspeakable 30-year nightmare. They also delivered a clear message to terrorists and tyrants alike: the United States will not tolerate a regime that pursues tools of mass murder and destruction. Operation Iraqi Freedom reversed more than a decade of failed diplomacy which exacted a devastating price. Because the world permitted Saddam Hussein to violate 16 U.N. resolutions with impunity, the terrorists became convinced of our weakness. Meanwhile, Saddam continued to murder, torture, mutilate and rape men, women and children by the millions. After routing Saddam Hussein's forces from Kuwait in 1991, we urged the Iraqi people to rise up and rebel against this brutal dictator. Then, because United Nations and international opinion required us to leave Saddam in power, we betrayed them.

During the Pryce delegation's mission to Iraq last fall, we listened to the victims and witnesses describe the horrors of this wicked regime. Incredibly, however, the faces of the Iraqis with whom we met reflected a new hope, born from the blood, sacrifice, heroism, and successes of our troops. Even as they endure the attacks of the enemies of freedom, they know that by working together, we will win the twilight struggle for their future.

□ 1445

In the heart of the Middle East, we are replacing the oppression and despair that breeds terrorists with the freedom and hope that defeats them. Mr. Speaker, this stunning transformation is the very essence of the war on terror and let us not permit the rhetoric of an election year to obscure this fundamental truth.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. ACKERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is extraordinary, not for what it says but for what it deliberately refuses to admit. The President took us to war. An immediate nuclear threat was the bait. This resolution is the switch.

In the aftermath of the war, we found no stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction, and with shifting justifications coming from the President and memorialized here in this Republican-crafted resolution, I cannot help but feel, as my constituents do, that we were sold a bill of goods. Not surprisingly, today's feel-good pep-rally resolution does not speak to these issues. What it does provide is the background music for justification revisionists.

But since we have not discovered the promised stockpiles of weapons, we have a big problem. Not that our failure to find the weapons is not a big problem or that al Qaeda forces sneaking into Iraq is not a big problem or that nation building a place the size of California is not a big problem. The real problem is an utter lack of White House credibility. It is gone. Having not just cried wolf, but rabid wolf, this administration has lost its credibility with the Congress, with the American people, with the people of Europe, even with the people of ''New Europe,'' and with the international community.

And the credibility gap extends to the plans for what we would do after the war. We won the war. The Secretary of War makes good war. And for the peace we were assured, the American people were assured that there was a plan. In fact, there was. It was crafted by the State Department. It spoke to all of the issues and problems that we have come up with until today, and it was scrapped by the Secretary of Defense. So how are the American people supposed to believe that the current plan to hand over power to the Iraqis on June 30, ready or not, come hell or high water, will actually work when all the expertise the United States Government could muster in advance has been summarily dismissed? I have concluded that the administration's plans to get us into the war was bait and switch, and the plan to get us out looks like cut and run.

Finally, I am deeply concerned that the war against Iraq has undermined our stated Bush national security doctrine on preemption. Surely we face a new and different world in the wake of September 11 and we must think differently about how to win the war on terror, but preemption as a valid and legal doctrine for self-defense depends on imminence, an imminent threat to our national security. What we have discovered in Iraq is that there was no imminent threat and that our intelligence about Saddam's weapons was far from the mark. The administration has destroyed its credibility with the world community, and if by our actions we have transformed preemptive war into preventative war, then despite what today's resolution says, we have not made the world a safe place but a more dangerous place in the long run.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would just like to comment on the use of the word ''imminent.'' I wonder when the aircraft smashed into the World Trade Center, what was imminent. That morning? The day before? See, when we are dealing with suicide bombers, ''imminence'' is a rather difficult term to apply to circumstances. Sometimes by the time one finds out it is imminent, they are dead.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS).

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of this important resolution. It has been almost a year now since our brave men and women in uniform liberated the Iraqi people from the oppressive regime of Saddam Hussein. In doing so, our Armed Forces brought individual freedom to a people who have for decades only known persecution. Now they are proving just as impressive at rebuilding the country.

Mr. Speaker, several of the previous speakers have said that the Bush administration falsely claimed that the threat posed by Iraq was imminent. The threat was not imminent. The administration made no such claim. The threat was it needed to be dealt with before the issue became imminent. Saddam's regime continued to try to kill our American and British air crews patrolling the no fly zone, people like the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), who flew those missions as a naval reservist. The United States could not keep a potential invasion force on station near Iraq indefinitely, nor would we want our soldiers to have to fight at the height of the summer.

With the ousting of Hussein from power, we have discovered the true horror and atrocities of this regime. As we look at the unearthed mass graves and reflect on the countless human rights abuses, how can we possibly question the legitimacy of this decision? The world is a safer place with the liberation of Iraq, particularly for the 25 million Iraqis who no longer have to live in fear of a brutal tyrant.

We entered Iraq to free its people and plant the seeds of a democratic government, and that is precisely what we are doing. If a few years ago, one would have told someone, anyone, that in the year 2004 the Iraqi people would be creating a constitution founded on democratic principles, I daresay that no one, no one, would have objected. Consequently, that is just what our decision has done.

I commend the diligence of our Armed Forces in the reconstruction effort, and I am pleased with the rapid progress that is being made. The road is certainly not an easy one, but I remain confident in the ability of the Iraqi people, with the cooperation of the coalition, to rebuild their country and to create a secure and stable sovereign nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for yielding me this time.

We all in this institution support our troops. We marvel at and applaud their bravery and their courage. It is not, Mr. Speaker, what is in this resolution. It is what is not in it. I suggest to my Republican colleagues that they meet with families of the men and women who are serving in Iraq, something many of us in this institution have done. They will learn how badly this administration has supplied our troops.

There is no mention of the lack of body armor in this resolution and how the Bush administration has failed to outfit our troops. There is no mention in this resolution about the lack of safe drinking water for our troops, something that this administration has failed to supply. There is no mention in this resolution of cuts in prescription drug benefits to veterans that this administration has forced on those who have lived up to their obligation for our country. There is no mention in this resolution of the $1.2 billion underfunded for the Veterans Administration in the President's budget. There is no mention in this resolution of 558 courageous young men and women who have died in Iraq. There is no mention of the 2,788 soldiers and sailors who were wounded since President Bush dressed in his flight suit and declared, ''mission accomplished.'' There is no mention in this resolution of weapons of mass destruction. There is no mention in this resolution of the Bush administration's deceit in leading us to this war.

Mr. Speaker, the best way to honor our troops is to supply the troops adequately, to protect the troops and make sure they are safe, and to fulfill the promises to our veterans. Something the Bush administration has failed to do. Something my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle have failed to address.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I was fascinated by the remarks of the last gentleman. We have been checking records of people who have strong views on this subject, and I find the gentleman has voted 11 times to cut the intelligence budget. That is pretty consistent, and I give him an A for consistency. He also voted against the supplemental to provide the wherewithal for the troops to be fully equipped. And so, as I say, the gentleman talks a very robust military, but he does not quite follow up with supporting funding for our intelligence.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the $87 billion, first of all, I voted to equip the troops in Iraq in the first vote. When the Bush administration failed with enough money in that budget to provide safe drinking water, to provide body armor, when the administration failed to do it, they had plenty of money to do it; yet it took them months and months and months to make our troops safe. That is why so many in this body said do not give the Pentagon more money, do not give Halliburton more money, do not give more money to the company that is paying Vice President CHENEY $3,000 a week while he is Vice President of the United States.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said what is not in our resolution. I will tell the Members what is not in. The 11 votes he voted to cut funds for intelligence, his vote against the supplemental. And so to talk out of one side of his mouth for a vigorous military and that they should be supplied, and then to deny them the wherewithal to do it, it seems to me is standing on two stools. It is a great way to get a political hernia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution, first to praise the efforts of our men and women in the military who have worked so hard and sacrificed so much on behalf of this country. I also want to take a minute to recognize the courage and resilience of the Iraqi women.

Under Saddam Hussein, Iraqi women lived in fear. They endured years of great beatings, torture, under a farce of a legal system under which they had no rights. Does no one remember the pictures of the Kurdish people, dead, holding their babies in their arms, trying to shield them from the horror of a weapon of mass destruction in Iraq? Only Baathists were awarded the right to have medical care. Families were torn apart on trumped-up charges. Divorce was grounds for having their children taken away. Imagine a mother watching her child die because of her political beliefs. Imagine watching a husband leave for work one day, never to come back. Imagine walking down the street and having their children ripped from their hands.

The persecution of women under Saddam Hussein was brutal and systematic and left deep and damaging psychological wounds. Women were afraid to walk down the streets. Girls were afraid to go to school. With the source of that oppression now removed great challenges lie ahead. Some estimate, for example, that over 70 percent of the Iraqi women are illiterate. They could not go to school.

Somehow this battered and oppressed nation has to educate a new generation of Iraqi children. And in the face of that tough task, there is optimism in Iraq. For the first time in generations, they see an opportunity where only once they had terror. Where once there was depravity, there is excitement and hope in these women for the future. I have met with these women. I have talked with these women.

The optimism is due to the United States' intervention and the selfless service of our men and women in uniform. In our Armed Forces stationed in Iraq, women stand alongside with men there and they serve as a model for the Iraqi women who aspire to that kind of equality on their own in their own country.

The new Constitution of Iraq calls for almost a 25 percent representation of women. The Iraqi women themselves have asked for 40 percent. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us commends the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of unspeakable oppression. I commend the women of Iraq for overcoming that unspeakable adversity. I hope that everyone will back this bill.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on International Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Human Rights.

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we send troops into battle without body armor. Shame. Those troops come back deprived of the veterans benefits we promised. Shame. And now we deliberately divide the homefront for political advantage. Shame.

Make no mistake about it. This resolution was designed by political consultants to generate the largest possible Democratic ''no'' vote which can then be the subject of political ads saying one of our Nation's great political parties does not support our troops. Shame.

The world is better because Saddam is gone. But a fair resolution would acknowledge that we are worse off because 566 of our troops are now deceased and 3,254 were wounded. And we are less safe because our military is exhausted and overextended. Our international credibility has been mangled beyond belief. So the real threats to our security, North Korea and Iran, are able to make progress on their nuclear weapons programs. We are not safer now than we were a year ago because those who would develop nuclear weapons and smuggle them into our cities have had a year further to progress.

□ 1500

And one party devotes a day of floor time to dividing our Nation during our war on terrorism. Shame. Just as that political party brought forward money for our troops in a supplemental and linked it to a giant welfare program for Halliburton and forced us to vote on it as a package. Now it attacks our patriotism when we said ''no'' to Halliburton, because they would not let us say ''yes'' to our troops and ''no'' to Halliburton at the same time. Shame.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the learned gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

After listening to some of this debate, and I am sure it will get worse during the day as we deal with this politically, from a policy point of view, I would just like to take a minute and review what really we are talking about here. We are talking about a resolution that I cannot imagine any American, frankly, could not support. I mean we are simply saying that we affirm that the United States has made the world safer by the removal of Saddam Hussein. Well, I believe that pretty strongly.

We are commending the Iraqi people for their courage and going through all they have gone through. We are commending the Iraqi people because they actually have an interim Constitution and a Bill of Rights. That ought to have been on the front page of some paper somewhere. And we are commending our troops. What is there to be against, against that? All of it is true.

Do we want something else added to it? Well, I do too. And my colleagues will vote no because they did not get it exactly like they wanted it. I would like for this resolution to have commended the Commander in Chief of the United States. I would like for us to say to President Bush, thank God we have a man who has come along with enough backbone to stand up to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction around the world and is willing to stand up to the terrorists. Thank goodness we do that.

My colleagues spend all of their time talking about weapons of mass destruction. What this President has said to us about weapons of mass destruction is precisely what the previous administration said to us also. The difference is, we have a 9/11. And the difference is, we had a President that was willing and ready to act as we should have acted.

Just think about it a minute. We knew he had weapons of mass destruction. We knew he had the ability to make weapons of mass destruction, did we not? We knew he used weapons of mass destruction. When I voted yes for the President, I thought he had weapons of mass destruction, but I was not by myself. Israeli Intelligence thought so; British Intelligence, German Intelligence, French Intelligence, the U.N., even Saddam Hussein thought he had weapons of mass destruction. Get off of that.

We are doing the right thing to protect this world, and we are doing the right thing to protect our security here at home.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing but praise for our warriors in Iraq, but I oppose the President's Iraq war.

If this was a resolution praising our warriors instead of using them as a pretext for applauding the President's after-the-fact arguments for going to war, I would vote for it. If this was a resolution proposing ways in which Congress and the President will raise our soldiers' pay, improve their housing at home and abroad, ensure quality health care for their families and survivors, I would vote for it. If this was a resolution guaranteeing the greater benefits, job training, educational and employment opportunities for returning veterans, I would vote for it. If this was a resolution demanding that the President develop a real foreign policy agenda instead of a doctrine of preemption and preventative war, I would vote for it. If this was a resolution calling on the President and the Intelligence Community to come clean on why no weapons of mass destruction have been found, I would vote for it. If this was a resolution condemning the no-bid contracts by which private military companies like Halliburton have enriched themselves and whose contributions have fattened the President's campaign war chest, I would vote for it.

But since this resolution is none of the above, I am compelled to vote against it. Since this resolution is steeped in hypocrisy and self-congratulatory bravado while refusing to address the false pretenses upon which the Iraqi war was launched, I am compelled to vote against it.

Again, this is poli-tricks, again, as this resolution was crafted to divide this Nation, not bring this Nation together. No, none of us had an opportunity on this side to contribute anything to this resolution, if, in fact, they want to have any kind of unity.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for authoring this very important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, much of the dark and unseemly world of Saddam Hussein is only now coming to light, and it is significantly worse than many of us had thought. The fact that as many as 400,000 victims were systematically brutalized and raped and tortured to death ranks the Hussein dictatorship as one of the worst in modern history. Had the United States and coalition forces not gone in to liberate Iraq, there is no doubt whatsoever that the killing fields would have continued unabated and that tens of thousands Iraquis or more would have met a terrible fate.

Mr. Speaker, on the issue of chemical weapons, we know that chemical weapons used by the Iraqis are not mere conjecture. Hussein used weapons of mass destruction and used them with impunity both in the Iran-Iraq war and he used them against the Kurds. We know for a fact, according to Human Rights Watch and many other organizations and the U.S. Department of State, that upwards of 5,000 Kurdish people died a horrific death from those chemical attacks. There have also been, as my colleagues know, a staggering number of disappearances, believed to range between 250,000 to 290,000.

Mr. Speaker, the Armed Forces of the United States and our coalition partners have conducted themselves in Iraq with incredible valor, professionalism, and commitment. Our forces and those of our allies are peacemakers. We often talk about peacekeepers, soldiers who go in when the situation, while volatile, presents the opportunity to ensure that the combatants can be separated. Our men and women went into Iraq and they ''made'' the peace. They are peacemakers in a place in the world where peace was an oxymoron.

The recently adopted interim Iraqui constitution, Mr. Speaker, will more likely get further worked once the new assembly is up and running next year, is historic; a constitution which articulates basic fundamental human rights and the rule of law in the Middle East. After Israel, which has an excellent constitution, we now have Iraq. And I think there is a great opportunity for democracy to break out and the rule to be respected and that also mitigates the danger of Iraq which now is a peacemaker itself to its friends and allies in the region.

Finally, just let me say, a previous speaker talked about shame when it comes to our veterans and our men and women who are returning home. I chair the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. We have seen, since the Bush Presidency began, and it continues the trend line of the late 1990s, more than a 30 percent increase in health care funding and we will increase it again this year, and we will do so significantly.

President Bush has signed no less than 16 separate bills to enhance, to expand veterans benefits. The Veterans Benefits Act of 2003 was signed on December 16. There were seven titles to it, filled with very important provisions to enhance veterans benefits. The Veterans Education and Benefits Act contains a 46 percent increase in the GI Bill, 46 percent increase in college funding. I know, because I authored it. I was the prime sponsor of the bill. With no fanfare whatsoever, this President signed that legislation and 15 other bills into law.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that these trying to use veterans issues as a political football would cease on this floor today. We are trying, in a bipartisan way, to meet the obligations and the needs of our veterans. I stand committed to that. This party, and I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, to do so as well, we should all be pro-veteran, and we are matching our words and our rhetoric with funding and with responsive and responsible laws.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), a

distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this resolution, but I am going to do it with a heavy heart. I am going to do it with a heavy heart because this is obviously a politicized resolution. It is a resolution that was designed to make Democrats look bad. It is a resolution which Democrats had no input in whatsoever. It is a resolution that really smacks, I think, of hypocrisy, because when we look at the self-righteousness on the other side, when we had a resolution on the House floor several years ago when Bill Clinton was President to support our troops in Kosovo, almost everyone on the other side voted no.

I am going to vote for this because I support our troops. I am glad that Saddam Hussein is no longer in power, and I am glad that there is an Iraqi Constitution, and that is essentially what this resolution says. I believe that whether one believed that the war in Iraq was justified or unjustified, the fact that we are there now and we cannot cut and run because if we did, Iraq would surely be a terrorist state now if it was not one before, we really cannot cut and run.

But I think my friends on the other side of the aisle really ought to build a consensus. Democrats should have had input into this resolution. Democrats should have been allowed to amend this resolution. If we truly want bipartisanship, then we really need to stand together.

I am troubled that no weapons of mass destruction were found in Iraq. I am troubled that it seems that our intelligence was not exactly up to snuff. I am troubled that the American people were not told the entire truth. But I think we have to come together to support our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say again to my friends on the other side of the aisle, we support our troops whether they are in Iraq, Kosovo, or anywhere around the world, and we have to stand together and say it, not play partisan political games.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 557. Americans should be proud that we are again confronting an evil threat to the Western world. We have done that before and we will do it again. We should be proud of our soldiers and we should be proud of our President.

The last administration did nothing. What we are doing now is making up for what was not done 10 years ago. Ten years ago, we let Afghanistan be turned into a terrorist base. Ten years ago, we let Saddam Hussein continue his dictatorship and yes, the administration before the last, George Bush's father, deserves some of the blame for this; but for the 8 years of the Clinton administration, Saddam Hussein was murdering his people and aligning himself with the terrorists of the world. Yet we did nothing.

Now, I remember voting for the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998. It passed this House by 360 to 38. Now, today, we hear oh, the President of the United States did not justify going into Iraq. Well, many of the people making that point voted for the Iraq Liberation Act in which section 3 of the Iraq Liberation Act authorizes the President of the United States to remove Saddam Hussein by force. Yet this President is taking care of business, while the last administration did nothing. Finally, we have a President who is taking care of business, protecting our national security. And what do we get? What do we hear? Nitpicking and back-biting from day one.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to support this resolution because it indicates that America is standing proud again. We have a President that is providing leadership. We are courageous and we are going to change the course of history. By getting rid of Saddam Hussein, we are going to create a democratic Iraq and we are going to stick it out there. Nobody is going to force us to cut and run; no amount of nitpicking or back-biting will hurt our resolve. We are going to create an alternative for moderate Muslims throughout the world, and that will change history. It will take the power away from the radical Islam. We are taking care of business now. Let us support our troops and our President.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, and 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for purposes of control.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a valued member of our committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first let me just say I rise in total opposition to this resolution. This is another resolution to deceive the American people. This resolution completely distorts and ignores the basis for this war and its costs.

□ 1515

This resolution never even mentions the more than, now, unfortunately, 560 Americans and countless others who have died in this war. This is really insulting, and it is insensitive.

It also leaves out any mention of weapons of mass destruction, which was the rationale for this war. And it claims the war made the world a safer place. That ignores reality.

We had choices. We had options. We did not have to go to war. In the last year, for example, 72 Members of this House voted for my amendment to the Bush administration's war resolution that would have rejected the unnecessary rush to war and instead strengthened our commitment to the United Nations inspections process.

Now we have a resolution today that celebrates this war but ignores its cost, its cost to our soldiers, to our credibility, to our children's future. This pattern of deception and distortion must end.

I tried to offer an amendment to this misleading resolution yesterday. It just expressed our deep sorrow for all those who have been killed in this war and pointed out the terrible toll this war has taken on our own security. The Committee on Rules did not even allow my amendment honoring the sacrifice of our troops or offering the truth about the war. Once, again, the debate is being stifled.

What has happened to democracy in this body? Once again, this administration and the Republican leadership are attempting to trick the American people. And they are neglecting the very soldiers they claim to honor, the men and women who need health care, proper equipment, and veterans benefits, whose families need economic security. We must call them out on this and vote against this resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the opportunity for Members of the Committee on Armed Services to talk about our piece of this important resolution, and that is, I think, the most gratifying part of this resolution, which I think we can all join together on and that is commending our great troops who have been carrying out this effort in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, from the time when they spearheaded this drive up from Kuwait up through the choke points in Nasarea with the Marines out to the east and the Army, the 101st Airborne and the 3rd Infantry Division further to the west and worked up to those choke points at some places where RPGs were coming like volleys of high-tech arrows at those convoys of Humvees and trucks and tanks, to where they got up and went past the bridges before they could be blown, took the positions in the dams before the electronics could be executed to blow those places, and launched one of the most rapid-moving attacks in the history of warfare, with great heroism and great accomplishment, from those days to today when our troops are in this AO, this area of operation, not as much as attackers but in this case defenders of the new freedom of the Iraqi people, and hooking up pipelines and sanitary systems and getting children to school and opening up medical clinics, our people in uniform have performed heroically.

The most important message we can send from the United States House of Representatives is, you did a great job, America's people in uniform. You did a wonderful job for our country. And what you are doing has great value and

will enure to our freedom over the coming decades as well as the freedom of the world.

So, Mr. Speaker, we stand together and even united in commending our troops. I am glad that my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), is here as my partner on this committee to also commend the troops for the great job that they have done.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a valued member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, if the Republican leadership wanted to work on a bipartisan expression of support, we would have been able to get some place today. They could at least have had an opportunity for Congress to step back and examine what we have learned.

We were prepared to win the war in Iraq. It was never an issue. A major concern is that we were not adequately prepared to win the peace, either in terms of equipping or staffing the occupation of Iraq nor preparing the American public for the full scope of the cost and consequences.

Giving too much money to the wrong people to do the wrong things in Iraq is a legitimate object of debate, and I hope that we will some day have it. But, in the meantime, the most important unanswered question is whether the massive investment of the troops, the money, and the attention was best spent rushing to Iraq rather than concentrating on continuing the global struggle against al Qaeda and the other forces of terror.

By delaying for over a year and a half the concerted efforts in searching out bin Laden, it has allowed al Qaeda and other terrorists to gain strength, to metastasize, making bin Laden almost irrelevant other than as a symbol of our policy failure. Our unwillingness or inability to launch a concentrated effort to mobilize global support when we had the entire world united on our side is a sad by-product of this administration's policies.

We are long on celebration; we are short on analysis. We are long on talking; we are short on accomplishment. Congress's job is to know what is going on, define the policy, to fund the right things, and provide oversight. That is our job, and we are falling far short of the mark.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), my colleague and a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this Friday, the President ordered the men and women of our Armed Forces into Iraq. They performed magnificently and have continued to do so despite an ongoing guerilla campaign, difficult conditions, and a shortage of protective gear such as Kevlar vests and armored Humvees.

As we celebrate their courage and skill, we must also reflect on their sacrifice. As of today, 565 American troops have been killed in this war including United States Army Specialist Rel Allen Ravago, IV, one of my constituents.

I will support this resolution because it includes language honoring our troops, but I am very concerned over what the resolution excludes and deeply disappointed that it was not crafted in a bipartisan manner.

Our troops in Iraq are not representatives of one political party or the other, and those who seek to exploit their daring and sacrifice for partisan gain would do well to remember that.

This resolution fails to address a number of serious issues that have arisen as a result of the war. Although the resolution before us makes no mention of it, this Nation went to war over intelligence that Saddam Hussein had both an existing arsenal of biological and chemical weapons and an ongoing nuclear weapons program. A year has passed, and we have yet to find evidence that this was correct.

Clearly, we must look at the totality of the circumstances that led to such a colossal intelligence failure. This failure cannot be minimized or, in the case of this resolution, ignored all together. To do so does no honor to our troops who have been lost and further imperils our future.

The planning for the post-war period of this operation was also deficient and based on a number of unsupported assumptions. Over the past decade and a half, our forces have been engaged more and more in post-conflict operations. Clearly we need to organize ourselves better to meet the challenges posed by post-conflict reconstruction.

In the coming days, I will offer a House companion to a bill introduced in the Senate by Senators LUGAR and BIDEN that does just that, and I hope my colleagues will support it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON), my good friend and distinguished colleague.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, for more than 200 years the men and women of the United States military have, through their valiant actions, earned a well-deserved reputation for courage, honor, and sacrifice in defense of liberty. The brave Americans now fighting and dying in Iraq are heirs to a legacy that flows from Lexington and Concord through Normandy, straight up to the present day. They should be very proud of what they have accomplished in Iraq, and they deserve our firm support as they continue to face danger there.

I am sure that my colleagues who support H. Res. 557 are sincere in their desire to salute our troops. However, I feel they have committed a grave error by confusing the valor and the sacrifice of our troops with the misguided and misleading policy that sent them to Iraq in the first place.

Members of Congress voted in good faith for a resolution on the use of force believing that Iraq was capable of unleashing deadly weapons of mass destruction. We were told that the threat was imminent and could directly impact our Nation's security. Certainly the people of Iraq had suffered from the brutal regime of Saddam Hussein, but this was not the primary reason given for the preemptive strike by the United States.

It is good that Congress is on record listing the many atrocities of Saddam Hussein's regime. Saddam was a brutal dictator. That is not debatable. What is debatable is whether our actions in Iraq have improved the security of the United States and our allies. I therefore question the resolution's assertion that "the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq." In fact, our laser beam focus on Iraq, with no proven connections to 9/11, has allowed al Qaeda to regroup and again unleash its destructive capabilities on one of our closest allies. Moreover, I believe our involvement in Iraq is a major contributing factor to America's declining image around the world, which Margaret Tutwiler, the administration's head official in charge of public diplomacy, admitted "will take us many years of hard, focused work" to restore.

When the President announced on May 1 of last year that major combat operations in Iraq had ceased, I expected a quick draw-down of American troops and a significant increase of United Nations peacekeepers. Tragically, our Nation has lost more American men and women in Iraq after the President's declaration that major hostilities had ended. The total now stands in excess of 565 and is climbing.

This resolution is disingenuous. In its place should be a straightforward resolution of commendation for those who fought valiantly and risked their lives to overthrow Saddam Hussein's regime. And condolences to those whose lives were snatched from them in this most unjustified conflict.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), our last speaker.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today we are asked to commemorate a preemptive war. President Bush told the world there was no doubt Iraq was concealing weapons of mass destruction, but this Republican resolution instead reinterprets history.

It would have the American people believe that President Bush took our Nation to war because in 1988 Saddam gassed the Kurds while President Reagan appeased the Iraqi regime or because Saddam punished the Marsh Arabs by draining the marshlands while the first Bush administration watched.

This resolution memorializes the horrors of a dictator to justify the flawed premise for preemptive war, but it fails to acknowledge the 565 American patriots who sacrificed their lives. This resolution exploits the sacrifices of our troops, the suffering of the Iraqi people, all for partisan gamesmanship.

Our Nation is at war. Our troops, their families, and the American people deserve honesty from this House and from the White House.

We all support our troops. We all want a safer world. And the American people deserve the truth.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I designate each of the following three Members to control ½ hour of time allotted to me under the rule: ½ hour for the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ½ hour for the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), and ½ hour for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the greatest asset our Nation has known, those heroes, and they are heroes, that we call on every time when we need courage and effectiveness on the battlefield, the incredible American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines that reflect the best attributes of those who have served before them; and they are a wonderful reflection of America across our country. So we thank them and we honor them.

Like many Members, I have had the privilege of traveling to Iraq twice, this last time with our minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) from the Committee on Armed Services.

And what was clear is that our men and women are doing an extraordinary job in the most trying of circumstances. They are superbly trained, superbly led, and are just the finest force in the world. We owe them a great debt of gratitude.

We also owe the same to more than 550 families of those who have given the ultimate sacrifice to our Nation in Iraq. But what was also clear in my trips, there was no effective or realistic planning done for the aftermath of the military invasion of Iraq. We did a superb job on the battlefield; but since that time, sadly, as I warned the President in two letters, September 4, 2002, and then one a couple of days before the actual invasion, I feared the outcome and I warned the administration in these letters about what the potential consequences might be of getting the post-war wrong.

□ 1530

Sadly now, we are seeing those consequences come home to roost, and some of the issues that I raised in those letters are sadly coming to pass today.

While the Iraqis now have an interim constitution and we should congratulate them for that, it is no clearer now than it was back in November, when the timetable for transformation was laid out, who will take over on June 30. Now it looks like there will be no status of forces agreement negotiated before that time. Let me tell my colleagues, a status of forces agreement is very important because it can establish limitations. It could establish rules of engagement that make it more difficult for our forces to protect themselves.

Perhaps most dangerously we see more signs of ethnic and religious strife, raising the possibility of a civil war in Iraq. I truly hope that does not happen, but the tensions are growing, and there are insurgents and foreign fighters who have fanned those flames. Today's most deadly and tragic bombing of the hotel in Baghdad seems to be the only recent sign of this. We need to do a better job in planning. Everything we have worked to achieve in Iraq will be undermined if we do not figure out who we are turning sovereignty over to on June 30 and how to manage the transition in a way that avoids civil war.

These are dangerous times. This is not an easy day for our troops or for the leadership in our country, and that is why I raise these issues, Mr. Speaker. The security of the Iraqi people, the security of our troops, the stability in the region, and even our own national security depends on doing this right.

I will support this resolution because I support the men and women who are sacrificing daily, and I support those families who are fighting the insurgency in making Iraq secure, but I urge the administration to do the hard planning, to figure out quickly what will happen after June 30 to hold off a potential civil war, and we cannot have that.

We must not let last year's military victory become a long-term defeat because of more failures due to the tough planning ahead. June 30 is a date that must be taken very seriously by our country. We must make sure there is a stable Iraqi transition, and that it works; because if it does not work, if there is civil war, all of the sacrifices of those young men and women in uniform, whether wounded or killed, and the families that have grieved and shared their burdens with them, will have been in vain. We really, really cannot afford to have that.

So let us praise the troops. And every American should be proud of them as I am.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his thoughtful statement, and I yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

(Mr. SHAW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, and I rise in support of this resolution, support of our troops and particularly pay my great admiration to the 124th Infantry, Bravo Company, that just returned safely to Palm Beach County, Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 557 and to offer my gratitude to all the men and women who have worked, and who continue to work, so hard to serve their country in Iraq. In particular, I'd like to extend my respect and admiration to Captain Joseph Lyon and the reservists of the 1st Battalion, 124th Infantry, Bravo Company, who have returned home safely to West Palm Beach from service in Iraq.

The contributions of these brave soldiers can be seen every day in the numerous improvements in the Iraqi economy and society. With the aid of the Coalition forces, the transfer of power to the people of Iraq is progressing smoothly. Iraqi forces are gradually relieving and will completely replace coalition forces in all aspects of the reconstruction.

I am thankful to all who have helped the Iraqi people establish a stable and peaceful country. By doing so, we defend our people from the danger of Iraq returning to being a haven for terrorists. Today, Iraq is a safer place and is on the road to establishing their own democracy to serve as an example in the heart of the Middle East.

I urge all my colleagues to support H. Res. 557.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities, who spends more time with the troops than he does with us.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of traveling to Iraq twice in the last few months to visit our troops and to thank them for the job they are doing, as well as to see firsthand the progress that is being made by both the Iraqis and the international coalition in providing security and growing stability to the Nation.

I was amazed to see and hear some of the very real and significant success stories that our forces are accomplishing. When one travels by air, for example, over Iraq, it is easy to realize that 65 percent of the Iraqi people live off the land. Many are accomplished farmers, but others are being aided by the efforts of the American soldiers and by American generosity.

In Iraq, the Iraqi Ministry of Agriculture once ran a 400-acre farm not far from where Saddam Hussein was captured. It was called Saddam Farm, and it produced a harvest that benefited only Saddam Hussein and his family. Today, the Army is helping Iraqis establish the nation's very first cooperative farm on that 400 acres. Iraqi farming families are also being helped by the generosity of the American citizens who have donated some $20,000 worth of seeds, and the Army has distributed them.

Throughout my travels in Iraq, I have found Iraqi children with smiles on their faces. It is remarkable to think that they are living in freedom for the first time. They know it and they like it. Like many children throughout the world, Iraqis enjoy the sport of soccer, and I have seen Iraqi children kicking soccer balls on the playing fields and vacant lots and empty streets. American troops have undertaken projects to give soccer balls to some of the poorer Iraqi children who may not be able to obtain for themselves. For example, the 501st Forward Support Battalion undertook one

project and gave away 150 soccer balls to kids in Baghdad. The 101st Airborne also distributed soccer balls in the north.

Perhaps the greatest and most noteworthy accomplishment that I have seen in Iraq, however, is the increase in the level of security and stability for the Iraqi people. Unfortunately, there are still those that want to see a free Iraq fail, but for our troops, many changes in the Iraqi lifestyle have been evident. In many other areas, security and stability are succeeding because of the efforts of the international coalition forces and the Iraqis themselves.

Iraq's security forces have grown tremendously in the last year since they were first created. The Iraqi Department of Border Enforcement now employs 80,000 Iraqis and 9,000 border enforcement agents, as well as to monitor the nation's 3600-kilometer border. More than 11,000 experienced policemen now patrol Iraq, and another several thousand Iraqi policemen will join their ranks by the end of this year.

There is still much to be done in Iraq, but the fact of the matter is that there are many success stories, many more than one reads in the morning newspaper or sees on daily television reports, and certainly many more than I have time to outline here.

The successes I spoke of and the countless others not only are helping Iraq to become more stable, but they are helping Iraqis to provide for that security and stability. Ultimately, the sooner Iraq is run and secured by Iraqis, the sooner our great troops will come home.

I am proud to stand here today and commend the Iraqi people for their courage and to say again thank you to our troops for a great job well done.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman, formerly from Missouri, now from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Missouri for recognizing that Missouri, too, is the State of my birth, and I am delighted to be on the floor today with him because he has provided wonderful leadership for our caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I came today to the floor to shame the Republicans and the President for politicizing this tragic war in Iraq. God bless our soldiers. They do not deserve to be made pawns in political gamesmanship. There are many Members who love and support our soldiers but refuse to be blackmailed into supporting this preemptive strike doctrine of this administration and to be used by this President. Just as President Bush is attempting to use the New York 9/11 scene as a backdrop in his political advertisement, this resolution is being used to paint the picture that this President is a tough leader, fighting terrorism and winning.

Mr. Speaker, this President is not winning. Our country and the world is not more secure. Tragically, over 564 soldiers have died since the war began last year, and thousands more have been injured. The administration has spent $157 billion so far in this war, and even the allies who have supported him are being retaliated against.

If my friends on the opposite side of the aisle were sincere about gathering us all together in a resolution to say to our soldiers thank you for your sacrifices, they would have done what was asked of them by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) today: Pull this one-sided resolution off the floor, get Democrats involved, let us join hands and support our soldiers.

This is the most divisive administration that this country has ever had, polarizing us, putting us at each others' throats. It is a shame, and I do not mind saying it on this floor today. You need to withdraw it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank our great chairman for yielding me the time. And, Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues in this Chamber have any doubt about the necessity of our war against the sadistic and despotic regime of Saddam Hussein, I urge them to look at this photo that I took with Iraqi girls during a congressional trip that some of my colleagues and I went on last December.

If my colleagues take a close look at this picture, they will see bright, sunny faces of happy girls who look like they could live in my district or any of their districts around this country, but the sad reality is that a little over a year ago, these young girls were living under the ugly regime of a murderous dictator who would not hesitate to take their lives or the lives of their friends and family. In fact, from 1983 to 1988 Saddam Hussein wiped out 60 villages and murdered more than 30,000 Iraqi citizens with weapons of mass destruction. Human rights organizations continually received reports from women who said that rape was routinely used by Iraqi officials as weapons of torture, intimidation, and blackmail.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what would have happened to these girls if the United States had not acted against Saddam Hussein's ruthless Baathist regime, but I do know this much. Since the liberation of Iraq, more than 5.5 million children went back to school this year; 2,300 schools which fell into disarray under Saddam's regime have been rehabilitated. School children have books, shoulder bags, notebooks, pencils, papers and desks to use for their studies; but, most importantly, they are now living free from Saddam's repressive regime, and they never have to worry again about being harmed by their tyrannical government, thanks to the strong leadership of President Bush and the heroic efforts of our men and women of the armed services.

I cannot say enough about our troops who risk life and limb every day to bring freedom to these girls and to the other people of Iraq. I urge strong support of this resolution endorsing our troops.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and it is unfortunate that this resolution has become so political because I think clearly all of us should have been able to sit down and come up with a resolution that would be united and that would send a clear voice to all of the world how much we support our troops.

We are going to have 4 hours of debate, and there are so many important things we should be discussing, like the fact that we failed to provide our troops with critical protection and equipment that they need, from interceptive body armor to anti-jamming devices, to armored humvees.

Yesterday, I met with Brian Hart, the father of Private First Class John Hart who was killed in Iraq last October when the unarmored humvee that he was patrolling in was ambushed and sprayed with bullets. Just days before his death, Pfc. Hart called his father and told him how unsafe he felt riding around in humvees that lacked bulletproof shielding or reinforced doors.

The story of John Hart is all too familiar. A couple of months ago, the Defense Department stated that 29 American troops had been killed and 290 wounded on attacks on humvees. Now I hear they are not even tracking those numbers anymore, but I do know that of the 18 soldiers killed in Iraq from Massachusetts, 6 died in unarmored humvees or trucks.

Look at this chart. Almost 80 percent of the 12,500 humvees deployed in Operation Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom lack reinforced windows and doors. The evidence here is overwhelming that we have not gotten what our troops need fast enough.

□ 1545

And what bothers me is that the Army did not even begin to address this shortage until August 2003, 3 months after President Bush announced the end of the war in Iraq. The Secretary of the Army says that they will get this done by August; but as of today no new orders have been placed, leaving our troops, many of them, in this vulnerable position, in unarmed vehicles. August just is not good enough.

For too long, the Army has dragged its feet because it failed to consider quick, effective alternatives to uparmoring Humvees like installing add-on armor kits.

If we purchased more add-on kits and reached out to other vendors, we can get these Humvees armored now.

Recently, 25,000 Marines deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan and took with them 3,000

trucks and Humvees, all of which have been armored with protective plating. The Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Hagee, understood that installing temporary add-on kits provides a quick, easy alternative to uparmoring Humvees in depots at home. So Gen. Hagee purchased $9 million worth of add-on armor kits to outfit Humvees before he sent his Marines back into the battlefield.

I have introduced a resolution urging the Defense Department to use whatever means possible to armor these Humvees as quickly as they can.

If we truly want to support our Armed Forces, this would provide them with the critical protection and equipment they deserve!

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to let my colleagues know that all Humvees are manufactured unarmored. They are basically big Jeeps, and this Congress has been rushing to armor Humvees in the wake of the new threat known as the IED, the remotely detonated device. We put some $400 million in the last supplemental to pay for that armor.

I just would say to my colleagues, it would have been great if they could have voted with us on that one because that is the funding supplemental that paid for the arming of the Humvees.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, that is precisely why I could not vote for it. We were supposed to have this money appropriated. We have troops over there in unarmed vehicles. It is inexcusable.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the idea that you do not armor vehicles because it is not done already at the factory makes no logic to me.

I would urge the gentleman to work with me to continue to armor them, because we are shipping steel in there now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, just as an introduction, it seems to me that, to a certain degree, the other party doeth protest too much.

The first thing I have been hearing about is complaints about intelligence information. Yet it was the other party, the Democrat Party, that under the Church Commission dismantled our human intelligence and has consistently done that. Over the 8 years Clinton was in office, they voted to cut the human intelligence budget 30 percent and now want to complain about the fact that our intelligence information is not that good.

This is also a party that cut the defense budget close to half and wonders why there is not some equipment sometimes. They cannot have it both ways.

But I would like to focus, rather, about what was and what is now. What was, we saw. We saw the late-night knock of the secret police. We saw the torture chambers when I was in Iraq that used to exist. We saw the women that had been raped as a form of political coercion. We saw women that were not educated.

Those things have changed. Because what is now is a society that is moving into a new century, a place where women can be educated, where no longer torture and murder and amputation are used as a tool to intimidate, and where we saw on the streets of Iraq people starting to emerge into a free civilization. There are all kinds of new businesses being formed.

These are words from a brave Iraqi Parliamentarian, probably risking his life, talking about the new constitution. Some, he says, may say that the Bill of Rights is copied from the West. My answer: these rights and values are not exclusively the property of the West. They are universal and should be respected and implemented everywhere. We have put up a high standard so that the people of the future may always try to reach.

I think that is a statement of our success. Americans have always succeeded when we invest in those tremendously important principles of our own founding, the belief that people are valuable. And we continue to attest to that by our presence in Iraq, by our brave soldiers there. They believe people are important, as opposed to the terrorists that say they are mere pawns.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution claims to honor our troops, but it is nothing but a thinly veiled attempt to run a political campaign on taxpayers' time.

We have the best military in the world. I am honored to represent the men and women of Travis Air Force Base in Congress, and I will always be grateful to all of our men and women in uniform for their patriotism, courage, sacrifice, and devotion to our great Nation. As Members of Congress, we must support them in word and deed.

I have been to Iraq and the Persian Gulf twice in the past year to talk to our troops serving there and learned firsthand what they need to get the job done and return home safely. Forty thousand American troops were sent to Iraq without bulletproof vests, and many more still do not have reinforced Humvees to protect them from daily roadside bombs. But this resolution does nothing to get this critical life-saving equipment to our troops.

I am very disappointed this resolution does not offer condolences to the families of the 564 Americans killed in Iraq thus far, nor mention the 2,500 wounded in action.

It is also hard to believe that these congressional leaders would consider a resolution that categorically reaffirms that the United States and the world are made safe by the removal of Saddam Hussein and the Ba'ath Party from power just days after the Spanish people buried more than 200 of their citizens in the worst act of terror in European history, and on a day, today, when a bomb blast killed dozens in Iraq.

Instead of patting ourselves on the back, it is time to ask whether this administration's approach to the war on terror and the war on Iraq have made us safer. Two and one-half years after the September 11 attacks, al Qaeda is more dangerous than ever. The war in Iraq removed a dictator, but has created a new front on the war on terror that did not exist before and has pinned down a large amount of our troops in the Middle East for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote ''no'' on this resolution. I urge my colleagues to support our troops with action, not shameless political ploys, and do the same.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, all too often the voices whining about what they find wrong with our planning, our troops, or our military tend to drown out their great successes. But when I went to Iraq, I found our troops were proud that they had liberated 24 million Iraqi people in just 3 weeks.

The untold story of Operation Iraqi Freedom were the stories describing the logistics warriors who not only accomplished extraordinary things but who were often also put in harm's way to support the phenomenal contributions of our combat troops. Sometimes we just assume that food is going to get there and our ammunition is going to get there, but let me tell you some of the truly amazing logistics work that occurred during this conflict.

The main supply line stretched 350 miles; and on any given time, there were 2,500 logistics and support vehicles on the road. There were 2.5 million gallons of gas per day delivered effectively to fly our aircraft. We built the longest pipeline the Army has ever built, 220 miles long. There were 66,000 pipe sections hand laid to construct that critical system, and it is still in service today serving the Iraqi people. We delivered 1.5 million liters of water a day successfully and effectively. A third of a million meals were served per day. Two million tons of spare parts and equipment were moved effectively every day.

In particular, the tremendous effort of the Army's Quartermaster Corps, the home of which is in Fort Lee, Virginia, are reflected by these totals from the war: 186 million gallons of fuel, enough to fill the tanks of 40,000 cars; they served 53 million meals, enough to feed the entire population of New York State with three meals a day; provided 330 million gallons of water, enough for a daily shower for the half million residents of Las Vegas; and delivered nearly 8 million pieces of mail.

With so much success and such an enormous effort, it should not be hard to find additional improvements to be made. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fitting today that we stand up and pass this resolution to honor their great work.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Guam (Mr. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding me this time, and I rise today in support of our service men and women who need much more than the words we speak here today to help them in Iraq.

As the fires from the most recent terrorist attack today in Baghdad burn against the night sky, I am moved to remember Army Specialist Christopher Jude Rivera Wesley, who died in Iraq, the first Chamorro casualty of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

I also want to take time to pay tribute to Army Specialist Hilario Bermanis of the 82nd Airborne Division. He joined the Army from the Federated States of Micronesia, and after losing both legs and his left hand fighting in Iraq, he has now become an American citizen. I visited him at Walter Reed Medical Hospital. One day he might even become a Senator, like Max Cleland, who also sacrificed for his country a generation before him.

In my mind, this resolution affirms that we are yet to do everything that we can for our troops. We need the best technology to defend our troops and care for the wounded, the best diplomacy to make sure they do not stay a day longer than they have to, and the courage of our convictions to finish the job.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¾ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the leadership of President George W. Bush, the valor of the American military and the courage of our coalition partners, 1 year ago this week the liberation of Iraq started marking the beginning of the end of Saddam Hussein's brutal regime.

My gratitude for this historic success is as a Member of Congress. I had the opportunity to go with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and visit our troops in Iraq. Additionally, I am grateful as a veteran myself. I retired last July after 31 years of service with the Army National Guard, and I am so proud of what our active Guard and Reserve forces have done. But additionally, I am proud and grateful as a parent. I have three sons who are in the military of the United States, and one of my sons began his deployment in Iraq this week. We are very proud in the Wilson family of our contribution and the success of the American military.

Some today have incorrectly accused the administration of saying Iraq was in imminent threat. In reality, the case for the war with Iraq was made precisely because Iraq was not yet an imminent threat. After the hard lesson of September 11, we can no longer wait until our enemies grow stronger and more deadly before we take decisive action to prevent future tragedies.

Saddam Hussein posed a unique danger to the people of the United States and the world. He ignored 17 United Nations resolutions for over a decade, harbored and supported terrorists, and had used biological and chemical weapons on his own people, had a history of violent aggression against his neighboring countries, and attempted to assassinate a President of the United States.

Today, Saddam Hussein's regime of terror has ended and the world is a safer place for it; yet we know the war of terrorism is not over. We need to remain vigilant to protect America's families by promoting this resolution today, and I urge its support. In conclusion, God bless our troops. We will never forget September 11.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, never opened for committee discussion and now closed to amendments, is perhaps a consistent way to mark the anniversary of an unnecessary war that was built on misleading statements, dangerous disregard for the facts, and dangerous policies.

To a person, we believe that our military men and women have done a remarkable job in very difficult conditions, conditions like traveling in tactical vehicles that do not have steel armor, leaving them dangerously vulnerable to grenades, small arms, and roadside bombs. Soldiers in Iraq are hanging flack vests and even plywood on their Humvees in desperate attempts at protection, army officials are quoted as saying, and the casualties mount week by week.

Republicans who choose to slime the records of opponents of this resolution would be better to turn the mirror on themselves. Many of us will be supporting a Democratic budget resolution that will back up our rhetoric with the resources needed to provide equipment, compensation, military housing, child tax credits for military families, and other necessities that are missing in the Republican budget proposal. Let us put our money where our mouth is.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), who provides all those quality-of-life issues to our uniformed services.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today to support House Resolution 557.

Under the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein, the Iraqi people lived in poverty and fear. During his 30-year reign of tyranny, he massacred tens of thousands of his own people, some murdered for their religion and some for their ethnicity.

On March 19, 2003, the United States and its coalition partners launched the first air strikes of Operation Iraqi Freedom. In 3 weeks, Iraqis in Baghdad danced and waved their country's flag as U.S. forces toppled a statue of Saddam Hussein, signaling the end of Saddam's brutal tyranny.

□ 1600

Operation Iraqi Freedom was a military success, courageously executed by American men and women in uniform. It was an operation of unparalleled precision and speed, and was carried out in a way that prevented widespread destruction of Iraqi's infrastructure, lengthy street-by-street fighting or a humanitarian crisis. Food and medical aid flowed into Iraq immediately after the troops and there was no ''adventurism'' by Iraq's neighbors or other destabilizing action in the region.

One year later, Iraqis are engaged in the enormous challenge of rebuilding their country after decades of neglect, and are working with the coalition toward the creation of a secure, stable, sovereign and peaceful Iraq. To date, in nearly all major cities and most towns and villages, Iraqi municipal councils have been formed, and for the first time in more than a generation the Iraqi judiciary is fully independent. More than 600 Iraqi judges preside over more than 500 courts that operate independently from the Iraqi Governing Council and the Coalition Provisional Authority.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. forces are handing the torch to the Iraqi people as they take control, form an army, build an effective police force, and develop a fair justice system.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution. I have a lot of other good stuff to say, but my time has expired.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise first and foremost to thank the men and women of the Armed Forces serving bravely in Iraq, Afghanistan and literally all over the world. I supported the resolution to authorize the war, and in the supplemental request I continue to support those troops and their work, but I must express my continued concerns about the safety of the troops and the haphazard way the administration has proceeded in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we have no end game in sight. Our exit strategy is murky, and our efforts to help this fledgling democracy seem to be going nowhere. When this war began last year, it became clear our troops do not have the

life-saving body armor and vehicle armor they needed. Even with the passage of the Iraq supplemental last November, there are still too many soldiers at risk, and we are experiencing increasing reports of street fire, mines and ambushes aimed at our troops. It is unconscionable that they continue to lack the protective gear they need.

On yesterday's evening news, Houston's CBS affiliate KHOU reported there are still a number of Humvees in Iraq without bulletproof armor, and I will include for the RECORD the news report. In fact, there are Humvees on the streets of Houston that have more safety features than the ones being used by our troops, according to the report. These vehicles are intended to transport soldiers and defend them in the war zone, and the last thing we should hear is soldiers' complaints that their family's sedans are safer than the military's soft-sided Humvees.

A year ago today, we started a war to remove an evil man from power; but in doing so, the lives of our troops are unnecessarily jeopardized by sending them into harm's way without proper armor and underequipped vehicles. Our troops are doing a dangerous job, and I hope the administration will correct these problems.

[From KHOU.com, Mar. 17, 2004]

UP CLOSE: MILITARY LEADERSHIP LITTLE SOFT ON VEHICLE PROTECTION

(By Dave Fehling)

As we approach the 1-year anniversary of the war in Iraq, we're learning more about an additional risk to our troops overseas. Thin-skinned vehicles not designed for combat are currently being driven by hundreds of soldiers in Iraq right now. And several service men have been killed, including one from League City. 11 News looks at the shortage of armor and the rush to fix what some call a deadly miscalculation.

Last October, 20-year-old paratrooper John Hart phoned his parents from Iraq and whispered words that shook them. He felt exposed in his softsided humvee, the same kind in which friends already had been killed or wounded in ambushes. The vehicle offered less protection than the family sedan.

''We were thinking about how best to address it,'' says John's father, Brian Hart, ''when we got news the following week that John had been killed in an ambush.''

John Hart was shot to death in his unarmored humvee, along with Lieutenant David Bernstein, fifth in his class at West Point.

Diane Elliott lives in fear that her husband is also an easy target in his unarmored humvee. ''A bullet came through the humvee and through the back of his seat,'' she says. ''He said there was a bullet hole, just barely missed his head.''

That was the second time Army reserve Captain Roger Elliott escaped death in a canvas covered humvee in Baghdad.

The first time he got hit by a homemade bomb. ''They said it hit the humvee, rolled off and hit the ground, and it blew a big hole in the ground,'' says Elliot. ''Here's the humvee, and screws and nails and everything flying, just goes right through it.''

Captain Elliott's Purple Heart arrived in an ammo box, along with his wife's wedding anniversary gifts.

Bullets, nails and shrapnel go right through the vast majority of humvees in Iraq because they were designed to transport soldiers, not to protect them.

A factory near Cincinnati is the only plant in the world that produces armored humvees. ''This is what we end up with. Fully armored doors, armored perimeter, turret,'' says a factory worker. ''Underbody capable of defeating a landmine.''

And windows that stop bullets. It's the kind of protection soldiers are asking for, and dying for.

''It's maddening,'' says Brian Hart. ''It's absolutely maddening.''

Maddening for John Hart's father, for Roger Elliot's wife. ''How could you not know you need armored humvees when you're going into a war?'' asks Diane Elliott.

And maddening for the parents of Texas National Guardsman Nathan Feenstra who says their son was sent to Iraq with old soft sided humvees, and without new bullet proof vests that have saved an untold number of lives since the war began. ''Basically, they're saying they've done all they can for now, 'It's too late for your unit, but we are preparing for the next group going into Iraq,'' says John Feenstra. ''I said that's not good enough.''

The Feenstras write letters to military leadership, and pray their son comes home alive.

Brian Hart is pressing congress to press the Army to speed up production. The plan in Ohio is boosting output. But some lawmakers are outraged. And the republican chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee called the shortage of armored humvees ''unacceptable.''

The Army Vice Chief of Staff told Congress in September more armored humvees weren't sent to Iraq because ''To be honest, we just didn't expect this level of violence.''

Back in May there were only about 235 armored humvees in Iraq. The army now wants more than 3,000. But it's expected to take until summer of 2005 before the Army gets all the beefed up humvees it wants.

To Brian Hart who made a promise to his son and to the soldiers who brought home his son's body, that's not good enough.

The army says it's rushed all available armored humvees to Iraq, and is sending 6,000 kits to toughen up standard humvees. It's also speeding up production of new armored vehicles.

Meanwhile many soldiers are improvising, using steel plates, rubber mats and sandbags to harden their humvees against attacks.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH).

(Mr. LEACH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, the measure before us contains many consentaneous American thoughts: Recognition that Saddam was a despot of tyrannical proportions; support for a process of democratic self-governance in Iraq; and, profoundly, appreciation for the sacrifice and commitment of Americans serving in our armed forces in these very troubling, indeed dangerous, times.

But as widely accepted as these notions are, care must be taken in this debate to underscore what this resolution is not. It cannot be read either as a Gulf of Tonkin-like resolution giving the Executive a blank check for future actions or considered an indication of Congressional approval of executive action to date.

Many in Congress, perhaps a majority, would be willing to vote for a more expansive resolution, but such is not before us today. Nonetheless, the subject matter of this resolution necessitates a review of what has transpired since the Congress, without my support, authorized military intervention in Iraq a year and a half ago.

All of us recognize that Iraq is a judgmental quagmire. Thoughtful Americans are conflicted. The President has a case for the actions he has taken. But I feel obliged to make clear why I continue not to find it compelling and indicate, in as constructive a way as I am able, the problems that a lengthy occupation may yield and present a theoretical framework and the case for timely disengagement.

Perspective is difficult to apply to current events or for that matter life itself. But it is important to attempt to frame the discussion of the war in which we are engaged in relation to our history, to the development of knowledge (particularly science), and to our relations with other countries.

First our history. In the broadest sense the political history of America has encompassed four great debates. The first was the question of whether a country could be established based on the rights of man. The second was about definitions: whether the concept of ''man'' included individuals who were neither male nor pale. It took over a century, a civil war and suffrage and civil rights movements to bring full meaning to the universal language of the Declaration of Independence. With courage and sacrifice Americans finally came together to embrace the democratic notion that consent of the governed lacked legitimacy unless all individuals of all backgrounds had rights of citizenship.

The third debate is about opportunity, whether individual rights can be protected if every citizen doesn't have a fair crack at the American dream. There are many on-going elements of the opportunity debate, which in the 20th century was symbolized by the New Deal initiatives of Franklin Roosevelt and the counter-weight of the Reagan revolution. But I would like to emphasize an aspect of this debate which gets little attention because it is taken for granted, and that is the role of public education. All young Americans not only have access to public education, they are required by law to attend public schools or comparable alternatives. As society becomes more complicated, educational opportunity becomes increasingly central to advancing social opportunity. And as we look at the narrow schooling provided by madrasses abroad it becomes apparent that how and what others teach has relevance to the security of Americans at home.

The fourth debate is symbolized by Hiroshima and Nagasaki and revolves around the question of whether any right can be valid if it is not underpinned by a right to peace.

In these debates the role of foreign policy is critical, and even when we've looked inward it has been with an eye to establishing a shining city-state on a hill, a beacon for all.

The greatest legislated act in American and perhaps human history is the Declaration of Independence. The universality of its principles constitutes the cornerstone of historic American idealism in foreign as well as domestic policy.

As architect of the Declaration, Jefferson—while never a member of Congress—was our greatest legislator. And as the architect of the Louisiana Purchase, he stands as our greatest

diplomat-president. The precept implicit in the Declaration and the Louisiana Purchase is the notion of individual rights and collective decision-making by a people entrusted with the capacity to make sovereign decisions.

Jefferson was the philosophical godson of John Locke, who borrowed from Thomas Hobbes the 17th century paradigm of a state of Nature where, according to Hobbes, life was nasty, brutish and short.

Hobbes had a pessimistic view of human nature. Self-centered man could not escape from the jungle of human relations. Locke, on the other hand, was an optimist. He also assumed that man was self-centered, but, unlike Hobbes, he believed that individuals were rational enough to recognize the necessity of accommodating the self-interest of others. Civil society—the condition where rules would govern disputes and third-party arbitration would exist—was thus possible as well as necessary.

Whether or not the theoretical constructs that political philosophers relied on three centuries ago have relevance to real life on the planet, then or now, the progress of science has made man's efforts to protect the rights of individuals and society more difficult today. In one of the most profound social observations of the 20th century, Einstein noted that splitting the atom changed everything save our mode of thinking.

Physics has brought us nuclear energy and perhaps a way to help live a modern life without reliance on fossil fuels. Biology has brought us the capacity to extend the life of man by several and perhaps many decades. But just as splitting the atom has a dark side—nuclear weapons—splitting genes has ominous implications, too—the ability to manufacture diseases for which there may be no antidote. Hence the obvious: at no time in human history is there a greater obligation for people in public life to appeal to the higher rather than lower angels of our nature.

This is particularly the case as the world has smallened and friction between peoples has increased in economics, politics and, most profoundly, religion.

Perhaps the most thoughtful speech ever given in Iowa was delivered four decades ago by the Oxford historian, Arnold Toynbee. A decade earlier, Winston Churchill chose a small Midwestern college in Fulton, Missouri, to warn of the dangers of Soviet expansionism; an ''Iron Curtain,'' he said, had descended on Eastern Europe. Toynbee picked Grinnell College to chastise Marxists for shallowly looking at history through the lens of economic determinism and Americans for assuming, in part because of the civil rights movement then underway, that the most contentious issues in the world related to race. Toynbee argued that at this stage in history conflict would more likely erupt because of religious differentiations than economic or racial ones. As we look at the Middle East, at Northern Ireland, at the Balkans, at the divisions between Pakistan and India, Toynbee's observation appears to be vindicated.

Expanding on Toynbee, Samuel Huntington of Harvard has propounded a theory of international relations over the past several decades that suggests that the next great wars are less likely to represent battles between countries than clashes between various civilizations.

Given Toynbee's predictions and Huntington's civilization-clash paradigm, it is appropriate to return to Jefferson, who at the public level strove assiduously to protect individual freedom of religion and at the private level believed that what mattered most was not nuanced differences between religions or denominations, but the moral threads common to all creeds. In terms of guides to individual behavior, it is impressive, for instance, that the Ten Commandments underpin Islam as well as Judaism and Christianity. And the Confucian doctrine of ''shu,'' which asserts that moral behavior should be premised on not doing unto others what one would not have done to oneself, is an inverted kind of Golden Rule.

Despite the fact that history is rife with examples where religious differentiations have caused and intensified conflicts, there is no credible substitute for the constructive role of faith-based convictions. Conflict may be envisioned, but it can be constrained if individuals are taught the most esoteric of precepts: loving, or at least not hating, one's neighbor.

Ironically, genocide, which is disproportionately a 20th century phenomenon, is about weapons of lesser lethality: machetes, bullets, poisonous gas.

But if mankind can't prevent killing up close, the question must be pondered whether there can be any optimism that the world can avoid a cataclysmic exchange from afar of weapons of mass destruction, which would make the greatest crime of mankind to date, genocide, the second-to-last crime in human history. It is simply a short stop from genocide—the killing one at a time of millions—to ''global-cide''—the end in a single stroke of all life on the planet.

In recognition of the 20th century's experience with Holocaust and other brutal genocides, from Cambodia to Rwanda, we have no choice except to change our mode of thinking. Man's instinct to hate must be curbed and social wisdom applied to the new challenges science has thrown at man.

In this context, I want to stress a second challenge of science that has nothing to do with war and arms making but is clearly the largest foreign policy issue of our day. It is the problem of disease. In Iraq more than 500 Americans and perhaps as many as 20,000 Iraqis have been killed in the past year. But over the last two decades 20 million people have died of AIDS and 40 million are infected with HIV. In Africa, Southeast Asia, and Southern Russia, AIDS has hurdled well beyond the groups considered most vulnerable in the U.S. In many countries children are infected through mothers at birth and in several countries a 15-year-old girl is far more likely to have the disease than a 15-year-old boy. We simply must expand resources to stop this disease abroad before it stops our families at home.

Not that everything in the world is dark or unraveling. Promising political breakthroughs are occurring between India and Pakistan; in the civil war in Sri Lanka; in Libya, where Muammar Khaddafi may be giving up a quest for nuclear weapons; and even with North Korea, as six-party talks unfold. Several of these bits of good international news are developing without a central U.S. role; several will require our leadership. My only advice to the Executive is to meet every positive step of others with at least two steps of our own. Progressive change from suspect leaders cannot be sustained if peoples of various societies are not convinced that America prefers extending carrots to applying bullying tactics. We simply can't wait for tomorrow to respond to good omens today. This is especially true of a country like Libya where backsliding is so easy. It may be more difficult with the hermit country—North Korea—simply because paranoia and anti-Americanism run so irrationally deep in the people as well as the government. But constructive steps, especially of a humanitarian dimension, can be taken.

Iowa also has brought some good news to the world. In January I attended the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, and a Conference on the Prevention of Genocide in Stockholm, Sweden. In conversations with Europeans the depth of anti-American sentiment becomes quickly evident. But when asked what state I represent, I was impressed with the sincerity of the positive responses when I indicated I was from Iowa. Everyone knew of Iowa because of the caucuses. In Iowa the caucus process seems a bit mysterious. In other states it is very mysterious, and in Europe it is a full blown mystery. But people in Europe were deeply impressed that individuals seeking the most important political position in the world had to come to the homes and schools and offices of private citizens who, with real care, reviewed their credentials and platforms.

For many years I have had reservations about the caucus system because the ballot is not secret and because participation is not as large as in a traditional primary. But I feel obligated to reconsider and, as a Republican, must tip my hat to the Iowa Democrats for the thoughtfulness with which they advanced American democracy and spotlighted our values for the world. Abroad, people followed but did not necessarily identify with the individual candidates, but everyone was impressed with the process and the care with which citizens carried out their duties.

It is instructive to put the current tension in transatlantic relations in historical perspective. With regard to the profoundest issue—war and peace—attitudes on each side of the ocean have come full circle over the five centuries of interaction.

The U.S. was founded by immigrants seeking refuge from religious persecution and a spate of seemingly senseless wars among European countries and principalities. The new Americans sought to distance themselves from the violence and religious intolerance of the Continent. It was with the greatest reluctance that in 1917 a pioneer country, which had been convulsed with the magnitude of a westward moving Manifest Destiny, determined that blocking a Kaiser's ambitions called for intervention in European affairs.

In the wake of a war trumpeted to end all wars, America retreated into political isolation in the 1920's. After inspiring its creation, we refused to join the League of Nations; and after expanding trade in industrial and agricultural products, we succumbed to economic protectionism in the 1930's. Only a direct attack on our territory caused us to enter World War II.

Today, it is Europe which is looking inward, pre-occupied with its manifest destiny, political integration made feasible by a growing economic union. Increasingly secular Europeans desire to separate themselves from an America that appears to them to be too unilateralist and quick to go to war, too fundamentalist and

thus blind to tolerance, and too simplistic to realize that conflicts with religious overtones are the most traumatic to manage.

When speaking to constituents of the rationale for and against the Iraq War, I have over the past couple of years referenced a set of books that held particular currency in the 1960's: the Alexandria Quartet by Lawrence Durrell. Each of the four books describes the same set of events in inter-war Egypt from the perspective of a different character. While the events are the same, the stories that unfold are profoundly different, causing the reader to recognize that one person's perspective is at best a snapshot of reality. A clear picture cannot be pieced together without looking through the lens of a multiplicity of eyes and experiences.

The Moslem experience gives substantially less weight than the Western experience to the two cataclysmic wars of the 20th century. Despite Lawrence's involvement in Arabia and the battles between Allied forces and Rommel's tanks, the engagements in the Middle East and North Africa were skirmishes compared with the struggles in Europe and the Far East. Not only do Moslems see the 20th century differently from Westerners, but Europeans and Americans have drawn different strategic parallels in the application of common experience to current challenges in the Middle East.

In the immediate aftermath of the First World War, historians and political strategists in Europe rightly concluded that the European alliance system had been too rigid and the assassination of a relatively minor figure, an archduke, should not have precipitated a war of such devastating consequences. Hence European leaders in the 1930's falsely concluded that historical wisdom necessitated initial accommodation with Hitler's adventurism. Too little flexibility caused one war; too little spine led to Munich. In the current context, President Bush sees himself as Churchill rather than Chamberlain, but Europeans see 9/11 as more analogous to the shots fired at Archduke Ferdinand than as a cause for a doctrine of preemption or war with Iraq, a war that could too easily spring into a clash of civilizations. Second guessing is always conjectural because history gives few second chances. Unlike football, downs aren't repeated.

Accordingly, the challenge today on both sides of the Atlantic is to put debate about going to war behind and work together to figure out how we proceed from here. A lot of polite observations have been made that European leaders seem less angry about American decisions related to Iraq this year compared to the differences expressed during the pre-war buildup. This may appear that way on the surface, but my sense is that European judgment, if anything, is more solidified and definitive today. Europeans may have become resigned that events have unfolded without their concurrence. By the same token, frustration that their advice has been discounted has caused anti-American anger to metastasize into anti-American smugness. Europeans believe that their skepticism has been vindicated by events. The stark good-versus-evil clarity that Washington policy makers seek appears to Europeans to be un-nuanced, unsophisticated, and unappreciative of differing judgments.

Americans countenance criticism of our President and his policies by fellow Americans, but we are not so tolerant of foreign dissent. The assumption in Washington is that Continental leaders deliberately sought to undercut U.S. leadership in the world community and that, in particular, the refusal of the French and Germans to support the President's position in the Security Council and NATO has made matters more dangerous for our troops and reconciliation more difficult in the current post-war setting.

On our side of the Atlantic, the sense exists that French and German political judgment has not only been at variance with American ideas but that a concerted effort was made on the Continent to triangulate the terrorist challenge and take advantage of America's dilemma. By distancing themselves from Washington, Paris and Bonn are seen to be encouraging the re-direction of Moslem discord. Whereas the rhetoric of Osama Bin Laden and other extremists was initially anti-Western, it is now more exclusively anti-U.S. The opportunity to transplant America's commercial as well as political position in parts of the world consumed with anti-Americanism appears not to have been lost on the European political-industrial elite.

With all of the attention given to the new transatlantic tensions, the implications of the Iraq war on Russia have received short shrift. But the new European antagonism to America has not gone unnoticed in Moscow. The cleavage between Washington and Europe and the preoccupation of America with the Middle East clearly give Putin a freer hand to advance a less democratic and more nationalistic set of policies at home. This is one reason why it is so important that America and NATO demonstrate then can work together in such areas as Afghanistan, where strategic common ground exists.

Likewise, the priority we have given to Iraq as well as North Korea, two charter members of the so-called ''Axis of Evil,'' means that we have been implicitly forced to subordinate trade and human rights issues with China. China's support, or at least not opposition, in international strategic affairs, has become so central to Administration policy makers that Beijing has been able to downgrade U.S. concerns about the historic shifts taking place in trade terms. A Chinese trade surplus with the U.S. that now exceeds $10 billion a month and an undervalued currency pegged to the dollar that makes flexible trade adjustments impossible are simply not being given the attention they deserve.

Economics and politics have seldom been more intertwined. Yet underappreciated is the prospect that a protectionist backlash of 1930's dimensions could develop if our political policies fail and our government loses respect in the world. Analogously, a political backlash could sweep the country if Washington doesn't develop institutional reforms to protect the political system from vulnerabilities to single-issue and special-interest constituencies. At a time when our foreign policy appears too attentive to ideological forces and too prone to rely on proxy empowered corporations to advance the national interest, Congress has an obligation to aggressively provide oversight of the contracting as well as intelligence judgments advanced by the Executive. Just as committees to review a new intelligence inadequacies are in order, so is a new committee to oversee government contracting related to operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The professionalism and integrity of government decision-making about issues of war and peace must be above reproach. The country can afford neither ideological posturing nor war profiteering.

As for the dilemma of the moment, policy makers have been caught philosophically short. As mistaken as the overestimation of Saddam's WMD capacities was, the greater judgmental error may relate to the political pressure applied to the intelligence community on the issue of Iraqi complicity in the plane strikes on 9/11. Initially, the CIA straightforwardly noted that there was no credible evidence of Iraqi involvement. Then, under obvious pressure, it changed its stance and in presentation after presentation to Congress ominously suggested they had an ''evolving'' view of the role of Iraq, despite, to date, producing nothing of a definitive nature to show why the community changed its initial representation. Hence, the decision to go to war was against the backdrop of public opinion polls showing 60 percent of the American people believed significant Iraqi involvement existed in the 9/11 attack.

Compounding this lack of forthrightness, where the intelligence community knew the situation but refused publicly to differ with the political decision makers, was a judgment showing doubtful understanding of Moslem attitudes. The notion that American forces would be welcomed in Iraq as a liberating force with the well-intentioned option to reshape over time Iraqi political institutions was a mistake of profound proportions. Now, given the anarchy that has mushroomed in the country, Washington is swept by occupation analogies of World War II. Japan and Germany, it is noted, were occupied for more than five years after hostilities ceased. Hence, many are suggesting, we must be prepared to stay at least this long in Iraq.

I have seldom been more apprehensive about an historical analogy. Japan and Germany were the instigators of war; their citizens understood this. Iraqis don't see it this way. They see the U.S. as the aggressor. Images form Al-Jazeera portray a country under siege. In the Moslem world Iraq looks more like a police-cordoned West Bank than a great and ancient society on the move to a better life. Outsiders are viewed as unwanted intruders acting out of great power self-interest, unrespectful of the culture and values of the country being occupied. The irony that it is Shi'a clerics, not American statesmen, who are pushing for democratic elections at this time is not lost on the Iraqis or the Moslem world.

More profoundly, I am amazed that pundits haven't caught on to the possibility that the only thing worse than being wrong in our intelligence assessments of Iraqi WMD would have been if we had been right and thereby taken the risk of precipitating a retaliatory BW attack against Israel or possibly an American city. Biological weapons in the control of petty potentates is mad science in the hands of mad men. To go to war against a country with BW weapons, especially if the initiator has no knowledge where they are, is to hazard more than a clash of civilizations; it is to instigate a potential challenge to the maintenance of civilization itself.

In any regard, if a WMD rationale for intervention can't be established, we must not allow the democracy case to founder. To authorize an additional $80 billion for Iraq and

not be able to find the means to conduct timely elections is preposterous.

Legitimacy is critical for all countries. There may be times and circumstances in which the U.S. national interest requires action without a U.N. sanction. But the U.N. is ignored at great risk, especially when the international community is at odds with a nation state's policies. The U.N.'s help, for instance, could be significant at this point in facilitating elections and helping legitimize new governing structures. If a commitment to a time frame for democratic elections isn't soon forthcoming, the Administration may see an escalation of violence in Iraq led by the Shi'a in the South, thus adding to the traumas precipitated by Saddam's old henchmen and foreign trouble makers in the Sunni triangle to the north, where disorder is so prevalent today.

The judgment call Washington must make is whether to employ something closer to a ''get in/get out'' strategy or one of prolonged occupation. Each approach caries risk, with the likelihood of a certain amount of disorder developing whenever the American presence is reduced. Whether that disorder becomes less deep with time or whether time allows anarchist forces to organize more vigorously and lay claim to a legitimizing nationalist mantle is conjectural.

In the realm of policy timing can often be as important as substance. Just as Senator Dirksen once noted that a billion dollars here and a billion dollars there and pretty soon you're talking about real money, in foreign affairs a week here and a week there can soon add up to a policy dilemma.

The difficulty of timing was underscored this week when some in Washington charged the newly elected Spanish Government with ''appeasement'' for its announced intention to withdraw its forces from Iraq in the wake of last week's bombings in Madrid unless the U.N. role in Iraq is broadened. The language of appeasement may appropriately describe the lack of resolve of Western leaders when they refused to stand up to Hitler's growing power in the 1930s, but it may not be as fair to apply such a term to Spanish policy today. Indeed, doing so may carry irresponsible implications because fear of its connotations may make disengagement more difficult if the country or forces of an occupying power are ever under attack. For instance, if ''appeasement'' is considered the dominant potential issue, U.S. policy makers relinquish their sovereign discretion and instead could give terrorists the determinative say when we will disengage from Iraq. A few radicals could with relative ease launch a steady dose of terrorist attacks on our civilian and armed services personnel and ''force'' us to stay or then be in a position to argue when we eventually leave that they forced us out. That is why it is so critical that we lay out a basis for withdrawal that has nothing to do with the terrorist behavior of Iraqi radicals and everything to do with the establishment of a freely elected leadership.

On the issue of the timing of the hand-over of civil authority I give less judgmental weight in the Iraqi circumstance to historical analogies to the post-war occupation of Japan and Germany and more to a personal anecdote about the manner the Vietnam war came to be concluded. Early in my career in Congress, I was invited to the Library of Congress to join a small group of historians to listen to a lecture by Henry Kissinger about the negotiations that led to the end of that war. The night before the lecture, I perused one of Secretary Kissinger's autobiographic tomes and came across a paragraph that so startled me that I asked him about it in the seminar that followed the lecture. Kissinger wrote that in December 1968, shortly after Richard Nixon had asked him to be his National Security Council director, he met with the President-elect to discuss the direction of the new administration's foreign policy. They determined together, he noted, that their policy would be to get out of Vietnam. So I asked him why they didn't just proceed to do that. Kissinger looked at me for a moment and then uttered words I will never forget. ''Young man,'' he said, ''we meant with honor.'' I then asked him if ''honor'' required escalation. ''Absolutely,'' he responded.

In governance, judgment to be good must be timely. The course of history and attitudes toward America would be very different today if the Nixon administration had acted forthrightly on its own judgment. In Iraq, where we are fast becoming a magnet of instability rather than a force of stability, we must not hesitate. If the issue is democracy, let's hold elections with dispatch and use the democratic transition as the rationalization for deep troop reductions.

If we maintain a heavy presence much longer our president could find himself in a dilemma of the kind Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon came to know too well. There are circumstances in life where the small can humble the powerful. This has the makings of one. Despite the overwhelming nature of our military victory and the courageous commitment and sacrifice of our armed forces, policies can fail if the timing of disengagement is wrong.

This is why clarity of purpose and flexibility of response are so crucial. And why the neocon mantra—''we must see this through''—deserves review. Hasty withdrawal is problemsome; orderly, philosophically cogent decisions to wind down the military dimension of our presence in Iraq should, however, be our highest national interest priority. Democratic elections are the key. They can be held in relatively short order (at least by year's end; preferably earlier) if there is a will and commitment to do so. But the longer we heed the advice of those who want to hold onto power in Iraq, the harder it will be to avert increased terrorism here and abroad.

Here I would like to return to what in most contexts must be considered a rather esoteric paradigm: the Hobbesian notion of a state of nature. Terrorism is a military or, more precisely, militant tool of anarchy. It is the desire of terrorists to make Iraqi society a social jungle, a state of nature where anarchy rather than law rules. Legitimacy of government in this setting can perhaps be precipitated but it cannot be imposed from the outside. Outside pressure is less convincing when it appears to be presented by a singular authority—i.e., the United States. One of the reasons so many countries prefer a strong U.N. role is that such a role not only provides greater legitimization of intervention but greater legitimization of processes leading to a new government. U.S. slighting of the U.N. undercuts governmental legitimizing efforts and causes the entirety of the Moslem world to become more antagonistic to our country.

For our part, we have gotten caught in a web of events we can influence but not control. In the end, legitimacy of any new government in Iraq will depend on consent of the governed. The only wise U.S. policy is to steamroll ahead with a constitutional framework of democratic elections with a pre-announced strategy of large-scale troop withdrawals commencing somewhat before or just after elections are held.

In conclusion, let me suggest a corollary to Lord Acton's maxim that power corrupts and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely. The Leach corollary is that military power tempts and excessive power tends to tempt excessively. America's enormous military strength is critical at this stage in history. But while we are obligated to recognize that its maintenance is imperative, we must also realize that its utilization may not fit, and may indeed be counter-productive, in certain strategic settings. We have to use more than just our own eyes and rely on more that just our own expertise if in turbulent times we are to manage prudently the affairs of state.

Analogies between all wars exist, but comparisons between Iraq and Vietnam are frail. What must be understood is not that Iraq could be as bad as Vietnam; rather, that it could be far worse. Vietnam, after all, involved no WMD issues; and while the North was predominantly Buddhist and the South Catholic, there were no implications of a world-wide religious struggle; nor of a conflict that might last many decades, if not centuries. The issue at the time was Communism and fear that if Vietnam fell, neighboring governments would topple like dominoes. In retrospect, the real domino lesson of Vietnam was about political decision-making. Once the patriotic flag was raised, stands taken, words uttered, one doubtful decision precipitated another, and the pride of politicians did not allow a change of course until the people demanded common sense reconsideration.

In this context, there is an aspect of this resolution that deserves reflective review. It is true, as the resolution asserts, that Iraq and the world are better off without Saddam Hussein ensconced in power. But it is not necessarily true that our country and the world are safer if the overthrow of one thug leads to the creation of millions of rebels with a cause.

It would be a mistake of historical proportions if respectful relations not only between America and the Moslem world but between America and its traditional allies were to rupture. We are obligated to see that they don't.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a very distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 557 expressing the views of the House on the liberation of Iraq. Frankly, I find myself amazed that this resolution is the topic of such an extended and spirited debate.

Who can seriously dispute H.R. 557's main points? The world is safer with Saddam Hussein in prison as opposed to being in power. If anyone questions that, let them ask the citizens of the two Muslim countries he invaded, the Kurds whom he gassed or the Shiites whom he butchered by the thousands. The Iraqi people should be commended for their courage in overcoming 35 years of oppression and they should be

recognized for adopting an interim constitution and moving forward toward a democracy, similar to the same situation faced in our own Civil War.

Certainly the United States military and our allies in the coalition deserve to be recognized for their heroic service and their valor on the battlefield and their continuing struggle in Iraq.

The American people and our allies ought to also take pride in what we have done to improve the lives of the average Iraqi. Since the end of the war, 4.2 million children and 700,000 pregnant mothers have been vaccinated. Over 30 million vaccine doses have been procured and 22 million actually delivered to Iraq. By the end of 2004, 90 percent of Iraqi children will have been vaccinated against polio, tuberculosis, and measles; 600 primary health clinics have been reequipped to provide health care, dozens of schools opened, colleges kept operational and the sanitation extended.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of what America and Americans have done in Iraq. I hope and trust that pride is shared by Members of this House and every American.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members have said this resolution is simply about commending the troops and the people of Iraq. If that were truly the case, this measure would enjoy unanimous support. On the contrary, in what it says and what it fails to say, it attempts to speak to the handling of the war. It glosses over the serious intelligence failures and serious misstatements by the Bush administration concerning Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.

It papers over the lack of preparation for the aftermath of the war as well as the initial failure to actively seek international support and continued lack of it. It ignores the equipment shortages that need to be addressed to protect our troops. It fails to make any mention of the 565 U.S. soldiers who have died in Iraq, or the thousands who have been wounded, or the sacrifices of their families.

The resolution before the House today does not bring credit to this institution. It tries a well-used tactic to divide and conquer. Instead, it is a case of dividing and losing: dividing this House when it is a subject that needs unity and losing further credibility for the Republican House that does not even try to act on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just remind my colleagues if I am reading the same resolution they are, this resolution and I quote, commends the Members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces for liberating Iraq and expresses its gratitude for their valiant service to our country. That is not a political statement, that is a commendation, and it should be from all of us, Democrats and Republicans.

I do not read politics into that, and nobody else should.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I represent Fort Benning, the home of the Infantry in Columbus, Georgia, and I rise in support of the resolution to pay tribute to those Americans serving in uniform who have brought liberty to 24 million Iraqi citizens. It is their courage, commitment, and endurance that made possible the unprecedented success that we have witnessed halfway across the world.

While soldiers are hunting down leaders of Saddam's regime, Americans and Iraqis are working together to construct hospitals and schools and establish a new Iraqi government. As a physician, I know what it takes to provide health care for a large number of patients. That is why it amazes me to learn 52 clinics have been renovated and over 600 have been reequipped to provide primary health care.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to this chart which shows that more than 22 million doses of vaccines have been delivered to 4.2 million Iraqi children and 700,000 pregnant women. In fact, by the end of 2004, over 90 percent of Iraqi children under the age of 5 will be immunized against diseases such as polio, tuberculosis, and measles.

In February alone, 800 tons of high-protein meals were delivered to malnourished children. Sadly, those who oppose us are not idle. I do not know how long the war on terrorism will last, but I know America is right and our military and humanitarian efforts must continue until this evil is eradicated not only in the Middle East but in the entire world.

While we hope our allies will not abandon us when we face inevitable hardships, if necessary, we have the courage and the commitment to stand alone.

Mr. Speaker, my prayers remain with the soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines deployed around the world, and with their families who wait for them at home with love and patience. I wholeheartedly support this timely resolution.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, in October 2002, I voted to authorize the use of force to remove Saddam Hussein, and I would again. I think it was the right decision for this country.

I agree with the resolution statement that the world is safer with the removal of this leader from Baghdad; I believe it is. And the succession of changes that we have seen in Syria, Libya, and Iran are evidence of that.

I went to Iraq in January and saw young people serving this country in uniform and the leadership that they showed us, and I was so proud of them. They have never let us down.

I think today with this resolution we are letting them down. Leadership is about unifying people; it is about healing wounds; it is about bringing people together. There are many patriotic Members of this body who in good faith believe the world is not safer because Saddam Hussein is gone. I respectfully disagree with them, but we should have been able to come together today on the first anniversary of the initiation of hostilities and focus on the soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines and the guardsmen, and we should have been able to focus on what we agree on; and what we agree on is we respect their service, we mourn the loss of our dead, we are ready to heal those who have come home wounded, and then we are ready to debate the foreign policy of this country as to how we should go forward. We have let our troops down by this resolution, and it is a shame.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¾ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, no one can ever forget the horrific attacks on our Nation of 9/11. Our lives changed that day; the world changed that day; and America looked for answers and we looked for justice. And we looked, most importantly, for leadership.

I think the terrorists, recognizing the very limp response that America had made to terrorist activities during the 1990s, probably thought we would make a lot of noise, we would be out here rattling our sabers, and then go back to our comfortable lifestyles and that we would not respond in any meaningful way.

Well, these cowards, these terrorists who prey on the weak and innocent, seriously underestimated the will of the American people, and they certainly did not understand the political resolve of our great President George W. Bush, our President who understands that his constitutional responsibilities are to protect the homeland, to protect Americans.

And so we went to Afghanistan and toppled the Taliban. We went into Iraq where we liberated the Iraqi people from the oppression of Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity to travel to Libya where we met with Moammar Qaddafi, and as we all know, he has opened up the borders to Libya to let the Atomic Energy Commission come in and voluntarily dismantle his nuclear program. Apparently he watched Saddam Hussein get drug out of a rat hole and thought this regime change is not all it is cracked up to be. Clearly the Bush doctrine is working.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize the brave Americans who have lost their lives fighting for freedom, fighting the war

on terror. We recognize that battle is not over yet. Every one of them is a hero, every American who puts on the uniform is a hero, and we thank our partners in the coalition as well. God bless them all, God bless our Commander in Chief, and God bless America.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I support commending our troops, but I believe the war with Iraq did not make the United States safer. We know that Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11 and no connection to al Qaeda which poses the real threat to the safety of the American people.

We know that the war in Iraq diverted resources from the war against al Qaeda and the Taliban, which is staging a resurgence in Afghanistan today. We know that the war in Iraq alienated our allies whose help and intelligence we need to fight the real threat, the Islamic terrorists. We know that the war against Iraq makes it much harder to take action, perhaps military action, if necessary, to deal with the very real potential threat of a nuclear-armed Iran.

After the administration misled this House, misled the American people, and misled the world about the nonexistent Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, who will believe us if we need to act against the real nuclear threat from Iran?

□ 1615

I believe this war made us less safe because it dealt with a phantom threat, not the real threat. It diverted resources from the real threat. This resolution is good in commending our troops, but untruthful in saying the war against Iraq made us safer. Therefore, I cannot vote for it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I proudly yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), a member of our committee.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on behalf of House Resolution 557. The U.S. investments in the war on terror and in Iraq are proving worthwhile and are making the world safer. As of February 2004, 44 of the 55 most wanted former Iraqi leaders are dead or in custody. The Iraqi people have created and signed an interim constitution guaranteeing basic freedoms, rights and protections to all Iraqis previously unrealized in Iraq.

I visited Iraq in October and saw firsthand that Iraqis are much better off than they were under the oppressive regime of Saddam Hussein. Children are able to go to school without being taught government propaganda. Small businesses are able to open. Iraqi citizens have access to health care formerly denied to them, and once neglected infrastructure is being rebuilt. No one who argues against this resolution can deny that Saddam Hussein was an enemy of the United States and an enemy of the Iraqi people. The war on terror has encouraged nations to protect their national security, track down and arrest known and suspected terrorists, and to make ovations to the international community in order to create a more peaceful and stable environment.

Last fall, the United States stopped a ship carrying nuclear components bound for Libya. Recently, Libya voluntarily turned over equipment from its nuclear weapons program to the United States. Had Libya kept these materials, they had the ingredients to create nuclear weapon capabilities. The 50,000 pounds of machine parts to enrich uranium is just a small portion of the material and information that they have turned over. Qaddafi himself has cited the fall of Saddam Hussein as a reason for Libya abandoning its nuclear weapons of mass destruction program. Can anyone have imagined a nuclear power as Libya?

Libya's decision is an example of the administration's tough line against states that sponsor terrorism and have unconventional weapons programs. United States investments in Iraq are proving themselves effective. Iraq is a safer nation, as is the United States. I commend our Armed Forces of the United States and the coalition forces.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. First and foremost, let us all begin by thanking and saluting each and every American soldier, more than 500 of whom have died, thousands who have been injured, and several hundred thousand who are on active duty today, for their service and continued service doing what they are commanded to do every day. But under the shield of commending our troops, the sponsors of this measure are trying to run through what I believe is a resolution that does really nothing to, one, equip our soldiers with the body armor they still need and the extra protection for the armored vehicles that they use in Iraq, does nothing to restore veterans benefits that President Bush's budget proposes to cut for health care for our veterans, does nothing to bring in meaningful assistance from our so-called coalition partners or the international community to help patrol the streets of Iraq and rebuild the nation and the billions of dollars it will cost. And this resolution does nothing to lay out the exit strategy this Nation will need to tell our troops when they will be able to come home and when we will be able to stop spending the billions of dollars every day abroad.

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution which can commend our troops, and should; but it does nothing to move the ball forward.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would just take a minute to remind my colleague that every single soldier in Iraq has body armor as does every single civilian worker in Iraq and that the gentleman who just spoke voted against the very supplemental that sent that body armor to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), who has spent so much time with the troops and is home to the 82nd Airborne, the All-American Division.

Mr. HAYES. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do represent Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, the epicenter of the universe. I rise with great pride and admiration to support this resolution because of those troops.

The tragic events in Spain last week and in Iraq today remind us that terrorism is an ongoing threat to people around the world. However, today we live in a world that was different just 1 year ago. The Iraqi people were living under a tyrant, a brutal dictator who gassed his own people. The U.S. military victory in Iraq was unprecedented in military history. Our brave men and women in uniform liberated 24 million Iraqi people in just 3 weeks. Because of the actions and sacrifices of our troops, the regime of Saddam Hussein has been deposed and Iraq is on the path to becoming a free and prosperous nation.

The U.S. military victory in Iraq was truly unprecedented. On March 19, 2003, offensive operations began with air strikes against Iraqi leadership positions. Operation Iraqi Freedom was executed with a combination of precision, speed, and force that stunned our enemy. Soldiers and Marines, many from my home State of North Carolina, charged to Baghdad across 350 miles of hostile territory in one of the fastest military advances in the history of warfare. I am proud of those soldiers at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base and other posts around this wonderful country. The Hussein regime fell on April 9. By April 15 after only 27 days of offensive operations, coalition forces were in relative control of all major Iraqi cities.

I would like to highlight some of those military victories. Coalition forces carried out hundreds of raids and thousands of patrols seizing caches of enemy weapons and massive amounts of ammunition that can no longer be used against our troops or innocent civilians. As of February, 44 of the 55 most wanted Iraqi leaders are dead or in custody.

In addition to bringing down Saddam's regime with great skill, courage and speed, we can also be proud that our military conducted operations with minimal collateral damage to the country's infrastructure. No neighboring countries were hit with Scud missiles, as was the case in the first Gulf War.

Mr. Speaker, when I was in Iraq, Command Sergeant Major Gainey gave me the following quote: "You have never lived until you have almost died. For those of us that have been deployed or fought for it, freedom has a

special flavor the protected will never know.''

God bless our troops and protect them.

Mr. Speaker, I represent Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base and I rise in strong support of this resolution. The tragic events in Spain last week and in Iraq today remind us that terrorism is an ongoing threat to people around the world. However, today we live in a world that was different just one year ago. The Iraqi people were living under a tyrant, a brutal dictator who gassed his own people. The U.S. military victory in Iraq was unprecedented in military history. Our brave men and women in uniform liberated 24 million Iraqi people in just three weeks. Because of the actions and sacrifices of our troops, the regime of Saddam Hussein has been deposed and Iraq is on the path to becoming a free and prosperous nation.

The U.S. military victory in Iraq was truly unprecedented. On March 19, 2003, offensive operations began with air strikes against Iraq leadership positions. Operation Iraqi Freedom was executed with a combination of precision, speed and force that stunned our enemy.

Soldiers and Marines, many from my home State of North Carolina, charged to Baghdad across 350 miles of hostile territory in one of the fastest military advances in the history of warfare. I am particularly proud of the soldiers, airmen, special operations forces and others from Ft. Bragg and Pope Air Force base in my district in North Carolina. The Hussein regime fell on April 9, 2003 and by April 15 after only 27 days of offensive operations, coalition forces were in relative control of all major Iraqi cities, including Baghdad, Basra, Mosul, Kirkuk and Tikrit. Iraqi political and military leadership had collapsed.

I would like to highlight some of our military victories. Coalition forces carried out hundreds of raids and thousands of patrols, seizing caches of enemy weapons and massive amounts of ammunition that can no longer be used against our troops or innocent civilians. As of February 2004, 44 of the 55 most wanted former Iraqi leaders are dead or in custody, as well as thousands of other Baath Party loyalists and terrorists.

In addition to bringing down Saddam's regime with great skill, courage and speed, we can also be proud that our military conducted operations with minimal collateral damage to the country's infrastructure. No neighboring countries were hit with Scud missiles as was the case in the first Gulf War. There were virtually no instances of civilian casualties, nor were there large masses of fleeing refugees. Bridges were captured intact and rail lines protected. Dams were taken whole and villages were not flooded. Oil fields were protected and we denied Saddam's regime the opportunity to ignite widespread oil field fires. Of 250 wells in the key sections of the Rumaila oil field, only nine were detonated, causing just seven fires.

Operation Iraqi Freedom will go down in military annals as a truly unprecedented offensive. The Saddam Hussein regime was not a government of benevolence; it was a reign of terror. The U.S. men and women in uniform have deposed of that terror with their remarkable achievements.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to Iraq twice: the first time right after major combat operations ceased and we witnessed a country just beginning to consider life in the post Saddam era. The second time I visited was just this past month. Along with Leader PELOSI and Ranking Member SKELTON, we saw incredible progress being made. Command Sergeant Major Joe Gainey, one of the outstanding soldiers with whom we met, shared with me his favorite quote. I would like to share it with you:

You have never lived . . .
Until you have almost died.
For those of us that have been deployed or fought for it,
Freedom has a special flavor . . .
The protected will never know.

Our military success is about that freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my heartfelt thanks and admiration to our men and women in uniform for their service and success. May God protect and bless them as they secure freedom for Iraq and protect freedom for America.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. I would like to thank the ranking member for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues on the House Committee on Armed Services, I have been pleased to provide our troops with the support and the equipment that they need to succeed in their mission, and I have had the privilege of traveling to Iraq to meet with some of them personally. I am so proud of the job that they are doing. God bless them. Iraq's transition to democracy and the ongoing war on terrorism will pose new challenges for our men and women in uniform, but they may take comfort in the knowledge that this Congress stands behind them.

Yet despite the fact that every Member of this Chamber supports our troops, this resolution was prepared with no input from Democrats. Just as the administration has adopted a ''go it alone'' strategy on numerous foreign policy initiatives, the House leadership has done the exact same thing when drafting legislation. This resolution could have and should have been prepared with bipartisan input. I am disappointed that inappropriate tactics have overshadowed the unanimity we share in support of our Armed Forces.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a most distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, as we speak here today, progress is being made in Iraq. As chairman of the Water and Power Subcommittee, I have visited Iraq and witnessed firsthand their accomplishments. With our help, they have surpassed prewar electrical generation levels and are on track to be generating at almost 140 percent over their prewar level by June. Water facilities are currently operating at 65 percent of prewar levels and are improving. Current projects include the rehabilitation of 15 water treatment facilities and a canal to Basra. These projects will benefit millions of Iraqis and provide for a future of water reliability.

But make no mistake, we did not go into Iraq to improve water infrastructure or increase electrical power capabilities. One year ago, this country, along with our allies, made the decision to topple a tyrannical regime, liberate a people, and help build a democracy in the heart of a terrorist breeding ground. However, the gift of freedom and democracy is being built on the basic level of services and quality of life which they are building today. We must stand by the Iraqi people in their long and challenging journey toward democracy because their freedom contributes to our security and the security of the world.

God bless America and God bless our troops.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member on the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

As we near the 1-year anniversary of the commencement of hostilities in Iraq, now is an appropriate time to examine how we got into the war in Iraq in the first place. The resolution before us contains many ''whereas'' clauses about how brutally Saddam Hussein treated his own people. I agree with those clauses. But let us not fool ourselves about the reason the American people were told that we needed to launch a preemptive war against Iraq. Over and over again, President Bush and his senior advisers told us that we needed to go to war to protect America from weapons of mass destruction.

Several months ago I asked my staff to prepare a comprehensive analysis of the statements made by the top administration officials most responsible for making the case for war. Yesterday, I released the results of this work in a report entitled ''Iraq on the Record.'' Members can find the report, and a searchable database of administration statements, at www.reform.house.gov/min. What we found was that the President, the Vice President, and other top administration officials repeatedly and systematically misled the public about the threats posed by Iraq. They made claims that Iraq posed an urgent threat; they exaggerated Iraq's nuclear capabilities; statements that overstated Iraq's chemical and biological weapons; and statements that misrepresented Iraq's relationship with al Qaeda. We judge whether a statement was misleading based on what intelligence officials knew at the time the statement was made, not what we know now.

If Congress really wanted to show respect for the troops, it would enact legislation calling for an independent commission, a real independent commission to examine how the President and his top advisers made hundreds of misleading statements to the American public.

The resolution before us is reminiscent of these statements. Vice President CHENEY said: ''We do know with

absolute certainty that he, Saddam Hussein, is using his procurement system to acquire the weapons he needs to build a nuclear weapon,'' when this resolution says the same thing so unequivocally, quote, ''the world has been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein.'' I hope that is true, but we do not know it yet. Ask the hundreds who have died since Saddam Hussein was captured.

The purpose of this resolution is an attempt by the Republican leadership to divide us, not to unite us behind our troops. They are using the sacrifice of the lives of our young men and women for their own political gain. I will not vote for this resolution or against it. I will vote ''present'' as an act of disdain for those who want to play politics with the lives of Americans and the credibility of this great Nation as the world's leader.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just make a point to the gentleman who just spoke, that every Member in this House received a personal invitation from me for classified briefings dealing directly with our intelligence agencies with the opportunity to ask any question they wanted to ask so that when they made the vote on whether or not we should go into Iraq, they could make an informed vote. I presume that the gentleman accepted that opportunity and made an informed vote based on his own understanding of what the situation was. Let me just reiterate that every person in uniform in Iraq has full body armor, as does every civil servant.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the point of difference today appears to me to be the question of are we safer. I could not disagree more with my colleague from California on this issue.

□ 1630

It is not a question of truth or falsity or even of credibility. It is a question of judgment, a judgment that we collectively exercised as a body when we undertook our responsibility under the Constitution to authorize the use of force in Iraq. There were some things that were very important to me when I made that decision, which are reinforced here today. We knew that Saddam Hussein had used weapons of mass destruction against his own people and against his neighbors. We knew that he had tested unarmed aerial vehicles with sprayers. We knew that he had another unarmed aerial vehicle program with smaller drones that they were building and testing at long ranges. And we knew that that unarmed aerial vehicle program sought to purchase route mapping software over the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, September 11 we watched 3,000 people die in a morning. That would be a footnote in American history compared to someone determined to use disease to kill Americans. This is a question of judgment, and we did the right thing to remove Saddam Hussein from power.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

National security is not only a bipartisan effort, it is truly a nonpartisan effort. On the Committee on Armed Services, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), we do our very best to be bipartisan in nature. And, frankly, it concerns me a great deal that no Democrat was even asked to make a recommendation on what might or might not be in this resolution. I would have included several items including reference to the families. I would have included reference to those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice. I would have included a wish that the transition on June 30 be done correctly. And I would include that there should be increased international participation.

But I was not given that opportunity. Young men and young women from Democratic homes and from Republican homes and from Independent homes have paid the ultimate sacrifice. And I think it is incumbent upon everyone that offers such a serious resolution as this to give everybody an opportunity to make recommendations and to help write it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I would relinquish to the next group that has jurisdiction for the next hour.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This is a picture that Mr. Stavenas of our staff took of a reenlistment ceremony at Saddam Hussein's spider hole in Iraq. It symbolizes the willingness of our military, our soldiers, our people in uniform, to come back under very difficult circumstances and reenlist and continue to fight this wonderful fight for the United States and for freedom. And our soldiers have done a great job for us, and this resolution is commending those soldiers. All those people who wore the uniform of the United States supported our country at a time of need and are continuing to undertake the biggest deployment right now, redeployment, since World War II.

Let us all stand behind them, Republicans and Democrats, cast off the partisan positions that have been taken today on the House floor, and let them know that we support them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 557 and claim the time set aside for us under the rule, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, our President, having exhausted all other options, made the decision to take action against Saddam Hussein and the threat posed by his evil tyranny. During that course, the debate about that, this House was presented with an overwhelming body of evidence detailing the brutal inhumanity of Saddam Hussein and his regime, the suffering of the Iraqi people under his repressive dictatorship, the threat that Saddam presented to his neighbors and to the world, and indeed the piles of bodies in neighboring countries he left behind. Today, now that Saddam has been removed from power and the mass graves, the secret laboratories, the vast military stockpiles, missile capacities that he had, have all been exposed to the world, the world is a safer place. Certainly the Iraqi people, all Iraqi people, have a new hope for a better future today than they did just a year ago. Just a year ago. What a remarkable accomplishment by our troops and the coalition.

Yet we continue to hear claims from some that the liberation of Iraq, no matter how worthy the result, no matter how necessary to improving U.S. national security, was somehow a flawed endeavor. Yes, it was hard, but they claim it was a flawed endeavor because the intelligence that the United States had prior to the war was not perfect.

Some apparently feel that either the Intelligence Community was pressured by the administration into stating that Iraq was a threat or the Intelligence Community did not really believe Iraq was a threat but the administration misused the intelligence provided to it. The truth is neither of those are correct. But that has not deterred some conspiratorially critics from contorting themselves, trying to make both arguments simultaneously.

Looking back about a year and a half ago, while the Intelligence Community was focused heavily on Iraq, the President stated that Saddam was ''a grave and growing threat.'' And he was right. Today we have the benefit of hindsight, of a presence on the ground in Iraq, and of the thousands of hours of studying all there is to study on the prewar intelligence picture of Iraq, and we have barely begun to get that job finished.

Taking advantage of all these benefits, I would like to share my assessment so far, and I would note that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House, and I know of the Senate also, is underway in coming forward with a formal review of all this, which I hope we will be able to share with our colleagues before too long. That is our plan.

The intelligence picture of Iraq, of the threat Iraq posed to its neighbors and to the United States, including the assessment of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, was entirely consistent over a period of almost a decade. The assessment is consistent in the finished intelligence and the daily current intelligence pieces from the mid-1990s onward. It is consistent in the classified records that have been provided to the House Permanent Select Committee on

Intelligence over the past year. So I have to conclude on that basis alone, if the intelligence adjustments regarding Iraq were the result of political pressure or manipulation, any such machinations must have occurred in the middle of the 1990s. But I do not believe that that is the case. Therefore, if the intelligence picture is unchanging, was there a change in the substance or tone used by this administration to describe that threat? We do not need to go to the Intelligence Community or to any classified records to answer that question. We just need to compare public statements that have been made, and they are available to the world.

In 2003 President Bush said this: ''Today, the gravest danger in the war on terror, the gravest danger facing America and the world, is outlaw regimes that seek and possess nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. These regimes could use such weapons for blackmail, terror, and mass murder. They could give or sell those weapons to terrorist allies who would use them without the least hesitation.''

In 1998 then President Bill Clinton said: ''In the next century,'' which is now, ''the community of nations may see more and more the very kind of threat Iraq poses now, a rogue state with weapons of mass destruction, ready to use them or provide them to terrorists . . . who traveled the world . . . if we fail to respond today, Saddam . . . will be emboldened tomorrow by the knowledge that they can act with impunity.''

And again in 1998, then President Bill Clinton said: ''There should be no doubt, Saddam's ability to produce and deliver weapons of mass destruction poses a grave threat to the peace of that region and the security of the world . . . His regime threatens the safety of his people, the stability of his region and the security of all the rest of us.'' President Clinton, 1998.

Fast forward, 2003, President Bush: ''Some have said we must not act until the threat is imminent. Since when have terrorists and tyrants announced their intentions, politely putting us on notice before they strike . . . Trusting in the sanity and restraint of Saddam Hussein is not a strategy, and it is not an option.''

Actually, there is not a lot of difference in the leadership that was taking place in this country on the question of the threat that Saddam Hussein and his regime and weapons of mass destruction that might be at his disposal were to the rest of us. It is pretty clear that that was a consistent view.

So, were the intelligence assessments perfect? No. In fact, comparing the intelligence assessment to what has been found in Iraq today, it is clear there were insufficiencies in our intelligence capabilities and they are of concern to us, and on a bipartisan basis we are looking into that. What was the cause of these insufficiencies? Perhaps Iraq, under Saddam, was a difficult target. It was sort of a denied area. There was a ruthless security apparatus there that made information gathering inside the country extremely difficult, very dangerous. We also know that Iraq instituted a truly massive denial and deception program designed to mislead anyone attempting to learn about Saddam's weapons of mass destruction and related programs. Virtually everybody who tried found out that he was involved in denial and deception. So these factors made intelligence collection a little difficult, but it is the tough job that intelligence is there for.

So, what else? I found that cuts in intelligence resources, personnel, and political support in the mid-1990s made many aspects of the intelligence mission in Iraq even more impossible than what we are up against.

Where were these cuts most severe? In the case of Iraq, it turns out it was the decline in our intelligence capabilities that hurt the most. Human intelligence is where we get more than pictures, more than fragments. We get insight into the plans and intentions of our target. What is going on in the minds of the troublemakers? And without good human intelligence, HUMINT, as we call it, it is very difficult indeed to get an accurate picture of what an adversary is up to.

Yet from 1991 to 1998, a time of cutbacks for military and intelligence resources across the board, our human intelligence capabilities suffered dramatically. The number of officers collecting information shrank by about a quarter; the number of operating locations overseas dropped by about a third; reporting sources declined by almost 40 percent; and the number of intelligence reports produced were cut in half or thereabouts.

So we add on top of that the politically correct ''nice spies'' guidelines that were posed in 1995, the risk aversion problem, and we begin to see why information in Iraq was so hard to come by. Good information about plans and intentions, the eyes and ears, just were not sufficient.

So despite these severe limitations, I think the scorecard shows that the United States Intelligence Community provided the best assessment it could. And referring Members to the Director of Central Intelligence's recent speech at Georgetown, the assessments were not as far wrong as some critics of the war would have us believe.

In the final analysis, I think it is important that we get it right. Saddam was a threat. The United Nations believed he was a threat. The vast majority of the Western nations, even those outside of the U.S.-led coalition, believed he was a threat. The U.S. Intelligence Community assessed consistently that Saddam was a threat. The previous administration told the American people that Saddam was a threat. And it has been the official policy of the United States to seek regime change in Iraq since 1998 across two administrations. The difference between 1998 and 2003 is that President Bush took the bold action necessary to address a grave threat where others before him did not. The world is a safer place for it.

□ 1645

Freedom is not free. The purpose of this resolution is to recognize the hardships that the men and women who are doing the dangerous, risky work of protecting our freedoms, the people in our military services, the people in the coalition, the people who are taking risks. After a year, we are here to say, you are doing great work, keep it up, we are so grateful.

We are also including some applause for the people of Iraq who have gone through miserable times and now have some hope, and they have completed the remarkable achievement of a temporary constitution already. This is the sign of a spirited people who are looking for a better life.

This resolution simply says that and commends that. I believe we can all agree that these are the times that we can get together and say, well done, more to do, let us get on with it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I came here to talk about how we can improve this resolution, but I would like to say to the able gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS), the chairman of our committee, that some of the things he just said in his opening remarks might deserve amplification. It is true that during the 1990s, overwhelming bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress approved cuts in funding for intelligence. So strong was this bipartisan position that often no one called for a recorded vote; Intelligence budgets were approved on a simple voice vote. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is correct that overseas intelligence operations were canceled and that the core of our overseas intelligence operations declined by about 25 percent. But what he failed to mention is that those cuts were ordered by the 41st President, President Bush. They were supported by more than 95 percent of Republicans in Congress, including the gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS).

What I am here to say today, however, is that this resolution could be improved if it called for steps now on a bipartisan basis to fix what are obvious intelligence problems. In addition to commending our troops, we should be calling for action to make them safer.

Had I been consulted on this resolution, I would have suggested adding a clause calling on the President to acknowledge the obvious problems with our intelligence and to take steps to fix those problems now. Had I been consulted, I would have insisted on adding language applauding the brave and

dedicated cadre of people serving in Iraq and around the world as intelligence officers. They work in the shadows with little thanks and recognition.

Mr. Speaker, the terrorists are clearly not waiting for us to fix our intelligence, witness today's tragic bombing in Iraq and last week's bigger tragedy in Madrid. The insurgents in Iraq are not waiting for us to fix our intelligence. Ask the young men and women at Walter Reed Hospital.

The North Koreans and Iranians are not waiting for us to fix our intelligence. Their nuclear weapons programs are far more advanced than Iraq's ever were. As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the chairman of our committee, acknowledged this morning, the world is not safe just because we removed a brutal dictator. We all know this. It will not be safer until we fix our intelligence.

After deep study on the Select Committee on Intelligence, it is clear to me that our senior leaders remain in a deep state of denial. There are no discernible signs from the President or the Vice President acknowledging the obvious flaws in our intelligence systems and committing our country to fix the problems now. Force protection in Iraq depends on accurate, timely, and actionable intelligence to counter terrorism and insurgency. We must do better.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), and chairman of one of our critical subcommittees.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 557, recognizing the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant services of American and coalition forces.

In the years since the United States led a coalition of willing States to disarm Saddam Hussein, we have arrested a dictator that killed hundreds of thousands, possibly as many as 1 million people, during his reign. We have returned children to school and given the Iraqi people a new destiny.

I have been to Iraq several times. It continues to be a dangerous place. Iraq is also a complicated place. There has been a considerable amount of debate and attention to what we knew before we went to war and how well our intelligence is measuring up with the realities on the ground in Iraq.

I would like to take this time to clarify the record on a number of charges that have been levied against both the administration and our intelligence community.

A number of Members who voted for the Iraq war resolution claim they did so because they were fooled by the President who overstated the threat from Iraq. In fact, some suggest that the administration knew Iraq did not have weapons of mass destruction and went to war regardless of the facts. These critics do not understand the difference between intelligence and policy formation.

The President considered the intelligence in Iraq and calculated the risk of engaging in a conflict with Iraq and decided war was just. He took action, and we are all safer as a result. Some argue that the President portrayed Iraq as an ''imminent threat,'' that the administration misled the American public by overstating the threat posed by Iraq. This is what he said in January 2003, 2 months before the war: ''Some have said we must not act until the threat is imminent. Since when have terrorists and tyrants announced their intentions, politely putting us on notice before they strike? If this threat is permitted to fully and suddenly emerge, all actions, all words, and all recriminations would come too late. Trusting in the sanity and restraint of Saddam Hussein is not a strategy and it is not an option.''

In fact, this President's statements on Iraq are not all that different from the previous President and his administration's remarks when they discussed the threat posed by Iraq: ''If we fail to respond today, Hussein and all those who would follow in his footsteps will be emboldened tomorrow by the knowledge that they can act with impunity.'' And: ''What if he fails to comply and we fail to act? Some day, some way, I guarantee you, he will use the arsenal.''

These were President Clinton's words in August of 1998.

Another quote: ''And, indeed, we have information that Iraq has assisted in the chemical weapons activity in Sudan. We had information linking bin Laden to the Sudanese regime and the Al Shifa plant.'' These words were written by former National Security Adviser Sandy Berger.

Another quote: ''Sometimes the United States has to act alone or at least has to act first. Sometimes we cannot let other countries have a veto on our foreign policy.'' That was a quote from President Clinton during his election campaign.

President Bush used the best intelligence available, as it had been suggested by the former administration, that Iraq was a threat, a growing threat. The removal of Saddam Hussein and his evil regime from power was a policy endorsed by both sides of the aisle for more than a decade. This menace became even more of a concern when examined through the lens of September 11. Saddam is gone. The world is better because of it.

Mr. Speaker, we can argue the morality of war all day, but terrorists do not possess the same concern, as we saw again today. They act, and they act brutally. Iraq represents another front on the global war on terrorism. Iraq also represented a dangerous threat to the region and the world. This country witnessed the consequence of failing to act strongly against terrorism on September 11, 2001.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the bipartisan comments of the last speaker, and I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before us correctly points out the atrocities that Saddam Hussein perpetuated against his own people and the importance to Iraq's future to be free from the oppression of Saddam Hussein. The Resolution properly commends the members of the U.S. Armed Forces for their valiant service. They have made tremendous sacrifices on behalf of their country and have served longer deployments than expected. I extend my condolences to the family members of U.S. soldiers and civilian personnel who have lost their lives in Iraq, as well as to the many thousands of soldiers that were wounded in Iraq. I also express my sorrow and regret for the deaths in Iraq of Coalition forces and United Nations personnel, as well as for the unknown number of Iraqi civilians and other noncombatants that perished in the war. Congress and the Administration have a obligation to provide our troops with all the resources necessary to carry out their ongoing mission.

I am pleased that Iraqi Governing Council has adopted an interim constitution, and that the Council, in cooperation with the international community, is establishing war crimes tribunals in Iraq to create a historical record of the war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by Saddam Hussein and his regime. We must establish an accurate and complete factual record of these crimes, so that we can punish the offenders and deter future war crimes by government officials against their own population.

My support for this resolution in no way signifies my views on other issues beyond the scope of this resolution. This resolution does not offer a complete and balanced chronology of events that led to the U.S. invasion of Iraq. I am most disappointed that both before and after the war in Iraq the United States consistently failed to broadly engage the international community. The Administration is only belatedly seeking international support for our reconstruction efforts in Iraq.

Because of these failures, Americans have paid a heavy price. It is primarily American troops stationed in Iraq that face continuing attacks. It is our taxpayers that are being asked to almost exclusively pay the cost to rebuild Iraq, and these costs are mounting every day. Iraq is already facing a difficult transition in establishing a democracy that operates under the rule of law and protects minority rights. The U.S. must show enough flexibility in working with our allies to effectively help Iraq during this critical transition period, so that other countries will pledge both troops and funds to alleviate the burden on our American soldiers and taxpayers. Ultimately, the best way that we can support our troops is to reach out more aggressively to the international community, establish order and security in Iraq, and transfer authority to the Iraqis in a responsible manner.

Although I support the Resolution, I regret that it was not in order to consider a Motion to Recommit with instructions. The Motion to Recommit would have allowed us to strengthen the resolution by urging the President to: give our troops in Iraq all of the equipment

needed to keep them safe; provide the health care and benefits our wounded servicemen and women earned when they come home as veterans; recognize the key contributions made by our Reserve and Guard components, many of which came from my Congressional district in Maryland.

This Motion would have also asked the President to acknowledge that there were serious deficiencies in United States pre-war intelligence on Iraq, particularly in light of the failure to find any evidence of WMD programs, and to take action to improve our intelligence community so that United States troops are better protected and informed for future conflicts.

Finally, the Motion would have asked the President to seek broader international support for the reconstruction of Iraq, and to take steps to correct the deficiencies of the U.S. Government to plan adequately for the post-war occupation of Iraq.

We should have improved this Resolution to more accurately reflect our ongoing objectives in our involvement in Iraq.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), a member of the Committee on Intelligence and ranking member on the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution asks that the House affirm that the United States and the world is a safer place today with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq. Who can argue with that? Saddam Hussein, a tyrant that is responsible for so many thousands of deaths, a tyrant that has used weapons of mass destruction in the past.

There was a famous frontiersman who said, Be sure you are right, then go ahead. That was reported to be Davy Crockett. I think that is what we are about a year later, after going to war against Saddam Hussein and Iraq.

A colleague of ours mentioned earlier, this whole thing was about judgment. Well, I would submit that it is also about responsibility, it is also about accountability, and it is also about credibility. Why do I say that? Because when we talk about the world being a safer place today, I want us to remember that 55-some-odd families are without their loved ones today that have been killed in Iraq carrying out this war.

I saw into the eyes of Sergeant Rico's widow who asked me why. And I told her that we were very proud of the sacrifice that had been made by her husband and by her family. But she continued to ask me why. And that is why I think it is about responsibility. Did we do the responsible thing by attacking Iraq and Saddam Hussein when we knew that he had nothing to do with 9–11? It is also about accountability. A year later, we are finding out that he did not have weapons of mass destruction. And, obviously, it is about credibility, because if we as the last superpower are going to benefit from credibility, we have to be patient, we have to understand what the threat is, and we have to act responsibly. That is what I think this is about.

I am going to support this resolution, as I support the men and women in uniform. But this whole issue is about those three words: responsibility, accountability, and credibility.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), a member of our committee and the chairman of a subcommittee as well.

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 557, and I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, our military and coalition forces, as well as our intelligence community, are all working tirelessly to protect this Nation 7 days a week, 24 hours a day.

A year ago, the United States led a military coalition to disarm Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein's regime committed horrible atrocities; and Saddam was a threat, a grave and increasing threat to his country, his region, and to the world. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, marked the 16th anniversary of Saddam's use of chemical weapons on the Kurdish citizens of Iraq. Sixteen years ago, Mr. Speaker, as a result of this atrocity, 5,000 Kurdish Iraqis died. Saddam was indeed a terrorist in his own nation. Thanks to our efforts, Saddam Hussein will never commit such atrocities again.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, we are all safer without this tyrant in power. Our decision to go to war in Iraq was based on our intelligence about Saddam's threat to world security.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence, I know the substantial investment now being made in our intelligence community to meet the demands of the global war on terrorism. Our intelligence community is aggressively rebuilding its capabilities that withered during the mid-1990s. Our clandestine service dropped by 25 percent, and nearly one-third of our overseas offices were closed. Our overall intelligence reporting fell by almost 50 percent during that period of time. Language skills were slow to develop, limiting our ability to infiltrate rogue organizations or intercept messages encrypted in tribal dialect and regional tongues. We effectively lost our ability to see and hear in many of the world's most dangerous places. Our intelligence community provided the best information and analysis on Iraq that it could, given the reduced collection, language shortfalls, and Iraq's active denial and deception programs.

Every one from David Kay to the Director of Central Intelligence, George Tenet, has stated that analysts did not and would not change their judgment to meet policy objectives.

Some argue that judgments in the October 2002 National Intelligence Estimate on Iraq's Continuing Programs of Weapons of Mass Destruction Programs were flawed. They point to the report's statement that ''Iraq has chemical and biological weapons.'' However, this is only the first six words of the second sentence in the declassified portion of the report. The rest of the sentence reads, ''as well as missiles with range in excess of U.N. restrictions and, if left unchecked, Iraq probably will have a nuclear weapon during this decade.''

Critics also fail to mention judgments made by Dr. Kay and the Iraqi Survey Group regarding their findings in Iraq: ''We judge that Iraq has continued its weapons of mass destruction programs in defiance of U.N. resolutions and restrictions.'' Quote: ''Although we assess that Saddam does not yet have nuclear weapons or sufficient material to make any, he remains intent on acquiring them.''

□ 1700

Yes, chemical or biological weapons stockpiling have not been found, but secret laboratories have. And, yes, Iraq appears not to have reconstructed its nuclear program, but the Iraq survey group uncovered documents that revealed Saddam's intent to make nuclear weapons.

Intelligence analysts seldom, if ever, are 100 percent perfect. This is the nature of the business. Intelligence officers collect the dots and analysts attempt to connect them. Given the reduced resources and inadequate insight into Iraq, I say the picture we drew from a limited amount of dots was pretty good.

And we were right to take action. Every day intelligence officers make tough judgment calls and dangerous operations are conducted. We must support them. We must support our troops in the ongoing efforts to protect our Nation.

I support House Resolution 557 and strongly urge its adoption.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, once again, the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives has taken an issue of bipartisan concern and turned it into an occasion for partisan division.

On the 1-year anniversary of the beginning of Operation Iraqi Freedom, the leadership introduced a bill that claims to honor our troops—at the same time that our Armed Forces and veterans are being shortchanged in the budget that is under consideration in this body.

I strongly oppose this resolution for two important reasons.

First, it fails to properly acknowledge and honor the American troops who are serving, have died, or have been injured in this war.

And secondly, it is a blatant attempt to cover-up the fact that American soldiers went to war in Iraq because Iraq allegedly had weapons of mass destruction that threatened America. And yet no such weapons have since been found in Iraq.

Our troops—National Guard and Reserve and regular forces alike—deserve more than one line in a resolution on the first anniversary of a war. Their service and their sacrifice deserve to be honored, and more importantly they deserve the resources to help them succeed with the greatest degree of safety possible.

Had Democrats been afforded the opportunity to modify this resolution, we would have offered our sincere condolences to the families of the more than 500 soldiers killed and thousands wounded in Iraq, given our troops in Iraq the body armor and armored vehicles they need to keep them safe, and continued to press for a true international coalition to relieve the United States of its nearly unilateral burden in Iraq.

I am a proud cosponsor of the Democratic Salute to Veterans and the Armed Forces Act, a comprehensive package of benefits designed to honor the contributions of those who have served America in the Armed Forces. The legislation ensures that those who are serving today have incentives to continue serving, those who served in previous conflicts are properly honored, and those who choose to serve in the future are coming into a system that is the best in the world.

As I said at the outset, I also oppose this resolution because it is a blatant attempt by the Bush administration to distort the public's understanding of why America went to war.

Americans did not die in Iraq to punish Saddam Hussein for his reprehensible and vile actions, such as gassing the Kurds in 1988 or flooding the Arab marshlands. Those actions clearly did not pose an imminent threat to the security of the United States, especially not in the year 2003. And yet those are the actions that this partisan House resolution today speaks to. Americans would not have believed that those actions warranted a military attack in Iraq last year.

President Bush warned Americans that Iraq posed an imminent threat to the security of the United States that could only be deflected by a unilateral military strike against Iraq. Today, the House seeks to bury this crucial piece of history.

The President provided intelligence that has not been discredited to justify the attack on Iraq. It must never be forgotten that American soldiers attacked Iraq because the President said that it had weapons of mass destruction that endangered our security.

The Republican leadership sponsored this resolution today hoping to later attack Democrats who vote against it. But I for one will not join them in their partisan charade that brings shame on the People's House. My Democratic colleagues and I will continue to articulate our concerns for America's armed forces, for America's veterans, and for America's security.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), the ranking member on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Subcommittee on Human Intelligence.

(Mr. BOSWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN). I appreciate it.

And I want to say at the outset I rise to support the resolution. When I look over there, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), and a whole bunch of others, they are my heroes. But we have some on this side of the aisle too. I think of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), I think of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), a lot of us as well as a lot of my colleagues.

This is not a partisan thing. We support the troops. No question about it. I was a little appalled this morning as I heard my dear friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), and his comments. But I still support the troops.

Our troops in Iraq are to be commended for their courage and their valor. I do say the same about the dedicated men and women of the intelligence community. I visited with them in Iraq. It is truly inspiring to see what they have accomplished. And the Iraqi people are to be commended for their courage in the face of Saddam's cruelty.

But I agree with the remarks of my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the proposed resolution ought to do more. It is time the President set about fixing the problems in intelligence that are already known to exist. This will do much more to secure the peace in Iraq than just commending the troops and the Iraqi people which, of course, is very important.

For example, the DCI has acknowledged that we did not have enough human intelligence. In addition, the sources we did have too often gave us bad information. There are also some indications that we may have dismissed potential sources of information because they were not telling us or we did not believe or did not want to believe that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction.

Closed societies of Iraq are among the most difficult of intelligence targets. No question about it. Terrorist groups are equally difficult to penetrate. However, there are steps we can take to improve our ability to recruit sources of information on these hard targets.

The intelligence community is developing new ways of deploying human intelligence collectors. In urging the President to take steps now to fix intelligence, we can encourage these efforts which will yield benefits in Iraq today. The proposed resolution ought to do this. Why not? We can. We should.

I do support the resolution.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the last speaker for his wonderful remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), the ranking member on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Subcommittee on Intelligence Policy and National Security.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank our very distinguished ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), for the time.

Mr. Speaker, we are just about a year to the day that America with our very brave forces invaded Iraq. So it is coming up to the moment where we commemorate those that serve, those that did serve and lost their lives, through a resolution that is on the floor.

This resolution has good parts to it. Of course, we commend our troops who are second to none. They are the best led, the best equipped, and the best performing troops in the world, the best military. But this resolution is not necessarily a celebration, nor should it be. Because what it does not include are the sacrifices that have been made: 558 American troops, 101 allied troops, and some 10,000 Iraqi citizens have died since this war began. They are not mentioned in this resolution.

Where is our commitment in this resolution? It should be stated and restated in more than one ''whereas'' about the 115,000 troops in Iraq with all the protective gear that they should have. Nowhere in this resolution do we affirm or reaffirm our commitment to our troops and veterans.

Today the House Committee on the Budget cut over $1 billion. So there is a bit of double speak to this. Nowhere in this resolution are the people that serve in our intelligence community, some of the most dangerous jobs that anyone could ever have, are they set apart and thanked in this resolution relative to Iraq.

Turn on the TV sets. Iraq is not safe. There are more people that have lost their lives today. There are more fires; there are more blow-ups. So this is a very sobering resolution. And I think the good parts of it should be underscored. But we have not been allowed to add to it the things that I just stated that I think should be very much a part of it.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER), our able rookie.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I will support this resolution as an expression of our Nation's gratitude and pride of our men and women in uniform who were ordered to war in Iraq by their Commander in Chief. Whether you are for or against the war, the fact is we are there now and we need to support our troops.

These military servicemembers are working around the clock to make Iraq a better place for the Iraqi people. Many of them have left their young families behind to serve their country,

and they deserve our thanks here on the floor of Congress.

I recently returned from Iraq as part of a bipartisan group of Members from the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I truly believe that good intelligence is the best way to prevent terrorist attacks in our country, as well as Iraq. The members of our intelligence community who are also working on the dangerous front lines of this war deserve our gratitude. They serve in silence with little thanks.

I was proud to join with my Republican colleagues and visit the Iraqi police training academy and honor 23 Iraqi police officers killed in a recent bombing. Even in the face of tragedy, the resolve of the Iraqi people to take back their country and start governing themselves was strong.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution should have simply expressed our support for our Armed Forces working and living in harm's way. Regrettably, however, the majority has handled this resolution in a manner intended to divide us, not unite us.

Mr. Speaker, I share the view that the Middle East and the world are better off without Saddam Hussein and his brutal regime; but success must be our only exit strategy. When those goals are accomplished, we can say with certainty that the world is a safer place. We owe our military men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice for their country in Iraq nothing less.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I join the authors of this resolution in commending the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of oppression and in praising the valiant service of the United States and coalition forces in Iraq. We are as proud as we could possibly be of our troops, their sacrifice and their service.

But to put forth this partisan resolution in this way is both an affront to our troops and a disservice to our country, sowing division where there should be unity.

This resolution is not necessarily objectionable because of what it says, but because of what it omits. There is no reference, for example, to the mid-course correction that is called for in terms of financial accountability, contracting practices, securing international cooperation, and repairing our relationship with long-standing allies whose support is integral to our ultimate success.

The minority has been denied the opportunity to improve this bill, to give our troops the body armor they need, for example, to achieve pay equity for National Guard and Reserve personnel, to provide much needed health care and benefits for our wounded servicemen and -women, and to offer condolences to the families of those killed in Iraq.

This resolution rightly affirms our support for the Iraqi people as they adopt an interim constitution that upholds the values of open debate and democracy. How ironic that this very bill is structured to shut down discussion and debate.

The rule rammed through by the majority is not only a closed rule, making it impossible to offer a Democratic substitute, but it also eliminates the right to offer a motion to recommit with instructions. That takes to a new level the procedural abuses that have become almost routine in this House.

At stake is the manner in which we, as members of the House, are permitted to express our encouragement. We can support our troops serving in Iraq, yet still debate how to extend support to them and their families and to hasten the day when they can return. We can support the Iraqi people, yet still debate how best to ensure the development of a stable, democratic form of governance. To debate such issues does not reflect a lack of patriotism. To the contrary, it's a celebration of it.

We should be proud, Mr. Speaker, of the progress we have made in Iraq. At the same time we should address the deficiencies in our prewar intelligence and our post-war occupation plan.

No one disputes that the world is better off with Saddam Hussein gone, but we are doing our troops and the American people a grave disservice if we perpetuate the illusion that they are somehow ''safe'' or that our mission in Iraq is accomplished. Many difficult tasks still lie ahead, and glossing over the serious questions that remain unaddressed by this administration jeopardizes our mission to secure and stabilize Iraq.

I urge the Republican leadership to honor the collaborative and unifying approach that we are urging on the people of Iraq. This body should support our troops and lead by example, and this resolution falls short on both counts.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), my classmate and colleague.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 year ago the first bombs blasted in Baghdad and the United States christened a shameful new military doctrine, the preemptive war, against a regime that for all its vicious cruelty had not provoked the United States or our allies.

We were told by the President that Iraq posed an imminent threat to our national security with a link to al Qaeda, which is fiction. And our own weapons inspector concluded that weapons of mass destruction did not exist. Where was our intelligence? What were we working on?

After September 11, countries throughout the world clamored to give the United States support in the global fight against terrorism. But after bombing Iraq without multinational support, the United States lost the moral authority we once enjoyed around the rest of the world.

Today, 1 year later, Iraq remains mired in chaos. It is becoming a breeding ground for terrorists, nowhere near ready to assume the responsibility of a democracy.

For this we have sacrificed nearly 600 American lives with thousands more wounded; 27 today have already been killed in Baghdad with hundreds injured. If this Congress wants to support the troops, we should work to equip every soldier in Iraq and Afghanistan with the best equipment and supplies available, including hydration water systems. We would ensure them the benefits they have been promised and they deserve when they return home. But we do not talk about that in this resolution.

Tomorrow I will introduce a resolution called Smart Security. Smart Security is about prevention, not preemption. It sees war as a last resort to be considered only after every diplomatic solution has been exhausted.

□ 1715

It calls for more robust multilateral institutions to prevent terrorism, manages international conflicts and promotes global stability, since smart security is tough, pragmatic, and patriotic. It is smart and it would keep America safe and it supports our troops.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my extreme pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, if all we were doing here on the floor today on the House was commending our troops for their valor, there would be no debate. There would be no disagreement and there would be no opposition. This resolution, however, says something more than that we honor our troops.

What this resolution says is that we, the House of Representatives, affirm that ''the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq.'' There is not a Member of this body that mourns the fact that Saddam Hussein and his regime have been removed from power. We all agree that Saddam was a brutal thug. The problem is that America was told before the war that we would be made safer by fighting to find and destroy Saddam's weapons of mass destruction. We now know that those weapons either did not exist, in which case we fought a war based on flawed intelligence, or that there really were weapons of mass destruction, in which case they are now in the hands of Saddam's

Baathist henchmen or al Qaeda terrorists or some other party, and that would put us in greater peril than we were before the war started.

Moreover, if we switch our TV from C–SPAN to CNN, we will see that another bomb has gone off in Baghdad today, killing more than 25 and wounding nearly 50 innocent people. We will see that two American missionaries have been assassinated in Iraq. We will see reports of more and more targeted assassinations of civilian employees of the Coalition Authority, as well as continued attacks on our military forces in Iraq.

Meanwhile, the real terrorist threat to America, al Qaeda, continues to organize and plan future terrorist attacks against our country. Osama bin Laden and some of his top lieutenants remain at large. Mullah Omar, the head of the Taliban, remains at large.

What is happening on the House floor today is symptomatic of everything that is wrong with the Bush administration and Republican leaders in Washington. Instead of working together in a bipartisan fashion to congratulate the troops for the wonderful job which they did, they seek to divide this House by forcing us to vote on something which, in fact, is not an accurate representation of what has happened across this world.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), another able member of our committee.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution commends the men and women of the United States Armed Forces and the Coalition forces for their valiant service. It is appropriate to do that. They have made huge sacrifices, their families have. In many cases, the soldiers have made the ultimate sacrifice in their response to the call of their country.

As a member of the committee that oversees the Intelligence Community, let me also add my gratitude to the incredibly hardworking men and women of the Intelligence Community whose role in Iraq is less public but no less vital and in many cases is every bit as dangerous. These dedicated public servants should have all the tools they need to accomplish their mission. So rather than simply commending the Iraqi people for their courage and their accomplishments, rather than simply thanking these brave men and women in the U.S. armed services and Intelligence Community with words, we should see that they have what they need to do their jobs.

This resolution today, I believe, has different motivation than simply to honor our troops. It really is more about the House of Representatives patting themselves on the back than it is to honor our troops.

It perpetuates a simplistic thinking that took us into the war with unexamined intelligence, and clearly there were deficiencies in the intelligence that took us up to and into that war. It perpetuates the simplistic thinking that left our troops unprepared for the postwar occupation, and it perpetuates a kind of divisive thinking. I mean, what can be more divisive than a closed rule that allows no amendments, no substitutes, really nothing to make this a better resolution?

It is not enough to say thanks in words to 550 families who have lost someone in Iraq. They want more than thanks and words. Same for the more than 3,000 families of the wounded. If we only give them what they need, this resolution would be more meaningful: more armored Humvees, more language speakers, more support.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), who is also a subcommittee chairman of the committee.

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 557, recognizing American and coalition forces in Iraq and the liberation of the Iraqi people.

The American people should know and believe that the President brought the U.S. into this war to oust Saddam Hussein and bring freedom in that part of the world with 34 coalition partners, and that was a good decision. Many of us supported the President and voted to provide emergency supplemental funding for military operations in Iraq. These were the resources that financed the capture of additional Saddam regime loyalists and Saddam himself and provided funding to protect our troops.

As a matter of fact, the lion's share of the money went to the troops and the other went to rebuilding the country, opening schools, opening hospitals, putting electricity on line, opening businesses. The people of Iraq love America because of their newfound freedom, their newfound hope, and their newfound opportunities.

Many of us voted for the war resolution because we believed it was the right thing to do, and many of us voted for the supplemental funding because we believed it was the right thing to do.

We have heard all the claims that the intelligence community's analysis was politicized and analytical judgments were made to advance the administration's policy. The same judgment and analysis was given to President Clinton who used that analysis to take limited action against Saddam. The point is that both Presidents received the same intelligence. The only difference is that President Bush took serious and meaningful action against Saddam Hussein.

In my opinion, critics have not given the intelligence community a fair shake, and it is obvious from some of those who do not even serve on the committee come down here and criticize when they have not had the benefit that many of us have had of serving on the committee. That is unfortunate. They have failed to highlight those judgments on UAVs, ballistic missiles, illicit procurement networks that have been found and confirmed in Iraq. They have failed to highlight those judgments about the presence in Iraq of terrorist elements associated with al Qaeda.

It is fine to highlight real problems and propose real solutions to fix them, but we have yet to hear that from the critics. Telling analysts not to make tough judgments is not a viable solution. Rebuilding our intelligence community and providing them with the resources needed to fight the global war on terrorism seems more appropriate.

I support our troops and our intelligence community, people who work in dark places in the world but never get any credit for the work that they do. The credit goes in some cases to politicians and government officials, but those people in dark places who are doing the hard work deserve the credit. No politician can take credit for capturing Saddam. That credit goes to the intelligence community and the military, and those of us that have supported them with our votes on this floor to give them the money to do it. Also I think they deserve the credit, and the critics need to really, I think, examine what they are saying.

Congratulations to those in the intelligence community and the military community for liberating Iraq, freeing the people and giving them hope and opportunity, and for that reason, I support I think a very well-worded and -constructed resolution.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the last speaker that I think this resolution should include words of praise for the members of the intelligence community who take risks on our behalf in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do not find myself critical of the intelligence community. The criticism I and many others have is of the political leadership which I think misused the intelligence and made faulty decisions.

The gentleman talked about people who work in dark places. I did not talk about the Vice President. I do not know how he got into this debate.

The point about what we are saying is this. We now, without weapons of mass destruction, without a tie to al Qaeda, have been told that the rationale for this was essentially to extend democracy. I am in favor of extending democracy; although extending it by military invasion is a difficult policy. There are plenty of undemocratic, tyrannical governments in the world, and I want to oppose them, but I am not

generally for invading them. But what troubles me is that in the name of advancing democracy internationally, the majority is debasing it at home.

No one can think, who understands the tenets of democracy, that this procedure today comes close to it. There is no justification whatsoever for this legislation to have been drawn up and then brought to us without amendment. Will someone explain to me why this could not be amendmentable? Were we too busy? That would not pass the laugh test. The reason is that the majority is afraid that if amendments were available, it would bring into discussion things they do not want to talk about.

Of course, we support the troops. Voting for or against this resolution is wholly uncorrelated to supporting the troops. A resolution that simply congratulated the troops would have been passed unanimously. What we have here, frankly, is an effort to use the troops for political purposes. It is an effort to say that because Americans are proud of our fighting people, we will put into a resolution some phrase for them which contains a number of other politically more controversial items; we will bring it forward in a way that does not allow the democratic process to go forward.

I hope the Iraqis will not be watching this and think that this is the way a democracy should work, that it should be up or down, that the Constitution should not be amendable, resolutions should not be amendable. We do not advance democracy by debasing it as we do in this procedure.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today seeks to rewrite history. It recognizes that on March 16, 1988, Iraq used mustard gas and other nerve agents against the Kurds in Halabjah, Iraq, killing an estimated 5,000 people. This is an atrocity that is used by many, including members of the President's war cabinet, as justification for invading Iraq.

Yet, if the gassing of the Kurds was a reason for war, why did these same people in both the Reagan and the first Bush administrations work to increase aid, cooperation, trade and intelligence-sharing with Iraq after the gassing occurred? Before history is rewritten, it is important to set the record straight about what did happen in this tragic event.

Secretary of State Colin Powell was Ronald Reagan's National Security Adviser from December 1987 to January 1989 and was the chairman of the Joint Chiefs from 1989 to 1993.

Under Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz was Under Secretary of Defense for Policy from 1989 to 1993.

National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice was a director on the National Security Council from 1989 to 1993.

Vice President DICK CHENEY was the Republican whip in the House in 1988 and the Secretary of Defense from 1989 until 1993.

Why then, when they were in positions of tremendous influence, did they not cry foul when this atrocious gassing happened? Briefly, here is what they did after the Halabjah gassing happened.

In 1988, the Reagan Administration sent $1.1 billion in loan guarantees to Iraq.

According to declassified State Department documents, the United States shared intelligence data with Iraq before and after this mass murder.

In early October 1989, President Bush signed a national security directive to expand political and economic ties with Iraq, including $1 billion in new aid to Iraq.

On October 31, 1989, Secretary of State Baker personally intervened with the Agriculture Department to get more money to go to Iraq.

On April 19, 1990, the National Security Council did the same thing.

□ 1730

Following the end of the Gulf War, U.N. inspectors discovered that front companies for every known site at which Iraq developed biological and chemical weapons bought American computers with licenses approved by the Reagan and Bush administrations.

Weapons of mass destruction did exist in Iraq, but that was 15 years ago. We missed our chance to do something about it, and we cannot allow history to be rewritten here today. This war was not about Halabja or other human rights abuses. It was a preordained preemptive war of choice based upon twisted intelligence and driven by an equally twisted ideological agenda.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), for yielding me this time and giving me the opportunity to be heard this afternoon.

I stand here representing the 11th Congressional District of Ohio. In the Iraqi war, I lost two of my constituents. I read to my colleagues now the statements of the father of one of those constituents, and this is from an article in the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

''The soldier's father feels betrayed. On March 17, the President told the country intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised. A week later, Private Brandon Sloan, 19, was killed in Iraq. On Sunday, February 8, Brandon's father heard the President hedge about Saddam Hussein: 'We thought he had weapons. He had the capacity to make a weapon.'

''The Reverend Tandy Sloan believes there is a key difference between having no doubt a country possesses weapons of mass destruction and having the ability to make them. A minister, he calls that difference the eighth commandment: 'Thou shalt not bear false witness.' It bothers him deeply that the President apparently has no regrets for overstating the danger for weapons of mass destruction that do not appear to exist. Sloan says, 'At least we admit we were wrong. I want the President to say that mistakes were made that cost lives.'

''It has been almost a year since that Sunday night knock on the door when military uniforms brought news that Brandon was missing. Days later, Sloan learned that his son was dead. Months later a brigadier general told him what happened to the 507th Company, made famous by Jessica Lynch. 'He basically told us the military goofed,' Sloan said. 'The President wanted a hard, fast hit,' the general said. Brandon's unit, hauling trucks, water, tools and gear, couldn't move fast enough to keep up with the other units, so they left it behind.

''Sloan said, 'You let my son down. My son did not sign on to be left behind.' ''

I stand here on behalf of the parents of private Brandon Sloan and other young people killed across this country. Let us not politicize whether or not we are safer without Saddam Hussein or not safer. Let us celebrate the young people who lost their lives in this war and let us move forward to make the United States a safer Nation.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the vice chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I do rise as a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on International Relations, and I want to commend the authors of the resolution. I think it is straightforward and an accurate statement of the facts regarding Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address just a few aspects of the resolution, particularly those relating to the WMD. As H. Res. 557 notes, the brutal regime of Saddam Hussein not only trampled on the rights of the Iraqi people but he repeatedly defied the U.N. Security Council and ignored its obligations to the U.N. weapons inspectors. The resolution correctly notes that in November 2002, the Security Council unanimously agreed that Iraq ''remains in material breach of its obligations under the relevant resolutions.''

Let me repeat that, because it is important. The U.N. Security Council unanimously found that Iraq was unquestionably in material breach of its international obligations. The Iraqi regime had unquestionably interfered

with the IAEA inspectors and prevented the U.N. from effectively doing its job.

Contrary to our greatest fear, and fortunately for our forces, Iraq did not use weapons of mass destruction in the conflict with the U.S. and allied forces. Members of this body are acutely aware of the fact that no large WMD stockpiles have been found. This, of course, raises a number of questions. We certainly should examine the quality of our intelligence, and the appropriate oversight committees are doing just that. It is important, however, to remind the body of exactly what we have found that Saddam Hussein did possess.

We know, for example, that Saddam had, A, a concealed ballistic missile production line that dramatically breached U.N. range and payload restrictions; B, had covert programs to develop both new and more effective liquid and solid rocket fuels, which would further enhance the range and accuracy of Saddam's illegal missiles; C, had a secret pipeline to purchase advanced missile components and technology from North Korea; and had, D, two separate undeclared, unmanned aerial vehicle production lines that senior Iraqi officials now admit were to have been used for carrying biological weapons.

These items are critically important because missiles and UAVs are the means to deliver any weapons of mass destruction. That is why the U.N. prohibited Iraq from having these systems. There is no doubt that these missiles and UAV programs existed, in clear violation of Iraq's international obligations; and there is no doubt that they had WMD application.

What else do we know that Saddam Hussein had? One, the Iraqi Survey Group has found a network of labs and safe houses that contained everything needed for chemical/biological weapons production. These were undeclared facilities under the direct control of the Iraqi intelligence and security services.

Two, at an Iraqi prison they found evidence of an undeclared chemical/biological laboratory complex that seems to have been for human testing.

Three, we have learned that Iraq maintained a WMD scientific community and infrastructure that was organized in such a way that WMD production could be quickly resumed.

Four, we learned from David Kay, the former head of the Iraqi Survey Group, that Saddam and his son Uday were demanding to know from their subordinates how long it would take Iraq to produce chemical weapons.

And, five, while the evidence on nuclear activity is less clear, David Kay has testified that ''the testimony we have obtained from Iraqi scientists should clear up any doubts about whether Saddam still wanted to obtain nuclear weapons.'' He did.

Mr. Speaker, none of this should be in the least bit surprising. Throughout the 1990s, we knew Saddam Hussein was seeking to maintain an arsenal of prohibited weapons. Over the years, he became a master of deception, hiding many elements of his extensive WMD program. For example, after the 1991 Persian Gulf War, we found that Iraq was much further along on a nuclear weapons development program than anyone had suspected, only months from a serious capability.

We do know in the 1990s Saddam himself admitted he possessed 30,000 liters of anthrax. Now, remember, just a teaspoon of anthrax paralyzed the other body, the Senate, for months.

Saddam acknowledged a stockpile of 5,000 gallons of botulinum toxin and 25 biologically filled Scud missiles. He admitted to these lethal weapons after years of denying he had such weapons because his son-in-law defected and provided incontrovertible evidence of their existence.

All intelligence services—U.S., British, French, Italian, German, and others, agreed that Iraq had WMD. The U.N. concluded Iraq possessed a hidden WMD arsenal. The IAEA warned that Saddam was not cooperating. The WMD threat in the late 1990s was considered so compelling that, in December 1998, President Clinton felt he had no choice but to launch retaliatory airstrikes. The case for action was compelling in 1998, and the case was every bit as compelling in 2003.

Certainly our intelligence could have been better; it should have been better. It will never be as good as the consumers—the policymakers—want it to be.

As we prepared for Operation Iraqi Freedom, there were gaps in our knowledge. There were things that we just did not know. It would seem that we just didn't have good access to Saddam Hussein's inner circle. There is a reason we didn't have that access and the intelligence information we would have wanted. Frankly, in the decade following the collapse of the former Soviet Union, we didn't invest adequately in human intelligence (HUMINT). The Intelligence Community sharply reduced the number of case officers, and the number of recruited intelligence assets is reported to have significantly declined.

This lack of HUMINT resources was compounded by self-imposed limits on whom our intelligence officers could recruit. In the 1990s the CIA established guidelines that made it extremely difficult to recruit the unsavory characters—individuals who are exactly the sort who could have provided useful intelligence. Any excuses aside, the ''Deutsch Guidelines'', as they were known, discouraged the recruitment of spies with criminal or human rights issues in their background. Yet these were precisely the sort of people who could get close to Saddam Hussein. In practical effect, our intelligence services were not allowed to recruit them.

With the active and tenacious involvement of the Intelligence Committee the Deutsch Guidelines were rescinded in the FY 2002 Intelligence Authorization Act, but there is little doubt that the damage to our human collection capability has been substantial. Under the guidance of the distinguished gentleman from Florida, the Chairman of the HPSCI, this body has been supporting the rebuilding of our HUMINT capability so that we aren't as likely to face future intelligence gaps. It is, however, a matter that will require continued priority, resources, and the close attention from the relevant oversight committees.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 557 is a good resolution that reflects the basic truth that the world is much better without Saddam Hussein governing Iraq. This Member commends the authors of the resolution and urges its support.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I, on this side of the aisle, I am also saddened. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and the people I work with on the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and I think that we should have worked this together. But I tell my colleagues on the other side, I have been here 14 years, and this is the worst partisan bickering I have seen from the Democrat leadership since I have been here. And when my colleagues ask us to be bipartisan, I think you need to look inward at what has happened on this House floor recently.

They say the President overstated. But look at what Dr. Kay said. Liberal Democrats will not tell you what Dr. Kay actually said that Saddam Hussein and Iraq was even more dangerous from what we have found out since we went in there than we thought prior to the war. More dangerous. He said that any reasonable person, including any country, would know that Saddam Hussein was working on weapons of mass destruction; that he had them, used them against his own people, and would feel that he still had weapons of mass destruction.

So when I hear from the left that the President overstated, it's not so; and it makes me mad to point fingers like that. Evidence of weapons of mass destruction going to Syria. Dr. Kay. Any reasonable person would believe WMD.

Saddam Hussein ethically cleansed four times the number of people, four times, than when my liberal friends supported President Clinton going into Bosnia and Kosovo because of ethnic cleansing. Was there chemical or biological or nuclear weapons there? No, but ethnic cleansing.

And the liberal left, the most extreme case of bantering a secretary that I watched in the Haiti discussion was miserable. Tell me there is weapons of mass destruction in Haiti.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The Chair would remind all Members when addressing other colleagues that it is appropriate to use the term gentleman and gentlewoman, and not refer to the Member by a first name.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to say first off that I am sure that is what the last speaker intended. He is a good friend, a member

of our Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and I am certain he did not have me in mind when he was suggesting that there is excessive partisanship about our intelligence budget.

I call myself a passionate bipartisan on intelligence and security matters, and I take a back seat to no one for my efforts to try to work out agreements on a bipartisan basis to fix our intelligence.

As I said earlier, in my view, the proposed resolution does some good things, but it also should be calling for action to keep our troops and other personnel serving in Iraq safe.

Just a few hours ago, Mr. Speaker, a devastating car bomb destroyed a hotel in Baghdad. The casualty reports are still coming in, but at least two dozen people have died. Better intelligence is essential to protecting our troops in Iraq and ensuring that we ultimately succeed there. It is the first line of defense in the war on terrorism.

There are good ideas from both sides of the aisle that should be discussed and debated this year. What should we be doing? In my view, let us try six things:

First, the President should direct intelligence agencies to scrub weapons of mass destruction intelligence on all major targets and release updates on areas of concern. Now.

Second, the President should direct intelligence agencies to improve collection and vetting of information. Now.

Third, the President should require intelligence agencies to improve the way they analyze intelligence and convey information to policymakers. Now.

Fourth, the President should direct a review of the activities of various DOD offices, particularly the Office of Special Plans, to see whether they fed unreliable and unvetted intelligence to him, the Vice President, or his senior national security team.

Fifth, the President should take immediate steps to strengthen and reinvigorate international inspections.

And, finally, the President should consider longer term changes to the leadership organization and business methods of the intelligence community.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution should have been a call to action in support of our troops, in addition to an expression of our heartfelt gratitude.

We could have done much, much better.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1745

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), a former member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard plenty of questionable statements today from Members about misrepresentation of intelligence and alleged use of military force, without enough information to back up that action. As a former member of the Committee on Intelligence, I would remind Members about one particular incident and the, quote, ''depth of intelligence'' supporting that action.

Not long ago the United States, on the order of the Commander in Chief launched a cruise missile attack against a pharmaceutical plant in Sudan, destroying the facility and taking human life. At the time, the action was justified by the President and his administration on the grounds that the al-Shifa plant was involved in the production of chemical weapons and had ties to Iraq and possibly al Qaeda which had just bombed two U.S. embassies in Africa.

What was the administration's basis for making these claims? What was the entire intelligence record that backed up this military action? This represents the entire intelligence on the al-Shifa plant. Yes, the entirety of the intelligence record connecting the al-Shifa plant to chemical weapons production was this, a single soil sample collected by a friend of a friend of a source. That is it.

The Intelligence Community did not know who actually owned the plant or have any other clear and convincing evidence to connect al-Shifa to weapons of mass destruction production; all it had was a bit of dirt and many unanswered question.

Yes, the information gaps were emphatically stated in the intelligence record of the day. None of these caveats were expressed by the President or his administration, and I believe the President picked this target himself. Now, I could name the President and the precise day in August 1998 and the attacks, and what else was happening that day; but rather than dwell on that, I would like to ask my colleagues on the other side: Where was their outrage in 1998? The information that this President used to inform his policy decision and act militarily against Hussein was voluminous, consistent, and as sound as it could be.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining 45 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) working as the ranking member on our committee to improve our Intelligence Community and to build support for the Intelligence Community in this House. It is important that we deal with a subject like this on a bipartisan basis. I know the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) is anxious and sincere in her call for action. I am too.

I believe we did have a call for action after 9/11, and I think that call for action has led us to go forth as the United States of America and to try to do the right thing on the war on terror. And I think from time to time as we go through that war, it is fine for us to say to the troops, well done, God bless you, and it is time to say to people involved in places like Iraq, we know it is tough, thanks for hanging in there, you have a better future ahead.

That is what this is about. I thank all Members for having that kind of understanding and looking ahead. We have a lot to do; we have got to get along and get it done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentleman's time has expired.

The Chair would advise the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) he has 31 minutes remaining, including 1 minute from the gentleman's previous time rolled forward, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) controls 35 minutes because the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) reserved the remaining 5 minutes of his time for this debate.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I was fortunate to go to Iraq with a couple of my colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVIS) just a few weeks ago, and was able to see firsthand what is going on.

I think there is consensus that Saddam Hussein was a brutal dictator and he committed horrific crimes. But the question is whether we are right in ending this regime. I say emphatically I think the Iraqi people back this up, and we did the right thing there. There is still a very difficult security situation there, and the bombings which happened today underlie that.

But what are we to expect? When Saddam Hussein and his followers fled, coalition forces and ordinary Iraqis had to start from scratch to defend the place.

We had a taste of what went on over the past decade in particular. We went to several palaces built during the Oil-For-Food Program. We were told over 70 palaces were built during the 1990s when Saddam Hussein was supposed to use all of the revenue from oil to pay for food and medicines. Seventy palaces, with an estimated cost of over $2 billion, were built while Saddam Hussein's people starved.

We also went into the basement of one of these palaces and saw Uday Hussein's stash of personal belongings: booze, cigars, swords, guns, paintings, all kinds of things, while the people went without medicine. Saddam Hussein and his shallow circle of loyalists were able in part to control Iraqis by depriving them.

We were the first CODEL able to go to the south in Basra, and we were able to see what those people had during that time, particularly the last decade. A lot of them simply were killed by neglect. No money was put into the south. The buildings are falling down, the infrastructure is horrible, and the

people were literally killed. We discovered remains of about 400,000 Iraqis. Over a million are believed to have been killed during that time.

Mr. Speaker, the question here is did we do the right thing. I can tell Members the Iraqi people know we did the right thing. Are we safer today because Saddam Hussein is gone? Yes, emphatically. People all over the world are safer because that madman is gone. I urge support of the resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to lay some groundwork for some comments I will make later. I am concerned in the first place, as I said before, that no one on this side was consulted about this resolution. I am embarrassed, I am indignant that they did not consult me.

This looks like an innocuous resolution, but when it says it is safer today than before Saddam Hussein was captured, I believe we are putting on paper something that is not true. It is like some of the things that were said, and I said, before this war started. I said there were weapons of mass destruction. I said that Saddam Hussein was a danger to the world. We do not go to war unless there is a core national security interest, and now we are trying to justify why we went to war by some of the things that are in this resolution.

There is no question that a number of people were killed. Thousands of people were killed. There is no question that Saddam Hussein was a despot. There is no question about a brutal regime. But in this one list, they say that in 1988, 5,000 people were killed, Kurdish citizens were killed. Well, we went to war in 1991. President Bush once said, and he was one of the best foreign policy Presidents we have ever had, he said, I am not going into Iraq because I do not want to occupy Iraq because that would be a problem. He said that in his book, and he said, I do not want to reconstruct Iraq.

We have spent $150 billion in Iraq today. We had testimony before our committee right before the war started by the Under Secretary of Defense who said it will not cost us a penny, the oil revenues from Iraq will pay for this war. Well, $150 billion later we are still paying for it. When Members say it is safer, it makes me nervous because we are exaggerating, as we have during this whole thing. And I blame myself as much as anyone else.

A constituent of mine said to me, he said, never in history have so many been misled by so few, and he was talking to me. He was saying I misled him. I believed there were weapons of mass destruction. I believed there was an imminent danger, but it turns out that I was wrong.

What we have to look at now is we need bipartisanship now to win long term. This is a long-term problem. I have voted for every appropriation, I have supported every President when it comes to foreign policy, but this resolution, just because it says on paper it is safer, does not mean it is safer throughout the world.

Today we had an incident where there was a bombing in Baghdad where the bomb took out as wide as a street, 30 or 40 feet wide and 30 or 40 feet deep. We had the Spanish problem where they killed a couple hundred people and wounded 2,000. So worldwide, and it says here the world is safer. The world is not safer today than it was before they captured Saddam Hussein.

I have a list of countries where they do not think it is safer. Those countries, Canada, France, Italy, Germany, Spain, all of them believe there is an increased terrorism threat in the world. The reason I am saying this is we have to depend on those countries. We have to be honest and upfront, and when we say it is safer today, we are not being upfront. It is not safer. It may be down the road. This is not the time, in my estimation, for us to make statements like that. There will come a time if we persist, and I am going to be there the whole way, but I am just concerned that we are making a statement which just exacerbates the very problem that we have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, really in one sense, it does not matter how people vote on this resolution because it has no effect, but some things need to be said about it.

Every Member here supports the troops. Every Member here applauds the sacrifices the men and women of our Armed Forces have made. Every Member here understands that America needs no one's permission to defend this country from attack.

But when American leaders choose to wage a preemptive war against a country that did not attack the United States, when those leaders attempt to rally the American people to their support on the basis of faulty information and bad intelligence, when that unilateral decision costs more than 500 American lives, when it costs thousands of American wounded, when it costs the lives of uncounted thousands of innocent civilians, that decision does not, despite the claims of this resolution, it does not leave us in a stronger and safer position, as this resolution falsely suggests. In fact, it could be argued it does just the opposite.

Are we really in a safer and stronger position when the world and our allies know that we went to war unilaterally on the basis of wrong intelligence? Are we really going to be in a stronger position to persuade the world to follow us the next time we tell them it is necessary to act; for example, in the case of an American conclusion that North Korea has nuclear weapons?

Are we really in a safer and stronger position in persuading more Americans to serve in the military when they see that we rushed to war before 45,000 U.S. troops were supplied with the ceramic inserts that they needed for their body armor, when they see their government did not provide the shields that protect Humvees and their occupants from roadbed explosions, or when they see that their government did not supply our troops with the electronic jammers needed to protect those troops against remotely detonated bombs and mines?

Are we really in a safer and stronger position when we are forced to police Iraq largely on our own, with little help from our allies? Have we really created a safer world when, by our actions, we have told the Indians and Pakistanis, who have been close to nuclear war with each other, that a doctrine of preemptive war is acceptable? Are we really as safe and strong as we would be if we had not diverted to Iraq key personnel and taken intelligence resources away from the crucial task of finding Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan?

Last night, many of us sang the praises of John Hume, the great Irish peacemaker. Hume said last night that there has been no war in history that has not killed more innocent civilians than it has combatants.

Are we really safer and stronger in a world where thousands of young Muslims now are being told to hate the United States because we waged a war against a Muslim country that had not attacked the U.S., rather than focusing like a laser on destroying the al Qaeda network which is the justifiable target of our rage?

Many Members who vote for this resolution today will do so despite the misstatements it contains, because it contains an expression of support for our troops. Many who vote against it will also do so because of the unwarranted assertions in this resolution that needlessly detract from our focus on the sacrifices those troops have made.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, shame on the House leadership for drafting this resolution in a way that needlessly divides us rather than unites us. By not allowing meaningful alternatives to be debated and voted on, they do not promote democracy; they mock it.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD after my statement a copy of the resolution on which we should have been allowed to vote.

RESOLUTION

Relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces.

Whereas Saddam Hussein and his regime committed crimes against humanity, systematically violating the human rights of Iraqis and citizens of other countries;

Whereas Saddam Hussein's terror regime subjected the Iraqi people to murder, torture, rape, and amputation;

Whereas on March 16, 1988, Saddam Hussein's regime had and unleashed weapons of mass destruction against Kurdish citizens, killing nearly 5,000 of them;

Whereas as many as 270 mass grave sites, containing the remains of as many as 400,000 victims of Saddam Hussein's regime, have been found in Iraq;

Whereas rape was used to intimidate the Iraqi population, with victims often raped in front of their families;

Whereas the regime punished the Marsh Arabs by draining the marshlands, which created hundreds of thousands of refugees and caused an ecological catastrophe;

Whereas the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–338), passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 360 to 38, made it United States policy to support efforts to remove from power the regime headed by Saddam Hussein;

Whereas with the Iraqi regime failing to comply with 16 previously adopted United Nations Security Council resolutions, the Security Council unanimously approved Resolution 1441 on November 8, 2002, declaring that Iraq 'has been and remains in material breach of its obligations under relevant resolutions, including resolution 687 (1991), in particular through Iraq's failure to cooperate with United Nations inspectors'; and

Whereas on October 10, 2002, the House of Representatives passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107–243) and on March 19, 2003, the United States initiated military operations in Iraq: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) acknowledges the belief on the part of some that the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq and the belief that a final judgment on the value of activities in Iraq cannot be made until Iraq is stable and secure;

(2) commends the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of unspeakable oppression and brutality inflicted on them by Saddam Hussein's regime;

(3) commends the Iraqi people on the adoption of Iraq's interim constitution;

(4) commends the members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces for liberating Iraq and expresses its gratitude for their valiant service; and

(5) urges the President—

(A) to take all steps necessary to ensure that all members of the United States Armed Forces serving in Iraq receive the best force protection equipment available, including protective body armor and extra-armored wheeled vehicles capable of providing better protection against explosive devices;

(B) to ensure that all members of the Armed Forces who suffer wounds or other injuries, or who incur illness, while serving in Iraq receive complete, timely, and high-quality health care to treat the short-term and long-term consequences of such wounds, injuries, and illnesses;

(C) to recognize the key contributions made by members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and their families, in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and, in consultation with Congress, to address immediately the disparity that exists for many Reserve and Guard personnel between the pay they receive in civilian life and the military compensation they receive when ordered to active duty;

(D) to acknowledge that there were serious deficiencies in United States pre-war intelligence on Iraq, particularly in light of the failure to find any evidence of significant weapons of mass destruction programs, and to take steps now to improve intelligence so that United States troops are better protected and future United States national security strategies are better informed;

(E) to request sufficient funding immediately to fully support United States military operations in Iraq and the surrounding region in order to ensure the safety and well-being of United States troops deployed to Iraq and the surrounding region;

(F) to obtain far-reaching international participation in the securing, reconstruction, and political development of Iraq so that the United States can reduce the number of its troops in Iraq, and reduce the size of its financial commitment to Iraq operations; and

(G) to take steps to correct the failure of the United States Government to plan adequately for the post-war occupation of Iraq, including the failure to integrate internal United States Government studies and outside expert opinions that predicted the onset of guerrilla activity and described how to promote effective reconstruction, democratization, and civil society development activities, and the failure to apply those studies and opinions today in order to improve current United States reconstruction efforts in Iraq;

(6) expresses deep sorrow and regret for the deaths of more than 550 and the wounding of more than 3,500 members of the United States Armed Forces in Iraq and extends support to their families; and

(7) expresses sorrow and regret for the deaths in Iraq of United States civilians, Untied Nations personnel, unknown numbers of Iraqi civilians, and other noncombatants.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. I think there is a little semantic difficulty on the words ''safe'' and ''safer.'' I would not say that Iraq is safe. I would not say crossing Pennsylvania Avenue in rush hour is safe. The question is, Is it safer with Mr. Saddam Hussein in a cell? Or is it less safe with him in one of his palaces plotting to amputate limbs from some of his people or to bury Kurds alive like he has done?

The world is a safer place with him in a cell because Mohmmar Qaddafi watched that and went to school on that. He decided to put his cards down and give up his nuclear pretensions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in commending the brave men and women who have liberated the Iraqi people. And I want to express my heartfelt sympathies to those families who have lost loved ones in battle. Did we do the right thing? I would say we did. Hundreds of mass graves containing the remains of as many as 400,000 victims of Saddam Hussein have been found in Iraq. For those of my colleagues who have not seen it, I would urge them to get a copy of ''Iraq's Legacy of Terror: Mass Graves,'' published by USAID. Let me quote from it:

''Rows of white bundles containing bones filled room after room. Families filed by searching for signs of those who had disappeared, some stolen during the night, others taken in daylight. Even small children were not spared the butchery. Some graves hold a few dozen bodies, their arms lashed together and the bullet holes in the backs of skulls testimony to their execution. Other graves go on for hundreds of meters, densely packed with thousands of bodies.''

We have learned from survivors about Iraqi citizens being indiscriminately detained, men, women, children, the elderly, the blind, the aged, led to the edge of a swamp and executed one by one. Why? Just to let everybody know who was in charge. We know that Saddam's psychopath sons were as evil as their father. His eldest son Uday boasted that when it was his time to rule Iraq he would be even more brutal than Saddam. It was Uday who routinely had his thugs deliver women to him so he could rape them. It was he who was said to have fed a young woman to his attack dogs. It is he who reportedly abducted and violently raped a newlywed. After she committed suicide, he had her husband arrested and executed.

Now, because of the bravery and sacrifice of the men and women of our Armed Forces, Saddam is behind bars, Uday and Qusay are roasting in hell, and 25 million Iraqis are free.

Did we do the right thing? I think we did.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the learned gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in my office listening to the rhetoric. It has been very interesting. People have been talking about how this resolution divides us. I do not think it is the resolution. I think it is the rhetoric. We are all in support of our troops, but those who have been over there, as we were just a couple of weeks ago, know that our troops know they are doing the right thing. They know that the Iraqi people are happy that Saddam Hussein is gone. We talked to people when I was over there that said they did not have 400,000 people in mass graves, people that were tortured in the prison; but they believe it was more like between 1 million and 1.3 million. Over 1 million people were thrown into mass graves. That alone is reason enough to get that guy out of there.

But let us talk about weapons of mass destruction. In the 1980s, the Israelis attacked a nuclear reactor in Iraq because they knew he was going to build a nuclear weapon, and a nuclear weapon is a weapon of mass destruction. He used, as we all know, chemical weapons to kill thousands and thousands of Kurds, women and children, and he used those same things in the Iran-Iraq war that went on for 7 years. So this guy used weapons of mass destruction. He violated every single U.N. resolution that came out of the United Nations. So why should we believe that he would not have weapons of mass destruction, that he would disarm himself when he violated every agreement that he made? And he used weapons of mass destruction.

The President had every right to do what he did. Saddam Hussein was a threat not only to the region but to the whole world. As far as working with al Qaeda, you will never convince me that he was not working with the international terrorist network, including al Qaeda. That guy wanted to destroy our way of life and everything we believe in.

Some of my colleagues today have been down here on the floor haranguing about how they feel about this. I want to quote some of my Democratic colleagues and what they have said in the past. On December 17, 1998, regarding Iraqi women and children and how they should be protected, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) said:

''I also say that we in this body, along with the Commander in Chief, must have a definitive policy to protect the suffering women and children and to make sure that democracy comes to the region.'' That is a little different than the tone we are hearing today. My distinguished colleague for whom I have high regard, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), said:

''Had the President not ordered the attack, many would have bitterly criticized him for not having followed through with the tough words he uttered just 1 month ago.'' And also my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) came to the floor to decry criticism of President Clinton's motives for ordering air strikes on Iraq. He said:

''To my colleagues who have questioned the President's motives in the midst of this crisis, shame on them. Shame on them for breaking the longstanding tradition that leaves party politics at our Nation's shores.'' What are we hearing today? Party politics. This is a resolution congratulating our troops and talking about doing the right thing in Iraq, and we ought to be working together instead of criticizing each other for this. Then the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) echoed those sentiments at the same time when he said, ''For one day we should have been patriots, not partisans. Politics should have stopped at the water's edge.'' How about today? That is what the Democrat colleagues of mine were saying just a few years ago.

And, of course, the distinguished minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), said on National Public Radio's ''Talk of the Nation'' program, ''There is no question that everyone wants regime change in Iraq. The question is change to what?'' And then on the ''O'Reilly Factor'' she said in 2002, ''I think Americans and those in Congress are unified in wanting and joining the President in wanting a regime change in Iraq.''

Then let me quote the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), who said in 2002, ''We cannot simply hope that Saddam Hussein will be deterred. He has shown himself to be an inveterate and dangerous gambler.'' The gentleman from New York was not wrong. This is a good resolution. We ought to all join together to pass it.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The President of the United States has said there is no connection between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein. The director of intelligence has said there is no connection. Secretary of State Colin Powell has said there is no connection. You may think there is a connection. We are revisiting history when we start to talk about all the things the gentleman is talking about. We went to war because there were weapons of mass destruction. We went to war because there was connection with al Qaeda. We did not go to war because of this. Many of these incidents happened when George Bush I was President and he said, ''I'm not going to go into Iraq because I don't want to rebuild Iraq.'' The cost to this Nation, the Under Secretary of Defense said, will be nothing. He said, ''We'll pay for it with their oil.'' $150 billion later we are still paying, and we will pay for a long time.

I am in this for the long haul, but when I see a partisan resolution which was brought up without any input from me or any other Democrat, and you call us partisan? This does not make any sense. Why did anybody not come to us and say, change a few words, change some in the preamble and we will have a resolution we can support.

I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. There is nobody that has supported Presidents more than I have, but I just get upset when something comes across this way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), a Korean War veteran.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most difficult periods of time that I have had, because I do not get angry when the majority drafts bills in order to embarrass Democrats. I think that goes with the job. But I think it is really insulting and embarrassing when they use the troops as a vehicle to embarrass us.

There is nobody on either side of the aisle that will challenge the deep respect that we have for the men and women in our Armed Forces. But when the majority drafts a bill and says this is a Republican bill, you know that there is something crummy about it. You just have to look and find out what it is.

So they start saying all of these things that we agree to; but then they say, and it is a safer world as a result of Saddam Hussein being captured. It would seem to me that the lives of Americans that are on the line, their safety, that if there is anything that we as Democrats and politicians could find as sacred, if we just wanted to commend them and their families and their loved ones, that we would go out of our way to make certain that we do not put anything in there that could be described by political pundits as a poison pill. We should run it by Democrats and Republicans and say, Is there anything at all offensive in this because we do not want this to be controversial?

I am so glad I was not a fly on the wall when the Republican leadership put this together because in my heart I do not truly believe that they wanted to find some way to laud the troops, but they wanted some way to try to find to embarrass Democrats. To use our military is one of the cheapest things that I think you can do.

Let us talk about who these military people are that we are lauding. This is one of those things I learned on Lennox Avenue when I was a hoodlum. There are always some people talking about, Let's go to fight. Let's settle this. Bring them on and we're not going to tolerate anything except total victory. But when it comes time to get involved in that fight, they are the same ones saying, ''You go ahead in the fight, I'll hold your coat.''

There is a lot of talk about shared sacrifice, but I hope we take a look and see who are the people who are volunteers, that is, volunteering putting their lives on the line each and every day. I remember in June of 1950 I was in Fort Lewis, Washington, and we were alerted that the Second Infantry Division was going to go to Korea to fight the North Koreans. Not one of us ever said, ''What is the fight about? What is the war about?'' We only knew that we were warriors, we were military people; and when that flag went up, we saluted it.

I go off and see the Reservists. I go off and see the National Guard going to Iraq. Not one of them has asked the political question as to why are we going over there. Yet I think that we have the political responsibility when we endorse the wars to find out not only why are we doing it but we have a political responsibility to be satisfied that it is the right thing. If we differ about that, that is what America is all about. That is what the Congress is all about. But you do not put that controversy in a bill when these military people do not have the options to discuss whether the war is right or wrong. They have the responsibility to obey the Commander in Chief.

I have taken a little survey along with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) about who is fighting this war and these people that we are commending. Believe me, they did not sign up to get rid of Saddam Hussein. As evil as this guy may be, one day some of us may be asked the question, Was it worth 550 American lives or 3,000 people that are in our heart, some with and some without Purple Hearts? One day someone would ask, where did they come from? Did they enlist to fight terrorism, or did they enlist because there were no jobs available? Are these minorities from the inner cities that are looking for a better way of life but accept their responsibility as to why they enlisted? Do they come from districts such as the gentleman from Missouri's district, the rural areas where unemployment is rampant? And why do we find there are more blacks, almost twice as many as the population, in the Army and how does that compare where in my city 50 percent of the African American men are unemployed?

□ 1815

Do the Members not think that had something to do with the enlistments? Do the Members not think they wanted to send a check home to their mom because they could not get a job? Do the Members not think they want the educational benefits to improve themselves, as I did as a high school dropout?

And why do we have to commend them when we find out just today that 12 percent of the Nation's population is black but they represent 20 percent of those that were killed. Black deaths in the Iraq war exceeds the rate of Vietnam. Go to Hispanics, we see the same thing. Go to white Americans and we see the same thing.

So we do not need a political resolution to try to polarize this Congress. We know we love and respect those people who salute that flag. And to put in a political controversial clause to attempt to embarrass us is just not going to work.

How low can you get when you use the military as a way to attempt to embarrass your colleagues?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I enjoyed listening to the last speaker tell us of his war exploits. I never tire of hearing them, and I find them quite fascinating. But I am bewildered. I do not quite understand why someone who wants to praise the military does not understand that getting rid of Saddam Hussein and trying to secure Iraq is a conquest by our military, an achievement, and that is why they are first in the four things this resolution does. And why he would want to detract from that accomplishment, that military achievement, is something that I am bewildered by.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for edification since he is bewildered?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the last time I yielded, I did not get my time back.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentleman from Illinois controls the time. If the gentleman yields back his time, the gentleman from Pennsylvania may recognize the gentleman from New York, and then we have got our time in order.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HYDE. Very well, Mr. Speaker. I yield back my time and I will listen again.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the chairman may be fascinated by my war experiences. I did not talk about it. When he has time, I will give him more time than he will ever want to hear about it.

What I am saying is this: We have an opportunity to laud our service people. You know there is one issue on this floor, and that is whether or not we were misled in getting involved in this. I do not care which side one is on. We want to laud the servicemen. Why would you put Saddam Hussein in this resolution? Why did you not leave him out so that we could have unanimous consent that we laud the military? You deliberately put Saddam Hussein in there to divide us and not to bring us together.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of this resolution. One year ago this week, freedom came to the good people of Iraq and the tyrant Saddam Hussein fell. And it is impossible to speak of the one without the other. And the contents of this resolution are therefore fitting and appropriate.

I rise to support this resolution, Mr. Speaker, with my feet still dusty from a trip to Iraq just 2 weeks ago. And while I was deeply moved and overwhelmed by the valor of our troops during that journey, I was equally moved by the gratitude and the affection that I experienced from the people of Iraq. I really fell in love with the Iraqi people, and I learned that the Iraqis that I met love the American people.

We traveled through a ravaged city of Basra, one-story sandstone homes, and met at Coalition Provisional Headquarters. During our meeting with top civil and religious leaders, I thought when it came to my turn I would just ask them, What did they think of our decision to remove Saddam Hussein? And what had been a cool if not distant atmosphere in our discussion suddenly erupted in a flourish of passion and candor. A local Muslim leader, whose dress and appearance gave him an ancient air, said icily to me ''Saddam Hussein was a nightmare, and the day that your people removed him from power was a day when a dark curtain was lifted from the people of Iraq and the daylight was able to shine in.''

Later we met with a large group of ordinary Iraqis eager to speak to American officials. As we sat around the lunch table, there were pointed opinions. These English-speaking Iraqis were so strong in their views and sometimes criticisms of our reconstruction policies, I thought for all the world I was back on the floor of Congress. But then they began to speak of their gratitude toward the American people, of the horror of living under Saddam Hussein, of 400,000 bodies of men and women and boys and girls that had been found, and another 800,000 that were missing. I saw them many times, Mr. Speaker, with tears in their eyes say to me as an American official ''When you go home, tell the people that you serve that we are grateful to the American people and your allies for what you have done for us.'' And they were breathlessly excited about democracy.

I will never forget the moment at a USAID class where I spoke to a group of Iraqi women. They shared with me poems in English that they had written about democracy, and almost with the enthusiasm of grade-school children, their hands almost quivered as they spoke of the future in which they believe.

I rise to honor in this resolution our Armed Forces, our allies, and the good people of Iraq, all of whom deserve the resolution and support of this Congress.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for yielding me this time.

This resolution rightly highlights the vast crimes against humanity committed by Saddam Hussein's regime. And as we have heard today, as many as 270 mass graves have been found so far, containing the bodies of 400,000 Iraqis. Four hundred thousand.

I remember photos my father, a U.S. serviceman, took when U.S. forces overran the death camp in Dachau, Germany in the closing days of World War II. People executed in pits, by the thousands. I never thought I would see photos like those photos again.

In the days and weeks following Saddam's overthrow, we learned more about another dictator's evil, and here is one account from the L.A. Times: ''The executions took place two or three times on most days. Each time between 100 and 150 blindfolded people, their hands and sometimes feet bound, were led into pits about 10 feet deep. Gunmen then fired into the pit, often for several minutes . . . A bulldozer then pushed dirt over the bodies, sometimes burying or crushing people who had survived the volley and were trying to climb out.'' Four hundred thousand people.

In two trips to Iraq, I have had the chance to talk to tortured Iraqis. Some ask, Why act in Iraq and not the other countries suffering through human rights nightmares? I would respond that just because we do not act in all cases of gross human rights abuses does not mean we should not act in any cases. Moreover, in Iraq's case, our ability to act effectively is greater because our vital national security interests are on the line. Our interest in seeing a reformed Middle East will keep us committed to building a free Iraq. So let us forget that argument. It obscures the nightmare that was Saddam's Iraq and it belittles our closing of his torture chambers.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We did not go to war in World War II because of Dachau. We went to war because they attacked us, because our national security was in danger. And we went to war in Iraq because there

were weapons of mass destruction, I thought. There were al Qaeda connections, I thought. We did not go to war because these people were killed.

George Bush one, the first George Bush, knew there were mass graves. And he did not go into Iraq and he said, I do not want to rebuild Iraq; I do not want to occupy Iraq. And one Under Secretary of Defense said to our subcommittee it will not cost us a cent. It has cost us $150 billion to fight in Iraq and to rebuild Iraq.

So we are trying to revisit history. I mean, we cannot change it. We went to war because we thought we were threatened. These things were terrible things. We are glad to get rid of Saddam Hussein. That is not the point. We cannot revisit and change history. So I feel very strongly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, like many senior Democrats, I supported George Herbert Walker Bush in going into Iraq the first time. I also served my country in World War II, and I know a little about the military.

But I want to talk about this curious process that we are going through today. I want to talk about this resolution. If we look, the Committee on Rules has given us a closed rule. No Democratic amendments are allowed. No real discussion is permitted. And it says so in the report. If my colleagues do not believe me, they should get a copy of it. No Democratic sponsors. Very little Democratic support or consultation on this side with the Members.

If we want to have bipartisan support for what we are doing over there, there is a way to do it. It may well be my Republican colleagues do not know it. But a little consultation over here could be useful. I think my colleagues on the Republican side should know what the problem is. It is where we make an affirmation that the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime. Have we really been made safer? Let us look at it. We have committed the entirety of our military to serve over there. We have nothing to meet a problem which might exist in Korea or somewhere else where there are atom bombs and weapons of mass destruction now readily available. No weapons of mass destruction have been found. Mr. Kay and Mr. Blix both said none. The President said they are there. Now the President has admitted they are not. And, of course, my Republican colleagues now want to purge themselves of responsibility for what is evidence of some kind of either disingenuous behavior or outright dishonesty in committing us to a war on the theory that there were weapons of mass destruction there.

Now we also have our Republican colleagues in the curious position where they say that al Qaeda is operating there, and al Qaeda probably is operating there, and we must ask again if we are safer because al Qaeda operates there. The fact of the matter is there is no evidence at any time previously, and the administration has to admit it, that al Qaeda or any terrorist group was functioning out of Iraq. That is something that has now been manufactured in the teeth of admissions by the administration that that kind of situation does not obtain.

I do not want to say whether the administration has deceived the American people intentionally or otherwise. That will be decided by history, and we are going to have to let the Republicans and their administration decide whether it was an exercise of supreme incompetence or whether there was dishonesty or some curious mixture of the above. I do not want to pollute this debate with that kind of discussion.

But I do want to point out some things. We are not safer now with the troops that we have all committed over there and the inability to address problems that exist in Korea or elsewhere in the world where people might stir up trouble, or in Iran, immediately next door, or, for that matter, in Pakistan, or in other places where there are dictators who are anxious and willing and able to make trouble. We are not stronger in this country because we have committed, as my good friend from Pennsylvania says, 150-some billion dollars. The number is actually more like $186 billion over there.

□ 1830

That is money that will not be available for schools and education and health. It is money that is not going to be able to assist us to deal with threats to the security of this Nation from other causes, from the risks that exist in the other countries that do make trouble.

This is the defect of this process. If we want to deal with this thing of our commitment in Iraq, I say to my Republican colleagues, address it in a real bipartisan way. Let us consult. Let us work together. Let us consult together so that we can pull together in the interests of the United States. Because every man and woman in this Chamber wants to bring those young people home safe, with dignity and honor. Every person in this Chamber wants to see to it that we win over there. And every American in this Chamber is committed to seeing to it that we not only bring our people home safe, but to see to it that we win, and that we now do correct the problems of having committed ourselves to what was essentially a very unwise war on the basis of unwise statements which had little or no basis in fact.

That is the way we should be addressing this issue. We should not be bringing forward to the House something that looks like a pronouncement from the Republican National Committee that has all of the bipartisanship that one can find in such an undertaking. We should be talking and working together about how we bring Americans together now to address this question. Patriotic Americans are still entitled to speak their thoughts. Patriotic Americans are still entitled to have answers to why we are in this mess. And sensible, intelligent men and women are entitled to ask why we are in this mess.

Mr. Speaker, history tells us what we are looking at. The British went in in 1920 to Iraq. They left Iraq after a dozen years of warfare over there. They had lost thousands of British troops' lives, hundreds of millions of pounds, each one of those pounds was worth somewhere between $50 and $100 U.S. dollars today, and they still were not able to win, to get the peace that they wanted, to establish a world in that area where things would go the way honest and decent human beings wanted it.

Iraq is a country which is driven by racial and religious differences. We have the Sunnis, the Shi'ias, we have the Kurds, the Turkmens, the Catholics, the Christians, and the Chaldeans over there. None of them like each other and all of them distrust each other intensely.

We are losing today about one American every day, one American, dead; but thousands of them maimed and killed in the most gruesome of ways. We need to understand that we have to pull together. This is not the mechanism for that.

These people over there and the United States are not more safe because of this. We are not focusing on international problems which threaten us. We are not able to spend the resources which we need because we are spending them over there and cannot now spend them over here on schools and education and health and other things that are important to our people.

This is the wrong way to proceed. I say shame.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

What are our goals and how do we best achieve them? I would think our goal in this war on terror is to have a safer and better place in America and the rest of the world. I would suggest that we are moving ahead in that direction.

Let me just read the resolution:

''Commends the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of unspeakable oppression and brutality inflicted on them by Saddam Hussein's regime.'' I do not think we should disagree with that.

''Commends the Iraqi people on the adoption of Iraq's interim constitution.'' I do not think anyone should disagree with that.

''Commends the members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces for liberating Iraq and expresses its gratitude for their valiant service.'' Certainly nobody would disagree with their valiant service.

Is it a question that we are liberating Iraq? I thought the poll that came out was very interesting, where 2,500 Iraqis were polled on their opinion now, a year later, and I will read a couple. Some 57 percent said that life was better now than under Saddam, against 19 percent who said it was worse. Fifty-seven said it was better now and 19 percent said it was worse. Overall, 70 percent said that life was good now. Seventy percent said that life was good now, compared with 29 percent who said it was bad.

Asked what political system they believed was needed in their country, 86 percent said they wanted democracy. I met a little over a month ago with 60 nations at the Pacific Interparliamentary meeting. Those people are happy, in my mind, as I judge their conversations, that the United States and Great Britain and the coalition forces are doing something. They are sort of happy they are not paying for it, but they are happy that somebody is aggressive in this war on terrorism.

I met a couple of weeks ago in Libya, and Qaddafi, there is no question that Qaddafi did not want to end up the way that Saddam did. I was one of eight Members in Libya, and now we have countries like Libya saying, We are going to give up our nuclear weapons. We are going to give up our weapons of mass destruction.

Did Saddam have those weapons? We know he had them. This summer we found all of those airplanes buried under the sand. I think, I suspect, that some place under the sand or someplace, there are still those weapons. We know he had them; we do not know what he did with them. I think the world is safer.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, like so many here in the House, I continue to pray for all of the courageous men and women in the uniforms of our Armed Forces, and especially the families who have lost a loved one and have paid the ultimate price in Afghanistan and Iraq. But I wish, as the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) referenced, that all of the Members could have been with me in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, this past Monday, along with the Secretary of Energy, to see the centrifuges and the nuclear arsenal that was voluntarily given up by Moammar Qaddafi from Libya, because there is no doubt, while we can all draw our own conclusions, there is no doubt in my heart that that is a result of our consistent and decisive offensive since September 11 around the world against terror; because terrorism, as we see in Spain and in Baghdad and the fear in London, is alive and well, and terrorism continues, and we must pursue the terrorists and keep them on the defensive.

I believe our consistency and our resoluteness has paid off in effective ways, such as Libya giving up their nuclear deterrent; the Bush doctrine: You are either with us or you are against us. They have to declare. Libya declared. We do not want to be against you; they are voluntarily giving it up.

Now, we need to listen to some of the neutral parties. I know a lot of the concern today is about process. I do not know, I was not here when the Democrats were in the majority. Frankly, both parties are guilty of shutting out the other side. But I know that I am concerned about the signals that are being sent today out of this Chamber and in this town about our commitment to Iraq. This is a bold, long-term commitment.

Neutral observers like Thomas Friedman expressed concern in the last 48 hours about Spain, what is happening in Iraq, and whether the terrorists are intimidating free people around the world. We need to stand our ground in this war on terror. There is no doubt we had to do what we did in Iraq and that good has come out of it.

Mr. Speaker, terrorism cannot be allowed to win the day. Peace through strength works. Appeasement has never worked. And we are tested again today, whether or not we will stick to our guns and finish what we have started, even if it takes years and more money.

I want to secure our investments in the region. The people were poor there, but the country was wealthy. I believe we have done the right thing, and we have to be strong and tough and dig our heels in.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I believe that when the political smoke of this great debate today clears, that this bill is going to pass with a very substantial vote. I think it is going to be passed with a substantial vote because every one of us in this Chamber wants to keep the commitment that we made several years ago after September 11, that we are going to support our troops when they are in the field, when they are at risk, when they are in harm's way.

This is just another statement, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has repeatedly said today, we have spent a lot of money of American taxpayer dollars to fund the operation, and we want to make sure that our troops understand that we believe they are doing a good job, and they are. We want to let them know that they are not in harm's way in vain.

So I think the bill is going to pass with a nice vote. But do my colleagues know something? I had a chance to be the sponsor of the bill that appropriated $40 billion on September 14 of 2001. I had the privilege of being the sponsor of the supplemental that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) talked about, that was sizable, to pay for our troops in the field and what they needed by way of equipment. But do my colleagues know something? Besides being a player to that extent, I am not offended that I was not asked to write this bill. I am very satisfied that the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) and his committee wrote a very good bill. I am not offended that I was not asked to be the sponsor. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is the ideal sponsor, and those who did sponsor this bill.

So I think once the political smoke clears, this House is going to stand up and is going to be counted and to tell our troops in the field and to tell our troops who are recuperating in hospitals that we support what they are doing, we believe in what they are doing, and that we are here to do whatever has to be done to protect our country and our countrymen from terrorist attacks and to provide support for those who provide that kind of security for us.

I have a lot of other things I would like to say, but time is limited. So, Mr. Speaker, I will insert the balance of my statement into the RECORD at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 557, which honors the valor, courage, and professionalism with which our American forces, and those of our coalition partners, have served in liberating the people of Iraq.

We consider this resolution today on the first anniversary of the initiation of military operations in Iraq. However, the difficult decisions by Congress to authorize the use of force in Iraq and the President's ultimate directive to send troops into Iraq were the culmination of more than 13 years of violence and terrorism directed at the United States and our allies throughout the world.

Saddam Hussein's movement of troops into Kuwait in 1990 threatened the freedom and security of the people of that nation who remain one of our country's staunchest allies. We responded as a Nation and in partnership with the free nations of the world in Operation Desert Storm to throw Saddam's forces out of Kuwait. Subsequently, through a series of United Nation's resolutions, we sought to monitor Saddam's activities to prevent him from again threatening the sovereignty of another ally.

Since then, as this resolution points out, Saddam Hussein and his regime have committed repeated heinous crimes against humanity, including the murder, torture, rape, and amputation of his own people. This is the regime that unleashed weapons of mass destruction against the Kurdish people, killing nearly 5,000. We have found more than 270 mass graves sites in Iraq, with the remains of more than 400,000 people. Saddam Hussein poisoned the water supply of his enemies, he even punished the Marsh Arabs by draining their marshlands, which created hundreds of thousands of refugees and created an ecological catastrophe.

This Congress responded in 1998 by adopting the Iraq Liberation Act, which made it U.S.

policy to support efforts to remove Saddam Hussein and his regime from power. President Clinton, however, after signing this act into law never followed through.

Four years later, after little or no U.S. action to rid Iraq of Saddam Hussein, the United Nation Security Council approved Resolution 1441 declaring that Iraq ''has been and remains in material breach of its obligations'' under previously adopted Security Council resolutions.

Clearly, the United States and President Bush did not start this war, just as we did not start the global war on terrorism. We responded to a series of attacks against the American people and our allies throughout the world.

Recall that on February 26, 1993, six lives were lost in the first bombing of the World Trade Center. Our response at the time was a series of harsh words and empty rhetoric.

Three years later, on June 25, 1996, 19 U.S. service members lost their lives in the bombing of Khobar Towers, outside a U.S. air base in Saudi Arabia. The response again was harsh words, empty rhetoric, and promises of a thorough investigation.

Two years after that, 259 died, including 11 Americans, in the bombing of U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. The response again was more harsh words and a cruise missile attack on a pharmaceutical factory in Sudan.

Finally, feeling empowered by the continuing lack of a credible U.S. response to past attacks, terrorists bombed the USS *Cole* while anchored off Yemen, killing 17 U.S. sailors, and injuring countless others. The U.S. response again was harsh words of outrage and the promise of a full investigation.

The year 2001 arrived with a new President and a new set of world challenges. However, just nine months into the Bush Administration, the world changed forever on September 11, 2001. A hijacked airliner crashes into the Pentagon killing 189. Two hijacked planes crash into the World Trade Center, killing 2,801. And a hijacked plane crashes in rural Pennsylvania, killing 44.

This time it was a different President with a different response. President Bush announced that in response to these terrorist attacks on our nation and our people we will respond by seeking out those who were responsible and hold them accountable. We will respond by identifying terrorist organizations and eliminate them at their roots.

Mr. Speaker, the terrorist attacks of September 11th were a direct assault on our nation's freedom, and a test of our will to defend it. The nations of the free world wondered if we would meet the challenge, if this time our promises to strike back against the terrorists would be followed by decisive action.

Just three days after September 11th, my Committee on Appropriations and this Congress stepped forward to approve a $40 billion emergency supplemental appropriations bill to fund recovery efforts in New York City and at the Pentagon, and to take military action against the perpetrators of those despicable attacks. That was the first concrete signal to the world that this time, we as a nation were serious in backing up the words of our President. Since that day Congress and the America people have shown time and again that no matter how long it takes or where it may lead, our commitment to win this war on terrorism is unshakeable.

President Bush sent U.S. troops to Afghanistan to destroy and disrupt al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden's operations. Our forces routed the Taliban, killed many terrorists, and eliminated al-Qaeda main base of operations. They also liberated millions of men, women, and children from a cruel regime, and gave them a chance to choose their own government and enjoy the benefits of freedom. But our victory against the Taliban was not the end of the war on terrorism.

When the United Nations determined that Saddam Hussein was not living up to the Security Council resolutions, President Bush acted decisively in sending troops to Iraq.

This resolution recognizes the remarkable swiftness and precision with which our troops advanced across Iraq to remove from power the Hussein regime. The effectiveness of our Armed Forces caught the enemy by surprise. Even after the end of major combat operations in Iraq our troops have continued their mission to stabilize and rebuild that country. They have captured 45 of the 55 most wanted Iraqis, including Saddam himself, ensuring that he will never return to power. With the cooperation of Iraqi security forces, our troops have captured and killed hundreds of terrorists who sought to restore the dictator to power. The world has also seen the humanity and generosity of America, as our troops, using funds appropriated by this Congress, help restore water and electricity, provide basic health services, and bring children back to school, free from intimidation and indoctrination.

There are those in this debate today who have said that we started the war against terrorists in Afghanistan and Iraq. The truth of the matter is that the war started in 1993 with the first bombing of the World Trade Center, which was greeted with such a tepid response. Thank God that on September 11, 2001 George Bush was President and he decided that there was enough of this one-sided war against Americans and our allies. There was enough of us being on the receiving end of cowardly acts of terrorism, with the bad guys getting away with it. So yes, we did engage in combat finally to fulfill our obligation to protect our country and our people whether in their workplace, in their homes, or in their schools.

Having spent considerable time with our troops here at home and abroad, including those who have been injured in the line of duty, I can tell you that they support President Bush and their mission. These kids; and I say kids because many who are on the front lines are 18, 19, and 20 years old; are true patriots. Those who are injured are determined to get well so they can get back to the fight to finish the job they have begun. They all share a strong belief that what we are doing is right, not just for the people of Iraq, but it is right for the freedom loving people of the world.

The battle of Iraq was another critical advance in the War on Terrorism. Today we are establishing a Muslim democracy at the heart of the Middle East. Representatives from all three of Iraqi's major ethnic groups came together on march 8 to sign an interim constitution. Iraq now has an independent judiciary and will have free elections later this year. Because of the leadership of our President, the courage and determination of our troops,and the strong commitment the members of this body made to the rebuilding of Iraq, that nation is making strong progress towards freedom and prosperity.

As many of you know, my wife Beverly and I spend many hours visiting wounded soldiers and Marines at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center and the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, Maryland. In addition to comforting them and helping give them strength for their recovery, I always take the time to remind them that the American people are grateful for their service and their sacrifice, and proud of their achievements. Mr. Speaker, this resolution gives Members of this body the opportunity to remind all of our men and women in uniform that we are thankful for their service, and proud of their victory in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, it was President Franklin Delano Roosevelt who in this very Chamber talked about the ''four essential human freedoms.'' He said that they are, ''The freedom of speech—everywhere in the world. The freedom of every person to worship God in his or her own way—everywhere in the world. The freedom from want—everywhere in the world. The freedom from fear—anywhere in the world.''

President Bush has led the world-wide effort to ensure the freedom from fear, anywhere in the world, whether it be the United States, Iraq, Afghanistan, or Spain. And he has called upon the world's most powerful and best trained soldiers of peace to carry out that mission, which they have done with valor, with courage, with pride, with devotion, and with unmatched professionalism.

Mr. Speaker, with the adoption of this resolution today, we can reiterate our support for their mission which is to ensure a world where people can truly live free from fear.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN).

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, for more than 20 years, Saddam Hussein used tactics of torture, brutality, and fear to terrorize the citizens of Iraq and neighboring countries. Exactly 16 years ago this week, Saddam Hussein unleashed weapons of mass destruction that killed 5,000 of his own Kurdish citizens. He encouraged Iraqi officials to rape and torture women. Men and women of Iraq were repressed, and they were isolated from the rest of the world.

One year after the United States and coalition forces liberated Iraqi citizens, the people of Iraq are embracing this opportunity to build a new and free Iraq for their children.

Last October, I saw firsthand the remarkable activities that are taking place on the ground in Iraq. There are now over 3,800 programs that offer immediate assistance to improve the quality of life for all Iraqi people. As reconstruction efforts continue to move forward, many essential services like water, sanitation, electricity, and telecommunication have been restored and even surpass prewar levels. In fact, public health spending is now 26 times as great as it was under Saddam's regime.

Today I met with a delegation of Iraqi leaders to talk about the continuing advances in Iraq. This was a diverse delegation. It was men and women, Shi'ias, Sunnis, tribal leaders, doctors, members of the free press. They are dedicated to promoting and to teaching democracy throughout south central Iraq. They shared their personal stories. They talked about the Democracy Regional Center where a democracy discussion was held for more than 1,500 Iraq people from different backgrounds, and they are launching a radio station, and they are promoting democracy to 10 million people through that part of the country. The Iraqi people are embracing democracy with open arms.

Mr. Speaker, last week I held a roundtable discussion with a group of remarkable women leaders from Iraq. One of the women in the group gave me her wedding ring to keep as a reminder that we should not waiver from our commitment to women.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, support the Iraqi men and women who have done so much for us in that Nation. We should help them.

□ 1845

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, as I sit here and I listen to the debate, I am almost in disbelief when I hear Members on the other side claiming perhaps that the world is not as safe a place since Saddam Hussein was removed.

But I do not hear anyone on the other side disputing the facts in the resolution that Saddam Hussein committed crimes against humanity, that he subjected the Iraqi people to murder and torture, and that he unleashed weapons of mass destruction against his own people.

So I can only arrive at the conclusion that perhaps someone is insinuating that the horrific terrorist bombings that have occurred in Bali, in Riyadh, Madrid, Jerusalem since Saddam Hussein's ouster would not have occurred if he were still in office. Now, that is just preposterous. I know that no one would suggest such a thing.

President Bush was right when he said that we cannot distinguish between the terrorists and the states that sponsor those terrorists. Regimes like Saddam Hussein's still exist. Those brutal outlaw regimes around the world who are there supporting the terrorist organizations are our enemies just as the terrorists themselves.

Clearly, without Saddam Hussein, America is safer. The Middle East is safer. Just ask the Israelis. Ask them if they feel that they are not safer without the threat of Saddam and his Scuds aiming at Tel Aviv. Of course they are safer. Of course the world is safer.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by thanking God that we have our troops and our young men and women who are volunteering their lives, risking their lives to go and take the battle to the front lines, to take the battle to the terrorists so that perhaps we can avoid another terrorist attack on our homeland.

Mr. Speaker, some people may flinch when they look in the eyes of the terrorists, but with this President in this House with the American people, that will never happen.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the distinguished whip.

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, today as we debate this resolution, I am more convinced than ever that our country's leadership in removing Saddam Hussein from power was both morally and strategically right. Saddam Hussein left no choice but for us to act. He systematically violated 17 separate U.N. Security Council resolutions. The U.N. chose not to act. He tried to conceal from the international community his desire to produce weapons of mass destruction.

In November of 1999, our Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, said that Saddam Hussein has chosen to spend his money on weapons of mass destruction and palaces for his cronies. No doubt David Kay was correct when he called Saddam a gathering threat during a recent congressional hearing. If you do not believe Mr. Kay, maybe we should ask the families of the thousands of Kurds Saddam gassed in 1988 or ask the first U.N. weapons inspectors who prior to 1998 revealed the presence of anthrax, mustard gas, VX nerve gas, chemical weapons casings, and bombs filled with germ agents. These weapons remain unaccounted for today.

Saddam Hussein's regime's support of numerous other terror organizations is well documented. Iraq stoked terrorism and instigated violence in Palestinian territories by paying the families of suicide bombers $25,000 for attacking innocent civilians.

Iraq harbored the notorious Abu Nidal, whose terror organization carried out more dozens of terrorist attacks in 20 countries that killed and injured nearly 900 people including many Americans.

Iraq harbored Abu Abbas who was responsible for the Achille Lauro.

Iraq also incorporated the MEK terrorist organization into its own military and security forces.

Since Saddam's fall, Libya voluntarily opened its weapons program to inspectors. Pakistan is now taking overdue action to reign in its nuclear proliferators. And very importantly, the emergence of a pluralist and democratic Iraq is forcing the region to undertake democratic and social reforms which will enhance stability throughout the Middle East.

Iraq has a bright future. Not every day is a bright day, but every day moves closer to constitutional government and democracy. On March 8, the governing council approved an interim constitution. Took us a lot longer to do that in our country. A sovereign government will assume authority for Iraq, we hope, later this year, later this summer even.

There is plenty of work left to be done. But I think as we move this resolution today, we appropriately commend those who led this fight, the Iraqi people, for their incredible courage and optimism in the face of unspeakable horrors, and the proud men and women who serve us in the United States Armed Forces.

For the reasons I just mentioned, along with many other reasons, I voted with the vast majority of my colleagues in 1998 in favor of the Iraq Liberation Act, which made it the policy of the Untied States that Saddam Hussein should be removed from power. And I commend the President for his leadership in taking action on this policy.

And, Mr. Speaker, as a result of this action, there is no question that the United States and the world are safer. Decisive coalition action against this brutal dictator and his WMD programs has demonstrated our resolve. To name a few specific examples: First, in the weeks and months after the war, Colonel Gadhafi's regime in Libya voluntarily opened up its weapons program to inspectors after considering the cost of defying the United States and its partners in the war on terrorism; second, Pakistan is now taking overdue action to rein in its nuclear proliferators and, as a result, the network of illicit WMD suppliers is becoming more clear; last, Mr. Speaker, and this is very important, the emergence of a pluralist and democratic Iraq is forcing regional autocrats to undertake much-needed democratic and social reforms, which will lead to greater stability in a tumultuous region.

For the first time in their lives, Iraqis will be guaranteed a free and fair election process, a Bill of Rights, and an independent judiciary; ideals which we here in America take for granted. All Iraqis, most notably Iraqi women, now have freedoms and rights they could have only dreamed of after a generation spent under Saddam's reign of terror. And more than 200,000 Iraqis have been trained and equipped by coalition forces to provide for the security, not the repression, of the Iraqi people.

To be sure, there is plenty of work left to be done in Iraq. A society of terror and repression does not transform into a free and stable democracy overnight. But we must have faith in the Iraqi people. Early in our own Nation's history, regional and racial schisms threatened to tear the United States apart. Although the parallel is not perfect, many of Iraq's challenges today resemble those of early America as Iraq struggles to secure peaceful borders, build institutions, and draft a working democratic constitution in the face of great odds.

The United States and the new Iraqi government must be strong allies in the war against terror, the effort to halt the proliferation of WMDs, and the ongoing struggles to bring fundamental human rights to all people. No other modern nation's people understand the need for these efforts like the people of Iraq. The normalization of relations with Iraq will provide us with opportunities to work closely

with our Iraqi friends. I urge my colleagues to meet and work with Rend Rahim, the Representative to the United States from the Iraqi Governing Council, and who under the new sovereign government will become Iraqi Ambassador to the United States. Representative Rahim left Baghdad as a young woman in the 1970s. In 1991 she founded the Iraq Foundation and has become well-known as a passionate advocate for democracy in her homeland. In her new role she will work tirelessly toward fostering and maintaining the relationship between the United States and a free and democratic Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we must be prepared to stay the course in Iraq, to overcome the terrorists and Ba'athists who fear democratic principles, and to put forth the necessary resources to demonstrate to the Iraqis and to the world that the United States will always remain committed to a free and secure Iraq. I commend the President and our coalition allies for their leadership in deposing Saddam Hussein, a brutal dictator who procured and employed weapons of mass destruction, repressed and tortured his people, and actively encouraged global terrorists with financial rewards. I commend the Iraqi people for their incredible courage and prevailing optimism in the face of horrors you and I cannot imagine. And I commend the proud men and women of the United States armed forces, who have proven once again that when called upon in defense of freedom, their effectiveness is unmatched anywhere in the world.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I associate my remarks with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

I rise with concern and dismay on the Resolution before us.

First of all it resolves a sense of the House of Representatives. How can you have a sense of the entire House when it only has Republican authors?

How can it be a sense of the House with not a single Democrat as a co-sponsor?

This Resolution seems to provide political cover for the President for failing to secure support from our major Western allies in the War on Terrorism in Iraq.

This Resolution ignores the fact that we had no post-conflict reconstruction plan, before the first bombs dropped.

The Resolution glosses over the fact that our investigators, along with the United Nations inspectors, have found no weapons of mass destruction and were denied more time to complete their inspections, which could have obviated the need to go to war.

This Resolution is brought up at a time when the President's poll ratings are slipping.

The world is not safer and adoption of this politicized resolution won't make it so.

Baghdad is suffering new deaths as we debate, our own home turf suffers from its own brand of terrorism. Inner city communities are losing lives in drive by shootings and Americans don't feel safer.

No, the world is not safer and to get Congress to say that it is, is hypocrisy at its worst.

In an election year, Congress should work to bring us together—not to play political gotcha.

I urge this body to reject this Resolution. We can do better. We can truly support our troops without political excuses. We can commend the Iraqi people for their courage without taking credit for their courage.

Write a Resolution without partisan politics and it will get a unanimous vote, which is after all, what is needed to show support for our troops—not a house divided for partisan purposes.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. TIERNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in salute to America's troops and veterans, and urge my colleagues to honor their sacrifices not with lofty political rhetoric but with concrete budgetary reality.

Sadly, we are denied that opportunity today. Instead, after waiting weeks for a budget and voting primarily on uncontested matters, receiving only this week a proposed budget that:

Fails to appropriately address the sad state of our economy;

Fails to propose policies that will create an environment for the maintenance and creation of jobs;

Fails to clearly fund ongoing expenses related to the continuing military efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq and fails to adequately fund force protective measures as well as first responder needs for homeland security;

Fails to fund the President's own promises with respect to education mandates on local communities;

Fails to even begin to deal with the nation's health care crisis;

Proposes pilfering the Social Security surplus; and

Forces enormous further debt burden on every one of our children.

This Republican House leadership—I believe in cooperation with the White House—now proposes to politicize foreign policy for their own domestic political purposes.

It's a disgrace!

The self-promoted "uniter not divider" in the White House has at every opportunity slammed any effort at bi-partnership—this resolution is one more example. The White House has been complicit as House Republicans manipulate and distort rules and customs to wring every ounce of the democratic process out of the exercise of government here, while professing to support democracy worldwide.

After shamelessly exploiting in TV advertisements the 9/11 tragedies and depicting victims (whose families the President would not honor by cooperating with the investigation into circumstances surrounding the incident as well as intelligence and government action and inaction leading up to and following 9/11) and first responders (who must continue to labor on the front lines without adequate communications, equipment, training, standards and support), this group of Republicans now allows four hours to debate a resolution the sole purpose of which is to create a dilemma for those who know the Administration's effort with respect to Iraq and with respect to fighting terror to be woefully inadequate.

The resolution is structured with the appearance of supporting our troops, but is worded so that it could be argued—however wrong such an argument would be—that Congress endorsed the way this Administration has conducted itself with respect to Iraq.

In essence, yet another false choice for Members: Vote for it, so disingenuous political operatives can claim the President is supported even in his misleading acts and his diversion of efforts from the fight against terrorists and his Administration's abject failures of planning for post-Saddam Iraq, or Subject oneself to even more disingenuous assertion by political hacks—for that is what they would be—who might assert a vote against the resolution was a vote against support and recognition for our troops.

It is politics at its most base and vile level, yet this White House and this Republican majority promote it without hesitation.

Well, it will not work! The American people—even with an all-too-slowly awakening media—is learning more each day that this President and this Republican majority have very little in the way of meaningful policy for America—and far too much politics aimed at benefiting their careers and ideological extremists.

Whichever way people vote on this resolution, it will be clear to America that the President's and the Republican majority's hypocritical resolutions will not work any better than their tasteless advertisements.

The American people deserve far better, and the Democrats stand ready with a vision and a plan to deliver it: Democrats are working to protect and defend America from those who plan attacks against our families and communities. Democrats are prepared to use military force to protect our security, our people, and our vital interests, and have an unswerving commitment to ensure that America's armed forces remain the best trained, best led, best equipped force for peace the world has ever known.

Democrats applaud the troops who ousted Saddam in 20 days. We want to support them on their still dangerous mission, and believe we should be debating giving our troops the armor—body and vehicle—rifles, jammers and other equipment they need.

It now appears that the President's rationale for war was flawed. CIA Director George Tenet admitted that the intelligence agencies never told the White House that Iraq posed an imminent threat. [Washington Post 3/10/04] Former Chief UN Weapons Inspector Hans Blix stated that the Bush Administration made up its mind that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction—and wasn't interested in evidence to the contrary. [AP, 3/12/04] But the President and the rest of the Administration said Iraq posed an "urgent and unique threat," an "immediate threat," a "mortal threat," and an "imminent threat" to the people of the United States. [President Bush, 11/20/02; Secretary Rumsfeld, 11/14/02; Financial Times, 8/27/02; Press gaggle with Scott McClellan, 2/10/03] Democrats want a full accounting of the events leading up to the war in Iraq. Americans should be able to trust that what the President tells them is true—especially when it comes to the life and death decisions of war and peace.

Our troops were sent to Iraq without enough of the equipment they depend on to do their jobs safely. Un-armored Humvees are falling victim to road-side bombs and rocket propelled grenades. Thousands of soldiers are

forced to fight without body armor—and the President still failed to include enough funds in his budget to pay for operations in Iraq.

Americans shouldn't have to continue to bear most of the burden of rebuilding Iraq alone. President Bush's dismissive treatment of our allies has left the United States primarily responsible for the heavy burden of stabilizing and rebuilding Iraq. A year after invading Iraq, we are seeing the price of the President's distorted priorities. American taxpayers are paying almost all the bills—a colossal $120 billion and rising. Most importantly, American soldiers are enduring almost all the casualties: over 550 Americans killed and thousands more wounded.

Democrats want to work with our international allies. Democrats want to strengthen the capacity of America's intelligence gathering operation, and forge stronger international coalitions, to increase our ability to target and capture terrorists even before they act. Instead of alienating our allies, Democrats want to work with them and with international institutions so that we can prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and keep them out of the hands of terrorists.

Democrats support a foreign policy that reflects American priorities. Democrats want to make America safer with a foreign policy that reflects American priorities—promoting political and economic freedom and human rights; cooperating with allies and friends; and respecting international law and institutions.

Democrats want an honest accounting of the continued cost of the Iraq war. Top defense officials, including Army Chief of Staff General Peter Schoomaker, testified to Congress that the U.S. war efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan will run out of money in September, leaving the military scrambling to cover as much as $19 billion in costs. [St. Petersburg Times, 2/11/04] Democrats want a detailed plan for future spending, so our troops are guaranteed to get the resources they need.

Homeland security must be a priority. Democrats want to make sure that our firefighters and police officers get the tools they need to keep us safe here at home. But the Bush Administration and the Republicans' budgets fail to provide the funding we need to address our security concerns. Democrats want to connect local, state, and federal terrorist information systems to make sure that every cop on the beat has the information they need to keep our families safe. We want to provide firefighters, police officers, and emergency medical personnel with the equipment they need to communicate in a crisis. We want to protect the long stretches of our border that are currently unwatched and unprotected. And we want to help make sure states are prepared to respond to a bioterrorist attack.

Part of winning the war on terror is taking care of those who helped us fight it. On the battlefield, our troops pledge to leave no soldier behind. Here at home, Democrats know that we must leave no veteran behind. We must ensure their health care, their pensions, and their survivor's benefits. But the Bush Administration wants to raise health care costs for over 1 million veterans, increasing co-payments and imposing new enrollment fees that will cost veterans $2 billion over five years.

Unfortunately, in a disgraceful rebuke to democracy, the Republican majority has stubbornly refused to offer Democrats any opportunity to share our vision and plan with the American people—refusing an up-or-down vote on the Democrats' plan to salute our troops not just with lofty political rhetoric, but with concrete budgetary reality. What are they afraid of? Why are the Republicans cowed by the prospect of a fair debate?

My colleagues, just because the Republican majority refuses us a democratic debate, you need not subject yourselves to the political antics of this most demeaning political ploy. Vote no, yes or present . . . whichever best allows you to share these comments and facts with the American people.

What is important is that the American people know our troops are supported, and that their sacrifices and those of their families are appreciated and honored.

They will know (quickly if the press is alert and perceptive; over time if left to their own diligent inquiries and pursuit of truth) that at a time of great national challenge and need for unity, this White House and their Republican majority once again sought to divide the nation, not unite it, and did so for crass, shortsighted, selfish benefit.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Democratic leader.

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense for yielding. I thank him and commend him for his extraordinary leadership and support of our troops. When the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) speaks, we listen. And that is why I will be joining him in opposition to this resolution this evening.

Mr. Speaker, before I enter into my reasons why, I want to call to the attention of our colleagues a section of the San Francisco Chronicle that was published this Sunday: ''Portraits of Sacrifice.'' It has the face, the name, and the date of sacrifice of the 556 members of the U.S. Armed Forces as of last Thursday who had lost their lives in Iraq since the war began almost a year ago. Of course, sadly, since last Thursday, indeed, since last Sunday, that number has grown.

Mr. Speaker, I will include for the RECORD these names and dates of sacrifice and home towns.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in a moment of silence to honor the memory, the sacrifice, and the patriotism of these brave American troops.

Mr. Speaker, every one of us who serves in this body supports our troops. There is no question about that. We appreciate their valor, their patriotism, again, the sacrifice that they are willing to make for our country. When I have had the privilege of visiting them before the initiation of hostilities with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) last year in Qatar, Turkey, and Kuwait, we promised those troops that they would have whatever they needed, that regardless of what we were on the resolution of going into the war, once we went into the war, once the President made that decision, we were one team, one fight.

And that is why it is so sad that today with this resolution to support the troops that we cannot be one team, one fight. Why was it so difficult for the Republicans to reach across the aisle, say to our troops that we could have come together as one team, one fight, in support of our troops?

Mr. Speaker, it is sad to say that more than 415 of our troops have died, over 415 of the 560-some have died since the President declared in early May the end of major combat with a sign saying ''Mission Accomplished'' behind him.

Perhaps some of those deaths could have been avoided if our troops had the equipment and the actionable intelligence to protect them, the force protection that they needed. But they did not.

I visited Iraq with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the senior Democrat on the Committee on Armed Services, and, similar to the visit with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the troops greeted him with great appreciation for his service to our country.

Again, we promised them the equipment that they needed. And it is only recently, maybe just this week, that the troops have the Kevlar in their lining, in their flak jackets that they need. It has taken that long. And it would not have happened without the gentleman from Pennsylvania's (Mr. MURTHA) insistence when the $87 billion request came to the floor, the second request for Iraq, that did not have the request for that equipment in it.

We all agree that our military conducted itself with great excellence. It performed its duties in a way that is worthy of commendation. However, the civilian preparation was not so good. Do not take my word for it. Take the word of General Zinni, who said the level of sacrifice of our troops was not met with the level of preparation for post-war Iraq.

Over 400 of our troops have died in the post-war phase.

This resolution that we have before us today is interesting in what it lacks. It lacks the recognition of the challenge that we face in Iraq. It is clearly an indication that the Republicans are in severe denial about Iraq. They are in denial as to why we went into Iraq, they are in denial as to what the conditions are that exist in Iraq right now, and they are denying in this resolution what our troops and those who have served in Iraq need.

There is such inconsistency this day that I must spend my time on this floor to point it out. There is so much I want to say about this resolution and about statements that have been made in this debate. But what I want to focus on are some of the inconsistencies of the Republicans. Because

while we have been debating here what would be the best resolution, bringing us together, of course, we do not have that opportunity, while the Republicans are proposing this resolution on the floor, they are dishonoring the troops in the Committee on the Budget. They are dishonoring the troops in the Committee on the Budget.

The Bush budget shortchanges American veterans. When he tells our brave troops serving in Iraq and Afghanistan in the State of the Union address that he will, quote, ''give you the resources you need,'' but then does not budget for them, his credibility gap grows and so does my colleagues'.

This budget refuses to end the disabled veterans tax. It does not end the survivors' benefit tax. It proposes new increases in the cost of veterans health care. This is what is going on on Capitol Hill today while we have this meager resolution to support the troops on the floor. It fails to provide meaningful investments in veterans' health care. The list goes on and on.

And the severe blow was that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Military Construction, offered a resolution to add $1.3 billion for veterans' health. And that was defeated along party lines. That would have been a way to honor our troops. Yes, indeed, it would have.

□ 1900

When I say that this resolution is in denial about why we went into the war, of course it mentions nothing about weapons of mass destruction, but it does mention that Saddam Hussein drained the Arab marsh, causing an ecological disaster. Did my colleagues realize that that was the reason that we went to war, the same folks who have rolled back 30 years of bipartisan environmental progress are declaring a cause of war, the draining of the marsh in Iraq? It was a terrible environmental disaster.

Nobody spoke about it at the time, but there is another swamp that must be drained and that is right here in Washington, DC, the swamp of special interest money, the swamp that says special interest money calls for giving tax cuts to people making over $1 million, not having $1 million, making over $1 million a year, give them that tax cut but do not provide for our troops and do not provide for our veterans. At the same time, we are giving money to Halliburton, who is ripping off the taxpayer while feeding the troops with overcharges.

Yes, there is a swamp that needs to be drained. It is right here in Washington, DC, and that would not be an environmental disaster.

Mr. Speaker, we did have an opportunity and we requested of the Committee on Rules that we be able to present a Democratic resolution. In fact, we had hoped it would be a bipartisan resolution, and it drew upon the expertise of so many; the leadership, the patriotism, the intellect, the integrity of so many of our Members.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), of course, called for us immediately to offer our condolences to the families of those who were killed in Iraq. That would have been a valuable addition to this resolution. It insisted that we give the troops the body armor, all of them, and the armored vehicles they need to keep them safe. Some of that has come to fruition because of the gentleman from Pennsylvania's (Mr. MURTHA) work. Much of it is still not accomplished.

Under the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. HARMAN) leadership, we had in our resolution to immediately remedy the deficiencies in the intelligence on which our troops rely. Force protection saves lives. As a 10-year member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I value that. It should be part of what we are advancing.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) insisted that we honestly account for the cost of ongoing military operations in Iraq.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) insisted that we assemble a true international coalition to accomplish our mission.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) demanded that we eliminate disparities in pay between our active duty military and the National Guard and reservists. We had that opportunity today, but you rejected it.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) again insisted that we provide for the health care and benefits our wounded servicemen and -women earned for when they come home.

Why could we not have come to the floor with a bipartisan resolution? Why could we not have been one team, one fight? I do not understand it. We all take our responsibility to provide for the common defense very, very seriously. The clear and present danger facing our country is terrorism. Our military and our Intelligence Community serve our country well. They protect us with their lives. We must support them with our actions, as well as our words.

Our military, we pledged to leave no soldier behind on the battlefield. We must leave no soldier or any veteran behind in our budget. Only then will we honor them in a manner worthy of their sacrifice.

The material I referred to previously I will insert in the RECORD at this point.

Name, Age, Branch, Hometown, State

Jay Thomas Aubin, 36, Marine Corps, Waterville, ME.

Ryan Anthony Beaupre, 30, Marine Corps, Bloomington, IL.

Therrel S. Childers, 30, Marine Corps, Harrison, MS.

Jose Gutierrez, 22, Marine Corps, Los Angeles, CA.

Brian Matthew Kennedy, 25, Marine Corps, Houston, TX.

Kendall Damon Waters-Bey, 29, Marine Corps, Baltimore, MD.

Thomas Mullen Adams, 27, Navy, La Mesa, CA.

Nicholas M. Hodson, 22, Marine Corps, Smithville, MO.

Eric James Orlowski, 25, Marine Corps, Buffalo, NY.

Christopher Scott Seifert, 27, Army, Morrisville, PA.

Brandon S. Tobler, 19, Army, Portland, OR.

Jamaal R. Addison, 22, Army, Roswell, GA.

Edward J. Anguiano, 24, Army, Brownsville, TX.

Michael E. Bitz, 31, Marine Corps, Oxnard, CA.

Brian Rory Buesing, 20, Marine Corps, Cedar Key, FL.

George E. Buggs, 31, Army, Barnwell, SC.

Tamario D. Burkett, 21, Marine Corps, Buffalo, NY.

Kemaphoom A. Chanawongse, 22, Marine Corps, Waterford, CT.

Donald J. Cline Jr., 21, Marine Corps, Sparks, NV.

Robert J. Dowdy, 38, Army, Cleveland, OH.

Ruben Estrella-Soto, 18, Army, El Paso, TX.

David K. Fribley, 26, Marine Corps, Cape Coral, FL.

Jose A. Garibay, 21, Marine Corps, Costa Mesa, CA.

Jonathan L. Gifford, 30, Marine Corps, Macon, IL.

Jorge A. Gonzalez, 20, Marine Corps, El Monte, CA.

Nolen R. Hutchings, 19, Marine Corps, Boiling Springs, SC.

Howard Johnson II, 21, Army, Mobile, AL.

Phillip A. Jordan, 42, Marine Corps, Brazoria, TX.

James M. Kiehl, 22, Army, Comfort, TX.

Johnny V. Mata, 35, Army, Amarillo, TX.

Patrick R. Nixon, 21, Marine Corps, Nashville, TN.

Lori Ann Piestewa, 23, Army, Tuba, AZ.

Frederick E. Pokorney Jr., 31, Marine Corps, Tonopah, NV.

Brendon C. Reiss, 23, Marine Corps, Casper, WY.

Randal Kent Rosacker, 21, Marine Corps, San Diego, CA.

Brandon U. Sloan, 19, Army, Warrensville Heights, OH.

Thomas J. Slocum, 22, Marine Corps, Thornton, CO.

Donald R. Walters, 33, Army, Kansas City, MO.

Michael J. Williams, 31, Marine Corps, Yuma, AZ.

Thomas A. Blair, 24, Marine Corps, Broken Arrow, OK.

Evan T. James, 20, Marine Corps, LaHarpe, IL.

Braedley S. Korthaus, 28, Marine Corps, Scott, IA.

Gregory P. Sanders, 19, Army, Hobart, IN.

Francisco A. Martinez Flores, 21, Marine Corps, Los Angeles, CA.

Donald C. May Jr., 31, Marine Corps, Richmond, VA.

Patrick T. O'Day, 20, Marine Corps, Santa Rosa, CA.

Gregory Stone, 40, Air Force, Boise, ID.

Michael Vann Johnson Jr., 25, Navy, Little Rock, AR.

Kevin G. Nave, 36, Marine Corps, Union Lake, MI.

Joseph Menusa, 33, Marine Corps, San Jose, CA.

Jesus A. Suarez Del Solar, 20, Marine Corps, Escondido, CA.

Fernando Padilla-Ramirez, 26, Marine Corps, San Luis, AZ.

Robert M. Rodriguez, 21, Marine Corps, Queens, NY.

Roderic A. Solomon, 32, Army, Fayetteville, NC.
James W. Cawley, 41, Marine Corps, Roy, UT.
Michael E. Curtin, 23, Army, Howell, NJ.
Diego F. Rincon, 19, Army, Conyers, GA.
Michael Russell Creighton Weldon, 20, Army, Palm Bay, FL.
William W. White, 24, Marine Corps, Brooklyn, NY.
Eugene Williams, 24, Army, Highland, NY.
Aaron J. Contreras, 31, Marine Corps, Sherwood, OR.
Michael V. Lalush, 23, Marine Corps, Troutville, VA.
Brian D. McGinnis, 23, Marine Corps, St. George, DE.
William A. Jeffries, 39, Army, Evansville, IN.
Brandon J. Rowe, 20, Army, Roscoe, IL.
Jacob L. Butler, 24, Army, Wellsville, KS.
Joseph B. Maglione, 22, Marine Corps, Landsdale, PA.
James F. Adamouski, 29, Army, Springfield, VA.
Brian E. Anderson, 26, Marine Corps, Durham, NC.
Mathew G. Boule, 22, Army, Dracut, MS.
George A. Fernandez, 36, Army, El Paso, TX.
Christian D. Gurtner, 19, Marine Corps, Ohio City, OH.
Erik A. Halvorsen, 40, Army, Bennington, VT.
Scott Jamar, 32, Army, Granbury, TX.
Michael F. Pedersen, 26, Army, Flint, MI.
Eric A. Smith, 41, Army, n/a, CA.
Nathan D. White, 30, Navy, Mesa, AZ.
Chad E. Bales, 21, Marine Corps, Coahoma, TX.
Wilbert Davis, 40, Army, Hinesville, GA.
Mark A. Evnin, 21, Marine Corps, Burlington, VT.
Edward J. Korn, 31, Army, Savannah, GA.
Nino D. Livaudais, 23, Army, Ogden, UT.
Ryan P. Long, 21, Army, Seaford, DE.
Donald S. Oaks Jr., 20, Army, Erie, PA.
Randall S. Rehn, 36, Army, Longmont, CO.
Russell B. Rippetoe, 27, Army, Arvada, CO.
Todd J. Robbins, 33, Army, Pentwater, MI.
Tristan N. Aitken, 31, Army, State College, PA.
Wilfred D. Bellard, 20, Army, Lake Charles, LA.
Daniel Francis J. Cunningham, 33, Army, Lewiston, ME.
Travis A. Ford, 30, Marine Corps, Ogallala, NE.
Bernard G. Gooden, 22, Marine Corps, Mt. Vernon, NY.
Devon D. Jones, 19, Army, San Diego, CA.
Brian M. McPhillips, 25 Marine Corps, Pembroke, MA.
Duane R. Rios, 25, Marine Corps, Hammond, IN.
Benjamin W. Sammis, 29, Marine Corps, Rehobeth, MA.
Erik H. Silva, 22, Marine Corps, Chula Vista, CA.
Paul R. Smith, 33, Army, Tampa, FL.
Stevon A. Booker, 34, Army, Apollo, PA.
Larry K. Brown, 22, Army, Jackson, MS.
Edward Smith, 38, Marine Corps, Chicago, IL.
Gregory P. Huxley, Jr., 19, Army, Forestport, NY.
Kelley S. Prewitt, 24, Army, Birmingham, AL.
Andrew Julian Aviles, 18, Marine Corps, Palm Beach, FL.
Eric B. Das, 30, Air Force, Amarillo, TX.
Lincoln D. Hollinsaid, 27, Army, Malden, IL.
Jeffery J. Kaylor, 24, Army, Clifton, VA.
Jesus Martin Antonio Medellin, 21, Marine Corps, Fort Worth, TX.
Anthony S. Miller, 19, Army, San Antonio, TX.
George A. Mitchell, 35, Army, Rawlings, MD.
William R. Watkins III, 37, Air Force Danville, VA.
Henry L. Brown, 22, Army, Natchez, MS.
Juuan Guadulupe Garza Jr., 20, Marine Corps, Temperance, MI.
John W. Marshall, 50, Army, Los Angeles, CA.
Jason M. Meyer, 23, Army, Swartz Creek, MI.
Scott D. Sather, 29, Air Force, Clio, MI.
Robert A. Stever, 36, Army, Pendleton, OR.
Jeffrey E. Bohr Jr., 39, Marine Corps, Ossian, IA.
Terry W. Hemingway, 39, Army, Willingboro, NJ.
Riayan A. Tejeda, 26, Marine Corps, New York, NY.
Jesus A. Gonzalez, 22, Marine Corps, Indio, CA.
David E. Owens Jr., 20, Marine Corps, Winchester, VA.
Gil Mercado, 25, Army, Paterson, NJ.
John E. Brown, 21, Army, Troy, AL.
Thomas A. Foley III, 23, Army, Dresden, TN.
Armando A. Gonzalez, 25, Marine Corps, Hileah, FL.
Richard A. Goward, 32, Army, Midland, MI.
Joseph P. Mayek, 20, Army, Rock Springs, WY.
Jason David Mileo, 20, Marine Corps, Centreville, MD.
John T. Rivero, 23, Army, Tampa, FL.
Andrew T. Arnold, 30, Marine Corps, Spring, TX.
Roy R. Buckley, 24, Army, Merrillville, IN.
Robert W. Channell Jr., 36, Marine Corps, Tuscaloosa, AL.
Alan D. Lam, 19, Marine Corps, Snow Camp, NC.
Troy D. Jenkins, 25, Army, Ridgecrest, CA.
Osbaldo Orozco, 26, Army, Delano, CA.
Narson B. Sullivan, 21, Army, North Brunswick, NJ.
Joe J. Garza, 43, Army, Robtown, TX.
Jesse A. Givens, 34, Army, Springfiel, MO.
Sean C. Reynolds, 25, Army, East Lansing, MI.
Jason L. Deibler, 20, Army, Coeburn, VA.
Marlin T. Rockhold, 23, Army, Hamilton, OH.
Cedric E. Bruns, 22, Marine Corps, Vancouver, WA.
Richard P. Carl, 26, Army, King Hill, ID.
Hans N. Gukeisen, 31, Army, Lead, SD.
Brian K. Van Dusen, 39, Army, Columbus, OH.
Matthew R. Smith, 20, Marine Corps, Anderson, IN.
Jakub Henryk Kowalik, 21, Marine Corps, Schaumburg, IL.
Jose Franci Gonzalez Rodriguez, 19, Marine Corps, Norwalk, CA.
Patrick Lee Griffin Jr., 31, Air Force, Elgin, SC.
Nicholas Brian Kleiboeker, 19, Marine Corps, Irvington, IL.
David T. Nutt, 22, Army, Blackshear, GA.
William L. Payne, 46, Army, Otsego, MI.
Douglas J. Marencoreyes, 28, Marine Corps, Chino, CA.
Rasheed Sahib, 22, Army, Brooklyn, NY.
Dominic R. Baragona, 42, Army, Niles, OH.
Andrew D. LaMont, 31, Marine Corps, Eureka, CA.
Jason W. Moore, 21, Marine Corps, San Marcos, CA.
Timothy L. Ryan, 30, Marine Corps, Aurora, IL.
Kirk A. Straseskie, 23, Marine Corps, Beaver Dam, WI.
Aaron D. White, 27, Marine Corps, Shawnee, OK.
Nathaniel A. Caldwell, 27, Army, Omaha, NE.
David Evans Jr., 18, Army, Buffalo, NY.
Keman L. Mitchell, 24, Army, Hillard, FL.
Kenneth A. Nalley, 19, Army, Hamburg, IA.
Brett J. Petriken, 30, Army, Flint, MI.
Mathew E. Schram, 36, Army, Sister Bay, WI.
Jeremiah D. Smith, 25, Army, Odessa, MO.
Thomas F. Broomhead, 34, Army, Cannon City, CO.
Michael B. Quinn, 37, Army, Tampa, FL.
Kenneth R. Bradley, 39, Army, Utica, MS.
Jose A. Perez III, 22, Army, San Diego, TX.
Michael T. Gleason, 25, Army, Warren, PA.
Kyle A. Griffin, 20, Army, Emerson, NJ.
Zachariah W. Long, 20, Army, Milton, PA.
Jonathan W. Lambert, 28, Marine Corps, Newsite, MS.
Atanacio Haromarin, 27, Army, Baldwin Park, CA.
Branden F. Oberleitner, 20, Army, Worthington, OH.
Doyle W. Bollinger, 21, Navy, Poteau, OK.
Travis L. Burkhardt, 26, Army, Edina, MO.
David Sisung, 21, Navy, Phoenix, AZ.
Jesse M. Halling, 19, Army, Indianapolis, IN.
Michael E. Dooley, 23, Army, Pulaski, VA.
Gavin L. Neighbor, 20, Army, Somerset, OH.
John K. Klinesmith Jr., 25, Army, Stockbridge, GA.
Andrew R. Pokorny, 30, Army, Naperville, IL.
Ryan R. Cox, 19, Marine Corps, Derby, KS.
Shawn D. Pahnke, 25, Army, Shelbyville, IN.
Joseph D. Suell, 24, Army, Lufkin, TX.
Robert L. Frantz, 19, Army, San Antonio, TX.
Michael L. Tosto, 24, Army, Apex, NC.
Michael R. Deuel, 21, Army, Nemo, SD.
William T. Latham, 29, Army, Kingman, AZ.
John T. Nakamura, 21, Army, Santa Fe Springs, CA.
Orenthial J. Smith, 21, Army, Allendale, SC.
Cedric L. Lennon, 32, Army, West Blocton, AL.
Andrew F. Chris, 25, Army, San Diego, CA.
Gregory E. MacDonald, 29, Marine Corps, Washington, DC.
Kevin C. Ott, 27, Army, Columbus, OH.
Gladimir Philippe, 37, Army, Linden, NJ.
Corey A. Hubbell, 20, Army, Urbana, IL.
Joshua McIntosh, 22, Navy, Kingman, AZ.
Richard P. Orengo, 32, Army, Toa Alta, PR.
Tomas Sotelo Jr., 20, Army, Houston, TX.
Timothy M. Conneway, 22, Army, Enterprise, AL.
Christopher D. Coffin, 51, Army, Bethlehem, PA.
Travis J. Bradachnall, 21, Marine Corps, Multnomah County, OR.
Edward J. Herrgott, 20, Army, Shakopee, MN.
Corey L. Small, 20, Army, East Berlin, PA.
David B. Parson, 30, Army, Kannapolis, NC.
Jeffrey M. Wershow, 22, Army, Gainesville, FL.
Chad L. Keith, 21, Army, Batesville, IN.
Barry Sanford Sr., 46, Army, Aurora, CO.
Craig A. Boling, 38, Army, Elkhart, IN.
Robert L. McKinley, 23, Army, Kokomo, IN.
Dan H. Gabrielson, 39, Army, Spooner, WI.
Roger D. Rowe, 54, Army, Bon Aqua, TN.
Jason A. Tetrault, 20, Marine Corps, Moreno Valley, CA.
Melissa Valles, 26, Army, Eagle Pass, TX.
Christian C. Schulz, 20, Army, Colleyville, TX.
Joshua M. Neusche, 20, Army, Montreal, MO.

Paul J. Cassidy, 36, Army, Laingsburg, MI.
Michael T. Crockett, 27, Army, Soperton, GA.
Cory R. Geurin, 18, Marine Corps, Santee, CA.
Jaror C. Puello-Coronado, 36, Army, Pocono Summit, PA.
Ramon Reyes Torres, 29, Army, Caguas, PR.
David J. Moreno, 26, Navy, Gering, NV.
Mason Douglas Whetstone, 30, Army, Jacksonville, FL.
Joel L. Bertoldie, 20, Army, Independence, MO.
Jonathan D. Rozier, 25, Army, Katy, TX.
Justin W. Garvey, 23, Army, Townsend, MA.
Jason D. Jordan, 24, Army, Elba, AL.
David A. Scott, 51, Air Force, Union, OH.
Christopher R. Willoughby, 29, Army, Phenix, AL.
Mark A. Bibby, 25, Army, Watha, NC.
Jon P. Fettig, 30, Army, Dickinson, ND.
Joshua T. Byers, 29, Army, Sparks, NV.
Brett T. Christian, 27, Army, North Royalton, OH.
Evan Asa Ashcraft, 24, Army, West Hills, CA.
Raheen Tyson Heighter, 22, Army, Bay Shore, NY.
Hector R. Perez, 40, Army, Corpus Christi, TX.
Juan M. Serrano, 31, Army, Manati, PR.
Jonathan P. Barnes, 21, Army, Anderson, MO.
Jonathan M. Cheatham, 19, Army, Camden, AR.
Daniel K. Methvin, 22, Army, Belton, TX.
Wilfredo Perez Jr., 24, Army, Norwalk, CT.
Heath A. McMillin, 29, Army, Canandaigua, NY.
Nathaniel Hart Jr., 29, Army, Valdosta, GA.
William J. Maher, 35, Army, Yardley, PA.
Leif E. Nott, 24, Army, Cheyenne, WY.
Michael J. Deutsch, 21, Army, Dubuque, IA.
James I. Lambert III, 22, Army, Raleigh, NC.
Justin W. Hebert, 20, Army, Arlington, WA.
Farao K. Letufuga, 20, Army, Pago Pago, AS.
David L. Loyd, 44, Army, Jackson, TN.
Zeferino E. Colunga, 20, Army, Bellville, TX.
Kyle C. Gilbert, 20, Army, Brattleboro,VT.
Brian R. Hellerman, 35, Army, Freeport, MN.
Leonard D. Simmons, 33, Army, New Bern, NC.
Duane E. Longstreth, 19, Army, Tacoma, WA.
Matthew D. Bush, 20, Army, East Alton, IL.
Brandon Ramsey, 21, Army, Calumet City, IL.
Levi B. Kinchen, 21, Army, Tickfaw, LA.
Floyd G. Knighten Jr., 55, Army, Olla, LA.
David S. Perry, 36, Army, Bakersfield, CA.
Timothy R. Brown, 21, Army, Conway, PA.
Richard S. Eaton Jr., 37, Army, Guilford, CT.
Daniel R. Parker, 18, Army, Lake Elsinore, CA.
Taft V. Williams, 29, Army, New Orleans, LA.
Steven W. White, 29, Army, Lawton, OK.
Eric R. Hull, 23, Army, Uniontown, PA.
David M. Kirchhoff, 31, Army, Cedar Rapids, IA.
Craig S. Ivory, 26, Army, Port Matilda, PA.
Bobby C. Franklin, 38, Army, Mineral Bluff, GA.
Kenneth W. Harris Jr., 23, Army, Charlotte, TN.
Michael S. Adams, 20, Army, Spartanburg, SC.
Kylan A. Jones-Huffman, 31, Navy, Aptos, CA.
Vorn J. Mack, 19, Army, Orangeburg, SC.
Stephen M. Scott, 21, Army, Lawton, OK.
Ronald D. Allen Jr., 22, Army, Mitchell, IN.
Pablo Manzano, 19, Army, Heber, CA.
Darryl T. Dent, 21, Army, Washington, DC.
Gregory A. Belanger, 24, Army, Narragansett, RI.
Rafael L. Navea, 34, Army, Pittsburgh, PA.
Anthony L. Sherman, 43, Army, Pottstown, PA.
Mark A. Lawton, 41, Army, Hayden, CO.
Sean K. Cataudella, 28, Army, Tucson, AZ.
Charles T. Caldwell, 38, Army, North Providence, RI.
Joseph Camara, 40, Army, New Bedford, MA.
Cameron B. Sarno, 43, Army, Waipahu, HI.
Christopher A. Sisson, 20, Army, Oak Park, IL.
Bruce E. Brown, 32, Air Force, Coatopa, AL.
Jarrett B. Thompson, 27, Army, Dover, DE.
Ryan G. Carlock, 25, Army, Macomb, IL.
Joseph E. Robsky Jr., 31, Army, Elizaville, NY.
Henry Ybarra III, 32, Army, Austin, TX.
William M. Bennett, 35, Army, Seymour, TN.
Kevin N. Morehead, 33, Army, Little Rock, AR.
Trevor A. Blumberg, 22, Army, Canton, MI.
Kevin C. Kimmerly, 31, Army, North Creek, NY.
Alyssa R. Peterson, 27, Army, Flagstaff, AZ.
Richard Arraiga, 20, Army, Ganado, Tx.
Brian R. Faunce, 28, Army, Philadelphia, PA.
Anthony O. Thompson, 26, Army, Orangeburg, SC.
James C. Wright, 27, Army, Morgan, TX.
Lunsford B. Brown II, 27, Army, Creedmore, NC.
David T. Friedrich, 26, Army, Hammond, NY.
Frederick L. Miller, Jr., 27, Army, Hagerstown, In.
Paul J. Sturino, 21, Army, Rice Lake, WI.
Michael Andrade, 28, Army, Bristol, RI.
Robert L. Lucero, 34, Army, Casper, WY.
Robert E. Rooney, 43, Army, Nashua, NH.
Kyle G. Thomas, 23, Army, Topeka, KS.
Andrew Joseph Baddick, 26, Army, Jim Thorpe, PA.
Christopher E. Cutchall, 30, Army, McConnellsburg, PA.
Darrin K. Potter, 24, Army, Louisville, KY.
Dustin K. McGaugh, 20, Army, Derby, KS.
James D. Blankenbecler, 40, Army, Alexandria, VA.
Analaura Esparza Gutierrez, 21, Army, Houston, TX.
Simeon Hunte, 23, Army, Essex, NJ.
Tamarra J. Ramos, 24, Army, Quakertown, PA.
Charles M. Sims, 18, Army, Miami, FL.
James H. Pirtle, 27, Army, La Mesa, NM.
Spencer T. Karol, 20, Army, Woodruff, AZ.
Kerry D. Scott, 21, Army, Mount Vernon, WA.
Richard Torres, 25, Army, Clarksville, TN.
Joseph C. Norquist, 26, Army, Oakland, CA.
Sean A. Silva, 23, Army, Roseville, CA.
Christopher W. Swisher, 26, Army, Lincoln, NE.
James E. Powell, 26, Army, Radcliff, KY.
Jose Casanova, 23, Army, El Monte, CA.
Benjamin L. Freeman, 19, Army, Valdosta, GA.
Douglas J. Weismantle, 28, Army, Pittsburgh, PA.
Donald L. Wheeler, 22, Army, Concord, MI.
Stephen E. Wyatt, 19, Army, Kilgore, TX.
Kim S. Orlando, 43, Army, Nashville, TN.
Joseph P. Bellavia, 28, Army, Wakefield, MA.
Michael L. Williams, 46, Army, Buffalo, NY.
David R. Bernstein, 24, Army, Phoenixville, PA.
Sean R. Grilley, 24, Army, San Bernardino, CA.
John D. Hart, 20, Army, Bedford, MA.
Paul J. Johnson, 29, Army, Calumet, MI.
Paul J. Bueche, 19, Army, Daphne, AL.
John P. Johnson, 24, Army, Houston, TX.
Jason M. Ward, 25, Army, Tulsa, OK.
John R. Teal, 31, Army, Mechanicsville, VA.
Artimus D. Brassfield, 22, Army, Flint, MI.
Michael S. Hancock, 29, Army, Yreka, CA.
Jose L. Mora, 26, Army, Bell Gardens, CA.
Steven Acosta, 19, Army, Calexico, CA.
Rachel K. Bosveld, 19, Army, Waupun, WI.
Joseph R. Guerrera, 20, Army, Dunn, NC.
Jamie L. Huggins, 26, Army, Hume, MO.
Aubrey D. Bell, 33, Army, Tuskegee, AL.
Charles H. Buehring, 40, Army, Fayetteville, NC.
Jonathan I. Falaniko, 20, Army, Pago Pago, AS.
Algernon Adams, 36, Army, Aiken, SC.
Michael Paul Barrera, 26, Army, Von Ormy, TX.
Isaac Campoy, 21, Army, Douglas, AZ.
Todd J. Bryant, 23, Army, Riverside, CA.
Linda C. Jimenez, 39, Army, Brooklyn, NY.
Benjamin J. Colgan, 30, Army, Kent, WA.
Joshua C. Hurley, 24, Army, Clifton Forge, VA.
Maurice J. Johnson, 21, Army, Levittown, PA.
Daniel A. Bader, 28, Army, Colorado Springs, CO.
Ernest G. Bucklew, 33, Army, Enon Valley, PA.
Steven D. Conover, 21, Army, Wilmington, OH.
Anthony D. Dagostino, 20, Army, Waterbury, CT.
Darius T. Jennings, 22, Army, Cordova, SC.
Karina S. Lau, 20, Army, Livingston, CA.
Keelan L. Moss, 23, Army, Houston, TX.
Brian H. Penisten, 28, Army, Fort Wayne, IN.
Ross A. Pennanen, 36, Army, Shawnee, OK.
Joel Perez, 25, Army, Rio Grande, PR.
Brian D. Slavenas, 30, Army, Genoa, IL.
Bruce A. Smith, 41, Army, West Liberty, IA.
Frances M. Vega, 20, Army, Fort Buchanan, PR.
Paul A. Velazquez, 29, Army, San Diego, CA.
Joe N. Wilson, 30, Army, Crystal Springs, MS.
Rayshawn S. Johnson, 20, Army, Brooklyn, NY.
Robert T. Benson, 20, Army, Spokane, WA.
Francisco Martinez, 28, Army, Humacao, PR.
Jose A. Rivera, 34, Army, Bayamon, PR.
James A. Chance III, 25, Army, Kokomo, MO.
Paul F. Fisher, 39, Army, Cedar Rapids, IA.
James R. Wolf, 21, Army, Scottsbluff, NE.
Cornell W. Gilmore I, 45, Army, Baltimore, MD.
Kyran E. Kennedy, 43, Army, Boston, MA.
Morgan D. Kennon, 23, Army, Memphis, TN.
Paul M. Neff II, 30, Army, Fort Mill, SC.
Scott C. Rose, 30, Army, Fayetteville, NC.
Benedict J. Smith, 29, Army, Monroe City, MO.
Sharon T. Swartworth, 43, Army, n/a, VA.
Gary L. Collins, 32, Army, Hardin, TX.
Kurt R. Frosheiser, 22, Army, Des Moines, IA.
Mark D. Vasquez, 35, Army, Port Huron, MI.

Nicholas A. Tomko, 24, Army, Pittsburgh, PA.
Genaro Acosta, 26, Army, Fair Oaks, CA.
Marlon P. Jackson, 25, Army, Jersey City, NJ.
Nathan J. Bailey, 46, Army, Nashville, TN.
Robert A. Wise, 21, Army, Tallahassee, FL.
Joseph Minucci II, 23, Army, Richeyville, PA.
Irving Medina, 22, Army, Middletown, NY.
Michael D. Acklin II, 25, Army, Louisville, KY.
Ryan T. Baker, 24, Army, Brown Mills, NJ.
Kelly Bolor, 37, Army, Whittier, CA.
Jeremiah J. Digiovanni, 21, Army, Tylertown, MS.
William D. Dusenbery, 30, Army, Fairview Heights, IL.
Sheldon R. Hawk Eagle, 21, Army, Grand Forks, ND.
Jacob S. Fletcher, 28, Army, Bay Shore, NY.
Richard W. Hafer, 21, Army, Cross Lanes, WV.
Warren S. Hansen, 36, Army, Clintonville, WI.
Timothy L. Hayslett, 26, Army, Newville, PA.
Damian L. Heidelberg, 21, Army, Batesville, MS.
Erik C. Kesterson, 29, Army, Independence, OR.
Pierre E. Piche, 29, Army, Starksboro, VT.
John W. Russell, 26, Army, Portland, TX.
Scott A. Saboe, 33, Army, Willow Lake, SD.
John R. Sullivan, 26, Army, Countryside, IL.
Eugene A. Uhl III, 21, Army, Amherst, WI.
Joey D. Whitener, 19, Army, Nebo, NC.
Jeremy L. Wolfe, 27, Army, Menomenie, WI.
Alexander S. Coulter, 35, Army, Bristol, TN.
Nathan S. Dalley, 27, Army, Kaysville, UT.
Dale A. Panchot, 26, Army, Northome, MN.
James A. Shull, 32, Army, Kamiah, ID.
Joseph L. Lister, 22, Army, Pleasanton, KS.
Scott M. Tyrrell, 21, Army, Sterling, IL.
George A. Wood, 33, Army, New York, NY.
Gary B. Coleman, 24, Army, Pikeville, KY.
Damian S. Bushart, 22, Army, Waterford, MI.
Robert D. Roberts, 21, Army, Winter Park, FL.
Eddie E. Menyweather, 35, Army, Los Angeles, CA.
Christopher G. Nason, 39, Army, Los Angeles, CA.
Rel A. Ravago IV, 21, Army, Glendale, CA.
Darrell L. Smith, 28, Army, Otwell, IN.
Jerry L. Wilson, 45, Army, Thomson, GA.
David J. Goldberg, 20, Army, Layton, UT.
Thomas J. Sweet II, 23, Army, Bismarck, ND.
Ariel Rico, 25, Army, El Paso, TX.
Stephen A. Bertolino, 40, Army, Orange, CA.
Aaron J. Sissel, 22, Army, Tipton, IA.
Uday Singh, 21, Army, Lake Forest, IL.
Clarence E. Boone, 50, Army, Fort Worth, TX.
Raphael S. Davis, 24, Army, Tutwiler, MS.
Ryan C. Young, 21, Army, Corona, CA.
Arron R. Clark, 20, Army, Chico, CA.
Ray J. Hutchinson, 20, Army, League City, TX.
Joseph M. Blickenstaff, 23, Army, Corvallis, OR.
Steven H. Bridges, 33, Army, Tracy, CA.
Christopher J. Rivera Wesley, 26, Army, Portland, OR.
Jason G. Wright, 19, Army, Luzerne, MI.
Todd M. Bates, 20, Army, Bellaire, OH.
Richard A. Burdick, 24, Army, National City, CA.
Jerrick M. Petty, 25, Army, Idaho Falls, ID.
Aaron T. Reese, 31, Army, Reynoldsburg, OH.
Marshall L. Edgerton, 27, Army, Rocky Face, GA.
Jarrod W. Black, 26, Army, Peru, IN.
Jeffrey F. Braun, 19, Army, Stafford, CT.
Rian C. Ferguson, 22, Army, Taylors, SC.
Kimberly A. Voelz, 27, Army, Carlisle, PA.
Kenneth C. Souslin, 21, Army, Mansfield, OH.
Nathan W. Nakis, 19, Army, Corvallis, OR.
Christopher J. Holland, 26, Army, Brunswick, GA.
Glenn R. Allison, 24, Army, Pittsfield, MA.
Charles E. Bush, Jr., 43, Army, Buffalo, NY.
Stuart W. Moore, 21, Army, Livingston, TX.
Edward M. Saltz, 27, Army, Bigfork, MO.
Benjamin W. Biskie, 27, Army, Vermilion, OH.
Eric F. Cooke, 43, Army, Scottsdale, AZ.
Christopher F. Soelzer, 26, Army, Sturgis, SD.
Christopher J. Splinter, 43, Army, Platteville, WI.
Michael E. Yashinski, 24, Army, Monument, CO.
Thomas W. Christensen, 42, Army, Atlantic Mine, MI.
Stephen C. Hattamer, 43, Army, Gwinn, MI.
Charles G. Haight, 23, Army, Jacksonville, AL.
Michael G. Mihalakis, 18, Army, San Jose, CA.
Michael J. Sutter, 26, Army, Tinley Park, IL.
Ernesto M. Blanco, 28, Army, San Antonio, TX.
Rey D. Cuervo, 24, Army, Laguna Vista, TX.
Curt E. Jordan Jr., 25, Army, Green Acres, WA.
Justin W. Pollard, 21, Army, Foothill Ranch, CA.
Dennis A. Corral, 33, Army, Kearney, NE.
Solomon C. Bangayan, 24, Army, Jay, VT.
Kimberly N. Hampton, 27, Army, Easley, SC.
Eric T. Paliwoda, 28, Army, Goodyear, AZ.
Marc S. Seiden, 26, Army, Brigantine, NJ.
Luke P. Frist, 20, Army, West Lafayette, IN.
Jesse D. Mizener, 24, Army, Auburn, CA.
Craig Davis, 37, Army, Opelousas, LA.
Michael A. Diraimondo, 22, Army, Simi Valley, CA.
Christopher A. Golby, 26, Army, Johnstown, PA.
Gregory B. Hicks, Army, Duff, TN.
Nathaniel H. Johnson, 22, Army, Augusta, GA.
Philip A. Johnson, Jr., 31, Army, Mobile, AL.
Ian D. Manuel, 23, Army, Jacksonville, FL.
Jeffery C. Walker, 33, Army, Havre de Grace, MD.
Aaron A. Weaver, 32, Army, Inverness, FL.
Ricky L. Crockett, 37, Army, Broxton, GA.
Keicia M. Hines, 27, Army, Citrus Heights, CA.
Roland L. Castro, 26, Army, San Antonio, TX.
Cody J. Orr, 21, Army, Ruskin, FL.
Larry E. Polley Jr., 20, Army, Center, TX.
Edmond L. Randle, 26, Army, Miami, FL.
Kelly Hornbeck, 36, Army, Fort Worth, TX.
Gabriel T. Palacios, 22, Army, Lynn, MA.
James D. Parker, 20, Army, Bryan, TX.
Michael T. Blaise, 29, Army, Macon, MO.
Brian D. Hazelgrove, 29, Army, Fort Rucker, AL.
Jason K. Chappell, 22, Army, Hemet, CA.
Ervin Dervishi, 21, Army, Fort Worth, TX.
Kenneth W. Hendrickson, 41, Army, Bismarck, ND.
Randy S. Rosenberg, 23, Army, Berlin, NH.
Keith L. Smette, 25, Army, Fargo, ND.
William R. Sturges Jr., 24, Army, Spring Church, PA.
Adam G. Mooney, 28, Army, Cambridge, MD.
Matthew J. August, 28, Army, North Kingston, RI.
James T. Hoffman, 41, Army, Whitesburg, KY.
Luke S. James, 24, Army, Hooker, OK.
Lester O. Kinney, 27, Army, Zanesville, OH.
Travis A. Moothart, 23, Army, Brownsville, OR.
Cory R. Mracek, 26, Army, Hay Springs, NE.
Patrick Dorff, 32, Army, Buffalo, MN.
Sean G. Landrus, 31, Army, Thompson, OH.
Luis A. Moreno, 19, Army, New York, NY.
Juan C. Cabralbanuelos, 25, Army, Emporia, KS.
Holly J. McGeogh, 19, Army, Taylor, MI.
Eliu A. Miersandoval, 27, Army, San Clemente, CA.
Armando Soriano, 20, Army, Houston, TX.
Roger C. Turner Jr., 37, Army, Parkersburg, WV.
Seth J. Dvorin, 24, Army, East Brunswick, NJ.
Joshua L. Knowles, 23, Army, Sheffield, IA.
Richard P. Ramey, 27, Army, Canton, OH.
Thomas D. Robbins, 27, Army, Schenectady, NY.
Elijah Tai Wah Wong, 42, Army, Mesa, AZ.
Christopher Bunda, 29, Army, Bremerton, WA.
Jude C. Mariano, 39, Air Force, Vallejo, CA.
William C. Ramirez, 19, Army, Portland, OR.
Patrick S. Tainsh, 33, Army, Oceanside, CA.
Eric U. Ramirez, 31, Army, San Diego, CA.
Bryan N. Spry, 19, Army, Chestertown, MD.
Nichole M. Frye, 19, Army, Lena, WI.
Michael M. Merila, 23, Army, Sierra Vista, AZ.
Christopher M. Taylor, 25, Army, Daphne, AL.
Jeffrey C. Graham, 24, Army, Elizabethtown, KY.
Roger G. Ling, 20, Army, Douglaston, NY.
Henry A. Bacon, 45, Army, Wagram, NC.
Matthew C. Laskowski, 32, Army, Phoenix, AZ.
Stephen M. Wells, 29, Army, Egremont, MA.
Michael R. Woodliff, 22, Army, Port Charlotte, FL.
Michael J. Gray, 24, Navy, Richmond, VA.
Gussie M. Jones, 41, Army, El Paso, TX.
Matthew G. Milczark, 18, Marine Corps, Kettle River, MN.
Edward W. Brabazon, 20, Philadelphia, PA.
Richard S. Gottfried, 42, Lake Ozark, MO.
Bert Edward Hoyer, 23, Ellsworth, WI.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I just have to remind the distinguished minority leader that, in fact, every troop who is in country now and every civil servant has body armor in the fight, in the fight. Every frontline troop moving up to Baghdad had body armor, and I would say further to the gentlewoman that the Humvees, the jeeps that we have, have never been manufactured with body armor until very recently to meet the new challenge of the IEDs, and we are armoring them in rapid fashion, and many Members on her side voted against the supplemental appropriation that provided both body armor and armor for the Humvees.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman, Chairman of the

Committee on Armed Services, is respected by all of us here. I thank him for his service to our country.

Would the gentleman inform the Members of this body when all of the troops had the body armor? As of when?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, it was a frontline troop that moved into the major assault, going up through, leaving Kuwait, last year starting on this anniversary, moving up through Iraq.

Ms. PELOSI. Starting this anniversary?

Mr. HUNTER. Every frontline troop. That meant every troop that was in the front line had both types of body armor; that is, the old type of body armor and the new.

Ms. PELOSI. As of when? As of when?

Mr. HUNTER. Every one. When they moved across the line, every frontline troop had it. Then what we did was we gave body armor over the last several months not only to the troops that were the frontline troops but every single troop.

Ms. PELOSI. As of when? As of when?

Mr. HUNTER. Every frontline troop had it when they moved across the line.

Ms. PELOSI. But when did every troop have it? As of when?

Mr. HUNTER. When they moved across the line from Kuwait.

Ms. PELOSI. The gentleman knows that they only had it as a matter of weeks, and they would not have had it without the gentleman from Pennsylvania's (Mr. MURTHA) help.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The Chair would observe the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, after this partisan debate, I want to open my remarks by saying I agree with Bill Clinton who in December of 1988 said, ''There should be no doubt, Saddam's ability to produce and deliver weapons of mass destruction poses a grave threat to the peace of that region and the security of the world.'' I could not have put it better myself.

Unfortunately, too many in the minority, faced with the harsh realities of the war on terror, have not even tried to say it at all. Too many seem to be in denial. Too many seem to prefer to ignore the war on terror or choose to see it as ''far less of a military operation and far more of a law enforcement operation.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a fundamental debate before us today. Are we at war or are we not? Should the United States appease international terrorists and pretend that they are a law enforcement problem or fight them as the military threat that they are? Let us consider the records of these competing positions.

First, the appeasement approach. Through the 1990s, the United States and our allies were victimized by progressively deadlier and more audacious terrorist attacks, and in accordance with the international law enforcement strategies, our leaders did nothing. They passed U.N. resolutions and they issued subpoenas and indictments. They wrung their hands about root causes, and they tried to reduce the problem of international terror to a dorm-room dialectic.

Meanwhile, as we listened to doubletalk about constructive engagement and cross-culture dialogues, they gutted the national security and intelligence infrastructure of this Nation. They slashed our military budget and surrendered national interests to the higher authority of international institutions. And on September 11, 2001, on September 11, 2001, we witnessed the tragic and the inevitable consequences of the international law enforcement approach.

By contrast, America's foreign policy since 9/11 has been to wage war on the terrorists before they wage war on us. In Afghanistan, in Iraq, in the Philippines, in southeast Asia, everywhere in the world a terrorist sticks his head out of a cave, there will we fight, fight the terrorists, their networks, their allies, their financiers and, most importantly, their state sponsors.

Enter Saddam. One year ago, Iraq was still enslaved, still ruled by an unstable psychopath who started two regional wars, two regional wars in just a decade, who possessed and used weapons of mass destruction against his own people when he gassed the Kurds in 1988, who funded international terrorism and provided terrorists a safe haven; a mass murderer, sitting atop a nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons program, a ticking bomb, a ticking time bomb, a nuclear 9/11 waiting to happen.

So we violated the principle tenet of the international law enforcement approach. We acted, and in less than a year, since Iraq's liberation, a preliminary constitution, the most progressive of its kind in the region, has been signed by its leaders. Elections will soon be scheduled and the human right, the human right of self-determination will be exercised by the Iraqi people.

Had we not acted, as our opponents wished, Iraq would still be enslaved. Terrorists would still enjoy a strategic ally and a safe haven and a financier in Baghdad, and we would still be fighting the war on terror with U.N. resolutions and losing; but instead, Iraq is free, America is safer, and the world has changed for the better.

Now, terrorists have no safe harbors in Afghanistan and Iraq nor potential partners in Saddam Hussein or Moammar Qaddafi's weapons of mass destruction programs. States once conflicted about terrorism, like Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and others are now vital allies in the war, providing us with invaluable intelligence and assistance. And for all these reasons, Operation Iraqi Freedom and the courageous policies that set it in motion have won the most significant battle yet in the war on terror, and yet appeasers who endorsed the law enforcement approach, who did nothing to deter terrorism in the 1990s, had the audacity to call the Bush doctrine and Operation Iraqi Freedom reckless.

Well, what would you have us do? Wait until Saddam proved that he had nuclear weapons by detonating one in New York City? Wait like we waited for al Qaeda to prove that they really meant business on September 11, 2001? A war raged and many people did not know it. A war raged for 8 years and our national policy on Iraq was regime change, which had overwhelming bipartisan support and yet nothing was done. Six dead in the World Trade Center bombing, 19 dead at Khobar Towers, 224 dead in the African Embassy bombings, 17 sailors dead on the USS *Cole*, 3,000 dead on 9/11. And you speak to us about recklessness?

People are dying and the course of human history hangs by a thread, and that thread, Mr. Speaker, is the moral courage of this Nation.

In the name of justice, vote yes on this resolution to affirm the liberation of Iraq as a victory for all humanity over barbarism. In the name of decency, vote yes to salute our brave and compassionate troops, and in the name of freedom, vote yes to reaffirm that the citizens of these United States of America will never abandon the cause of human liberty, no matter how terrifying its enemies or tempting the platitudes of appeasement.

Support the resolution and make our voices heard. No retreat, no surrender, and no apologies. Victory, Mr. Speaker, only victory.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the words of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and salute the troops and emphasize that the world is not yet safe.

Mr. Speaker, every one of us in the House of Representatives supports our troops. We are proud of their services for this Nation. However, this is a complex issue. The War in Iraq has become costly and contentious. The American people are concerned for the future of Iraq, and for our own future. They deserve to hear that the House of Representatives is engaging in a thoughtful discussion of the progress and challenges before us in Iraq.

Unfortunately, on the one-year anniversary of the invasion of Iraq, instead of looking objectively at the situation in Iraq and discussing how we got there and how we could have

done things better, we are spending hours on the Floor just discussing a partisan resolution that is just an opportunity for the leadership to wave the flag and pat each other on the back. The American people and our troops deserve a more thoughtful process.

The Republicans put out a resolution, with no input from the many Members on our side with decades of experience on issues of diplomacy and foreign policy. The resolution is deeply-flawed in its incompleteness. It jumps out at me that there is no mention of the words ''democracy'' or ''women'' or even ''freedom''. What are we fighting for? What do we want out of this struggle? It used to be about Weapons of Mass Destruction, but now we are hearing that there probably have not been any banned weapons in Iraq in over a decade. It used to be about 9/11; now even the President has admitted that there is no connection between Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden. Now it is about ''liberating'' the people of Iraq. That is what we lost almost 600 of our sons and daughters for, and almost $200 billion—while thousands of Iraqis and losing the respect and admiration of the world community. But if liberation was the goal, why does the Republican resolution not mention the principles we are fighting for, and the tremendous costs we have incurred fighting for them?

Obviously, I feel the discussion this week should be taking a much different course.

In a time when we are trying to encourage democracy in Iraq and Afghanistan, we should not be hindering democracy in our own Congress. I had three amendments that would have enhanced the underlying resolution, drawing attention to some of the successes that have come from the toils of our troops and the Iraqi Governing Council, and pointed to directions where progress is needed.

The first amendment simply would have encouraged the Iraqi Governing Council to enhance the role of women in the governing process. During the transition from a brutal dictatorship to a true representative democracy, it is critical that women are not left out of the mix. Great strides are being made to provide opportunities for Iraqi women to take leadership positions. That should be encouraged and reinforced. Instead the subject is not mentioned in H. Res. 557. I believe the omission was probably just an oversight that could have been easily corrected with a quick amendment. Instead we are missing an opportunity because the Republican leadership is not allowing amendments to their resolution.

Similarly, I was surprised to notice that the word ''democracy'' is nowhere to be found in the underlying resolution. Isn't it the principles of freedom and democracy that our soldiers are fighting for? My second amendment would have added a sense of Congress that the Iraqi Governing Council should continue on the path toward making Iraq a free and just democracy.

My third amendment may have been more controversial, but I believe it would have made the most important contribution. Our soldiers are now risking their lives fighting for a cause that has been called into question by our own experts and those from around the world. I didn't vote to send our troops to War, but I understand that many who did thought they were doing it to prevent a chemical, biological, or nuclear weapon from being launched at the U.S. from one of Saddam Hussein's alleged stockpiles of such WMDs. Now we are learning from Dr. David Kay and others, that such stockpiles were probably not there when War broke out. Other Members and some people in the American public supported the War because they were told Iraq somehow helped cause 9/11. Now, the President had told us that there is no reason to think there was such a connection.

I agree that Saddam Hussein was a horrible man. A decade ago, he was also dangerous to our allies in the region. But a decade of sanctions, precision strikes by our brave pilots, and patrols of the no fly zone—left him basically impotent. We need to find out why this administration was telling us otherwise. It is the duty of Congress to exercise our oversight of the executive branch, to immediately launch full Congressional hearings to determine how our intelligence failed, or how intelligence might have been misused or abused in the run-up to war. We owe it to our soldiers and our future soldiers to prevent future lapses.

Some may argue that ''Intelligence is never perfect.'' Misjudging the size of a stockpile is, or thinking the missiles with anthrax are in Baghdad when actually they are in Tikrit—that is an ''imperfection'' in intelligence. However, when our President, Secretary of Defense, Director of the NSC, and Secretary of State are warning us of imminent threats and mushroom clouds—when the U.N. weapons inspectors are on the ground getting unprecedented access and can even bring senior Iraqi scientists to the U.S. for questioning—When we go to war and kill tens of thousands of Iraqis, and lose almost 600 of our own sons and daughters, and billions of dollars of taxpayer dollars, and lose the respect of the world community—that is not ''imperfection'' that is just a fundamental breakdown of our system.

We cannot base our foreign policy on such flawed intelligence in the future. It is up to Congress to find out what went wrong and start to fix the problem. My amendment would have started the process by calling for immediate hearings and a report to be produced by the end of the year.

But, we could not even debate that possibility on the Floor. It does not make sense. It is undemocratic. I would have liked to support the underlying resolution, but its failure to be forthright, to admit the need for more progress on the war on terrorism and the need for further investigation of our nation's representation that Iraq had at the time of the war, Weapons of Mass Destruction leaves me little choice but to vote no on partisanship.

I did not think we needed to go to War last year, while U.N. inspectors were making unprecedented progress in demonstrating that Saddam Hussein had no WMDs. We could have waited, and focused on terrorists like Al Queda and Osama bin Laden instead of broadening our scope and getting distracted by Iraq. Now we have compromised our military, compromised our budget, compromised our world standing, and embarked on a mission that could leave us in more danger than we were before.

As we look at the tragedy last week in Madrid, and then today with the bombing of the Palestine Hotel in Baghdad, we see that there is much work left to be done to make the world safer. It does not make sense to embark on that mission only drawing on half of our government's expertise. We need to work in a bipartisan fashion and in support of our troops and for real peace in Iraq and around the world.

It would have been a symbolic first step to work together on today's resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I went to Austin with the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) after the President was elected but before he was inaugurated, and I sat at his table, and I said to him, Mr. President, you do not have to worry about missile defense, you have got to worry about terrorism and you have got to worry about nuclear proliferation.

Then I came back, we went to committee, and under the leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) we moved $1.4 billion out of missile defense and put it into counterterrorism on September 11, 2001. We could not finish our markup that day because of what happened. One of the planes went down in my district. That was the start of the war against terrorism because those passengers in that plane took a stand. They got up and fought that plane to the ground. The plane was probably coming towards the Capitol of the United States.

The reason that I am so upset about this resolution, not only because they did not consult any of us, but because the terrorists worked with a calendar and we work with a clock. This is going to be a long war. We have been discredited worldwide with our intelligence.

I told the story before. When Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State at the time, went to meet with President de Gaulle to show him the evidence of the Cuban missiles in Cuba, and he offered to show him photographs, he said, I do not need to see the photographs, I will take the word of the President of the United States.

We have been discredited because our intelligence was faulty. I believed there was weapons of mass destruction. I believed that there was an al Qaeda connection. None of this has turned out to be true.

A constituent of mine said in pointing to me, he said, Never in history have so many been misled by so few. I said, You mean me? He said, I mean you, Mr. MURTHA. He said to me, Before I voted on the resolution and before we went to war, he told me, I have confidence in your vote; I have confidence we should go to war and put our soldiers in harm's way because I know you have the inside and you know the truth.

Well, let me tell my colleagues, the preamble to this paper is what makes me so upset. We are trying to justify what we did. Look, no question about Saddam Hussein being a bad guy, but that is not why we went to war. If we

took the preamble and we put that as a resolution, there would not have been a resolution. When they ask me if you would have voted for this resolution if you know what you know, I said there would not have been a resolution because the resolution would not have come up because there was no threat to our national course, national security.

□ 1915

This is going to be a long war, and I am going to be right there. I am going to be voting for something that means something. I am going to be voting for the money, for the troops, for all the things they need. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and I stand shoulder to shoulder. Only 16 people voted against our defense bill. I do not think that many voted against the authorization bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

So we are for the defense of this country, but we should not mislead the people. I have said over and over again, do not be overly optimistic. This is going to be a long haul. And if we are overly optimistic and we tell the American public and the international community and they lose faiths in us, we cannot win this war on terrorism. We have to have the support of the American public, which has dropped dramatically. And if you tell them the cost, it drops below 50 percent. Internationally they do not support us because they do not believe many of the things that we say now, and we have to have them if we are going to win this war on terrorism.

So I would ask the Members to be careful with the charges that they are making in this resolution. And I would hope the Members understand that all of us support the troops. All of us want to do everything we can; and when it comes to the money, we will be there. So I would ask all the Members to vote for the recommital motion and let us make a slight change in this resolution so that we can pass it overwhelmingly.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

First of all, I want to say that I have the utmost respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He has been a leader in this Congress for a long, long time; and I have seen him in action in the Middle East and other places. He has the utmost concern for our men in uniform and respect for them and compassion for them.

However, I have to take some difference in his conclusion; and I just want to say that when we made that decision to move into, first of all, Iraq, we all made decisions based on the information we had before us, information that a previous President had, information that we had in the Senate, information that we all looked at. It was the best information that we could bring before us. I do not think anybody in this Chamber or in this town tried to deceive anybody on that information. I would stand shoulder to shoulder with him and say we tried to make the best decisions for our men and women in this country with the information that we had.

We still do not know where weapons of mass destruction are: if they are buried, if they are in a lab someplace, or where they are. But we know that the enemy at that time had the potential to make those weapons; and for all we knew, they had those weapons.

So I rise today in support of this resolution, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it. This resolution is quite straightforward. My constituents back home would call it plain talk. It is common sense. It commends the Iraqi people for adopting an interim constitution. It commends our military for their brave efforts in liberating Iraq. And it affirms to the world that the world is a better place without Saddam Hussein in power. That is what it does.

It is hard to imagine that anyone in this Chamber could be against it; yet some are. Politicians sometimes behave in strange ways in election years. We all know that. And there are those who have vowed to change our national leadership no matter what it takes. But the ''no matter what it takes'' approach causes folks to do some foolish things, to cast some foolish votes.

How can anyone vote against a resolution that commends our troops as they fight a just war overseas? How can anyone defend a dictator who used rape rooms as a matter of state policy? How can anyone forget the 400,000 victims in mass graves that had already been found in Iraq, brutally murdered by the Hussein regime?

There has been a lot said in the press and even on this floor about the victory of the Spanish Socialists in last Sunday's election in Spain. Clearly, the Spanish people have a right to elect their own government. But I hope that the terrorists do not draw the wrong conclusion about that election. Europe should have learned a painful lesson in the 1930s and should never return to a peace-through-appeasement strategy. Our country, the United States of America, must never adopt a policy of appeasement. We must never let terrorists take encouragement from anything that we do on the battlefield or in this Chamber.

We all must say with one voice that we were right to rid the world of the murdering thug Saddam Hussein; that our troops did the right thing to bring Uday and Qusay and all of Saddam's brutal henchmen to justice; and that the long march to democracy that has started finally both in Baghdad and Kabul is both inexorable and inevitable.

Today, with this resolution, we start the public trial of Saddam Hussein. Let us never forget the pain that he caused countless Iraqis, his neighbors, and even his so-called friends. Let us never forget the threats that he posed to America and America's allies or his willful disregard of the 17 United Nations Security Council resolutions. And let us never say that this war was in any way unjust or illegitimate.

Every brave man and woman who sacrificed their lives, their limbs, or their blood and sweat and tears to fight the Hussein regime did so for a righteous and just cause. This is not like Vietnam. Vietnam is over. This war we fight now is a war against terrorists. It is a war against those who have attacked and killed Americans abroad and on our own soil. Saddam Hussein was a terrorist of the worst kind.

Some of my colleagues might be looking for the shades of gray in this debate, but I simply do not see the gray. Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden are cut from the same cloth. They are both brutal killers. They both hate America with every ounce of their being. And because we are free, we want all people on Earth to be free. And they both must be brought to justice. We have Hussein, and we will get bin Laden.

Take a stand against terrorism. Take a stand for our troops. And vote for this important resolution.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, Halabja is alluded to in the resolution before us. Because Halabja is where Saddam slaughtered some 5,000 Iraqi Kurds with chemical weapons. The resolution appears to suggest that this despicable act—this crime against humanity—provides some justification for the invasion of Iraq in 2003.

But the tragedy of Halabja occurred in March of 1988. And we did nothing then. Because Saddam was our ally. And many of those currently serving in the Bush Administration were key figures in that alliance. They were fully aware of what happened in Halabja.

Our Secretary of Defense, Mr. Rumsfeld, was a special envoy to Saddam. The Vice President, DICK CHENEY, was Secretary of Defense for the first President Bush. The Secretary of State, Colin Powell, served as both National Security Advisor and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs.

The history of our relationship with Saddam is important so that we do not repeat the errors of the 80s and 90s in today's war on terror.

Under Presidents Reagan and Bush, Iraq was removed from the terrorist list. Full diplomatic relations were restored. Billions of dollars in loan guarantees were provided to Saddam. The sale of dual-use technology for weapons of mass destruction was approved—no wonder, after the first Gulf War, that we found that Iraq had an advanced nuclear weapons program. We gave them the tools to build it. We let other countries supply U.S. military equipment. We even shared highly sensitive satellite intelligence with Saddam's army. And even though we knew Saddam was using chemical weapons against Iran, the U.S. prevented the United Nations from condemning Iraq.

According to a Congressional Research Service report, which I will insert into the RECORD, not only did we support Saddam, but

when the Congress tried to impose sanctions on Iraq for the use of chemical weapons, the Reagan and Bush Administrations blocked those efforts.

I fear now we are forging similar unholy alliances in our war on terror. In Uzbekistan we are supporting a tyrant who, according to our own State Department, heads an oppressive regime that has more than 5,000 political prisoners. In Turkmenistan, we are allied with another Stalinist thug, by the name of Turkmenbashi, who has created a personality cult that rivals Saddam's. He's renamed January after himself, and the month of April after his mother.

So let us remember the lessons of Halabja. If we are going to speak of democracy and liberty, let us practice it. If we are going to talk about human rights, let us defend them. If we are sincere about the war on terror, let us not ally ourselves with those illegitimate heads of state who terrorize their own people. Let us keep what credibility we have left.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my support for H. Res. 557.

As I have done since the beginning of this war, I continue to focus my attention on the fine men and women of the Armed Forces that have fought so valiantly in Iraq. In particular I am pleased to recognize the contributions of the National Guard and Reserve.

The citizen soldiers of the Guard and Reserve left behind their families and careers to serve their country. We must continue to recognize those family members and employers who have also sacrificed over the last year while their loved ones served in harm's way thousands of miles away.

Today, three units from the Connecticut National Guard continue to serve in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, while one unit has returned and yet another prepares to deploy. I had the unique opportunity to meet with many of these fine soldiers in theater during my October trip to Iraq last year. Their morale and conviction for the mission remain as strong today as it was when they deployed.

We must remember that work here in Congress remains to insure that both active duty soldiers and our Guard and Reserve units continue to get the support they need. We must continue to see an increase in the flow of up-armored HMMWVs and up-armor kits and body armor to theater. We must also make sure the troops know that the American people support their efforts in securing a world free from the threat of terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I was not able to make the roll call vote for H. Res. 557, but had I been in attendance I ask that the RECORD reflect that I would have voted "yea," joining with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in commending the members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces for liberating Iraq. I am grateful for their valiant service.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I believe the resolution before us only tells part of the story about our efforts in Iraq. I will vote for this resolution because of my thanks to our brave service personnel for their efforts and my hope for the creation of a free and democratic Iraq, but I am deeply disappointed in the partisan way that such an important resolution is being used to further divide our country.

This resolution portrays the case that we went to Iraq solely based on the brutality of Saddam Hussein's regime. Americans were told that Saddam Hussein presented a clear and immediate danger to the safety of the United States, and our soldiers were told they were going to Iraq to protect our country from a direct attack on our soil. We now know that justification to be false, and I believe it is a disservice to our soldiers who are risking their lives and our citizens if we do not honestly address the failures in the use of intelligence.

Saddam Hussein was a brutal tyrant who oppressed and murdered his people. It is good that he is gone. The Iraqi people now have the opportunity to create something they have never had: a free and stable country. That is a goal that I fully support.

I am proud of our military personnel for performing above and beyond the call of duty. They have demonstrated that they are the best fighting force in the world, and we should show our gratitude for the professionalism and skill with which they have carried out their mission.

But that is not the whole story. This resolution fails to recognize the great sacrifices made by our military personnel and their families, or offer condolences to the over 540 families who have made the ultimate sacrifice. This resolution offers no recognition of the dedication shown by our citizen soldiers who have been asked to serve in far greater and more dangerous capacity than many of them ever imagined. We cannot afford to forget these sacrifices.

If we truly wish to honor our soldiers. I ask my colleagues to work together in a bipartisan way to provide not just words, but actions. We need to provide the proper support so that they may safely carry out their mission, and we need to recognize that our responsibility to our soldiers does not end when they take off the uniform. We need to recognize that caring for the veterans of this country and the veterans of this war is part of the cost of defending our Nation.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I support our courageous men and women in uniform who are bearing the burden of this military action in Iraq. I am deeply grateful for their patriotism, and their sacrifice.

Unfortunately, this resolution does not simply support our troops—it is an endorsement of this President's policy of unilateral, preemptive military action, and it makes the dubious assertion that the world today is safer than it was before the Iraq war began.

Considering that the President's budget does not request a single dollar for the ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan or provide the health care and benefits that our wounded servicemen and women deserve when they come home, I find it deeply ironic that the leadership of this House is so eager to offer a resolution praising our troops but empty of material support.

I would have happily supported an honest and fair resolution expressing support for our troops, but that is not what we are being asked to vote on today. The fact is President Bush and the Republican majority have not provided our troops in Iraq the body armor and armored vehicles they need to be as safe as they can be. The Administration has not explained its faulty "intelligence" to justify the decision to go to war or its failure to plan adequately for the post-war occupation of Iraq. The President clearly has not provided the Congress with an accurate accounting for the costs of the ongoing military operations in Iraq.

This resolution makes no mention of the more than 550 American service men and women who have been killed, another 2,500 Americans wounded, many grievously, or the thousands of Iraqis who have died during this conflict. Nor does this resolution mention the more than 200 people killed just last week in Madrid, and those who have been killed in numerous other terrorist attacks since the war began. It is hypocritical and disingenuous for the sponsors of this resolution to claim that the world is a safer place while ignoring the fact that terrorist operations in response to our occupation of Iraq are occurring with alarming frequency.

Mr. Speaker, like all of my colleagues, I am happy that Saddam Hussein no longer has the power to abuse and slaughter his own people—but unlike the claim made in this resolution, I do not believe that the world is a safer, less dangerous place than it was twelve months ago. Nor do I believe that we have provided our troops everything that they need to do their job properly.

The resolution that we are voting on today is really just a reminder of what the Bush Administration would like us to forget from the past year—the hidden costs, the faulty intelligence, the failure to find weapons of mass destruction, the false claims of links between al-Qaeda and Saddam Hussein, and the rising number of dead and wounded—and I cannot support it.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as it should be, military service is being held in high esteem. What strikes me when I visit our military bases and Walter Reed Army Medical Center, is the age of those who have answered the call to duty throughout America's history. In this war, as in those of our past, we send our young. They are the best of the best. Their motto might well be, in the words of Alexander Pope, "Act well your part, therein all honor lies."

Spc. Jeffrey Wershow, a National Guardsman from Gainesville, Florida, is a shining example of Pope's words. He was a patriotic young man with passion and heart who left this world too early. His dreams included law school and public service. Spc. Wershow wanted to change the world, and he did.

I stand 100 percent behind our troops. All those who deserve our appreciation, our respect, and our compassion. The brave men and women in uniform who have volunteered to defend our country are in my thoughts, and in my prayers. I pledge to work to ensure that they have all the resources necessary to help them accomplish their mission quickly and safely so that they can return home to their families.

I want to salute the 566 U.S. troops killed in the year that troops have been in Iraq. Our Nation is humbled by their allegiance, service and sacrifice. I pray that their families will find comfort and peace. To date, 3,254 U.S. troops have been physically wounded. I wish them a speedy recovery and happiness as they return to their family and friends. An untold number of troops will not bear physical scars from this war, but will struggle with their time in Iraq when they return home. I pledge that I will not forget their service and will stand with them when they come home to America. Thousands of Iraqi civilian casualties have been reported. I want the Iraqi people to know that my heart goes out to them during this difficult period.

May God bless our troops and may God continue to bless America.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 557, ''relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces.'' First and foremost, I believe that it is important to take this time to honor the men and women of our armed forces who have sacrificed under difficult and dangerous conditions to make our military efforts successful in Iraq. It is also important to recognize the sacrifices of the families of our troops, friends, and those who employ the members of our Guard and Reserve forces deployed overseas. Our appreciation goes out to these individuals for their support during these challenging times.

Last October I had the opportunity to visit with our military men and women in Iraq and survey the operations of the U.S. reconstruction mission to Iraq. I have never been more proud to be an American than when I witnessed our troops fulfilling their mission in difficult and dangerous circumstances. While we still have a long way to go in Iraq, I saw many signs of progress in helping meet the basic needs of the Iraqi people.

From Wisconsin alone there are over 1,460 members of the Air and Army National Guard who are serving on active duty. This includes military units activated from the Third Congressional District, which I represent. Wisconsin's 229th Army National Guard Engineer Company from Prairie Du Chien and Platteville, and 652nd Army Reserves Engineer Company from Ellsworth are currently serving in Iraq.

We welcomed the members of Wisconsin's 829th Army National Guard Engineer Detachment from Richland Center back home recently. We also welcomed back members of Wisconsin's 1158th Army National Guard Transportation Detachment from Black River Falls and Tomah, serving in Fort Irwin, CA. In addition, the 128th Infantry Battalion headquartered in Eau Claire was recently alerted for possible mobilization. The people of western Wisconsin are proud of their service and the service of all men and women of our armed forces during this important time in our Nation's history. I also want to recognize the incredible work of the people at Fort McCoy and Volk Field in western Wisconsin. They are working countless hours to get our troops ready.

As the day pass, we must not forget those who have died in the mission to liberate the people of Iraq. Over 540 American soldiers have died while serving in Iraq. 2LT Jeremy Wolfe, MAJ Christopher Splinter, and PFC Bert Hoyer from the Third District in Wisconsin, each paid the ultimate sacrifice to give the people of Iraq the greatest gift of all—their freedom. These young men exemplify all that is good and decent about America. Their loss is tragic; their sacrifices should not be forgotten.

I do, however, have reservations about certain language in this resolution, in particular, the references to the world being safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein. That subject is highly debatable. While I agree that the Iraqi people are better off free from the tyrannical rule of Saddam Hussein, the most critical threat to international security is still at large and still very active. To this day, it is al Qaeda, who remains the number one security threat and we must combat that international threat with an international coalition.

It is al Qaeda that was directly responsible for the attacks on September 11 and it is al Qaeda that is reconstituting itself as a truly global terrorist threat. As we know now, Saddam Hussein's regime, as ruthless as it was, did not possess an imminent threat against its own neighbors, let alone against the United States. We still need a thorough investigation of our intelligence failures so future miscalculations, that change world opinion against us, are not repeated.

As our military effort continues, I, and other Members of Congress will work to ensure that our service men and women have all the resources necessary to fulfill this continuing mission. My thoughts and prayers are with those serving our country, as well as their families. America is firmly behind our troops and we are all hoping to see them home safe, secure and soon.

May God continue to bless these United States of America.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 577. Under the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein, the Iraqi people lived in poverty and fear. During his 30-year reign of tyranny, he massacred tens of thousands of his own people, some murdered for their religion, some for their ethnicity.

On March 19, 2003, the United States and its Coalition partners launched the first air strikes of Operation Iraqi Freedom. On the evening of April 9, 2003, Iraqis danced and waved their country's flag in central Baghdad as U.S. forces toppled a huge statue of Saddam Hussein. In a matter of weeks, Hussein's decades-old regime was dismantled and 25 million Iraqis were liberated from one of the world's most brutal tyrannies.

Operation Iraqi Freedom was a military success, courageously executed by American men and women in uniform. It was an operation of unparalleled precision and speed, and was carried out in a way that prevented widespread destruction of Iraq's infrastructure, lengthy street-by-street fighting or a humanitarian crises. Food and medical aid flowed into Iraq immediately after the troops, and there was no ''adventurism'' by Iraq's neighbors or other destabilizing action in the region.

Coalition successes include delivering some 3.3 million metric tons of food to Iraq; all 240 hospitals in Iraq and more than 1,200 clinics are open with more then 90 percent of Iraq's 4.3 million children under the age of 5 have been vaccinated against diseases including polio, tetanus, diphtheria, measles and tuberculosis; two-thirds of potable water production in Iraq has been restored, treating nearly 800 million liters a day, benefiting 3.5 million people; electric power generation has surpassed 4,400 megawatts of electricity in contrast to only 300 megawatts prior to the war; average crude oil production has reached 2.5 million barrels per day and since June 2003 oil sales have generated more than $5 billion in revenue for Iraqi reconstruction.

One year later, Iraqis are engaged in the enormous challenge of rebuilding their country after decades of neglect, and are working with the Coalition toward the creation of a secure, stable, sovereign and peaceful Iraq. To date, in nearly all major cities and most towns and villages, Iraqi municipal councils have been forced, and for the first time in more than a generation the Iraqi judiciary is fully independent. More than 600 Iraqi judges preside over more than 500 courts that operate independently from the Iraqi Governing Council and from the Coalition Provisional Authority.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. forces are handing the torch to the Iraqi people as they take control of their own resources, form an army, build an effective police force and develop a fair justice system. Thousands of Iraqis now provide security for their fellow citizens, and Iraqi security forces now account for more than half of all forces in Iraq. Every day more and more Iraqis who know that a free Iraq will change the world are stepping forward to ensure a more prosperous and free Iraq. And Iraqis who once fearfully followed a fluid and unwritten law now have the assurance of a fair and reliable bill of rights that ensures equality for all.

Some skeptics continue to suggest that military action in Iraq was wrong, that preemption is never the answer and that Iraqis would have been better off left to the will of Saddam Hussein. Today, however, Iraq has been freed from the grips of fear, a liberated people are cultivating their resources and exploring their free lands, and the world is also a safer place because of Saddam's removal.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 557.

A year ago this week a remarkably successful military campaign began against Saddam Hussein's brutal dictatorship. As we honor the brave men and women of our Armed Forces who waged this battle and the Iraqi people who strive to establish a free and open society, we reflect on the tremendous sacrifice they have made and on the hard work that remains to be done.

We knew ridding the world of Saddam Hussein and introducing democracy to Iraq was not going to be easy. During four trips to Iraq since April, I have seen the strength and courage of our forces as they worked alongside Iraqis rebuilding schools by day, and risking their lives patrolling those same streets by night.

At the 1-year anniversary of military action, we extend our heartfelt thanks to the men and women of our military who continue to sacrifice in Iraq. We also honor the Iraqi people who, by signing an interim constitution, have taken a bold step in the pursuit of freedom.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, while I am a staunch and unwavering supporter of our Nation's troops, I must rise in opposition to this resolution.

One year ago, the United States invaded Iraq, a unilateralist strike approved by Congress because President Bush told us that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction and was prepared to use them.

The Bush administration, in fact, assured the country that we faced imminent danger.

Today, we know that President Bush and his advisors made dozens—perhaps hundreds—of misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq. Yet H. Res. 557 makes no reference to weapons of mass destruction, the leading justification for our supposed ''preventive'' strike at Saddam Hussein, other than to mention the use of such weapons some 16 years ago.

This is an attempt by the Republican Party to rewrite history and avoid accountability for their false claims about the nature of the Iraqi threat. Nobody from the Democratic side of the aisle was allowed to provide input on the resolution.

Let us remember: CIA Director George Tenet has admitted that U.S. intelligence never told the White House that Iraq posed an imminent threat; former Chief U.N. Weapons Inspector Hans Blix has stated that President Bush disregarded any evidence suggesting that Iraq lacked weapons of mass destruction; even David Kay, the Bush administration's hand-picked head of the U.S. post-war weapons inspection effort, has stated that the Iraq war "was not worth it" and recognized that weapons of mass destruction "don't exist."

But instead of taking responsibility for its repeated deception, Republicans now want to avoid any accountability for this misguided war by claiming to honor our troops.

More than 550 Americans have been killed in the Iraq war and occupation, and thousands more wounded, yet the Bush administration and the Republican congressional leadership refuse to admit that they were wrong.

I call for a full accounting of the events leading up to the war in Iraq. Until then, the American people cannot fully trust what their President tells them—especially when it comes to life and death decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of our armed forces, but stand opposed to this resolution.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the United States forces in Iraq. I also salute the troops from 34 other nations who have also fought to liberate Iraq from the clutches of tyranny and despotism.

Our armed forces have performed with the utmost skill and bravery. They deserve our gratitude and support. They have not only been warriors in the heat of the battle and in the fog of war, they have also served as change agents, transforming upheaval into pace.

However, both time and the facts have proven that we were led into war with the weapons of mass distortion. We have since learned that our reasons for sending our troops to Iraq were based on faulty intelligence.

Assumptions about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction were incorrect. President Bush admits that the United States has no evidence linking Saddam Hussein to the 9/11 attacks, despite the Administration's timing conflating al-Qaeda-led terrorism and Saddam's regime.

Plans for rebuilding Iraq were woefully inadequate, and cost estimate absurdly low. Rather than catalyzing Mideast peace, the region is again awash in violence.

The Administration's arrogant dismissal of our allies' concerns has made it all the more difficult to win their financial and military support for post-war efforts.

One part of winning the war against terror is proving to the world that America stands with freedom, champions the weak and aids the righteous. We are failing in that effort.

The Administration has boasted that America, as well as the world, is now safer because of the toppling of Saddam Hussein. Twenty-five million Iraqis will attest to this. While the threat of Saddam Hussein may be gone, al-Qaeda is still a clear and present danger. As recent news headlines attest, the people of Spain are reeling from the dastardly acts of this hydra-headed monster.

The war in Iraq and the intensified conflict in the Middle East has increased anger at the United States, and people throughout the world have lost faith in America's foreign policies.

America's foreign policies should be driven by human rights, justice and equality—values that would decrease the threat to terrorism—and not by corporate interests.

I agree with this resolution on two points: the Iraqi people have been courageous and Saddam Hussein was a brutal and dangerous dictator.

A year ago, my constituents demanded answers to their many questions. How much would a war with Iraq and subsequent occupation cost taxpayers? How would this be paid for when the federal government is running large deficits? Will it be worth it? How long will we be there? All of these questions about Iraq remain unanswered.

I told them that there were no guarantees that we could replace the current regime with a viable alternative that would bring stability and peace to the region.

I hoped my grim predictions were wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I would never turn my back on our troops and our commitments. Our Nation is at war. We do know that the sons and daughters of all our many communities are engaged in the dangerous and unpredictable duties that are carried by the Armed Forces in a time of war. Our military, including overburdened national reservists, are stretched thin and remain vulnerable to deadly attacks.

Mr. Speaker, Iraq was neither an immediate or imminent threat to the security of the American people. Iraq's structural integrity did depend on fear, violence, illicit oil revenue and the illegitimate authority of one man and the party he led.

But was that enough to justify the more than 565 lost lives of American soldiers and more than 2000 wounded that will have to return to their communities where jobs are not available?

Post-war chaos and disorder in Iraq has proven to be just as destructive to human life as the actual war.

I believe this resolution fails to point out that following the devastation of World War II, the United States showed tremendous leadership in the world as we created international institutions and a framework of international law to prevent war and to sustain and maintain peace.

We were the leaders in promoting a world where conflicts could be resolved peacefully and cooperatively. While never perfect, this system of international institutions has been remarkably effective.

I and many others around the world are shocked and dismayed by the unilateral, confrontational approach that the Bush Administration has taken in the world arena.

We must recognize the consequences in the world community of our rejection of Kyoto, of the International Criminal Court, of the treaty to ban land mines, and our own withdrawal from the ABM treaty.

We must be mindful about how our criticism of the UN and NATO are heard throughout the world community.

We have to recognize that after 9-11, the world came together in solidarity with our loss, working with us to find the perpetrators, to break up Al Qaeda and to arrest its leaders.

It should have been abundantly clear that fighting terrorism and protecting American security would require friends and allies; cooperation, not confrontation.

Yet, the Adminatration instead engaged in a singled-minded drive to achieve its Iraqi objectives at a deadly cost instead of developing a policy to deal with Iraq by working with our allies, by working with the world community.

Even if the Administration gets what they want this time, what is the long term damage to our international relationships? How will it impact our efforts to stop terrorism and protect the security of the American people?

I am worried. The people that I represent are very anxious. My colleague from Maine earlier circulated a dear colleague about this resolution. I would like to emphasize the points he highlighted in his Dear Colleague:

> The Republican leadership has scheduled four hours of debate today on H. Res. 577, regarding this resolution.
>
> This amount of debate time allocated to this non-binding resolution is equal to the amount the Republican leadership allowed on the 2003 tax bill (one hour) and the Medicare bill (three hours) combined.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all of Congress and all of America stand by our troops, but we think it is absolutely incumbent upon this Administration to answer our questions instead of debating a resolution with sound and fury while signifying nothing.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Res. 557. This resolution to mark the one year anniversary of the United States led military invasion of Iraq is a partisan measure. The brave men and women who continue to serve our Nation and fight for democracy in Iraq deserve bipartisan cooperation and an alternative resolution to the divisive proposal introduced today.

Back home in the fifth district of Missouri I have visited with families of service men and women to hear their concerns about the needs of our troops. Their message is clear: "We want them home. In the meantime, we want them safe." The Administration's budget proposes $1.2 billion less than the amount requested by Veterans Affairs Secretary Anthony Principi which the Veterans of Foreign Wars terms a "disgraceful" level of funding for veterans' healthcare. We must also provide active service members with the equipment, training and resources they need to protect our freedom and fight the war on terrorism.

On the one year anniversary of our involvement in Iraq, we praise the efforts and sacrifices of those who put their lives on the line for us every day. Let our future actions on their behalf reflect that. This resolution does not.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Res. 577. This resolution claims to support our troops, yet it fails to even mention the over 550 American service men and women who have died in this conflict.

It also fails to even mention the weapons of mass destruction what were supposedly the justification for this war with its terrible cost in lives, dollars, and security.

And its claims that this war has made the world safer. In fact, the war in Iraq and the Doctrine of Preemption have made the world a more dangerous place. This is a terrible resolution. And it is a trap.

This resolution completely distorts and ignores the basis for this war.

In the fall of 2002, the Bush Administration told us that Iraqi weapons of mass destruction posed a grave and gathering danger to the United States and that we therefore supposedly had to go to war.

This resolution does not even mention this.

Now, the Administration's own chief weapons inspector, David Kay, has said that there are no large stockpiles of chemical, biological or nuclear weapons. He said, ''We were almost all wrong.'' Why isn't this cited in the resolution before us? Leaving out the weapons of mass destruction argument represents yet another lie of omission.

In fact, the truth is, not everyone was wrong.

Mohammed El-Baradei and Dr. Hans Blix, the U.N. inspectors, raised real doubts about the Administration's rush to war.

And 72 members of Congress voted for my amendment to the use of force resolution that would have rejected the unnecessary rush to war and instead strengthened our commitment to the United Nations inspections process.

Last March, before the first shots in the war were fired, I introduced a resolution disavowing the Doctrine of Preemption because I believed that preemptive first strikes in the absence of a proven imminent threat go against both American values and American interests.

We had choices. We had options. We did not have to go to war.

Now we are on the verge of commemorating a year of war led by a President who is proud to claim his record as a war president. In that year over 550 American service men and women have died and over 3000 have been wounded, along with literally untold numbers of Iraqi civilians.

This Republican resolution blatantly and shamefully disregards this fact.

Some of us remember them today and their families. We also hope and pray for the safe and swift return of all our armed forces who are still in harm's way. As the daughter of a retired military officer, I know what we owe to these men and women.

We owe them and their families economic security. And we owe them our best efforts to create a safer world.

Now I tried to offer an amendment to this misleading resolution that said two things.

First of all, my amendment expressed our deep sorrow and regret for all those who have been killed in this war and extending our support to their families in this moment of terrible loss.

As I said, the resolution as written, never mentions the more than 550 Americans who have died. How insulting and insensitive.

Second, my amendment addressed the new world order—or disorder—that has been created by this war.

It stated: The war in Iraq and the Doctrine of Preemption on which it is based have undermined long-standing alliances; weakened the effectiveness of the United Nations; cost hundreds of American and unknown numbers of Iraqi lives and billions of dollars; and have made the world a more dangerous rather than a safer place.

We are not voting on this amendment today because the Rules Committee did not allow my amendment honoring the sacrifice of our troops or offering the truth about the war.

Once again, true debate is being stifled. What a shame and a disgrace!

Once again, this Administration and the Republican leadership are attempting to deceive the American people.

We must call them on it and vote against this resolution which does not mention those who have been killed.

It does not mention the weapons of mass destruction that supposedly were the justification for the war itself.

And it does not accurately portray the fact that this war and the Doctrine of Preemption on which it is based have made the world a more dangerous, rather than a safer place.

Is that the world that we want to turn over to our children?

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 557, commemorating the 1 year anniversary of the liberation of the Iraqi people.

In the past year, our soldiers, sailors, and airmen have performed magnificently, first liberating an oppressed country and now stabilizing peace and security. We could not be more proud of their efforts and dedication, and we thank them and their families for their commitment and sacrifices.

Solid progress has been made in the past year in reconstituting an Iraqi civil society and public infrastructure—after nearly 30 years of oppression under Saddam Hussein.

One sector I want to highlight is the work being done in improving the education system for Iraq's children. This is a critical step in giving them a viable, independent future, and it is necessary in order to secure Iraq's place in the world as a prosperous and peaceful country.

More children are attending school—currently 5.5 million are in school. All universities and technical schools have been re-opened. The curriculum now focuses on teaching reading, writing, and math—not instilling fear of the government.

As far as the Iraqi people have come in the last year, we know there is still more work to be done. Our troops and Iraqis still face threats from terrorists who have no future in a peaceful and prosperous Iraq.

Some during this debate have questioned the wisdom of our decision in liberating Iraq and removing Saddam Hussein as a threat to the international community. Some have focused on what has gone wrong, rather than on what has gone right. The recent terrorist attack in Spain should drive home the point of why we must take the fight to the terrorists—rather than waiting to fight with them here on our soil. This is not a clash of cultures, peoples of religions—this is about fanatic fundamentalists who despise their peaceful fellow countrymen and believers.

The new central front on the war on terror is Iraq. In order to defeat the fundamentalists, who love death and destruction more than they love life, we must stay the course in Iraq and in other parts of the globe where we and our allies work to defeat terrorism.

The war on terrorism is a global effort; it is a long-term effort. Terrorists have many agendas and capabilities. Their supporters hide in dark shadows and are elusive. But the one thing they have in common is the desire to change our way of life.

America is strong in its resolve in fighting terrorism. We will succeed, and we will continue to be patient, deliberate, and consistent in defending our citizens and interests.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, it has been one year since the brave men and women serving in the U.S. Armed Forces were ordered into Iraq. On a daily basis, these brave servicemembers are displaying tremendous patriotism and courage. They and their families have made enormous sacrifices, many even the ultimate sacrifice, to serve our Nation.

I continue to strongly support our troops serving us in Iraq, Afghanistan, and around the world. My own district has seen the loss of four fallen heroes who gave their lives in defense of our Nation: Jorge Casanova, Atanacio Haro Marin, Francisco Martinez Flores, and Kelly Bolor. Many more from my district have been injured. One of my constituents, Eugene Serrano, was part of the unit that captured Saddam Hussein.

Last month, I hosted a ceremony in my district to honor these fallen heroes and all of our Nation's veterans—those who have lost their lives, those who have put their lives on the line, and those who continue to risk their lives in order to defend our Nation.

We should honor our troops and our veterans. However, I cannot support the particular resolution before us today.

I oppose this resolution not because of what it says, but because of what it does not say. It fails to express sorrow and condolences to the families of the more than 550 servicemembers that have died in Iraq, over 415 of whom were killed after President Bush declared an end to major combat in Iraq. It also lacks mention of the more than 3,500 who have been wounded in Iraq.

Honoring our troops should go beyond mere words commending their service. We should also eliminate disparities in pay between our active duty military and the National Guard and reservists. Some reservist families in my district are struggling to make ends meet while their loved ones are serving our Nation abroad.

We should also provide the health care and benefits our wounded service men and women earned when they come home. I've had the privilege of visiting Walter Reed Hospital in Washington, DC, where many of the wounded troops are receiving care upon returning from Iraq. Some of these soldiers, many of who have little financial resources, are facing substantial medical bills for injuries sustained during war.

We should also take steps to ensure that the families of fallen soldiers have access to resources to cope with the loss of their loved one. This includes adequate funds for bereavement costs and translators for military personnel who visit families of fallen heroes whose first language is not English. When military personnel arrived at the home of one of the fallen service members from my district, his parents, like all parents in the same situation, feared the worst. Unfortunately, the parents were unable to fully understand why the uniformed military members were visiting them because they did not speak English. They feared for their son's condition. Language and cultural differences should be acknowledged and addressed, especially when families are hearing news that they have lost a loved one.

Finally, this resolution ignores the important steps that must be taken to lay the foundation for a stable and secure Iraq. We should immediately remedy the deficiencies in the intelligence on which our troops rely and assemble a true international coalition so that the United States does not have to consume all of the costs and nearly all of the casualties. Doing so will help secure the region and bring our troops safely home.

Today, we had an opportunity to truly honor our troops with words and action. Unfortunately, this resolution accomplishes nothing more than dividing us at a time when we should be united.

I continue to support our troops. I want to extend sincere gratitude to them and their families for their extraordinary sacrifices.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concerns about the process by which H. Res. 557 has been considered in the House.

Once again, a small group in the House—the majority party on the Rules Committee—has prevented a full and fair debate. Last night, I submitted an amendment to the Committee for consideration. The first part of my amendment would have struck the language in the resolution claiming that the Iraq war has made the world safer, replacing it with language about the deplorable and brutal regime of Saddam Hussein. The second part would have added a fifth clause to the resolution, commending the members of the Reserve and National Guard and their families for their dedication and sacrifice, given the extraordinary number of such members called to active duty and their length of deployment in Iraq. Unfortunately, not only was my amendment not made in order, but no amendments at all were made in order. In fact, the minority does not even have the right to recommit this resolution with instructions.

Let me be clear that there is no doubt that the world is better off without Saddam Hussein and his horrible regime. But to put forth a resolution stating that the world is safer because of the U.S. invasion into Iraq, while claiming it ''should be'' bipartisan, is purely partisan politics. I am shocked at the audacity of the Republican leadership to force an up or down vote on a resolution with a clause justifying the war in Iraq, bundled with provisions that every member of this House supports—commending the Iraqis for their courage, commending the adoption of an interim constitution, and supporting U.S. and Coalition forces for their bravery. My amendment would have truly made this resolution something members on both sides of the aisle could support.

I also share the concerns of many of my colleagues that this resolution does not acknowledge many of the questions surrounding the justification that the Administration used for going to war in Iraq. First, no weapons of mass destruction have been found. Second, CIA Director Tenet has stated that he never said the threat coming from Iraq was imminent, a claim that President Bush repeatedly made to the American people. Third, the Administration's alleged ties between Al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein's regime have yet to be proven. In my view, these discrepancies are the reason why the Republican leadership has decided to take up this resolution. I think that they believe if they can get the House to agree that the world is safer because of the U.S. invasion into Iraq, the war is justified. But I disagree wholeheartedly with this flawed logic.

We should be spending our time talking about how to make our country and world safer. We should be talking about the security of our borders, of cargo, of our critical infrastructure. We should be talking about truly supporting our troops by making sure they are taken care of when they return to the U.S.—ensuring that they don't have to wait for six months to get an appointment at the VA; ensuring that the veterans who fought before them get the benefits they were promised; ensuring that their loved ones will be taken care of when they pass on. We should be talking about how to help the Reservists and members of the National Guard who have been called to serve longer then they ever envisioned, whose families need help paying the bills while the soldiers are gone.

I have been moved by the bravery of the troops that have been deployed from my district in New Mexico. They include the 52nd Engineer Combat Battalion's Charlie Battery, the New Mexico National Guard's 1115th Transportation Company, a group of soldiers from the New Mexico National Guard 3631st Maintenance Company, thousands of reservists, and countless active duty. I will continue working in Congress to help their families while they are gone and to help them with the transition when they return.

Let's pass a resolution commending the bravery of our troops and coalition forces, thanking their families, commending the Iraqis for their courage in the face of a brutal regime and war, commending the adoption of an interim constitution in Iraq—but let's allow for a full debate and do it in a way that does not divide us. A resolution on the one-year anniversary of the beginning of the war should not be used for political purposes. Our armed forces, including the Reservists and National Guard members I sought to commend, as well as the Iraqi people, deserve better.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 557. I do so obviously not because I oppose praising our armed forces, but because our policy in the Persian Gulf is seriously flawed and an effort to commend our forces should not be used to rubber-stamp a policy of folly. To do so is disingenuous. Though this resolution may yield political benefits to those who are offering it, it will prove to be historically inaccurate. Justifying preemption is not the answer to avoiding appeasement.

Very few wars are necessary. Very few wars are good and just, including this one. In reality, most wars are costly beyond measure in life and limb and economic hardship, including this one. There have been 566 deaths, 10,000 casualties, and hundreds of billions of dollars for a ''victory'' that remains elusive. Rather than bragging of victory we should recognize that the war that rages on has intensified and spread, leaving our allies and our own people less safe.

Denying that we are interested in oil and that occupying an Islamic country is not an affront to the sensitivities of most Arabs and Muslims is foolhardy. Reasserting U.N. Security Council resolutions as the justification for war further emphasizes our sacrifice of sovereignty and Congress's reneging on its Constitutional responsibility on war.

This resolution seems to forget that for too long we were staunch military and economic allies of Saddam Hussein. This in itself only demonstrates the folly of our policy of foreign meddling over many decades from the days of the U.S. installing the Shah of Iran to the current world-wide spread of hostilities and hatred, our unnecessary intervention abroad shows so clearly how unintended consequences come back to haunt generation after generation.

Someday our leaders ought to ask why Switzerland, Sweden, Canada, Mexico and many other nations are not potential targets of an attack by Islamic extremists.

Falsely claiming that al-Qaeda was aligned with Saddam Hussein and using this as a rallying cry to war has now resulted in al-Qaeda actually having a strong presence and influence in Iraq. Falsely claiming that Iraq had a supply of weapons of mass destruction has resulted in a dramatic loss of U.S. credibility, as anti-Americanism spreads around the world. As a result of this, al-Qaeda recruitment sadly has been dramatically boosted.

That Saddam Hussein was a brutal dictator was never in question, so reaffirming it here is unnecessary. What we must keep in mind, however, is that Saddam Hussein was attacking his own people and making war on Iran when he was essentially an ally of the United States—to the point where the U.S. Government assisted him in his war on Iran. This support is made all the more clear when viewing recently-declassified State Department cables in the days after Donald Rumsfeld traveled to Iraq as a U.S. envoy in 1983. Here are two such examples:

(1) United States Embassy in the United Kingdom Cable from Charles H. Price II to the Department of State. ''Rumsfeld One-on-One Meeting with Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister,'' December 21, 1983.

Presidential envoy Donald Rumsfeld and Tariq Aziz meet for two and one-half hours and agree that ''the U.S. and Iraq shared many common interests,'' including peace in the Persian Gulf, the desire to diminish the influence of Iran and Syria, and support for reintegrating Egypt, isolated since its unilateral peace with Israel, into the Arab world. Rumsfeld comments on Iraq's oil exports, suggests alternative pipeline facilities, and discusses opposition to international terrorism and support for a fair Arab-Israeli peace. He and Aziz discuss the Iran-Iraq war ''in detail.'' Rumsfeld says that the administration wants an end to the war, and offers ''our willingness to do more.'' He mentions chemical weapons, possible escalation of fighting in the Gulf, and human rights as impediments to the U.S. government's desire to do more to help Iraq, then shifts the conversation to U.S. opposition to Syria's role in Lebanon.

(2) Department of State, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Action Memorandum from Richard W. Murphy to Lawrence S. Eagleburger. ''EXIM [Export-Import] Bank Financing for Iraq'' [Includes Letter From Lawrence S. Eagleburger to William Draper, Dated December 24, 1983], December 22, 1983.

Pursuant to the Reagan administration's policy of increasing support for Iraq, the State Department advises Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Lawrence Eagleburger to urge the U.S. Export-Import

Bank to provide Iraq with financial credits. Eagleburger signs a letter to Eximbank saying that since Saddam Hussein had complied with U.S. requests, and announced the end of all aid to the principal terrorist group of concern to the U.S., and expelled its leader (Abu Nidal), ''The terrorism issue, therefore, should no longer be an impediment to EXIM financing for U.S. sales to Iraq.'' The financing is to signal U.S. belief in Iraq's future economic viability, secure a foothold in the potentially large Iraqi market, and ''go far to show our support for Iraq in a practical, neutral context.''

This resolution praises the new constitution for Iraq, written by U.S. experts and appointees. No one stops to consider the folly of the U.S. and the West believing they can write a constitution for a country with a completely different political and social history than ours. The constitution that the occupying forces have come up with is unworkable and absurd. It also will saddle the Iraqi people with an enormous and socialist-oriented government. In this, we are doing the Iraqi people no favor.

Article 14 of the new constitution grants the Iraqi people the ''right'' to ''security, education, health care, and social security,'' and affirms that ''the Iraqi state . . . shall strive to provide prosperity and employment opportunities to the people.'' This sounds more like the constitution of the old USSR than that of a free and market-oriented society.

Further, this constitution declares that Iraqi citizens ''shall not be permitted to possess, bear, buy, or sell arms'' except by special license—denying the right of self defense to the Iraqi people just as their security situation continues to deteriorate. The Iraqi constitution also sets up a quota system for the Iraqi electoral system, stating that women should ''constitute no less than one-quarter of the members of the National Assembly.'' Is this kind of social engineering in Iraq on very left-liberal lines really appropriate? Are we doing the Iraqi people any favors with this approach?

We all praise our troops and support them. Had this bill merely done that I would have been an enthusiastic supporter. But in politicizing the issue rather than simply praising the armed forces, I regret that I cannot support it. Challenging one's patriotism for not supporting this resolution and our policy in the Persian Gulf, however, is not appropriate.

We should all be cautious in endorsing and financing a policy that unfortunately expands the war rather than ending it. That, sadly, is what this legislation does.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our troops and the work of our armed forces in Iraq. About a year ago, our troops embarked on a mission to liberate the people of Iraq and end the threat posed by Saddam Hussein.

Looking back on the year, it is important that we remind ourselves of the nature of the threat against the United States, the Middle East, and the Iraqi people. Saddam Hussein was nothing short of evil. He threatened his neighbors through war and invasion. He threatened his people through rape, torture, and intimidation. He threatened the United States through years of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons development. Thanks to the brave efforts of the American armed forces and our Coalition allies, we are now safer. Terrorists still prowl the earth but one of their protectors and one who wanted to add WMD to terrorism is finished.

The mission has not been easy. These are attacks by terrorist and Baathist forces who remain determined to undermine the United States, the war on terror, and democracy in Iraq. Our troops, however, are equally determined to root out and destroy these forces. Despite news reports and a constant barrage of negative commentary on our mission's success, American military personnel have routed the main Iraqi forces, rounded up countless rebels, and restored much of Iraq's long neglected infrastructure.

I had the opportunity and honor to visit our troops in Iraq in January. I visited with a number of troops from my district and the State of Indiana. Among these troops and among troops in general, I saw no signs of the low spirits that some media reports say are plaguing troops. The troops I met complained about the food, sand fleas and weather conditions, but felt their service is worthwhile.

None of Iraq's rehabilitation and reconstruction would have been possible without the hard work of American and Allied troops, including the thousands of National Guardsmen and Reservists who put their civilian lives on hold to serve their country. Our military relies increasingly on National Guard and Reserve units to supplement regular army deployments, and the liberation of Iraq was no exception. During this war, members of the 1–293rd Army National Guard Infantry unit and the 122nd Air National Guard Fighter Wing from the Third District of Indiana served our nation and kept us secure.

I rise support of this resolution because I think the worst thing would be for our troops to think there isn't support for them or their mission in the United States. This resolution sends a message to our troops that we support them. The U.S. mission was and remains justified. Our troops were and remain the key to this mission's success. I will continue to support the American troops in the field and those who have returned from their duty.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution. We ought to be honoring those who gave their lives, their limbs and sacrificed their futures for our country. So far, 565 service members have lost their lives, more than 3,000 have been wounded—many losing limbs—and now we are seeing American civilians becoming targets.

Instead, we are here today making hollow political pronouncements that the war was right and just and that somehow our Nation and our world are more secure. Unfortunately, the opposite appears to be true. Americans are less safe and the world is more dangerous—precisely because of the Bush policy in Iraq.

On this anniversary of the war we ought to include in this resolution the names of the heroes who gave their lives. We ought to be honoring and commending these brave Americans for what they have given and sacrificed along with the troops who continue to serve valiantly. But, the Bush administration doesn't want to talk about—or expose—the 565 Americans who've been killed and the 3,254 wounded.

The omission of this remembrance demonstrates that President Bush and his Administration are good at taking credit, but terrible at accepting responsibility.

We've seen in the past few weeks the President cloaking himself in September 11th. He's put images of ground zero in his campaign ads. I wouldn't be surprised if he didn't go so far as to give his acceptance speech for the Republican presidential nomination at that very site as the entire Republican Party politicizes September 11th at their upcoming convention.

Yet, President Bush won't attend any funerals or memorial services for soldiers killed in action in Iraq.

In fact, he's prohibited access to Dover Air Force Base to the media altogether. The Department of Defense has broken a long tradition by prohibiting arrival ceremonies because the images of these casualties are an embarrassment to President Bush.

The President knows that American troops were sent to Iraq ill prepared and without enough equipment to keep them safe. Soldiers face daily threats there. They don't have sufficient body armor or armored vehicles as rocket propelled grenades and roadside bombs take lives and limbs.

The President knows the troops wouldn't be there in the first place if he hadn't misled the American people. We now know—far too late—that the intelligence community never told the President or senior administration officials that Iraq posed an imminent threat or that it had weapons of mass destruction. Yet, President Bush continually referred to Iraq as an ''urgent,'' ''mortal'' and ''immediate'' threat in making his case for war.

The President knows his mind was already made up to go to war. Today, he should know the world is not a safer place as a result, especially for our troops. I will not support a resolution that falsely makes any such claim.

While senior defense officials have told Congress that we will run out of money and need another $19 billion in September, the President's Budget does not include a single penny of this spending. He simply refuses to give the American public the plain facts.

America and our security would benefit from a new approach to foreign policy. Imagine a President who embraces global cooperation, respects international law and institutions and promotes political and economic freedom and human rights around the globe. Imagine America exercising responsible leadership that reflects our priorities and capable of partnerships that make our world safer.

This would be a fitting tribute to those who gave their lives in Iraq. We should work for what these servicemen and women believed they could achieve: a more secure future for America and stronger, more peaceful world. That's the resolution I wish we were here considering today instead of this overblown rhetoric attempting to justify a failed Presidential agenda.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our men and women in uniform. I cannot however, in full confidence, rise in support of statements that the world is a safer place for the removal of Saddam Hussein from power. The human and financial costs of war are colossal. This action has been no exception. With the details of the tragic bombing of a hotel in Baghdad still developing as we debate this resolution, we are once again reminded of the horrors of war—and the long road ahead. Based on today's events, and the recent bombing in Spain, how can the authors of this resolution say that we are safer?

No one has borne the costs of this military action more than our soldiers and their families. No one understands these sacrifices

greater than the spouses and children of soldiers who spend month after month, deployment after deployment, in far away lands. No one understands sacrifices greater than the soldiers themselves who volunteer their time, but must sometimes pay with their health, their jobs, or even their lives.

All of us in this Congress want to honor these men and women in uniform. I am sure that we all want to minimize their hardships and that of their families. A bipartisan piece of legislation that I recently introduced, H.R. 3779, the Safeguarding Schoolchildren of Deployed Soldiers Act, would seek to bring us one step closer to this goal. At a time when Reservists and members of the National Guard are being used at unprecedented levels, many of them are experiencing new problems when they leave home.

According to the Department of Defense, there are currently 1.2 million children with military parents in the United States. This number is only slightly less than the total number of adults currently serving in the Armed Forces.

I learned firsthand how deployments can cause significant upheaval in a child's life when the brother of a deployed soldier recently contacted my office. He explained that his niece had moved to live with her mother while her father was away fighting in Iraq. As a result, she was prevented from attending her normal high school because she no longer resided within the school district.

The Safeguarding Schoolchildren of Deployed Soldiers Act would ensure some measure of continuity for children who change residence as a result of their parent's military service by allowing them to continue to receive an education at their schools, even if they are temporarily residing outside the school district.

While I will vote yes on today's resolution, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake that it is a vote of support for our troops and their families; troops such as Sgt. Christopher Kreiger from the 105th Military Police Company, who was informed this week that his unit's tour of duty has been extended indefinitely. It is my hope that he will come home quickly and safely to see his one-year-old daughter for the first time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on this very day 8 months ago, Prime Minister Tony Blair stood in this chamber and addressed a joint session of Congress. He said, ''The spread of freedom is the best security for the free. It is our last line of defense and our first line of attack.

''And just as the terrorist seeks to divide humanity in hate, so we have to unify around an idea. And that idea is liberty.

''We must find the strength to fight for this idea and the compassion to make it universal. Abraham Lincoln said, 'Those that deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves.' ''

Mr. Speaker, for over 2 decades Saddam Hussein denied freedom and liberty to the Iraqi people. He killed Kurds because of their ethnicity. He killed Shiites because of their religion. He killed Sunnis for their political views. And he even killed Egyptians, Kuwaitis, and Iranians because their lives meant nothing to him or his evil regime.

Today, Saddam's regime is no more. Overthrown in May and pulled from a spider hole in December, Saddam is now in jail.

America and its great military—made up of men and women from all branches of our Armed Forces including our resilient National Guard and reserves—recognized that our security and freedom was under direct threat from Saddam Hussein.

With the strength of an international coalition, America took decisive action and set out on a clear mission: to defend America. Nearly one year later we are seeing the fruits of our work take hold. Operation Iraqi Freedom has delivered hope and optimism to the well-educated people of Iraq. Today, 25 million Iraqis are free from the grip of Saddam's oppressive regime.

Our operation and responsibility in Iraq, however, did not end with a quick and decisive military victory. Finishing the fight and removing Saddam did not mean we finished the job.

We pledged to see a new Iraq government grow into a model for democracy and freedom in the Middle East. We must stay until the job is done because America's security still depends upon it.

Terrorism cannot be defeated unless we bring civility to Iraq. With assistance from our coalition, the Iraqi people have taken the first steps toward controlling their own destiny. Schools, medical clinics and hospitals have been reopened. An army and more effective police force have been rebuilt. A fair judicial system has been constituted. And a foundation has been laid for democratic elections.

An interim constitution has been signed. Every Iraqi—no matter their gender, religion or ethnic origin—today has the guarantee of basic freedoms, rights and protections under law.

I wish every member of this House could have taken the trip I took to Iraq last year. Led by Chairman JERRY LEWIS, we traveled from Baghdad to Mosul to Al Hillah to witness the incredible work of our brave young men and women in uniform. We thanked them for their service to our country and let them know how grateful America was for job they were doing protecting our freedom and bringing democracy to Iraq.

To see our mission up-close and through the lens of our soldiers gave me great hope that one day Iraq will be a country of great promise and able to demonstrate strong leadership in the region.

On the first anniversary of Operation Iraqi Freedom let us honor every service man and woman who is making our country safer and more secure. And let us remember all those who have sacrificed and fallen while defending our freedom. We mourn the loss of very American soldier and pray for the early recovery of our wounded.

Today, America's courage remains firm and steadfast. Yet, we know that dangerous days still lie ahead. Terrorists who have previously sought weapons of mass destruction from Saddam ''like ants to honey'' continue to plot against America. The terrorists will not rest. When they're not attacking, terrorists are planning or strategizing about where and when to attack next. And remember, we were attacked without provocation on September 11, 2001.

For freedom and democracy to prevail over violence and terrorism, we must continue to take the fight to the terrorist before they again bring terrorism to our shores.

Mr. Speaker, let us commend the members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces for liberating Iraq by passing this resolution.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this resolution, although I do not approve of the manner in which it is being debated. The fact that the House is not permitted even to consider amendments means that our debate will be incomplete because the resolution covers only some of the issues that are relevant to understanding where we are one year after the beginning of military action by coalition troops in Iraq.

On this one-year anniversary, there is no question but that the House should commend the Iraqi people ''for their courage in the face of unspeakable oppression and brutality inflicted on them by Saddam Hussein's regime.''

The resolution also very appropriately commends the Iraqi people on the adoption of Iraq's interim constitution, a key step toward what all Americans hope will be the Iraqi people's creation of a new, free, and democratic Iraq.

And there is no question but that the members of the U.S. Armed Forces and the Coalition forces should be commended for serving in Iraq. For me, this is the most important clause in this resolution.

We may not all agree on whether going to war a year ago was the right course for the U.S. to take—indeed, I was not persuaded that it was, and so I voted against the war resolution in 2002. But we can all agree that our brave men and women in uniform deserve our support, our respect, our gratitude for their service—and in the cases of over 550 servicemen and women, their giving what Lincoln rightly called the last full measure of devotion by sacrificing their lives.

But I must qualify my support for one clause in this resolution—the clause that asserts ''the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq.''

I believe that Saddam out of power is infinitely better than Saddam in power. Saddam can no longer terrorize his people and his neighbors in the region. The Iraqi people are now able to move into an era of freedom—an incredible step forward for a country that has been brutalized for so long.

And it's true that the U.S. and the world are now living free of fear from Saddam's possible use of weapons of mass destruction or his possible assistance to terrorists.

But, while the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime has liberated the Iraqis and freed us from some worries, I think there are still some things to fear.

I still fear the consequences of the Bush Administration's ''you're either with us or you're against us'' approach. This approach rushed the diplomatic process at the United Nations and dismissed a strategy of ''coercive inspections.'' This same approach caused Pentagon leaders to exaggerate intelligence claims and mangle the planning for the post-war occupation and rebuilding of Iraq. And by going in without broader support and without an adequate post-war plan, the Administration made long-term success in Iraq much more difficult to achieve.

So I'm afraid we're stuck with a heavy burden for years to come. I'm afraid that America won't be safer if it continues to have to focus so much of our attention and resources on our mission in Iraq. I'm afraid America won't be safer if we continue to spend so much in Iraq—$120 billion and rising—because it will mean we have that much less money to

spend on ways to keep us safe from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, from terrorists in other areas of the world, or from potential threats right here at home. That would be troublesome enough if we were paying for it ourselves, through taxes—it is even more worrisome that the Administration is insisting on putting the burden on our children, who will have to repay with interest the massive amounts we are borrowing to cover the budget deficit.

I'm afraid that unless we return to a foreign policy that reflects American priorities—putting a priority on promoting political and economic freedom and human rights; more closely cooperating with allies and friends; and more truly respecting international law and institutions—we risk fueling the very terror that we ultimately hope to prevent.

I don't believe that the answer to these fears is to cut and run by prematurely pulling our troops out of Iraq. On the contrary, I believe we have to work that much harder to work with the international community to win the peace and to assist the Iraqi people to establish a new, free, and democratic Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important to take this moment to reflect on this one-year anniversary. We can look back at the last year with pride at the service and sacrifices of our troops and with admiration for the Iraqi people, who are working hard to find their way in this new post-Saddam world. And we can look back at this last year to learn lessons from what we did right. But we also need to understand our mistakes and what we did wrong in Iraq so that we can move forward with a better understanding and greater confidence in our mission in the months and perhaps years to come.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering H. Res. 557, which is intended to praise the efforts of the United States to liberate the people of Iraq, and to commend the efforts of our valiant soldiers who are serving in Iraq. Let me state at the outset, I support our troops and their families who cling to hopes and prayers that our soldiers will not succumb to harm's way and will be home soon.

I must offer some sobering words regarding this resolution. I believe that although well intended, the resolution is untimely. It does not contain any input from Democratic members; it does not honor the over 550 soldiers who have died; or the over 11,000 who have been wounded. There is no mention of the fact that no Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) were found. I have concluded that the world is not safer today.

There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein was a tyrant and dictator. A revisiting of the facts leads me to conclude once again though, that Americans and members of Congress were misled by the Administration. The administration acted on flawed CIA intelligence, alleged that Iraq had WMD, and was prepared to use them. The U.N. inspection teams did not uncover any weapons. Their search for WMD was prematurely aborted.

Over 550 soldiers have been killed. Over 11,000 soldiers have been wounded. Here at home, the families of our military serving in Iraq, including reservists, are suffering financially and emotionally. They know that this mission was ill-conceived. Another problem is that our troop deployment is thin. Some of them have committed suicide. The administration and the Defense Department have our troops mired in a military holding action. The situation is compounded by the fact that there is no clear exit strategy.

As we tout our efforts to promote democracy, it is still clear that we are attempting to export our version of democracy, as opposed to encouraging a form of democracy that will best suit the citizens of Iraq. Iraq has a long history of sectarian strife amongst Shiites, Sunnis and ethnic Kurds. As Americans, we are attempting to export our ideals of democracy. The fact of the matter is, we are still a young democracy. We still have not mastered the process. As Iraqis prepare for the adoption of new constitution, they will still be confronted with the realities of internal sectarian strife that could well undermine our vision and their hopes for democratic rule.

Regarding the premise that the world is safer now than when Saddam was in power, the rhetoric fails to square with reality. Al Qaeda, which was purported to be operating in Iraq pre-invasion, was not. Clearly, there is no connection between Saddam Hussein and Al Qaeda. The facts are clear, terrorist activity by Al Qaeda has escalated. We need only look at the bombings in Indonesia, Turkey and most recently in Spain. Does this mean we should cease our efforts against terrorism? Absolutely not! It does mean that we should be much more circumspect in the way we go about fighting terrorism. We must build coalitions to assist us.

Finally, let me say our allies around the world continue to chafe at the bully of the world persona that is attached to the United States. We are seeing an increasing erosion of confidence throughout Europe regarding the foreign policies being promoted by this administration. The best way we can honor our troops is to provide them with the equipment they need to be effective. We must provide a clear exit strategy.

It is indeed unfortunate that we are considering and debating this resolution which does not adequately honor our troops. I urge the leadership to withdraw this resolution, It is important for Republicans to include our Democratic leaders in the crafting of a new resolution. The new resolution should honor soldiers who have been killed and wounded. It should also contain language that addresses a plan to bring our troops home.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, 2003, we were debating a similar resolution—then to express support for the President and the U.S. military (H. Con. Res. 104). I said on that occasion: "I want to make it clear that our young men and women, who are putting their lives on the line in Iraq, have my unequivocal support. I will do everything in my power as a member of Congress to see to it that they have everything they need to win this war and return home safe and sound to their families. We can only hope and pray that this war will end quickly, and a minimum number of American, British, and Iraqi civilian and military lives are lost, destroyed or maimed for the rest of their lives."

Unfortunately, my worst fears have come true. Our troops, and the few other nations whose troops are involved, are not home. Families and many good Americans are volunteering to raise money to buy for our soldiers the kind of protective vests they need to be as safe as possible in the middle of a war. Many Americans and thousands of Iraqi fighters, but mostly innocent Iraqi civilians, have died and been wounded. The wounded will spend a lifetime of disability and suffering. They will spend the rest of their lives knowing that they will never be able to accomplish the highest and best of what God had intended for their lives.

I said a year ago, "While the troops have 100 percent of my support, when appropriate, I will continue to articulate the grave concerns I have about the policies that sent them there." Today I am keeping the promise relative to the President's policies in Iraq.

This Congress did not vote to go to war in Iraq because Saddam Hussein was a bad guy. Everybody knew he was a bad guy. There are lots of bad guys in the world, and we are not even trying to remove them. Unfortunately, the fundamental lesson that President Bush has taught our children with his pre-emptive war strategy is that "the end justifies the means."

We were told we had to go to war because Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. Americans would not have supported going to war just because Saddam was a bad guy. One year later, we have found no weapons of mass destruction, and have little evidence that we will ever find them. Why? Because, mostly likely, U.N. inspections had contained his ability to make or use weapons of mass destruction.

President Bush has destroyed the unity, support and moral authority that the world gave to the United States after September 11. The latest evidence of that erosion of support was the Spanish election on March 14.

I said on March 20, 2003, "There is no convincing evidence that Iraq was involved or connected to Osama bin Laden, Al Qaeda or the events of September 11, 2001—despite President Bush's many failed attempts to morph the two, in order to convince the American people that there is such a connection." The attempt to weld 9/11, Iraq and the war on terror continues as we speak. The truth is we have virtually abandoned the real war on terrorism in Afghanistan. The truth is, Al Qaeda was not in Iraq a year ago, but they are today. As a result, the world has not been made safer, as the resolution suggests, but has become more unsafe and unstable.

I said on March 20, 2003, "Most Americans think that when our young men and women are risking their lives on the battlefield that Democrats, Republicans and Independents in this House would come together in a non-partisan manner to support our troops—because everyone does support them. . . . But the Republican extremists in the House have no shame and no limits. They will politicize the blood of our soldiers if they think they can gain a political advantage. They have never met an issue they were unwilling to 'wedge'." This resolution is a continuation of that same strategy in an election year.

I said one year ago, "Many Democrats, myself included, separate support for the troops from support for the President's policy. But the Republicans deliberately joined the two so they could make it a political wedge issue. Therefore, if you vote 'for' the resolution it appears that you support the President's policy. But if you vote 'against' the resolution, the Republicans intend to paint you as against our troops and unpatriotic in future elections. In other words, the Republicans have deliberately tried to set a 'Catch 22' trap."

Well, I support our troops, but I continue to oppose the President's policy in Iraq. I will

vote ''no'' on this resolution because the world has not been made safer because of the removal of Saddam Hussein. If you doubt me, ask the families of the over 200 people in Spain who lost loved ones in the recent explosions on the train there, and the hundreds who were wounded.

I filed a Federal lawsuit to try to stop the President from going to war in Iraq without a declaration of war from Congress. I believe the President's actions in Iraq were unconstitutional and in violation of international law.

The Bush policy of ignoring the United Nations and the lack of decent respect for the opinion of mankind; the U.S.-led preemptive policy has weakened the United Nations, weakened the structures of ''collective security,'' weakened the rule of international law and has not made the world safer, but more dangerous and unstable.

Again I repeat what I said on March 20, 2003: As the wealthiest and only superpower in the world, the U.S. has the most economic and military interests in the world. The United Nations, collective security, and the rule of international law have well-served those U.S. interests. Weakening any of them increases the threat to U.S. interests at home and abroad.

So today, even as I give our young men and women in Iraq my unconditional support, I also renew my dedication to strengthening the United Nations, collective security, and the rule of international law. They help guarantee peace and security in the world and, when fully utilized, make it less likely that American service men and women may have to be sent to possibly make the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our country in the future.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make a few comments about the resolution we are considering today in recognition of the one-year anniversary of the U.S. invasion of Iraq. The resolution before us on the floor has significant shortcomings that I want to point out for the RECORD.

On March 19, 2003, offensive U.S. military actions were initiated against Iraq. Just two days later, on March 21, 2003, the House of Representatives approved a resolution which expressed ''the unequivocal support and appreciation of the Nation for our troops and their families.''

Only 8 minutes before passing this feel good resolution, however, the House of Representatives passed a budget, which I voted against, that included a $28 billion cut over 10 years to veterans health care, disability compensation and pensions. While the Republican Party is able to eloquently express their support and admiration for our men and women in uniform via non-binding congratulatory resolutions, their follow through is non-existent.

Here we are a year later, and this ''unequivocal support'' has not been translated into substantive action. Congress must deliver on this promise of support by providing our troops with the equipment and training they need. And, Congress must deliver on this promise by providing our nation's veterans with the health care and services they've earned and deserve.

Words in a non-binding resolution will not provide a single soldier with the body armor necessary to protect his or her life nor will they ensure a single veteran can see a doctor in a timely manner or receive the disability compensation they've earned. Our soldiers and veterans need action, not words.

Unfortunately, the actions of the President and his allies in Congress have repeatedly short-changed our men and women in uniform and the veterans who have served our nation honorably.

Thousands of troops in Iraq remain in danger because the Pentagon leadership has failed to secure an adequate supply of body armor. Thousands of troops remain in danger because of inadequate supplies of armored Humvees and devices to disable roadside bombs.

According to a recent article in USA Today, U.S. military officers are having to dip into their own unit's funds in order to get this critical protective equipment because ''bureaucratic delays'' in Washington, DC, have short-changed troops.

I saw the dangers confronting U.S. troops first-hand during my recent trip to Iraq. I cannot understand why the President and the civilian leadership at the Pentagon would put our troops in harms' way without adequate protective equipment despite preparing for war with Iraq for 2 years prior to the actual invasion and despite $400 billion in annual Pentagon spending.

Yet, the resolution on the floor today will do nothing to solve this problem.

Further, our citizen-soldiers in the National Guard and Reserve continue to be subject to second-class treatment. When I recently visited Fort Hood, Texas, I discovered that the 2nd Battalion, 162nd Infantry of the Oregon National Guard was sent to train without the basics: fuel, ammunition, toilet paper, field radios and other essentials, and they were housed in moldy, crumbling barracks.

Media reports have documented that over 1,000 wounded Army National Guard and Army Reserve soldiers, evacuated from Iraq to Fort Stewart, Georgia, and Fort Knox, Kentucky, were housed in sub-standard concrete barracks with no air conditioning, indoor toilets or running water, while they were forced to wait weeks and sometimes months for medical care.

Yet, the resolution on the floor today will do nothing to solve these problems.

Next week, the House Republicans will present their budget on the House floor. Like last year's budget, this year's budget will fail to fully meet the needs of our troops and veterans.

The budget resolution, as currently drafted, underfunds veterans programs by $1.3 billion below the level requested by the Republican Chairman of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs.

The budget fails to repeal the age-62 penalty for military widows under the Survivor Benefit Plan. Yet, stand-alone legislation on this issue has 291 cosponsors, including 120 Republicans.

The budget fails to fully fund repeal of the disabled veterans tax immediately for all veterans despite the fact that stand-alone legislation to repeal the tax, H.R. 303, has 377 cosponsors, including 185 Republican cosponsors.

The budget fails to fund an expansion of the military health care program TRICARE to cover uninsured members of the National Guard and Reserve.

The budget fails to provide wage support for National Guard and Reserve members who are forced to leave civilian jobs with higher pay. These families are forced to do more with less.

The budget fails to provide additional compensation for soldiers who are forced to stay in the U.S. military through stop-loss orders despite having plans to retire or otherwise leave the service after fulfilling their time commitment under their enlistment contract. I have drafted legislation to provide a monthly bonus of $500 for soldiers subject to stop-loss orders, orders that amount to an involuntary draft.

The budget fails to fund an extension of imminent danger pay and family separation pay for troops in Iraq past the end of this year when even Pentagon officials admit that U.S. troops will be in Iraq for the next several years.

And, the budget cuts funding for military construction and quality-of-life improvements for U.S. troops by $1 billion from the levels approved before the Iraq war.

The resolution on the floor today will do nothing to address these challenges.

Finally, the resolution on the floor today fails to acknowledge the deaths of more than 550 American troops or the more than 3,000 wounded American soldiers.

The resolution fails to acknowledge the deaths and injuries suffered by American and Iraqi civilians, United Nations personnel, and soldiers from allied countries.

The resolution fails to adequately acknowledge the service and sacrifice of tens of thousands of National Guard and Reserve soldiers and their families.

However, I intend to support this resolution. There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein was a brutal dictator. He oppressed and killed his own people. He invaded his neighbors, and he used chemical weapons. The Iraqi people and the world are better off without him.

But, the fact that I am glad he's out of power and in U.S. custody does not mean I agree that the Iraq war was necessary. The war was not necessary. It was elective. I voted against the authorization for war. It was obvious even at the time of the vote, which occurred months before the war actually started, that the Administration had hyped, manipulated, and misrepresented the intelligence regarding the threat posed by Iraq and that the Administration had not planned adequately for post-war Iraq. The Administration's rosy scenario for post-war Iraq has not come to pass. Instead, the U.S. is bogged down in a costly—both in terms of dollars and lives—and lengthy occupation of Iraq.

I believe that America and the world would have been better served if the Administration had not become distracted by Iraq. Saddam was safely contained and defanged by sanctions supported by a broad international coalition. The sanctions prevented Iraq from redeveloping chemical or biological weapons, and made it impossible for Hussein to achieve his ultimate goal of developing nuclear weapons.

The Administration should have kept its focus on the single gravest threat to our society—al Qaeda. It was al Qaeda, after all, who attacked the U.S. on September 11, 2001, not Iraq. It was al Qaeda who bombed U.S. embassies in Africa. It was al Qaeda who bombed a U.S. warship in the Persian Gulf. And it is al Qqeda that continues to plan and carry out attacks against Americans and our allies around the world. The Administration should not have shifted intelligence and military resources away from the documented threat—al Qaeda—in order to invade and occupy Iraq.

However, I will support this resolution because it is merely hortatory. The resolution does not set national policy. It is not legally binding on anyone or anything. It commends the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of the brutal Hussein regime and commends their adoption of an interim constitution. It also commends the members of the U.S. military for their valiant service. I am voting for the resolution because I want to express my support for the nascent democracy in Iraq and for our soldiers.

I would urge the House Republican leadership to spend less time on resolutions like this, which offer merely words, and more time pushing through legislation that would actually provide our soldiers and veterans with the equipment, training and benefits they need and deserve.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the valiant service from our men and women in our Armed Services. That's why I am disappointed that the House leadership decided to present this toothless resolution rather than provide real assistance for our troops.

They say this resolution is meant to thank the American military men and women serving in Iraq. But if they truly wanted to honor these soldiers—this same leadership should have supported my amendment last year that would have given every American soldier serving in Iraq and Afghanistan a $1,500 bonus. But it failed with 210 Republicans voting against it.

The President is traveling across the country to mark the war's anniversary and thank our troops. Yet his budget cuts Veterans health benefits—just like last year. Some thanks!

I support this resolution. But let's be clear: this resolution won't save any lives; it won't provide adequate body armor and armored humvees to our troops any quicker; it doesn't repair the damage done to our reputation in the international community, it won't bring our troops home any sooner and it won't heal a single wound or restore a single American life lost in Iraq.

The resolution also fails to answer some key questions:

Why did this Administration mislead the American people 237 times in their statements about the so-called immediate threat from Iraq? As Mr. MURTHA of Pennsylvania stated, ''never have so few, misled so many.''

Why did this Administration say that reconstruction would only cost Americans $1.7 billion and that other countries and Iraqi oil would cover the rest? Instead American taxpayers have paid billions of dollars in rebuilding Iraq—and the tab is likely to increase in the next year.

To date, we have spent more than $150 billion in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, more than 560 soldiers have died in Iraq and another 5,300 have been injured. We owe it to them, to their families and to all Americans to level with them and given them the straight answers on why we went into Iraq and how long it will take to get the job done.

Like all Americans, I am proud of our Americans soldiers in Iraq who are serving their country with dedication and courage. But I am not proud of those in the Administration that may have misled our great Nation into war.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Mr. HYDE and Mr. DELAY, the authors of House Resolution 557, for crafting legislation that truly exemplifies naked political strategy.

This vapid proposal of phony patriotism does nothing to address the urgent concerns that are permeating the world stage.

Instead of seeking real solutions to the problems our troops are confronting; instead of taking the time to exercise judicious oversight to remedy the hardships that are being faced—we are instead spending a significant amount of our time indulging ourselves with legislation that ultimately does not help anyone.

And we are doing this today as Baghdad burns. How typical.

550 American service men and women have been killed in Iraq. No weapons of mass destruction have been found. Our Nation's reputation has been damaged to such an extent that former allies now have populations consumed with anti-American fervor.

Instead of affirming that Saddam Hussein is a bad guy—which we all know—shouldn't we be spending our time trying to decipher why the central arguments for a pre-emptive war appear to have been based on inaccurate intelligence?

Shouldn't we be examining reports regarding how Iraqi exile Ahmad Chalabi fed misinformation about Weapons of Mass Destruction to the United States government and investigate why the Pentagon is still paying him $340,000 a month?

Instead of proclaiming that the world is safer shouldn't we be analyzing the terrorist attacks in Spain that occurred last week?

And while each and every single Member of Congress is awed and thankful for the bravery and valor of our men and women in the Armed Services, shouldn't we be discussing what we can do to help alleviate the daily deaths and bloodshed that they face?

And shouldn't we, at some stage, focus our attention on Afghanistan as well?

Wouldn't real action by Congress honor our military more than this? Wouldn't real action be more patriotic?

Surely the leadership in the House of Representatives can focus on more important work than a celebratory resolution?

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our troops and in support of those who lost loved ones in the violence in Baghdad that we all witnessed today.

On a day that should have shown the unity of our government, we have seen the parties divided. The Republican resolution has left out Democratic input.

It has left out our condolences to the families of those killed in Iraq.

It has left out feelings that our troops must be equipped with body armor and armored vehicles.

And it has left out steps to correct the intelligence failures in the run-up to the war.

Even though the Republican resolution leaves out so much, I'm supporting it to show my support for our troops.

After one year in Iraq our troops are still suffering.

Our soldiers were sent to Iraq without enough of the equipment they depend on to do their jobs safely and without a plan to bring them home.

564 Americans and 100 other coalition troops have been killed. Americans deserve to know what happened in the events leading up to the war in Iraq.

We demand accountability. We are tired of the President and the Administration obstructing the 9/11 commission.

We must be able to trust that what the President tells them is true and we shouldn't have to bear the burden of rebuilding Iraq alone.

American taxpayers are paying almost all the bills, $120 billion and rising.

We deserve a detailed plan for future spending, so our troops are guaranteed to get the resources they need.

Part of winning the war on terror is taking care of those who helped us fight it.

We must ensure our veterans health care, their pensions, and their survivor's benefits.

But the Administration wants to raise health care costs for over 1 million veterans, increasing co-payments and imposing new enrollment fees that will cost veterans $2 billion over 5 years.

Just this past month the VA said it will cut 540 positions from the Veterans Benefits Administration. How can the Administration reduce the veteran benefit backlog when it cuts the resources needed to help our veterans?

I keep thinking about the young men in my district that we recently lost.

There was Corporal Jorge Gonzales. His parents, Mario and Rosa are from Rialto and they still grieve.

And then there was Corporal Sean Grilley of San Bernardino who was killed while he was enforcing a curfew.

These brave men and their families deserve truthful accountability so our soldiers are protected, our veterans are taken care of and our troops can come home as soon as possible.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this resolution. Our troops should not be a pawn in a political power play. This resolution is not a simple statement of support for the incredibly valiant work of our men and women in Iraq. It is a cynical, political tool to further the agenda of the Bush Administration during this election year.

This resolution was pushed through the House of Representatives without input from a single Democrat. I wanted to vote for a resolution that truly recognizes the sacrifice of our troops and the importance of living up to our commitments to them, but the Republican leadership would not allow a vote on any other measure but their own. I refuse to bow to the politization of the grave matter of our young people at war, and for this reason I voted against the resolution.

Let me be clear: our troops deserve our qualified support as they serve our Nation in such dangerous circumstances. But that support must be more than empty words, it must be in promises kept.

I would have voted today for a resolution that reiterated our commitment to providing our troops with the body armor and armored vehicles they need to keep them safe, to immediately address the intelligence deficiencies that continue to put our troops in further danger, and to insist on a clearly articulated strategy for post-war occupation and exit of Iraq.

This alternative resolution I supported included provisions to eliminate the disparities in pay between our active duty military and the National Guard and reservists, and provide the health care and benefits our wounded veterans need when they come home. But the Republican majority never allowed for a vote on this fair-minded alternative.

Last week I sat in the Budget Committee and watched in shock as the Republican members of the Committee voted on party lines to reject a ''Support Our Troops'' amendment that would have raised funding levels for the military by $2.5 billion. This money would have been spent on family separation pay, imminent danger pay, education funding for military school children, and TRICARE military health coverage for reservists, and military housing programs. How can we look our troops in the eye and tell them Congress rejected actual funding that would help them and their families through this difficult time, but instead passed a relatively meaningless resolution of our support? This is unconscionable.

I also strongly object to the clause in today's resolution claiming that the ''world is safer'' as a result of the Iraq war. Mr. Speaker, I disagree. Iraq is still in chaos. American soldiers, international diplomats, and Iraqi civilians are being killed every day. And the Administration is still a long way from pacifying Iraq or setting up a stable government. The Administration made claims that Iraq was a base of International terrorism and that turned out to be false.

Our troops deserve better than more empty words from Congress. On the one-year anniversary of the start to this misguided war, they deserve to be supported with sound policy, real dollars, and the commitment to bring them home safely.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, this is a deceitful resolution not for what it says, but for what it does not say. It is unfortunate that our Republican colleagues would once again use an issue that unites all Americans—support for our troops—into a naked political stunt that attempts to rewrite history in a divisive manner. The American people should understand that the Republican leadership in this House has prevented any Member of Congress from offering any change to this resolution.

The main defect of this resolution is that it tells only a small part of the story about Iraq. In an obvious attempt to change the subject, the resolution contains absolutely no mention of the primary justification President Bush gave for going to war in Iraq—the alleged existence of stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction. Instead, the resolution attempts to justify the decision for war on humanitarian grounds alone. It cites, among other things, Saddam Hussein's use of chemical weapons against Iraq's Kurdish citizens in 1988.

No one needs to tell me about Saddam Hussein's human rights abuses against the Kurds. In 1988, at the end of the Iran-Iraq war, I traveled to the Iraq-Turkish border as a staffer on the U.S. Senate Foreign relations Committee with my colleague Peter Galbraith. At that time, thousands of Kurds were fleeing across the border to seek refuge in Turkey. We interviewed hundreds of those refugees and documented Iraq's use of chemical weapons against the Kurdish people. Our report formed the basis for legislation to impose economic sanctions against Iraq for its use of chemical weapons against the Kurds. The bill passed the United States Senate; but the Reagan Administration, which included many of the key officials now in the Bush administration, opposed and helped block that sanctions legislation from passing. I challenge anyone to explain to me how you can oppose economic sanctions in 1988 in response to Iraq's use of chemical weapons against civilians and then today turn around and say that those same actions are the reason the United States went to war in 2003.

Moreover, if Saddam Hussein's use of chemical weapons against his own people was the reason for military action, we should have finished the job during the Persian Gulf War in 1991. Iraq has not used chemical weapons since 1988, since the time my colleague Peter Galbraith and I went to the Iraq-Turkish border at the end of the Iran-Iraq war. But 3 years later in 1991, not only did we not remove Hussein in Baghdad, but at the end of the war the United States looked the other way for many days while Saddam Hussein turned his guns on the Shias in the south and the Kurds in the north. This history exposes the hypocrisy of this attempt to rewrite history in order to change the argument for going to war in Iraq in 2003.

The fact is that the Bush Administration told the American people that we had to go to war because Saddam Hussein currently possessed stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction and posed an imminent threat to the United States. When the U.N. inspectors asked for additional time to determine whether Iraq possessed stockpiles of such weapons, the Administration rejected the request and went to war. We now know that—based on the report of Chief U.S. weapons inspector, David Kay, that to date no stockpiles of chemical, biological or nuclear weapons have been found in Iraq. This resolution says nothing about the serious blow to U.S. credibility and security around the world caused by the Administration's misuse and abuse of intelligence information.

The Republican leadership would like to equate support for our troops in Iraq with support for the President's decision to go to war in Iraq. But my constituents and the American people deserve better than the false choice presented by this resolution. I will not play the game of having to support the President's views on Iraq in order to express support our troops. I continue to stand behind our troops and am grateful for their valiant service. I recently returned from a trip to Iraq where I had the honor of meeting with many of the men and women in our Armed Forces. I expressed to them the gratitude of the American people for their sacrifice and for their service to our country. It is a disservice to our troops that the Republican leadership here would exploit them to attempt to gain partisan political advantage.

I have crafted an alternative resolution that presents the part of the story that the Republican leadership would like the American people to forget. This substitute resolution does not change a single word of the underlying resolution. However, it presents a fuller picture of the real story behind the decision to go to war in Iraq. Every one of the ''Whereas'' clauses in this alternative resolution is factually accurate and incontrovertible. Why does the Republican leadership want to hide from these facts? Why does it want to prevent the American people from knowing the full story? Why will it not allow this substitute to be voted on? Mr. Speaker, I submit this alternative resolution for the RECORD.

SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION PROPOSED BY REPRESENTATIVE CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

Relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people, and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces and the failure to find stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction.

Whereas Saddam Hussein and his regime committed crimes against humanity, systematically violating the human rights of Iraqis and citizens of other countries;

Whereas Saddam Hussein's terror regime subjected the Iraqi people to murder, torture, rape, and amputation;

Whereas on March 16, 1988, Saddam Hussein's regime had and unleashed weapons of mass destruction against Kurdish citizens, killing nearly 5,000 of them;

Whereas in September 1988, the United States Senate unanimously passed legislation (S. 2763) to impose economic sanctions against the regime of Saddam Hussein for the use of chemical weapons against its Kurdish citizens, but the bill failed after the Reagan Administration opposed the legislation and threatened a veto;

Whereas as many as 270 mass grave sites, containing the remains of as many as 400,000 victims of Saddam Hussein's regime, have been found in Iraq;

Whereas rape was used to intimidate the Iraqi population, with victims often raped in front of their families;

Whereas the regime punished the Marsh Arabs by draining the marshlands, which created hundreds of thousands of refugees and caused an ecological catastrophe;

Whereas in 1991, explaining the Bush Administration decision not to advance on Baghdad, then Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney stated, ''Once you've got Baghdad, it's not clear what you do with it. It's not clear what kind of government you would put in place of the one that's currently there now. Is it going to be a Shia regime, a Sunni regime or a Kurdish regime? Or one that tilts toward the Baathists, or one that tilts toward the Islamic fundamentalists? How much credibility is that government going to have if it's set up by the United States military when it's there? How long does the United States military have to stay to protect the people that sign on for that government, and what happens to it once we leave?'';

Whereas the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–338), passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 360 to 38, made it United States policy to support efforts to remove from power the regime headed by Saddam Hussein;

Whereas on September 8, 2002, Secretary of State Powell said, ''There is no doubt that he [Hussein] has chemical weapons stocks.'';

Whereas on September 8, 2002, Vice President Cheney said, ''We do know, with absolute certainty, that he [Hussein] is using his procurement system to acquire the equipment he needs in order to enrich uranium to build a nuclear weapon.'';

Whereas on September 8, 2002, Secretary Powell said, ''With respect to biological weapons, we are confident that he has some stocks of those weapons, and he is probably continuing to try to develop more.'';

Whereas on October 2, 2002, President Bush said, ''The Iraqi regime is a threat of unique urgency.'';

Whereas on October 10, 2002, the House of Representatives passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107–243) and on March 19, 2003, the United States initiated military operations in Iraq;

Whereas with the Iraqi regime failing to comply with 16 previously adopted United Nations Security Council resolutions, the Security Council unanimously approved Resolution 1441 on November 8, 2002, declaring the Iraq ''has been and remains in material breach of its obligations under relevant resolutions, including resolution 687 (1991), in particular through Iraq's failure to cooperate with United Nations inspectors''

Whereas on January 28, 2003, President Bush said, ''The British government has

learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa. Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production.'';

Whereas on February 5, 2003, Secretary Powell said, ''Our conservative estimate is that Iraq today has a stockpile of between 100 and 500 tons of chemical weapons agent. That is enough agent to fill 16,000 battlefield rockets. Even the low end of 100 tons of agent would enable Saddam Hussein to cause mass casualties across more than 100 square miles of territory, an area nearly 5 times the size of Manhattan. . . .'';

Whereas on March 7, 2003, IAEA Director General Mohamed ElBaradei reported to the United Nations Security Council that: There is ''no indication of nuclear activities . . . nor any indication of nuclear-related prohibited activities at any inspected sites . . . There is no indication that Iraq has attempted to import uranium since 1990.'';

Whereas on March 7, 2003, IAEA Director General Mohamed ElBaradei concluded that the documents purporting to show a uranium purchase in Niger provided to the IAEA by the United States were unsubstantiated and likely forged. He told the United Nations Security Council that ''Based on thorough analysis, the IAEA has concluded, with the concurrence of outside experts, that these documents, which formed the basis for reports of recent uranium transaction between Iraq and Niger, are in fact not authentic. We have therefore concluded that these specific allegations are unfounded.'';

Whereas according to UNMOVIC'S 13th Quarterly Report, between November 27, 2002 and March 18, 2003, the 731 inspections conducted by UNMOVIC did not reveal any ''evidence of continuation or resumption of programs of weapons of mass destruction or significant quantities of proscribed items.'';

Whereas in March 2003, United Nations weapons inspectors requested additional time to determine whether Iraq possessed stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction;

Whereas the Bush Administration rejected the United Nations request for additional time, to complete the mission;

Whereas on March 16, 2003, Vice President Cheney said, ''. . . we know he [Hussein] has been absolutely devoted to trying to acquire nuclear weapons. And we believe he has, in fact, reconstituted nuclear weapons.'';

Whereas on March 16, 2003, President Bush said, ''The dictator of Iraq and his weapons of mass destruction are a threat to the security of free nations.'';

Whereas on March 25, 2003, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld said, ''The threat posed by Iraq's weapons of mass destruction will be removed.'';

Whereas on October 2, 2003, Chief Weapons Inspector David Kay said, ''Information found to date suggests that Iraq's large-scale capability to develop, produce, and fill new CW munitions was reduced—if not entirely destroyed—during Operations Desert Storm and Desert Fox, 13 years of UN sanctions and UN inspections . . . Our efforts to collect and exploit intelligence on Iraq's chemical weapons program have thus far yielded little reliable information on post-1991 CW stocks and CW agent production. . . .'';

Whereas on October 2, 2003, David Kay said, ''. . . to date we have not uncovered evidence that Iraq undertook significant post-1998 steps to actually build nuclear weapons or produce fissile material.'';

Whereas to date, despite an extensive search by the United Nations and the United States no chemical, biological, nuclear or any other weapons of mass destruction have been found: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) affirms that the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq; however, the main question for the American people is not whether the United States is better off without Saddam Hussein, but whether the United States is better off for having gone to war in Iraq to remove Saddam Hussein;

(2) finds that, despite the removal of Saddam Hussein from power, it is premature to conclude that going to war in Iraq has made the United States safer; indeed, the weight of the evidence to date suggests that President Bush's approach to Iraq has not made the United States safer;

(3) affirms the findings of former Chief U.S. Weapons Inspector David Kay, that no weapons of mass destruction have been found in Iraq;

(4) affirms that no evidence has been found to support the statements made by president Bush, Vice President Cheney, Secretary of State Colin Powell, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice between September 8, 2002 and the present that are cited in the ''Whereas'' clause above;

(5) commends the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of unspeakable oppression and brutality inflicted on them by Saddam Hussein's regime;

(6) commends the Iraqi people on the adoption of Iraq's interim constitution;

(7) commends the members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces for liberating Iraq and expresses its gratitude for their valiant service; and

(8) extends condolences to the families of the American forces who have been killed in Iraq.

Ms. MAJETTE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise because we have reached the 1-year anniversary of the war in Iraq. One year ago, we invaded Iraq because the President said Saddam Hussein posed an imminent threat to the United States. A ''mortal threat,'' he said.

We were told Saddam Hussein possessed weapons of mass destruction. We were told the international community would be involved, providing troops and financial assistance. We were told the troops would get whatever they needed to get the job done.

So on March 19, 2003, we invaded Iraq. And here we are, 1 year later. Let's examine the facts:

CIA Director George Tenet said intelligence agencies never told the White House that Iraq posed an imminent threat. No weapons of mass destruction have been found.

American taxpayers are paying almost all the bills—$120 billion and still rising. Most importantly, American soldiers are enduring almost all the casualties—more than 560 Americans killed and thousands more wounded.

Our troops did not get the equipment they needed to do their jobs safely—the President failed to include enough funds in his budget to pay for the war in Iraq. Moreover, there is no money in the President's own proposed budget for 2005 to pay for the war in Iraq. He apparently chooses to keep Congress and the American people in the dark about how much we will need to spend.

Let me tell you what's going on today with this resolution. It is an attempt to rewrite history. And if any of us vote against it, we will be attacked for not ''supporting the troops.''

This resolution is intellectually dishonest. It selects facts that portray the President and his decision to invade Iraq in a positive light, while conveniently ignoring other facts that do not support the President. It tells only of what we already knew—that Saddam Hussein was an evil tyrant. No one disputes that. It tells us of the atrocities he inflicted on his people—no one disputes that. It tells us that the American people applaud the Iraqi people for adopting an interim constitution—and no one denies that. And it affirms our country's unending support for our troops.

All of these accomplishments are worthy of our commendation, and I support them.

But this resolution ignores other facts—that we went into this war with faulty intelligence and sent our soldiers in without adequate body armor. It ignores that there were no weapons of mass destruction, and that Saddam did not pose an ''imminent threat'' to the U.S. It doesn't tell us that the administration continues to veil the true cost of this war—and it does not say that these costs will be borne by our children because this administration refuses to pay for them today. Instead, this administration gives tax cuts to the people who make over $1 million—and does not provide adequate resources for the veterans and their families.

It does not even acknowledge the deaths and injuries suffered by the men and women in uniform.

So I cannot in good conscience support such a deceptive resolution. It simply does not tell the whole truth.

Make no mistake—I support our troops, and I will do everything I can to help them get what they need. It is not their fault they were sent to Iraq—they are doing their sworn duty for this country. I will do everything I can to fight for their safe return and for an end to this sham of a war.

The authors of this resolution might think it will provide them political cover, but I am here to tell you that the American people are wise and will not be fooled. They understand that domestic priorities are being sacrificed to fund a war it turns out we didn't have to fight. They understand that landing on an aircraft carrier and floating a banner declaring ''mission accomplished'' does not make it so. They understand that the Republicans refused to allow anyone to offer amendments to the language of this resolution.

After last week's explosion in Madrid, Spain, and today's bombing in Baghdad, I cannot in good conscience state today that the United States and the world has been made safer than it was before we went to war with Iraq.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, as the war in Iraq continues, our military personnel, veterans and their families face a myriad of hardships. Our troops in Iraq have lacked adequate body armor and armored vehicles to keep them safe. Their families have to scrape by because of the pay disparity between serving in the military and in civilian life. When the troops return home, they do not have the health care and benefits they have earned through their service to our country.

Republicans proposed a resolution to supposedly honor our troops. But it does not truly acknowledge the real hardships our troops and their families face. It merely ''commends the members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces for liberating Iraq and expresses its gratitude for their valiant service.''

Republicans also say in their resolution we are safer now that Saddam Hussein has been removed from power. But we cannot claim the

mission is accomplished. We must continue to fight the battle against terrorism to ensure safety and stability in Iraq. And we must be honest about the true task ahead of us, or risk America's credibility with our international partners diminishing further.

Ironically enough, on the same day Republicans claim to honor our troops, they approved a budget proposal for the next year that would slash funding for military pay, health care, education and training for military personnel, veterans and their families. It also fails to extend imminent danger pay and family separation pay for troops in Iraq past December 31 of this year.

I supported an alternative resolution that would appropriately honor the military personnel and veterans who have served our country so courageously. It praises the work our troops are doing and urges the President to provide protective gear for our troops, ensure quality health care to treat both short- and long-term injuries among our troops, and correct pay disparities among civilian and military pay for guards and reservists.

We need to stand behind our courageous men and women in uniform who are bearing the burden of this military action in Iraq. Supporting our troops and giving them the tools they need to carry out their mission in Iraq is the only way to truly honor their service, courage and sacrifice.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of my State recently went on a trip to Iraq. When she returned, she announced that the President's Iraq policy should not be the subject of political discussion. That suggestion is as problematic as it is unrealistic. Foreign policy and defense policy are always legitimate topics of political debate. That's how we do things in a democracy. The voting public has every right to a full and open airing of different points of view—especially when the lives of our service members and the treasury of our Nation are being committed.

Now, with this resolution it seems the Republicans want it both ways. They tell us Iraq policy is out of bounds for political discussion, and at the same time they present us with this resolution. This document amplifying the administration's spin is nothing less than an election-year endorsement of the President's Iraq policy. It will no doubt be denied that it has anything to do with politics. In fact it's blatantly political. It's transparently political. It's in-your-face political.

Our troops deserve better than this cursory salute swaddled in suffocating layers of political celebration. They've earned our gratitude for their patriotism, courage and spirit of sacrifice. More to the point, they deserve a solid commitment to their well being and the well being of their families. But that is something the majority refuses to do. Last week in the House Budget Committee, Mr. EDWARDS and others proposed some simple measures along these lines: TRICARE for reservists; a boost in imminent danger pay; improved military housing; higher pay for senior enlisted personnel; increased family separation allowance; and more funding for family support centers.

All of this is to be offset by a very modest rollback in the tax bonanza we granted to people making a million dollars a year and more. The majority's response? Forget about the troops—our allegiance is to people making a million or more. I don't have any statistics, but I suspect there aren't too many millionaires serving in Iraq or en route.

So let's not pretend this resolution has nothing to do with politics. It's about the politics of deception underlying this war. It's about the politics of delusion that we can remake the world in our own image. It's about the politics of desperation flowing from the realization that we're becoming stuck in a no-exit quagmire.

As for the troops, they're getting thin rations from the majority in this House. Saying you support the troops is easy. The issue here isn't whether anyone in this House supports the troops. We all do. The issue is whether we can fashion a policy worthy of their valor, dedication and sacrifice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 561, the resolution is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered on the resolution and preamble.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on House Joint Resolution 87. Votes on motions to suspend the rules postponed earlier today will be taken tomorrow.

RECORDED VOTE

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 327, noes 93, answered ''present'' 7, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

AYES—327

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pascrell
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sandlin
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—93

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
Doyle
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Kanjorski
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Rahall
Rangel
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Solis
Stark
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez

Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Wexler
Woolsey

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—7

Carson (IN)
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Johnson, E. B.
Lantos
Meehan
Waxman

NOT VOTING—7

Hoeffel
Kucinich
Sherwood
Simmons
Smith (WA)
Tauzin
Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1950

Mr. RUSH and Mr. JEFFERSON changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. NAPOLITANO changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. HILL changed his vote from ''present'' to ''aye.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on the vote on House Resolution 557, I spoke on the floor in opposition to H. Res. 557 and by mistake voted ''yes'' on the floor. I seek the record to be clear that I intended to vote ''no.''

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 87.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 87, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 5, answered ''present'' 6, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—398

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—5

Bartlett (MD)
Flake
Hefley
King (IA)
Paul

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—6

Crane
Cunningham
Everett
Johnson, Sam
Kingston
Pence

NOT VOTING—24

Akin
Ballenger
Blunt
Collins
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Foley
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Goss
Harman
Hoeffel
Kucinich
Lewis (CA)
Manzullo
Matsui
Otter
Rohrabacher
Sherwood
Simmons
Smith (WA)
Tauzin
Weldon (PA)
Weller

□ 1958

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM OFFICE MANAGER OF HON. HOWARD COBLE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Chris Beaman, Office Manager and Constituent Services Representative for the Honorable HOWARD COBLE, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 11, 2004.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the General Court of Justice for the State of North Carolina, Guilford County.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

CHRIS BEAMAN.

□ 2000

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1673

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1673.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

WE SHOULD NOT POLITICIZE FOREIGN POLICY

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a very heavy heart. And I speak from the heart. First, I think it is important for us to acknowledge that today in Baghdad another enormous tragedy occurred, the explosion that cost the life of almost 40 individuals, complete collapse of one of the hotels in the city of Baghdad, which shows us that the war is ongoing. And it reaffirms the fact that we are not yet safe.

I rise as well, Mr. Speaker, to say that we stand divided on policy but never divided from our troops. So I stand to salute those who have served and those who are serving now.

But I must stand today to also acknowledge why I voted no on the previous resolution, H. Res. 557. And I voted no, Mr. Speaker, because we should not politicize foreign policy or the lives of our young people. We should realize that the war on terrorism is both bipartisan and international. And when I met with a group of Iraqi citizens today who came and sat down and spoke with those of us who would listen, this is what they said. One, we will not be safe in Iraq until safety is number one; two, militia are roaming all over Iraq and kidnapping those of us who desire to be free; and three, rural Iraqis and Iraqis around the country, some 8 million, are not included in this constitution or the Iraqi Governing Council.

If my friends on the other side of the aisle would spend more time in honoring our troops and working in a bipartisan way, we would be safe and we could fight terrorism. And so I say today, shame on us when we politicize the foreign policy that needs a united front to save lives of our young men and women and the people in Iraq.

THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION'S PRESCRIPTION DRUG BILL

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the President's Medicare prescription drug bill is so good, why does the Bush administration have to sell it so hard?

The Bush administration has already used 13 million tax dollars to spend on selling this prescription drug bill, this prescription drug law, to the American people, spending tax dollars for a benefit that does not even take effect for 2 more years. They have already spent $13 million. They are planning to spend $80 million more to advertise to the American people, slick television ads to sell this law that simply is not going to work very well. That $80 million could fill 900,000 arthritis medicine prescriptions. That $80 million could by 1.5 million prescriptions of glaucoma medicine. That $80 million could buy 2.5 million prescriptions of blood pressure medicine. Instead, the Bush administration is going to spend that $80 million on an ad blitz of slick campaign-style ads in homage to late night infomercials.

TAX CUTS ARE WORKING IN TENNESSEE

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to talk about jobs and to talk about the success that we are seeing from the Bush tax cuts that this body passed last spring. The child tax credit, marriage penalty, expensing, depreciation, those are working for small businesses. They are working for entrepreneurs. They are working for the people that make this economy grow.

I want you to take a look at this article. I found it this weekend when I got home sitting on the top of my desk: ''Boom times ahead. LLC Formations Soar.'' What it tells us is that in Tennessee where these tax cuts are working, the State registered 15,064 new corporations, LLCs, limited partnerships. That topped the previous high of 14,500 in 1997 and is up 22 percent.

Now, jobs growth is working for small business. This is working for women, because the fastest growing sector of small business growth is women, women-owned businesses.

Tax cuts are working in Tennessee. I commend this body and the President.

[From the Nashville Business Journal, March 17, 2004]

BOOM TIMES AHEAD? LLC FORMATIONS SOAR

(By Holly Dolloff)

The formation of limited liability companies in Tennessee has soared over the past two years, a trend that could mean the region's bleak jobs picture may soon brighten considerably.

The Tennessee Secretary of State Division of Business Services registered 7,412 LLCs last year—500 more than were formed in 1998, the previous high mark, and 49 percent more than in 2001.

The number of LLCs registered last year was more than double the number of 1995, when companies first gained that option from the state. Local attorneys attribute the recent boom to several factors, from increased comfort levels with the process to a sluggish economy.

''The LLC has come into its own,'' says Leigh Griffith, an attorney at Waller Lansden Dortch & Davis. ''It's the entity of choice for closely held companies.''

Total for-profit business formation also set a new high. The state registered 15,064 new corporations, LLC, limited partnerships or limited liability partnerships. That topped the previous high of 14,565 set in 1997 and was up 22 percent from 2001.

Griffith speculates the 2003 boom may have resulted from the down-turn that began in 2001.

''As the economy gets softer, people get laid off and start their own businesses,'' he says.

A very similar dynamic applies to higher education and particularly graduate and professional programs. When the economy goes south, enrollment very often will rise as out-of-work professionals seek new opportunities or new skills.

Though their greater numbers may often be attributable to past bad news, new LLCs could end up improving the local and state economic picture as they grow into bona fide businesses with multiple employees.

At this point, it is very unlikely that many of the new companies are being counted in the local or state economic statistics that show a stagnant job market despite optimism from both consumers and business owners.

The record number of LLC formations last year also marked only the second time—1998 was the first—that Tennesseans created more LLCs than for-profit corporations. The year saw 7,209 corporations formed, up less than 1 percent from 2002 and 5 percent below their 2000 level.

Fellow Waller attorney Michael Yopp, who recently published ''Tennessee Limited Liability Companies: Forms and Practices'' (DataTrace Publishing, 2004), says the 1996 renovations of state law facilitated understanding and increased employment of the structure.

''Fairly extensive'' litigation involving LLCs in the late '90s has also contributed to the higher numbers, he says.

Yopp is part of a group of attorneys currently revising the LLC statutes.

Griffith was a prime author of the original statutes creating LLCs and remains a proponent of them. He says the most obvious benefit of an LLC is limited responsibility for liabilities incurred by others, particularly in small businesses.

''When you realize the fate of your company is in the hands of a 19-year-old delivery boy who may be hung over from the night before, and he hits someone with the delivery vehicle, your house is on the line,'' says Griffith.

Partners in LLCs could lose their businesses in a smaller situation, but their personal property is immune from seizure. And the LLC format offers breaks from the taxes and red tape that corporations incur.

''You don't have to have annual meetings and you're covered by operating agreements and not by-laws or restrictive stock,'' says Larry Papel, managing partner at Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz, who has registered several LLCs for clients.

One such client was a restaurant group with multiple locations. Papel says such businesses may be better off registering each entity separately, an assessment with which Griffith agrees.

''If each restaurant in a chain is an LLC, they won't all suffer if one has a problem,'' Griffith says.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TRANSPORTATION FINANCING AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, our transportation system has a direct and

significant impact on daily lives of all Americans. The United States has benefited greatly from having a strong transportation network. But, Mr. Speaker, we are approaching a crossroads.

In Texas our identified transportation needs outstrip available funding 3 to 1. Between 2000 and 2025, studies predict that the population of Texas will increase by 9 million people, and 90 percent, 8 million of those, will be living in metropolitan areas. The transportation system in Texas must be expanded to accommodate this projected population increase and related business growth. Important transportation projects all over the State of Texas are waiting in line for limited funding. Population growth, rise in construction costs, and increased transportation demands make this line a little bit longer every year.

We have three specific needs in Texas. The current pay-as-you-go funding system only covers about a third of our needs; the State's population growth is putting additional strain on aging roadways; and it just takes too long to get roads built.

As the only Texas Republican on the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the reauthorization of Federal surface transportation programs is the top priority for my legislative agenda in the 108th Congress. Congress and the administration continue to discuss the appropriate level of funding in our transportation reauthorization bill, but we also need to ensure that current Federal transportation dollars are being spent wisely. Our charge as congressional Representatives is to protect dollars taken from the taxpayer by streamlining and improving the activities of our Federal Government.

As a member of the committee, I wanted to be certain that the U.S. Department of Transportation was ensuring the most efficient business practices within the agency. Last year I met with Inspector General Kenneth Mead to discuss the business practices of the agency and how the Congress can curb transportation spending. Inspector General Mead and I discussed the need for greater stewardship and oversight of the Department of Transportation's programs.

To date, the Department of Transportation has not changed the way the agency disburses transportation funding to State and local entities since President Eisenhower was in office. The inspector general recommended that if 1 percent of the $500 billion spent over the last 10 years on transportation programs was saved, this would generate an additional $5 billion. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this $5 billion could equate to the amount of funding needed for 4 of the current 11 major transportation programs going on in the country today. I believe this practice could better assist the Department of Transportation in spending taxpayer dollars more efficiently.

There are examples of transportation projects that are done efficiently. Interstate 15 in Utah was finished ahead of schedule and under budget. In North Texas, the Dallas Area Rapid Transit system worked within their budget last year and actually returned over $20 million in transit funding to the Federal Government. There are bad examples. Currently the poster child for bad examples is the Big Dig project in Boston, Massachusetts, and well over $10 billion has been invested into that project.

Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office has estimated that for fiscal years 1998 to 2001, the highway account lost over $6 billion because of the ethanol tax exemption and the General Fund transfer. Using the Treasury's projections of the gasohol tax receipts, based on current law, it is estimated that the highway fund will not collect $13 billion because of the tax exemption from fiscal years 2002 to 2012 and almost $7 billion from the general fund transfer between the same years.

Not paying interest on the Highway Trust Fund balance, the U.S. Department of Treasury estimates the Highway Trust Fund would have earned $4 billion from September 1999 through February 2002. For those without a calculator handy, the total now is about $30 billion.

Mr. Speaker, there are several policy initiatives that I have asked to be included in the highway reauthorization bill. These allow States more flexibility, especially in the realm of environmental streamlining, to get projects delivered on time. The RAPID Act, the Reforming, Accelerating, and Protecting Interstate Design Act of 2003, is one of these policy initiatives, and I urge the other Members to look at this legislation and to consider its inclusion in the overall transportation bill when it is voted out of committee and on the floor later this month.

The key to a 21st century transportation program is partnering private entities with the Federal Government and allowing large transportation systems to be built in a timely and sensible sequence. My bill allows large transportation systems to be built in less time and save money by constructing roads in commonsense increments as they are needed. Among other things, the bill would streamline and expedite project delivery by allowing an environmental assessment to be prepared simultaneously for several different elements of a project. It also expands States' authorities to collect tolls on interstate highways and expands the eligible uses of toll revenues collected on those facilities.

Mr. Speaker, in short, we all know we are approaching a crossroads in transportation in this country. My goal is to facilitate and allow States greater flexibility in handling these precious dollars that they will receive under this year's Federal transportation reauthorization. Mr. Speaker, it is my goal that families will be able to spend as much time at the dinner table as they currently spend in traffic jams.

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

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

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

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

VACATING OF 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the 5-minute special orders of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) are vacated.

There was no objection.

IRAQ 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this Friday marks the 1-year anniversary of the invasion of Iraq. Over 10,000 Iraqi soldiers are dead. Thousands of Iraqi civilians are dead. Nearly 600 Americans, 600 of our sons and daughters, are dead. Thousands more have been wounded. Physically and emotionally, their lives changed forever.

But the dead and the wounded are not the only casualties of President Bush's decision to invade Iraq. Something else has died in those desert sands. Something else has been lost. Truth, nothing but the truth, honesty.

For over a year, the American people have been deceived by the words of the President and his administration. Officials at every level have misled the people that they were elected to serve. They have also misled the community of nations.

We asked for truth, and President Bush told us that ''Iraq sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa.'' We asked for truth, and Vice President CHENEY repeatedly warned us of close ties between al Qaeda and Iraq. We asked for truth, and Secretary of State Colin Powell told the United Nations that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. Where are those weapons, Mr. Speaker? We asked for truth, and President Bush warned us that Iraq had planes that could fly weapons of mass destruction to our shores. We asked for truth, and they told us that our troops would be greeted as liberators, that Iraqi oil would pay to rebuild Iraq.

The falsehoods go on and on. I do not know whether this administration cannot stop or will not stop. I only know that they do not stop.

Just last Sunday National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice told the American people that ''Iraq was the most dangerous regime in the world.'' Where is the truth?

Mr. Speaker, this administration would never be able to justify the war on Iraq because we cannot believe a word they say. They have never been honest about why we went to war. Just ask the former Treasury Secretary, Paul O'Neill. He told the Nation this administration was hell bent to go to war from day one, even before the President took oath of office.

And it is not just Iraq. It is almost on every issue, every comment, every deed. We cannot believe a word they say.

The Bush administration proposed a $550 billion Medicare prescription drug bill and told us it will only cost $400 billion. They cut down trees on public land and call it ''Healthy Forests.'' They let industry pollute our air and call it ''Clear Skies.''

The President himself, President Bush, proudly told the American people that his budget would cut the deficit in 5 years, but his budget does not pay for Iraq. It does not pay for Afghanistan. It does not pay for his tax cuts for the rich.

Mr. Speaker, instead of searching for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, we should be searching for the truth right here at home. The Bible tells us, ''The truth will set you free.'' And we will not find it at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. The British novelist John Le Carre once said, ''I think the single greatest enemy is the misuse of information, the perversion of the truth in the hands of terribly skillful people.''

On the eve of the anniversary of the invasion of Iraq, we must reflect on these words. President Bush and his administration have misused information. They have perverted the truth, and now 600 Americans are dead, 10,000 civilians are dead in Iraq, hundreds of thousands of our sons and daughters, brave men and women, young people, 18, 19, 21, 23 years old, have been torn from their homes, from their families, and sent thousands of miles from home.

□ 2015

I would ask the President, what are they fighting for? I would ask him why so many of our young people are dead and wounded, but I do not want his answer. I do not want the answer from the Vice President or Secretary Powell or Secretary Rumsfeld. The American people do not want more of what we have been hearing for the past year. What we want, Mr. Speaker, and what we need more than anything else, is the truth.

WASHINGTON WASTE WATCHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with several of my colleagues from the Washington Waste Watchers, a Republican working group dedicated to rooting out the rampant waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal Government.

Over the last 3 weeks, my colleagues on the Committee on the Budget have been discussing the Federal budget and debating the growth of government spending. With a historically large deficit and with Federal spending now exceeding $20,000 per American household for only the fourth time in American history and for the first time since World War II, many Democrats say, it is time to raise taxes yet again on the American people. Democrats are demanding that we roll back the tax relief that is responsible for the unparalleled growth that we have had in our economy, the tax relief that is bringing down our unemployment, the tax relief that amounts to only 1 percent, 1 percent of the $13.1 trillion 5-year spending plan the Committee on the Budget approved today. In other words, 99 percent of our budget woes lay on the spending side.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, we have a spending problem, not a taxing problem in this town. And I, for one, say it is time to take the trash out of Washington. It is time to go after the costly waste, fraud, and abuse that permeate every nook and cranny in our Federal Government.

Albert Einstein once said that the definition of insanity was doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. Well, Mr. Speaker, each and every year, we pour more money into the Federal Government with scant accountability; and we continue to throw billions of dollars of American taxpayers' money away in waste, fraud, and abuse.

Let me discuss just a few examples. The Office of National Drug Control Policy awarded one advertising agency a $150 million grant to craft ads keeping American youth away from drugs, even though this company had a history of overbilling the Federal Government. In 2002 the firm had to repay the government $1.8 million for overstating its labor costs, and some representatives of the company are currently under indictment for filing false claims. Now, the ads are part of a 5-year, $1 billion campaign whose effectiveness has been greatly scrutinized. A private research firm concluded that teenagers viewing the ads were no less likely to use drugs than if they had not viewed them and that some were even more likely to use drugs. False claims and ineffective ads, yet Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this.

The Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS, is currently undertaking a major crackdown on phoney claims for power wheelchairs and has recovered $52.5 million thus far. One 89-year-old from Florida said that she and her husband were approached by a salesperson who pressured them into an unnecessary order. Medicare was then billed $15,500 for two scooters, a hospital bed, and a pressure mattress, none of which was needed. Another senior citizen testified in court that a claim had been submitted without her approval. She then demonstrated her lack of a need for a wheelchair by walking before the jurors. Mr. Speaker, $52 million in fraud, yet Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for even more of this.

The Drug Enforcement Agency contracts with the private sector to get translators and transcribers in many of its field divisions. However, the Inspector General's Office found such loose controls were in place that $2.8 million of the $9.4 million paid was going to unauthorized and unallowable expenses. Yet Democrats want to raise taxes to pay for more of this.

In the year 2000, an investigation discovered that the Department of Energy spent more than $38 million developing information systems that it already had. They already had the systems in place. Yet Democrats want to raise taxes to pay for more of this.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few examples of the rampant waste in our Federal Government. After we begin to look closely, we see that so many Federal programs routinely lose 10, 20, even 30 percent of their taxpayer-funded budgets to waste, fraud, and abuse and have for years.

There are so many different ways that we can save money in Washington without cutting any needed services or without raising taxes as our Democrat colleagues seek to do. Because when it comes to Federal programs, it is not how much money we spend that counts, it is how Washington spends the money that counts.

SUPPORTING BLUE DOG BUDGET PHILOSOPHY IS RIGHT FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing listening to my colleague from Texas. One would think that we Democrats are still in control and that his party has not been in control of this House for the last 8 years. It is amazing listening to these speeches. It is amazing to see the budget that came out of the committee which he serves on, that next will propose to borrow $377.6 billion, including all of the Social Security trust funds, all of the Civil Service trust funds, all of the Federal military retiree trust funds. In this same budget he supported today, the debt limit will be increased to $8.88 trillion, and yet the finger-pointing stills goes on.

He had a chance today to vote for a budget enforcement bill that the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON)

offered that would do something about the deficit. He voted ''no,'' but he comes to the floor and makes a wonderful speech that sounds good, but does nothing to deal with our Nation's fiscal problems.

The Blue Dog philosophy and the budget we will offer next week begins with a simple wisdom: when you find yourselves in a hole, the first rule is to quit digging. Stop pointing the finger at the other side of the aisle and let us see how we might work together to deal with the most serious economic problems that have faced this country, perhaps in our history.

Strong budget enforcement rules are an important component of restoring fiscal discipline and making sure the budget remains in balance once we have done the hard work necessary to bring it back into balance. The budget enforcement rules Congress enacted in 1990 with bipartisan support, and that is when we Democrats were in control, and I worked with my friends on the other side of the aisle to do something about the deficit, and we did; it was an important part of getting a handle on deficits in the early 1990s and getting the budget back into balance with discretionary spending limits.

I want to make it very clear: the Blue Dog Democrats support President Bush's spending request to this body, not one penny more. So do not talk about spending when we talk about alternatives. If you do not have one that will work, do not come to the floor and speechify, unless you are just trying to make a good impression with the folks back home.

Unless we renew our budget discipline in this body, Congress will continue to find ways to pass more legislation that puts still more red ink on the national ledger. If we are truly serious about restoring fiscal discipline, budget enforcement rules must apply to all legislation that would increase the deficit. Through increases in spending or reductions in revenue, all parts of the budget must be on the table.

It is irresponsible and politically unrealistic to propose budget rules that apply to one part of the budget, but not the other. Borrowing for tax increases that do not contribute to growth in this country are just as irresponsible as the spending the gentleman was talking about a moment ago, if one is worried about the future of this country. Those of us who want to extend expiring tax cuts or make the tax cuts permanent should be willing to put forward the spending cuts or other offsets necessary to pay for them. Similarly, those who want to spend more in certain areas need to be willing to say where they would cut or how they would raise revenue to pay for their proposals.

Let me again repeat, I am part of the Blue Dog organization that will not vote to spend one dime more than President Bush asked us to spend this year, and let that be very clear. The Blue Dogs support spending caps, limiting total discretionary spending to no more than the spending levels in the President's budget. If it is the will of the majority to pass legislation that will make the budget situation worse, we should be forced to step up and take the responsibility for doing so.

Under the Blue Dog plan, a separate vote would be required to waive the pay-go requirements or increase the discretionary spending limits. Congress could pass new spending or tax cuts without the offsets, but we will be held accountable for increasing the deficit by waiving budget rules.

The recognition that budget enforcement is an issue that needs to be addressed and the announcement that the Committee on the Budget will be considering budget enforcement legislation tomorrow is a positive step forward. But I am very, very disappointed that the Committee on the Budget in their wisdom chose to leave most of the issue off the table. If we really want to do something about deficits, we have to begin to address them, yes, on the spending side, no question about that. But we cannot continue to cut taxes with borrowed money unless we are willing to say to our grandchildren, I do not give a rip about your future.

Mr. Speaker, we can continue to vote for tax cuts and have the greatest tax increase, which is exactly what the majority is doing. You are voting to have the greatest tax increase in the history of this Nation by continuing to borrow as you are now borrowing, we are borrowing. I am part of it. I am part of the Members of Congress. But we will have a constructive alternative that we will be putting forth next week, and I hope sincerely that we can find some bipartisan support to put meaningful enforcement into place, so that we do something about the deficit other than come to this floor and speechify.

DEMOCRATS PROPOSE INCREASED TAXES AND MORE WASTEFUL SPENDING

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

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to seeing the proposal that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) just mentioned because so far, the only proposals that have been put forward by the Democrats in committee have been billions and billions and billions of additional spending and billions of tax increases. So I am looking forward to seeing if, in fact, his proposal will be different.

Mr. Speaker, last week in the Committee on the Budget, by the way, the Democrats proposed raising taxes three times and increase spending by over $13 billion in their first five amendments to the budget resolution. Mr. Speaker, they had only just begun.

Tonight, in the Committee on the Budget that we finished a little while ago, they presented numerous more amendments increasing spending by billions more and increasing taxes on the hard-working American people by billions more. The final tally: stay tuned, because we will be bringing that to our colleagues in the next few days.

Now, why do Democrats want to raise, insist on raising, the American people's taxes to pay for more waste, fraud, and abuse in Washington? I say that because let me read my colleagues some examples. A recent GAO report found that bureaucrats at the Department of Agriculture were using taxpayer-funded purchase cards for premium satellite and cable TV packages, including charges for pornographic movies, thousands of dollars charged to the taxpayers. By the way, this one I could not understand: fish costumes, web of life costumes, and a hand-switched salmon tent, $12,000 that the taxpayers paid for those. Very expensive, it must have been a really nice aquarium for $3,000, a billiard table; and yet the Democrats insist on trying to raise the taxes of the hard-working American people in this country. And that is the difference. They insist on trying to raise taxes, and their proposals show that.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are trying to solve this problem alone. During the last year's budget resolution, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) tried to eliminate just 1 percent of waste, fraud, and abuse by cutting spending by 1 percent. The esteemed minority whip said of that proposal that that was senseless and irresponsible to try to cut just 1 percent of waste, fraud, and abuse. What they proposed was not agreed to, but they proposed billions of dollars of tax increases and billions of dollars of more government expenditures.

President Bush is working on implementing the President's management agenda, a performance-based system that seeks to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse and has got nothing, nothing but opposition from the members of the minority party. This year, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) once again is providing an avenue in the budget to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse. Democrats will likely, unfortunately, oppose those efforts as well, and likely, once again, as they have done tonight and as they did last week, will propose billions of dollars in more spending and billions of dollars of tax increases on the hard-working Americans in this country.

While Republicans are making great strides in cleaning up wasteful spending, Mr. Speaker, Democrats continue aggressively with this love affair of trying to raise the taxes on the hard-working American taxpayer.

□ 2030

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

ADDING TO THE NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, that great country singer and philosopher Merle Haggard has this wonderful song called ''Rainbow Stew.'' And the words go something like this: ''When a President goes through the White House door and does what he says he will do, we will all be drinking that free Bubble Up and eating that rainbow stew.''

Now, there must be a barrel of Bubble Up in the Republican cloakroom tonight because, if I did not know better, the last two speakers on the Republican side, I would suspect that they might have gotten here by falling off a turnip truck on Independence Avenue. I have never heard such ridiculous goings on in all of my days.

Now, I know that they have not been here very long, and I understand that. What we need is a little bit of sanity. This would be hysterically funny if it was not so painful for the next generation. What we need is a little credibility. What we need is a little honesty from the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle that just voted today to support a budget that will raise the debt ceiling over $8 trillion. And then they come down here and talk about some ridiculous deal that they do not even know what they are talking about and blame the Democrats for it.

The Republicans have been in charge since 1995 in this place. And it is the Democrats' fault? Some of these fraud cases that they are talking about were contracts that were administered by the current administration. You have got to wonder when the turnip truck got through the barricades out here.

When the President came in this January of 2001, the Blue Dogs went to him, we said, We want to work with you. We will work with you to cut taxes. That is all we ask. But if you are going to cut taxes, cut spending. Let us agree on that. Let us work together, and we will do it. And we will all be proud of our work when we get through.

They sent Vice President CHENEY down here in room 122, downstairs. I will never forget it. And he said this: ''We think you all are nice people, but we do not need you and we are going to do what we are going to do.'' And they can.

Now, look what we got, a budget that was voted for by the gentleman from Texas this afternoon that is going to borrow another $700 billion from our children and grandchildren. Now, you talk about waste, fraud, and abuse, that is it. There is not any proposal in there to cut spending in a responsible way.

The Blue Dog Coalition has worked and worked and worked to try to get the other side to sit down with us and let us do the responsible thing. We have proposed raising taxes. We have proposed balancing the budget in a responsible way. Then they sent Mitch Daniels, the head of the Office of Management and Budget, and he told us, ''Do not worry, we are going to have so much money after we cut taxes we are going to pay off all the debt. The biggest problem we are going to have is you will not be able to buy any U.S. Treasury bonds; they will not be a safe investment.'' They did just about fix it with the U.S. Treasury bonds: they are not a safe investment anymore. I just wonder what in the Sam Hill these people are thinking about.

But I can tell you this: you can keep trying to fool the American people which will not be successful. You can keep doing what you are doing which is add to the debt load of our children and grandchildren in such an irresponsible way that it will be a horrendous day when the payday comes. And you will be the one that suffers, because I am so old I will probably be dead when it happens. But the young man from Texas over there that is sitting there smiling in such a cute way, he is going to still be around. And he is going to have to pay this tax.

The one tax that you cannot repeal is the interest on the national debt. Now, they want to raise that one as much as they can. And, boy, they are doing it great.

I just cannot imagine why. That is the great mystery to me. Why would you want to do such a ridiculous but, more importantly, irresponsible thing to our children and grandchildren.

TERRORIST ATROCITIES IN SPAIN

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today to fervently condemn the terrorist bombings in Madrid on March 11 and to express his strong and unwavering support for the Spanish people in their fight against terrorism.

As all of our colleagues surely know, last Thursday at the height of the morning rush hour, terrorists detonated 10 bombs on commuter trains in the Spanish capital of Madrid. These synchronized attacks blew up four different trains. Several of them were in station at the time, increasing the carnage. At last count 201 people were killed in these attacks and almost 1,500 people were injured. These attacks were the worst terrorist atrocity in Spanish history and maybe the most terrible on the European continent in modern history.

Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, the French newspaper Le Monde, often a font of anti-American sentiment, declared that ''We Are All Americans.''

Now we are all Spaniards united in solidarity and resolve with our friends and our allies.

To compare terrorist atrocities is in some ways to minimize the importance of each human life that was so brutally and pointlessly extinguished by those who exalt in the murder and maiming of their fellow men, women, and, yes, children too. But I sense that most Americans saw the slaughter in Madrid on March 11 through the prism of our own experience on September 11. Even the dates mirrored each other with 3/11 coming exactly 2½ years after 9/11.

For those of us who evacuated our offices on 9/11, watched the smoke from the burning Pentagon, and heard the sirens of emergency vehicles, we could not help but identify with the scenes of killing and bloodshed that we all repeatedly saw on our television screens last week.

Sadly, last week's attacks marked not a new phenomenon in Spanish life, only a new magnitude of suffering.

For more than 30 years, Spaniards have endured a vicious terrorist campaign by the fringe, Basque-separatist ETA organization. Given this bloody history, it was no surprise when Spanish officials first blamed ETA for the March 11 train bombings.

Since then we learned that these reprehensible attacks are more likely the work of the Islamic terrorists linked to al Qaeda. A clear determination is not yet possible. We often speak of the global war on terrorism. Last week we were reminded just how global the threat of terrorism really is. Al Qaeda has already struck in Africa, Asia, and North America. Now nearly all relevant authorities are tentatively concluding that these terrorists have struck in Europe as well.

In conjunction with these attacks, Spanish authorities have arrested five suspects, three Moroccans and two Indians, who are believed to be al Qaeda loyals. Authorities are seeking other suspects in conjunction with the bombings. The bombings in Spain demonstrate that Europe is indeed a target of al Qaeda and the brand of Islamic extremism that it espouses. It is a terrible shock, but it comes as no surprise to European terrorism experts. Europol, which helps coordinate police activity among nations, warned in December that al Qaeda was still active in Europe and remained a threat there. However, if there was still any thought among Europeans that they were somehow immune from al Qaeda attacks, these bombings proved them wrong.

An additional concern in this case is the obvious, and apparently successful, effort by terrorists to influence a democratic election. Many analysts have attributed the unexpected victory of the Socialist Party in Sunday's national elections to voters' reactions to the terrorist attacks. Spain's participation in military action against Iraq was unpopular among the electorate. Some post-election reports indicate that a large number of Spanish voters

may have voted against the ruling popular party in the belief that its support for the Iraq war was responsible for Spain being targeted by al Qaeda.

If, indeed, as this Member believes, al Qaeda carried out these terrorist attacks just 3 days before a national election in order to affect the results of the election, it would be an extremely troubling development. We already know that al Qaeda aims to kill our people and cripple our economies. It is, furthermore, extraordinarily disturbing that this group seems to be targeting governments friendly to the United States in order to bring them down.

An editorial in the Omaha World-Herald yesterday declared that, ''The Spanish voters, in their sorrow and anger, have broadcast exactly the wrong signal: terrorism works.''

Mr. Speaker, if anyone in Europe believes that standing on the sidelines will somehow protect them from al Qaeda, they are wrong. Europe was a target of al Qaeda even before 9/11 and the Iraq war, and it remains a target of al Qaeda. The response to terrorism cannot be a quest for neutrality. It cannot be the pursuit of a nonaggression pact or a modus vivendi with al Qaeda. This is not possible.

The only response can be a reaffirmation of a commitment to strenuously work together within Europe and within the Atlantic Alliance to root out the terrorists in our midst and to destroy their ability to operate throughout the world.

Fortunately, we see indications from our European allies that this will be their response. Already officials in European countries and in the European Union are stepping up their efforts to improve cooperation against terrorist groups and strengthen legislation against terrorism.

However, that inclination, apparently, is not shared by Romano Prodi, the President of the European Commission, which is the executive bureaucracy of the EU. On Monday, Mr. Prodi said, ''It is clear that using force is not the answer to resolving the conflict with terrorists.''

This outrageous, wrong-headed comment is the worst thing an EU official could have said in response to the terrorist attacks in Spain.

Instead of vowing to redouble efforts to defeat al Qaeda in the mountains of Afghanistan, the head of the European Commission advocates appeasement and surrender to those who orchestrated the massacre of innocents in Madrid.

If the terrorists were encouraged by their apparent success at influencing the Spanish elections, they must be ecstatic that high-ranking officials like Mr. Prodi want to pursue a separate, dishonorable accommodation with terrorists.

In an article in yesterday's Washington Post, Robert Kagan offered a withering critique of Mr. Prodi's comments.

Mr. Kagan wrote, ''Al Qaeda seeks to divide Europe and the United States not just in Iraq, but in the overall struggle. It seeks to convince Europeans that not only the use of force in Iraq was mistaken, but that the use of force against terrorism in general is mistaken and futile—just as Prodi is arguing. Are Europeans prepared to grant all of al Qaeda's conditions in exchange for a promise of security? Thoughts of Munich and 1938 come to mind.''

And Mr. Kagan recognizes that the policy of weakness advocated by Mr. Prodi will only encourage the terrorists. ''Responsible heads in Europe must understand that anything that smacks of retreat in the aftermath of this latest attack could raise the likelihood of further attacks,'' Mr. Kagan wrote.

Surprisingly, a more realistic European assessment of the motivations and goals of these terrorists came from the French newspaper Le Monde.

Never known for sharing a worldview with the Bush Administration, Le Monde on Monday noted that these terrorists ''attack democratic societies because of what they are: open, flexible, respectful of the rule of law,'' and for them ''the only measure of success is killing as many people as possible.''

Mr. Speaker, America must stand by our Spanish allies and all of our European allies in this struggle against terrorism. We extend our sympathy to the families of those killed in the Madrid bombings, to those injured, and to the Spanish people. And we reaffirm our commitment to work together to defeat the perpetrators of this terrible crime.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I will insert into the RECORD the Omaha World-Herald article.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Mar. 16, 2004]

WRONG SIGNAL

Spain's change of leadership can be viewed as saying that terrorism works.

The surprise is not that Spain's prime minister-elect figures on pulling his nation's troops out of Iraq. He had made that pledge during the campaign. The surprise is that he was elected.

Spaniards have a long history of bravery verging on stubbornness. So it is unsettling to see them give at least a surface appearance of knuckling under to terrorism. Prior to last week's death-dealing bombings aboard Spanish trains, national polls had strongly suggested that Mariano Rajoy, candidate of the incumbent Popular Party, would be elected prime minister.

Then evidence increasingly pointed to the likelihood that Islamic fundamentalists—quite possible al-Qaida—were responsible for the bombings. After that, enough popular votes shifted to swing the Socialist Party into the parliamentary majority. That will make José Radríguez Zapatero prime minister.

In campaigning, Zapatero vowed to make fighting terror his ''most immediate priority.'' He has a strange way of showing it. The signal being sent here, intentionally or not, is that radicals can gain advantage by murdering hundreds of innocent people.

There may be some wiggle room in all this. What Zapatero has specifically said is that he will pull out his nation's troops on June 30 unless, by then, the United Nations has taken charge in Iraq. That brings to the forefront what is meant by ''take charge.''

The occupying forces intend to hand political control of Iraq to an interim government on July 1, and there is ample evidence that the United Nations will embrace that change. Moreover, substantial U.N. involvement in peacekeeping would be widely welcomed. But expecting the international body to actually run the show is unrealistic. It isn't staffed to handle the task.

Spain's withdrawal from Iraq would be symbolic, in that its troops number less than 1 percent of international forces there. But in such matters, symbolism is important. It's true that about 90 percent of Spaniards opposed their nation's involvement in Iraq. But that opposition appears to have taken on added weight after the bombs went off.

The world weeps with Spain, which suffered a terrible blow. But the Spanish voters, in their sorrow and anger, have broadcast exactly the wrong signal: Terrorism works. It's enough to make you wonder what nation might be next.

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

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

WASHINGTON WASTE WATCH

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

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to offer an update from the Washington Waste Watch. Every year the Federal Government wastes billions of dollars as a result of overpayments of government agencies, misuse of government credit cards, abuse of the Federal entitlement programs, and the mismanagement of the Federal bureaucracy. The waste exists in every program in every agency, in every Department of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, let me share a few examples with you. Accounting errors prevented the Department of Agriculture from being able to account for $5 billion of its receipts and expenditures. The Department had no way of knowing where the money came from and where it had gone.

The Department of Defense spent $41 million to develop a system to track its ammunition, but 8 years later no system had been created or was close to completion.

Individuals defaulting on their student loans cost the Department of Education $4 billion in 1999 alone. An audit of the Department of Energy discovered that the Department had incorrectly listed $900 million in assets instead of liabilities and could not account for $56 million in missing funds.

That is not all, Mr. Speaker. A 2000 audit of the Department of Labor discovered that 35 percent of the recipients of dislocated worker benefits were ineligible for the program.

More than a quarter of the IRS's earned income credit payments were improper. The error rate is consistently between 27 and 32 percent of the total claims. In 1999 alone it cost the American taxpayers $8.1 billion.

The Veterans Affairs Department continued to pay the daughter of a veteran $78,000 in benefits after the veteran had died.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are amazing examples. But what I think is even more amazing is that the Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this.

Mr. Speaker, these are but a few of the examples of the enormous amounts of waste that the Federal Government generates every single year, but these are only the tip of the iceberg when compared to the total amount of waste in Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, as long as the Democrats continue to define the value of programs by how much we spend rather than how well or how effectively we spend, the taxpayers will continue to suffer.

□ 2045

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats still want to raise our taxes for more of this.

ASSURING FISCAL HONESTY AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, good evening and aloha.

Tonight, I rise to address again the single most important issue facing our country, now, next year, and well into the next generation, and that is our crushing budget deficit and the fiscal corruption of our Nation's finances; and yes, I do not use that word ''corruption'' lightly because that is what is happening.

I do so in solidarity with my fellow Blue Dog Members, people of sincerity who I respect and who have stood here for years and decades and argued for fiscal responsibility and with whom I today cointroduced the Assuring Fiscal Honesty and Accountability Act of 2004. That is the subject that I want to address briefly here tonight because I can assure my fellow citizens, beyond any semblance of doubt, that fiscal honesty and accountability have no place at today's seat of power here in Washington.

Perhaps I am overly simplistic, but on any issue I like to ask: First, is there a problem? Second, what exactly is it? Third, what is the solution? Fourth, how do we accomplish it?

The act that we introduced today addresses the fourth question: How do we accomplish it? And it starts with the fourth question because I do not know how anybody can doubt that we have a problem. We know we have one, and we know exactly what it is, the systematic pillaging of our Nation's fiscal and budgetary integrity and resources for short-term political gain. We know the general parameters of the solution, and today we have had a good interchange on that.

We know we have to eliminate waste, fraud and abuse, wherever it is. We know we have to balance revenues and spending, but the reality is that we have lost our way on just how to get there.

We learned once in the eighties and the nineties that for us to have a realistic discussion and to make realistic decisions on the incredibly tough issues that go with the fiscal discipline territory, whether to raise or lower taxes and on whom, who and what to spend taxpayers hard-earned money on, and who not to spend it on, we had to set the rules of engagement and institute some basic checks and balances on natural political tendencies arising out of our reluctance, our abhorrence, of saying no. These rules were necessary, even though we had already placed limits on the amount of total national debt and required a separate vote to breach that national debt.

Those votes had become, as they are today and as we proved again today in the Committee on the Budget, a superfluous pro forma exercise as we now break through the $7.5 trillion total debt barrier. These rules had fancy names like discretionary spending caps and pay-go or pay-as-you-go, but they all stood for the same basic concept, a concept we are all familiar with in our personal and business finances: Set the ground rules, the overall boundary of the finances as a responsible, achievable, sustainable level before making individual decisions, and then match those decisions to those rules. The caps were just that, overhaul caps or limits. We could move around under caps, but we could not breach the caps, and pay-go just said if we break the rules in one area, if we exceed in one area, we have to make it up somewhere else, a pay-as-you-go. It all has to balance one way or the other. And these rules worked up until 3 years ago.

We had reversed a fiscal decline and were heading towards surpluses, but then what happened was something inexcusable, and it was on the watch of the current administration because that is when people around here in the majority and downtown decided they did not like those rules, because those rules got in the way of radically reducing revenues, while at the same time busting spending up to record highs. Yes, let us not talk about whose responsibility the spending increases were. The rest is history; record deficits as far as the eye can see, record total debt, material risk to our very fiscal foundations.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) again said tonight a saying that I am fond of: In order to get out of the hole, you have to stop digging. That is what this bill says: Let us stop digging right now by using techniques that worked in the past and let us start climbing.

One would think the majority and the administration would be falling all over themselves to get out in front on this issue. After all, I hear tell they are the party of fiscal responsibility. What an incredible surprise here in Washington to discover that that is anywhere but the truth.

So, lo and behold, they are not. They do not mind discretionary spending caps, as long as it is only the programs that they do not like. They do not mind putting caps on them. But, by the way, the programs that they want to raise, the programs that are busting our budget, no, we cannot afford discretionary spending caps. They do not mind pay-go, sounds good, as long as it does not apply to those programs, as long as it does not apply to evaluations of revenues and taxes.

Well, any fool can see that when you set the rules, they have to apply to everyone. When you balance a budget, you cannot leave it with so many outs, so many holes, that it is dead on arrival. And that is what the absence of this discretionary spending caps and pay-go rules has done.

So our bill says to everybody, hey, simply, you say you stand for fiscal responsibility, prove it. Set some rules that work and then live with them.

I urge this bill's prompt passage. And to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who have stood here today talking about fiscal responsibility, I invite their cosponsorship. I think we can form a good team to provide some realistic budget rules.

SALUTING OUR SOLDIERS

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, one of the world's most brutal dictators still sat on his throne and boasted that he would defy the world with impunity, protected by massive armies, and threatened terror through weapons of mass destruction. We sent brave young men and women into harm's way to contest that point.

Where it is appropriate, we pause today and review the progress we made, not against the monstrosity and Saddam Hussein's regime but the total war on terror. Our troops have registered a string of unbroken victories. They have won every battle and every campaign. They have destroyed the staging areas and the hiding holes of those who attacked this Nation on September 11, 2001, and they have helped to restore the security of their fellow Americans.

They have driven the Taliban from control of Afghanistan and are restoring the government of that country to its people. They have destroyed the Iraqi war machine and captured Saddam Hussein and are restoring the government of that country to its people. They have liberated a nation that has endured the darkness of tyranny and brutality ever since Saddam's Baath party seized control of that unfortunate nation some three decades ago.

Coalition soldiers have purchased with their blood, their sweat, and their tears, the best and brightest chance for freedom and democracy that this Nation and these nations in the Middle

East have ever known. These men and women are not just troops, they are my neighbors. They are my friends. They are my constituents. They are fellow Georgians. They are heroes to all Americans.

For the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and for posterity, the soldiers of Georgia's 12th District that have served in Iraq or Afghanistan thus far include the first of the 214th Field Artillery from Athens and Waynesboro, Georgia; the 878th Engineering Battalion from Augusta; the 513th Military Intelligence Brigade, Fort Gordon; the U.S. Army Signal School, Fort Gordon; the Eisenhower Army Regional Medical Center, Fort Gordon, Georgia; the 3rd, and the proud, Infantry Division from Fort Stewart, Georgia, did a marvelous job in campaign Iraqi Freedom; the 75th Engineer Detachment from Fort Stewart; the 165th Air Control Wing from Savannah, Georgia; the 117th Air Control Squadron from Savannah; the 165th Security Police Squadron from Savannah; the Air Combat Readiness Training Center from Savannah; and the first of the 75th Ranger Regiment, Rangers lead the way, from Hunter Army Airfield, Savannah, Georgia.

''Walk softly and carry a big stick,'' that is what Republican President Theodore Roosevelt said. These soldiers not only carried the stick for their countrymen, but they have swung it powerfully to convince the world that ours is not an idle threat, and because of that, we have won another victory.

We have eliminated a decades-long threat of Libyan terrorism, without a single shot being fired or a boot on the ground.

□ 2100

Once the dictator of that nation witnessed the professionalism and the resolution of our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, he capitulated to the world community. That speaks volumes to the power of the American will in bringing peace and conciliation around the globe without having to go to war.

If those who threaten peace and freedom are convinced that we really mean business in defending it, they will back down. But make no mistake, they will test us. They have been doing that in Iraq and Afghanistan with pointless attacks on our troops and our allies. And if they sense a weakening of our will, they will attack with even more frequency and ferociousness. If they sense a weakness, sacrifices and the victories that we have won honorably in battle by our troops will be lost dishonorably by politically motivated criticism of our war efforts.

Not only will those who speak such words undermine and jeopardize our troops; they will likely invite terrorist attacks on our homeland. We need only look at the example of Spain to realize this is not mere conjecture.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House has a mission in this war. Our mission is much more simple and more safe than that of the brave men and women who currently serve our country. We only have to show the world and our terrorist enemies that we are rock solid and that we will see this war through to final victory. We need to make sure our words of debate, both in this body and on the campaign trail, are chosen carefully to avoid even a hint of providing encouragement and aid to our declared enemies.

Our ammunition consists of words, but rest assured they are powerful weapons that can support our troops or those of the enemy. Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let us commit today that every word spoken by us in this body and across the Nation will be in support of the American troops and not those of al Qaeda.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 557

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about my colleagues on the other side in bringing to the floor House Resolution 557, which was just passed out with a ''no'' vote for me. This resolution is another attempt to divide this House on the Iraqi war while our young men and women continue to die, while parents, spouses and children suffer in their grief, and while we mourn their losses as a Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans did not involve a single Democrat in writing this resolution and, further, proposed a rule that allowed not a single amendment to be offered. We are here in this great House as a collective body to represent the people of America, and as the President constantly states, we are a Nation at war. Yet this House has chosen to ignore the Democrats and the people we represent in not involving us and including our position on this resolution. This is shameful, undemocratic, and an affront to our sons and daughters serving in this war.

Mr. Speaker, I share the view that the people of Iraq and the world are better off with Hussein in custody and his regime destroyed. Everyone agrees with that. However, the President told everyone in the Nation that combat was over on May 1, 2003. Yet every day young men and women continue to die in Iraq. Just today, a car bomb rocked Baghdad and killed more than 20 people. Over 500 Americans have died and over 3,000 have been injured, some seriously, during this war.

Our mission in Iraq has not been accomplished, the administration had no clear plan, our soldiers did not have the basic equipment that they needed, and returning veterans are being shortchanged on the benefits that they rightfully deserve. This resolution did not speak to any of these issues.

Resolution 557 states that Americans and the world are safer now that Saddam has been captured. Mr. Speaker, the facts simply do not support this. The world has become a much more dangerous place. Just this past weekend, over 200 people died in Spain as a result of a terrorist attack. The invasion of Iraq has become a breeding ground for terrorists, and we live here in America under a cloud of constant fear. We are not safer. We are also raising a generation of children living in fear instead of relishing the joy of the innocence of childhood.

I have heard my colleagues in the House state that Libyan leader Mommar Qaddafi decided to disarm because of the invasion of Iraq and the capture of Saddam Hussein. This is another attempt to twist the facts. It is well known that Mommar Qaddafi began negotiations with the United States and Europe to disarm long before the Iraqi war and the capture of Saddam Hussein. Even Secretary Colin Powell recently acknowledged that. This claim is akin to the claim that Saddam had weapons of mass destruction.

This resolution clearly shows the Republicans are in denial as to why we went to Iraq and denial as to the constant state of security and stability in the world and are delusional as to how this war is affecting other countries. This resolution also failed to mention how isolated we are in the international community. The people of Spain just showed the world what they thought of this war when they voted out the power of their government that supported President Bush on the war.

I stand behind our courageous men and women in uniform who are bearing the burden of this military action in Iraq. I am deeply grateful to their patriotism, their courage, and their sacrifice. I regret that they were placed in the position of fighting a war for weapons of mass destruction that did not exist, but I honor their service.

I have recently introduced legislation that would provide $50 million in funding to enable military families to get personal counseling upon return from this war and return from the service they have provided so admirably. I will continue to support our military men and women as they serve our country in this dangerous mission.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our men and women in uniform deserve more than one line in this resolution that was passed on the floor. Surely our men and women in uniform, who have made the ultimate sacrifice, given their lives, deserve to be recognized and honored far greater than this. This was not outlined in the resolution just passed.

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

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN OPPOSITION TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 557

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, today, in the floor debate on H. Res. 557, the Iraq resolution, though a member of the Committee on International Relations, I was unfortunately denied time to express my dissent on the policy of preemptive war in Iraq. The fact that the Committee on International Relations held no hearings and did not mark up the resolution further challenges the fairness of the process.

Mr. Speaker, I now rise to express my opposition to H. Res. 557, obviously, not because our Armed Forces do not deserve praise, but rather because our policy in the Persian Gulf is seriously flawed. An effort to commend our forces should not be used to rubber-stamp a policy of folly. To do so is disingenuous. Though the resolution may have political benefits, it will prove to be historically incorrect.

Justifying preemption is not an answer to avoiding appeasement. Very few wars are necessary. Very few wars are good wars. And this one does not qualify. Most wars are costly beyond measure, in life and limb and economic hardship. In this regard, this war does qualify: 566 deaths, 10,000 casualties, and hundreds of billions of dollars for a victory requiring self-deception.

Rather than bragging about victory, we should recognize that the war that rages on between the Muslim East and the Christian West has intensified and spread, leaving our allies and our own people less safe. Denying we have an interest in oil and that occupying an Islamic country is not an affront to the sensitivities of most Arabs and Muslims is foolhardy.

Reasserting U.N. Security Council resolutions as a justification for the war further emphasizes our sacrifice of sovereignty and Congress's reneging its constitutional responsibility over war.

This resolution dramatizes our forgetfulness that for too long we were staunch military and economic allies of Saddam Hussein, confirming the folly of our policy of foreign meddling over many decades. From the days of installing the Shah of Iran to the current worldwide spread of hostilities and hatred, our unnecessary involvement shows so clearly how unintended consequences come back to haunt generation after generation.

Someday our leaders ought to ask why Switzerland, Sweden, Canada, Mexico, and many others are not potential targets of an Islamic attack. Falsely believing that the al Qaeda was aligned with Saddam Hussein has resulted in the al Qaeda now having a strong presence and influence in Iraq. Falsely believing that Iraq had a supply of weapons of mass destruction has resulted in a dramatic loss of U.S. credibility, as anti-Americanism spreads around the world. Al Qaeda recruitment, sadly, has been dramatically increased.

We all praise our troops and support them. Challenging one's patriotism for not supporting this resolution and/or policy in the Persian Gulf is not legitimate. We should all be cautious in endorsing and financing a policy that unfortunately expands the war rather than ends it.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1375, FINANCIAL SERVICES REGULATORY RELIEF ACT OF 2003

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–439) on the resolution (H. Res. 566) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1375) to provide regulatory relief and improve productivity for insured depository institutions, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

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

IRAQ: ONE YEAR LATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Iraq, 1 year later.

First of all, I want to commend our brave troops who proudly serve our great Nation and risk their lives to preserve our freedom. I praise their courageous efforts to protect our country, and I am with them 100 percent. They are the best of the best. And I can truly say every Member of this House, this body, supports them 100 percent. What I do not support is this misleading Bush administration and this House that follows them like sheep. Let me repeat that. What I do not support is this misleading Bush administration and this House, the people's House, that follows them like sheep.

A new report has been released that shows that George Bush, DICK CHENEY, Donald Rumsfeld, and Condoleezza Rice made 237 misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq in 125 public appearances. Eighty-four of those statements misled the American people about Iraq's chemical and biological weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I was horrified last year to learn that 44,000 of our troops were sent out to battle without proper armor. Forty-four thousand. How can we ask young men and women to trust us when we make decisions that involve life and death and then not outfit them with the best that they need to save their lives. We deployed our young men and women to Iraq with Humvees that lacked armored protection and bulletproof windows.

I personally went to Walter Reed where six troops had lost their legs while riding in Humvees. If they had been riding in the right type of vehicles, this may not have happened. This use of Humvees in Iraq was not what they were made for. We need to get our troops the equipment they need now.

And, Mr. President, you need to spend more time planning for the safety of our troops and their families in your war efforts and less time fundraising and cutting taxes for the rich country club friends of yours.

There are two or three other points that I want to make. One, many of my constituents approach me about BRACC and the base closing amendment that we will be doing in 2005. They are telling me we are looking forward to your fighting to make sure our bases are not closed in our area. And my question to them is, why do you think that this Bush administration insisted, insisted, after the House and Senate both voted down and said we should not have a base closure, or BRACC scenario, during this time of war, why do you think this administration insisted that we go through this? It is destabling to the families and the communities during a time of war.

I have heard that someone from the other body indicated that if they were elected that that is one of the first things they would scrap.

I also want to comment on the 2000 election, which I cannot get past because the election determined who is in charge, and certainly I do not think we are headed in the right direction. I am going to submit for the RECORD an article that was in The New York Times last week indicating that Florida could be Florida again. In other words, the problems that we experienced in the 2000 election have not been corrected. It is a disservice to the people that we serve that we do not straighten out the problems with the elections, not just in Florida but all over this country; and we have not properly funded the program.

Lastly, let me mention the coup d'etat that took place a couple of weeks ago in Haiti. It is very unfortunate that this Bush administration has chosen to go in and take out a duly elected president. Just take him out. Just take him out. The poorest country in the western hemisphere. We have to make sure that the Haitian people get the assistance that they need from the super Bush administration, after going

in and taking out the duly elected president.

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

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

THE CARBON CYCLE AND CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present what I hope you will find as fascinating facts about the carbon cycle. There has been a great deal of discussion over the last several years about climate change: Is human activity causing the climate to change or is that not the case?

What I would like to present tonight, Mr. Speaker, is somewhat of a science lesson about the carbon cycle. Carbon, when burned, turns into a gas called CO_2, and CO_2 is a gas in the atmosphere that is needed to sustain life in its cycle. Excessive CO_2 would add to the greenhouse effect or cause the climate to warm. Thus, the climate would change.

What I would like to do tonight, Mr. Speaker, is to give some interesting facts, almost like a 7th grade science class; and I would like to go back to 1771, where an English minister named Reverend Priestley performed an experiment. Now, this is 1771.

He took a glass jar, about a foot high and about 8 inches in diameter, and he wanted to see how long air would stay good in that glass jar. And he discovered the air stayed good as long as he sealed it. Whether it was a week, a month, 3 months, it was always good air. What he did next, though, was put a flame next to that glass jar, which he found immediately fouled the air.

After that, he got another glass jar, and he put a mouse in that glass jar, and he sealed the glass jar. And it was not too long before the air was fouled again and the mouse died.

What he did next was pretty extraordinary. He took a glass jar, put a sprig of mint, a small green growing vegetable in that glass jar. Then he saw that the air stayed fine for a long time. He then put a flame to it. And we know that CO_2 comes from burning wood. The air stayed fine.

Then he put the mouse in the glass jar with that mint sprig and the mouse stayed in there for a long time and the air stayed fine.

□ 2115

Now Reverend Priestley did not realize what he had in that glass jar with the mint sprig and the mouse was a carbon cycle. The mint absorbed the carbon, built up its woody structure and exuded oxygen and so the mouse could live.

Trees across the planet breathe in carbon dioxide. They turn it into leaves and wood and breathe out oxygen. If we tested around the globe different areas and tried to discover the level of the CO_2 in the atmosphere, which is less than 1 percent, you would discover if you are near a forest, the CO_2 level is less than in other areas, if you are in an urban area. The trees breathe in CO_2, make wood and breathe out oxygen. This is the carbon cycle.

Every time you start your car, turn on a light, turn up the thermostat, you contribute more CO_2 to the atmosphere because you are burning carbon. Coal, oil, and natural gas fuel the world's economy, and they all use carbon dioxide which are inhaled by our forests and they turn that into oxygen.

But when we burn a lump of coal, when we burn oil, when we burn natural gas, we are releasing into our environment what took the natural processes, 20 million years ago, millions of years to lock up. So we are releasing into the atmosphere the same amount of CO_2 that took millions of years to lock up in about 150 years. So we are being excessive more than we have seen in eons of time by putting excessive extra amounts of CO_2 that goes against the grain of the natural cycle into our atmosphere.

Are there consequences to that faster releasing of CO_2? There are. The consequences are we see coral reefs around the world dying. We see deserts expanding, and we see the ocean currents themselves changing and in some cases slowing down. We see sea levels rise. In the northern parts of Canada, Alaska, and Russia, beetles are infesting millions of acres of forest that never infested those forests before because it was not that warm in the Northern Hemisphere. Forests, grasslands, and even our oceans absorb CO_2 that we emit into the atmosphere as humans.

If we diminish those carbon sinks, we accelerate CO_2 release into the atmosphere, and the consequences are that we are changing our climate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time allocated to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

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

There was no objection.

AMERICA'S PREEMPTIVE WAR

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the House today debated America's first preemptive war. If this were about the courage and valor of our soldiers, I would ask that we act by unanimous consent to praise our troops, but this resolution is really about the Bush policy of global domination.

A year ago America launched a preemptive war. Today we are considering the consequences of that war. Words of great Presidents and great Americans offer guidance. In 1848, Abraham Lincoln expressed the fear of President Polk's power when he wrote to oppose U.S. annexation of Mexican territory. ''If today, President Polk should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada to prevent the British from invading us, how could we stop him? You may say to him, 'I see no probability of the British invading us' but he will say to you, 'Be silent; I see it, if you do not.'''

Does that sound like George Bush to Members, with all of the misrepresentations we had?

One of America's greatest soldiers was President Dwight David Eisenhower. In what many regard as his finest speech, President Eisenhower said this about war: ''Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in the final sense a theft from those who are hungry and not fed, those who are cold and not clothed.''

Eleanor Roosevelt, ''We have to face the fact that either all of us are going to die together or we are going to live together, and if we are going to live together we must talk.''

Finally, Martin Luther King, ''Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do that. Hate multiplies hate, violence multiplies violence, and toughness multiplies toughness in a descending spiral of destruction. The chain reaction of evil, hate begetting hate, wars producing more wars, must be broken or we shall plunge into the dark abyss of annihilation.''

Today, we are considering whether to endorse the Bush doctrine of domination. The world the President claims to be making safer finds our actions offensive. The nonpartisan Pew Research Center, as reported in today's Washington Post, conducted a survey in nine countries. The results are frightening. It found people in several Middle Eastern countries increasingly support suicide bombings and other violence against Americans.

Majorities in Jordan and Morocco said attacks against Americans were justified. These same people now favor Osama bin Laden. These opinions are coming from ordinary people, not armed terrorists. In Europe, nations

are so concerned over American foreign policy they want the European Union to take on a new issue: America.

That is the world a year after the Bush doctrine of domination. Our best friends shudder at what we are doing. Those who hate us were convinced that terrorism is a legitimate defense. The world is not safer, America is not safe. This resolution will not help. It will only serve to deepen the mistrust of America and widen the great global divide created when President Bush invaded Iraq. We should all have voted ''no'' on this.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AMERICA EXPORTS JOBS, NOT PRODUCTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week the administration announced a record $541.8 billion trade deficit for the year 2003. That means 541.8 billion more dollars' worth of imports coming into our country than our exports going out. That is over one-half trillion dollars, the largest in the history of this country. We are exporting jobs, we are not exporting products.

In fact, this number is so big, it is bigger than the last record deficit set in the year 2002. These are staggering numbers. Let us take a step back and look at them again. $541.8 billion or almost half a trillion dollars being lost to foreign competitors. This is not just pocket change. With each additional billion, America loses another 20,000 jobs here at home. In fact, since President Bush took office, America has lost 2.2 million more jobs, mostly due to our jobs being shipped offshore.

Meanwhile, taxes are going up for the majority of Americans as only a wealthy few benefit while the majority of our people are paying higher gas taxes, higher property taxes, higher excise taxes, more money for their health insurance, and higher tuition if their children are lucky enough to go on to college. Consumer confidence is plummeting. Disapproval of the President's handling of our economy has reached 59 percent, a career high, in a recent ABC News Washington Post poll, and there is no reason to wonder why.

The Bush administration tells us we can trade our way to a better, stronger economy. But let us look at the record. Since NAFTA passed, unfortunately in 1993, a very flawed trade agreement, we have not had a trade surplus with Mexico. In fact, the surplus we had has plummeted into a giant deficit as more and more of our jobs move south of the border. Every single year since NAFTA passage, we have had a growing trade deficit with Mexico.

The United States signed a trade deal with China in 2000. Before the trade deal, we already had a $68 billion deficit with China. Guess what, since the trade deal, it has doubled to over $124 billion in just 3 years. Every time we enter into one of these flawed trade agreements, our balance of payments goes in the wrong direction. What does it tell you, it tells you that the model of trade we are using is seriously flawed. Is anyone in this city paying attention?

When it was only manufacturing jobs being shipped out, some self-styled trade experts claimed this was the way to modernize our economy. I am not quite sure how cutting our core will modernize us, but that did not matter when we had all those service sector jobs to depend on. But not so fast. Now we hear from the jobs of accountants, medical technicians and other formerly untouchables, those are on the line. So where does the future of America lie and how do we stem this job loss?

When we started losing manufacturing jobs in automobiles and other core economic sectors, the economists assured us we were in for a so-called information economy, but now the jobs in the information economy are moving to India, so where are the new jobs supposed to come from?

Well, the Bush administration had several great ideas over the last couple months. First, one of the President's top advisers suggested that outsourcing our jobs was actually a good thing. The administration resorted then to a sleight of hand: When you are losing the game, change the rules. So they proposed reclassifying fast food workers as manufacturing workers. Nobody gets a new job, just a new title.

So when a fast food employee is adding pickles to your Big Mac, that must mean he or she is ''working on the line.'' I will give them points for creativity, but the American people surely cannot be fooled.

Six months ago President Bush, with the fall elections in sight, announced he would be appointing a manufacturing czar. Now, that is not a bad idea to help a little bit, even though 6 months later as our economy still lags behind the administration's own rosy predictions, we still do not have that manufacturing czar in place because his name was pulled because that potential employee had one small problem: As he was letting American workers go, he was building a factory in China.

That is right, the man that President Bush wanted to put in charge of stemming the flow of jobs overseas was busy sending our jobs overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I have been coming to the floor asking for fair trade, good trade, balanced trade, not just free-for-all trade. Please, let us put a human face on trade.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 2130

AMERICAN JOBS IN THE 21ST CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin this evening by reading a brief excerpt from a letter sent by my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). He sent this letter to the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Greg Mankiw. The dean of the House, the gentleman from Michigan, writes, ''I'm sure the 163,000 factory workers who have lost their jobs in Michigan will find it heartening to know that a world of opportunity awaits them in high-growth manufacturing careers like spatula operator, napkin restocking and lunch tray removal.''

Mr. Speaker, I certainly understand my good friend and esteemed colleague's deep concern for the loss of manufacturing jobs in his home State. Jobs are a big concern on everyone's

mind, including my own. I believe that there are very few issues that are more pressing or more worthy of debate in this Congress than the issue of jobs. But I believe the premise behind the gentleman's statement is emblematic of a 2-decade effort on the part of anti-trade advocates to convince Americans that our economy is headed for disaster. It encapsulates a tired, yet oft used and mistaken, diagnosis of our economy, that is, that American business is going to ship all of our good jobs overseas, finally leaving American workers with no job opportunity other than the one behind the counter at a local fast-food joint.

In fact, I recently stood right here a couple of weeks ago and talked about the legacy of, quote-unquote, hamburger flipping jobs, that argument, and I traced its roots back to 1984. Mr. Speaker, politicians and pundits have been predicting the demise of our economy and the good American jobs for the last 20 years. The gentleman from Michigan's letter to Chairman Mankiw is a quintessential example of the persistent, yet just plain wrong, rhetoric that jobs overseas mean lower-paying, demeaning jobs here in the United States.

But let us look at what really happened in this 20-year period from 1984 to today. Mr. Speaker, profound and profoundly good changes have taken place. We shifted over this past 20 years from an economy based on heavy industry to our fast-paced, high-technology and ever-growing 21st century economy. This transformation ushered in a new era that fundamentally changed how business is conducted, and it vastly improved how we live our lives. Yet the letter written by the ranking member of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce proves that the predictions of gloom and doom are still alive and well today. He is not the only one predicting our hamburger-flipping future.

Let us take a look at what is being said by the other critics of our growing economy. Senator JOHN KERRY, who apparently now has all the delegates necessary to become the Democratic Presidential nominee, said not too long ago, ''People are worried about their wages, their jobs, about how we're going to compete with other countries, where we're losing a countless number of jobs to those countries.'' Before he dropped out of the Presidential primary, Senator JOHN EDWARDS commented, ''The mills are gone and so are the jobs.'' Mr. Speaker, Lou Dobbs, the CNN anchor, rails almost nightly against U.S. companies that invest in growing overseas markets, claiming that ''we're exporting many, many jobs.'' Paul Craig Roberts, the economist, formerly committed to this country's open trade policies and a believer in the strength of our economy, has recently done an about face. Several weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, he joined our colleague in the other body, CHARLES SCHUMER, in penning an editorial for the New York Times that claimed the American workforce is doomed, stating that, and I quote, ''Lots of new jobs are being created, just not here in the United States.'' Robert Slater said at a Brookings Institution forum that the United States will be a Third World country in 20 years.

Those are some very dire predictions that we have been receiving, Mr. Speaker. These political leaders and pundits are clearly asserting that our economy is in decline. They say we are rapidly losing all of our good jobs, mostly to foreign competitors, and that we are not creating new ones. Based on these claims, they see a very, very dismal future. That is why tonight I would like to focus on the heart of this issue, jobs, the issue that, of course, is regularly discussed here and should be discussed right here. Or more specifically, I want to talk about the incredibly fast pace at which our economy is creating exciting new types of jobs for Americans.

As I have said, the issue of job creation is always on the minds of the American people, and it is always a very important topic of debate. But in light of these growing attacks that are being directed at our economy, attacks that question our strength and assert that our good jobs are being destroyed or sent overseas, an honest look at the robust and dynamic job creation that is currently taking place is particularly relevant and timely.

Mr. Speaker, I am an optimist. I see a bright and promising future when I look at our economy. While I believe the doom-and-gloomers are correct in observing that our economy is changing, they have completely missed the fact that the change that is being made is change for the better. Like their predecessors who saw the decline of the buggy whip and telegraph industries, I believe those who are making the current gloom-and-doom predictions are missing the dynamism and innovation that have made our economy a global leader and one that continues to spur job creation. Literally thousands of new jobs, often in completely new fields, are being created routinely.

But before we get into these new kinds of jobs, I think it is important to get a firm understanding of the broad changes that are taking place in the American workforce. Throughout much of our economic history, fluctuations in employment have been the product of the business cycle. In the 1970s and 1980s, half of all employment was cyclical, that is, businesses would lay off workers during weak times and would rehire them during recoveries. As business picked up, employers were able to hire workers for the same jobs using the same skills that existed before the economic recession. Often this meant rehiring the very same workers. Because the job opportunities after a recession looked a lot like the job opportunities before the recession, job recovery always quickly followed economic recovery.

Today there is a lot more than just cyclical change taking place. Thanks to growing productivity, improved technology and a highly competitive global marketplace, many industries are undergoing fundamental changes. In other words, this economy has been experiencing a great deal of structural change. It is extremely important to note here that structural change is not just another term for permanent downsizing. As Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan has noted repeatedly in recent months, for years our economy has been a very dynamic job-creating machine. Every quarter, millions of jobs are destroyed and millions more are created. In 1999, for example, a booming year for the U.S. economy, 33 million jobs were lost and 36 million new jobs were created. The important distinction between structural change and cyclical change is that increasingly the newly created jobs are not only new positions in long established companies and long established industries; more and more a new job is new in every respect, a new type of work in a new business that demands new skills.

Mr. Speaker, this dynamism, which has produced a net gain of 40 million new jobs over these past 20 years about which I have been speaking, means that companies must constantly work to stay competitive and workers must continuously pursue more education and more training. But it also means that the U.S. continues to lead the world in productivity, innovation, and growth. But jobs are still a big concern. The U.S. may be the global economic leader, but what exactly are these new jobs that today's workers are supposed to be doing?

Mr. Speaker, workers in our 21st century economy are finding jobs in fields such as network and communications administration, business administration and management, computer engineering technology, health information technology, legal support, accounting, marketing, advertising, customer relations, news and information reporting, tax preparation and planning, highly specialized transportation and delivery, human resources support, pension and benefits management, purchasing and global sourcing, demand forecasting, inventory control, warehousing and distribution.

Mr. Speaker, these are good jobs using very valuable skills. They are service jobs that are a part of just about every kind of business in America today. They are not get-rich-quick jobs, but they are certainly not hamburger-flipping jobs. Think about the big and growing sectors of our economy. Think about what you spend, Mr. Speaker, on health care; biotechnology and pharmaceuticals; elderly care; education; movies; entertainment and digital gaming; recreation; telecommunications; cable; satellite TV and radio; phones; cellular and wireless networks; fashion; insurance; real estate; auto maintenance and repair; mass transit;

investments, whether you call it the stock market, pensions or securities; government services, which is almost unimaginably big, as we all know; leisure; hospitality and tourism.

Then there are the businesses that service other businesses: Engineering, environmental protection services and technologies, risk management, export and import financing, express delivery, high-tech manufacturing, and biomedical informatics.

These are the jobs of the 21st century economy. Sure, there will always be hamburger-flipping jobs as long as there are hamburger eaters, but the vast majority of jobs that this economy is creating are good, skilled jobs that pay well.

But in our ongoing debate about jobs and job creation, the issue of offshoring is inevitably raised. Whereas the doom-and-gloom crowd used to argue that good jobs will never be created, now they have shifted gears. They concede that for a while our economy managed to produce a few good service jobs, but today all of those jobs are being exported to low-wage countries via offshoring. They claim that countries like India and China are siphoning off our good jobs much faster than we can create them and Americans are being left with, you guessed it, the dreaded hamburger-flipping job.

So what exactly is offshoring and what is its effect on our economy? Since offshoring is a relatively new word in the collective lexicon, it is easy to believe that it is a relatively new phenomenon. In fact, offshoring has always been a part of the free market. Whether it is a Ford plant importing some of its parts from Mexico, a multiplex in London showing American movies, or an Indian accountant crunching numbers for H&R Block, offshoring is a vital component of our economy.

It comes down to one core concept, Mr. Speaker, and it is in many ways the basis on which this country and our market process was established and, that is, competitiveness. Again, there is nothing new about competitiveness. U.S. companies have always had to compete to survive in the free market. Being competitive has always required American businesses to be innovative, increase efficiency, invest wisely and employ the best practices that are available. This has, in turn, been a boon to American workers. Millions of Americans work for global leaders like Hewlett Packard, General Motors, IBM, and Johnson & Johnson and millions more work for small and medium-sized businesses that serve business customers that include these global leaders. The ability of Americans to find good jobs has always been directly linked to the ability of American enterprises to compete here at home and in the global market.

□ 2145

Therefore, it is no accident that the companies that offshore, all those companies that Lou Dobbs rails against on his program on CNN almost every night, those companies are the largest creators of jobs right here in the United States. By investing in growing markets, which maximizes efficiency and increases productivity, these successful global competitors are able to turn around and reinvest here in America. Companies that are globally engaged employ millions of Americans and pay above-average wages. They make the majority of investments in physical capital right here in this country. They perform the majority of research and development right here in this country. They produce the majority of U.S. exports that go into other markets around the world. In short, companies that offshore are the biggest job creators right here in the United States of America.

It is important to remember a key point that I discussed earlier. Job creation does not preclude job destruction. Remember that figure that I gave in 1999, 30 million jobs were destroyed while 33 million new jobs were created. This is a reality, and it is painful for some, I will acknowledge that, but this is a reality of our dynamic, fast-paced 21st century economy. Offshoring functions in the exact same way. Some jobs will be lost. The important thing is that more will be created and that they will be better jobs, using more skills and paying better wages.

So what are some of these new jobs that offshoring is helping to create? One example, Mr. Speaker, comes from the software industry. U.S. companies outsourced 71,000 software programming jobs between 1999 and 2002, and those jobs paid an average of $55,000. Those were offshored. During that exact same period of time, 1999 to 2002, 125,000, 125,000, over 50,000 more software engineering jobs, were created which pay on average $74,000 a year. Let me go through that again. We saw the number of software programming jobs offshored, 71,000 of them paying on average 55 grand a year, and yet software engineering jobs were created to the tune of 125,000 right here in the United States, paying on average $74,000 a year. Not only was there a net gain in software jobs, but they, as I have said, were higher wage, higher value-added jobs.

Another growing sector, logistics, has not only benefited from higher efficiency and productivity, it is actually a direct result of the practice of offshoring. As companies engage more and more on a worldwide basis looking for high-quality, low-cost goods and services throughout the globe, delivery has become a very complex engineering task. Complicated supply and distribution lines involve multiple sources, often literally a world apart; diverse shipping and transportation modes; weather patterns; political unrest that can affect ports, airports, and other transportation hubs in the developing world; raw material shortages; and, of course, the finicky consumer demand, these all come into the mix, and so logistics is a massive industry in and of itself.

All of these complex factors require the highly skilled work of logistics experts, and companies pay very well for their expertise. Business owners have realized that fast and reliable delivery is one more way to cut costs and improve efficiency, and they are turning to logistics consultants on a widespread basis.

Don Westfall, the director of the Research and Supply Chain Logistics Council at the Manufacturers Alliance, has called this line of work ''a huge growth area for service providers and an important part of improving productivity in U.S. industry.''

Mr. Speaker, demand for these types of workers has risen so dramatically in recent years, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for example, has significantly expanded its logistics program and has added a new master's degree dedicated to logistics in its school of engineering.

Other new types of jobs that our robust economy is creating can be found simply by looking at the ways we spend our time and our money. For example, many people turn to eBay when looking to buy or sell anything from sports memorabilia to used books or cars, but the online auction is increasingly a place of business, a powerful resource used by individuals and small enterprises. Small business owners are using eBay to dramatically cut costs and conduct their business. And individuals are turning the Web site into a source of full-time work. In fact, these kinds of practices have become so widespread today, and I met with Meg Whitman last week from eBay and she confirmed this again, over 430,000 individuals and small businesses make their living on eBay. That is their source of income. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about nearly half a million Americans that count eBay auctioneering as their full-time job.

Two decades ago, few economists could have predicted that in 2004, hundreds of thousands of workers would be employed by an online auction site that got its start by catering to collectors of movie posters and matchbox cars. But this is precisely the sort of dynamism that has kept our economy churning out new jobs in the face of rapid change.

Another area where Americans are spending their leisure time and money and spurring job creation in the process is in, and I come from California so I have to talk about this, spa services. Massage therapy, for example, is a booming industry in this country. Just as we visit our internist, our chiropractor, our dentist, these professionals provide therapeutic services that many Americans are increasingly incorporating into their health care regimes, and rapidly growing demand is fueling growth in an industry that pays about $35 an hour, sometimes significantly more than that. The American

Massage Therapy Association estimates that there are nearly 300,000 massage therapists in the United States. This is double the number in 1996, and the numbers are continuing to grow.

One might say that a few hundred thousand massage therapists, eBay entrepreneurs, and logistics specialists are not so important to our economy. One might say that the jobs in these three industries, eBay entrepreneurs, massage therapists, and logistics specialists, that these jobs are in industries that are not enough to sustain a Nation of nearly 300 million people. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe that these types of jobs are in fact critical to our economy and to this debate.

But I believe they are important for a number of reasons.

First, in terms of sheer numbers, these jobs are not insignificant. Just this handful of industries taken together represents literally millions of jobs, and in most cases we are talking about very well-paying jobs, jobs supporting families, sending kids to college, and padding retirement plans. But they are also significant because in many ways they represent the new face of the American economy: the independent contractor, the entrepreneur, the small business owner. It is very important.

Again, these people in these three industries that I have mentioned, eBay entrepreneurs, massage therapists, logistics specialists, they are part of this new economy consisting of the independent contractor, the entrepreneur, and the small business owner. These are the types of jobs that are booming the 21st century economy. Yet because of the old economy's mindset that is embedded in our employment survey, these are precisely the kinds of jobs that are overlooked in our jobs statistics.

Our primary method of counting jobs in this country is the Department of Labor's Payroll, or Establishment Survey. Its numbers are gathered by asking a sampling of established corporations how many people they are hiring and how many people they are firing. For years this was a fairly reliable way of figuring out our unemployment rate. The vast majority of Americans worked in factories and businesses that had been around for a long time. And because changes in employment were due largely, as I was saying earlier, to cyclical trends, as I discussed, most workers, whether employed or unemployed, were easy to track because when we would see the downturn, we would see people laid off, and then because it was reasonably static at that time, once we saw an improvement in the economy, people would go back to those same jobs.

But as we have seen, this is no longer the case. Americans are finding jobs in new industries. They are working as independent contractors and consultants. They are starting their own businesses, all of which are difficult to track using these old methods for determining unemployment. If we go looking for workers in their old jobs, we are not very likely to find them.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the Payroll Survey estimates that there are roughly 70,000 massage therapists working in this country. That would probably come as a surprise to the almost 300,000 massage therapists that the American Massage Therapy Association says are working in that industry today. The Department of Labor somehow managed to misplace over 200,000 workers or 70 percent of this industry's workforce. For eBay entrepreneurs the chances of getting counted are virtually zero. The Department of Labor does not currently count anyone making a living by selling or buying on eBay. No category exists for logistics specialists either. And because many of them work as independent contractors, prospects for counting seem pretty dim for those workers in logistics specialty areas as well.

Other workers who are largely getting missed by the Payroll Survey include the growing number of partners in Limited Liability Corporations or LLCs. The establishment of new LLCs is exploding, doubling in some States in just the last 3 years. But because these entrepreneurs are partners in new business startups, they are not counted in our jobs statistics.

And the Payroll Survey is not just ill-equipped to accurately portray our economy in 2004, it has historically been a poor indicator of job creation during a recovery. During the recovery of 1992, the Department of Labor's numbers showed job creation as relatively anemic.

As more and more data became available and a clearer picture of the economy emerged, the Payroll Survey was significantly revised to show that job creation had actually been quite robust. And that was over 10 years ago, before much of the boom in independent contracting, Internet entrepreneurship, and small business startups that, as I said, are such a big part of our economy today.

However, we do have at our disposal another survey which is strong precisely where the Payroll Survey is weak. It is the Department of Labor's Household Survey. Instead of asking businesses if they are hiring or laying off, the Household Survey asks individuals and families if they are working. By going straight to the employees, this survey is well suited to more accurately portray employment in our economy. Whereas the Payroll Survey counts established jobs in established businesses of established industries, the Household Survey counts any and all types of jobs, or more precisely, it counts people no matter what type of job they have. This approach allows the Household Survey to track workers like the self-employed. And, in fact, this survey shows that 31 percent of job growth right now is in self-employment. Thirty-one percent of our job growth is in self-employment. In other words, one third of all job creation is entirely missed by the Payroll Survey.

Therefore, it is no accident and no mystery why the Payroll Survey shows a net loss of 2.4 million jobs in the last 3 years and the Household Survey shows a net gain of 1.4 million jobs. That discrepancy is pretty significant during the highly politicized time that we are in, and it is huge in terms of the average American's peace of mind, which is why an honest discussion of what is really going on in the economy is so critical.

To be sure, while a fast-paced dynamic economy in which new jobs are constantly being created is good for all of us in the long run, it also means that rapid change is a way of life. That can be exciting. And, Mr. Speaker, we all know it can also be scary. The only way we can continue to succeed and lead the world as the strongest, most innovative economy is to significantly step up our commitment to education and training and, yes, retraining.

□ 2200

New jobs mean new skills to be learned, new technologies to develop and harness. But if we keep competing and innovating and remain committed to learning and using new skills, our 21st-century economy will continue to thrive and, Mr. Speaker, so will American workers. They are doing it today, and they can continue to do it in the future. We will keep creating new and better jobs, whether it is a specialized service in a booming industry like logistics or massage therapy, or an increasingly skilled part of a globally-competitive sector like software engineers whose jobs are supported by inexpensive computer programming labor in India, or an entirely new line of work that was just unheard of, inconceivable just a few years ago, like eBay entrepreneurship where, as I said, approaching a half a million Americans are working in their full-time jobs.

There is no doubt that many of the cutting-edge industries of today will eventually become routine or even obsolete. What is important is that through technology, innovation, investment, and education hard-working Americans keep on embracing change and propelling our economy forward.

REFLECTIONS ON TRIP TO IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for the remainder of the majority leader's hour, approximately 28 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to engage in a colloquy for the remainder of this Special Order joined, as I was in travel, by my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), also of the sixth district, him of Arizona, me of Indiana. The gentleman from Arizona and I had the privilege of

traveling in the last 2 weeks to cities in Iraq under the leadership of the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), of the Committee on International Relations. On this trip, as we will reflect tonight, we not only, as this photograph suggests, had the opportunity to spend time with soldiers in the instance of this photograph in the belly of a C–130 on our way into Baghdad. But more compellingly, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, today, as we went through a vigorous and, in many ways, historic debate in this Congress, about the merits of Operation Iraqi Freedom, we found ourselves arguing one between another about the existence of certain types of weapons and the credibility of arguments. It seems that there was a group of people that was left out of that discussion today, and it was the people of Iraq and how they have benefited or how they have been moved or how they have been inspired by the heroism of American and allied forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

It is in that spirit, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and I come together tonight on the House floor to reflect on our experiences, principally during the first congressional delegation trip into the city of Basra, Iraq.

Basra, which is an area of southeastern Iraq under British control, had, prior to 2 weeks ago, never entertained American Congressmen. So when we arrived in Basra that day, we were literally, the four of us, we were the first Members of Congress that these Iraqis, regular, rank-and-file Iraqis, men and women from every station in life had a crack at, had a chance to speak to. We had truly a unique opportunity meeting with religious leaders, political leaders, but, more to the point as we will emphasize in our reflections today, regular Iraqis who shared, as I will reflect and detail and then yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), they shared a story that we are not hearing in America today. And I would offer humbly, Mr. Speaker, we did not hear very much about it on this floor today; and it was an outpouring of gratitude and appreciation for American soldiers and allied soldiers who had freed them from the tyranny of Saddam Hussein, and just as intense was their enthusiasm and their passion in almost a grade-school level enthusiasm that I saw for democracy that is beginning to take hold.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, for such remarks on the trip as he would make.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and I appreciate my colleague including me in this Special Order. It was a wonderful trip and a great experience and what a momentous time to be in Iraq, to be there as they were drafting their interim Constitution.

I have had the good fortune over the years of being in two countries when they have been drafting a constitution. I spent time in southern Africa in the country of Namibia in 1990 when they were sitting down after their first elections and drafting their first Constitution; and I was able to see that process firsthand, to see a country draft its first constitution and actually look to the future with hope and optimism. It was a similar experience here, if the gentleman will recall. In Baghdad we were meeting with Ambassador Bremer, and on the coffee table was a copy of the interim constitution that they would approve later that night, with a scratch-out here, a circle here, a white-out here; and it was just amazing to see that. It was appreciated, I think, on a number of levels.

As the gentleman mentioned, we were able to go to Basra, and one thing that strikes you when you go to Basra is the utter neglect that the southern half of Iraq has faced over the years. Saddam Hussein, after the first Gulf War, simply repressed the people in every way possible. The infrastructure of southern Iraq was completely neglected. The streets, the buildings falling apart, because he wanted to punish the people there. And the worst part, obviously, were the killings, mass graves, over 400,000 people already discovered; and it is feared that over a million were killed over the last couple of years by Saddam Hussein. That was striking.

But like the gentleman from Indiana, I felt the optimism of the Iraqi people, particularly in the south, who had undergone a lot over the last couple of years and finally could see forward to a bright future. And that feeling was certainly palpable there as we met with business people and with students and with clerics and others. It was a great opportunity. It is difficult when you are in the north to actually meet with regular Iraqis, because the security situation is so tight; but we had the opportunity in southern Iraq.

With that, I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. In fact, as my friend from Arizona said today in his remarks during the debate over the resolution, the opulence of Saddam Hussein's palaces is rendered even more immoral when one sees the squalor in which he forced the largely Shi'ia population of southern Iraq to live in huge communities like Basra, and where we see sandstone homes, a sewage system that has 20 percent of the capacity that it needed. So as one Iraqi told me, for years a good rain in the streets become the sewers. Yet, as we traveled to Baghdad, we saw, having visited not just a couple of Saddam Hussein's palaces, but the sheer opulence, the decadent self-indulgence was, in my judgment, sinful. But it showed the immorality.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we were told that Saddam Hussein had built some 70 palaces just in the last 10 years during the time of the sanctions for food program, or the oil for food program, where every drop of oil revenue was supposed to be spent for the benefit of the Iraqi people, for food or for medicine. Instead, Saddam Hussein spent an estimated $2 billion building palaces for himself and the people of Iraq surely suffered during that time.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, our first meeting, as is captured in this photograph with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and myself and our delegation, on the right was with a series of Iraqi religious and political leaders. We see a Muslim imam here, the Catholic bishop of Basra was in attendance and warmly received by those present. But my memory of this meeting had more to do with the very silent Muslim cleric who sat at the end of the table, the gentleman wearing ancient garb and a long beard who, after we had gone through the series of questions about everything from border jurisdiction to the process of reconstruction, it fell to us to be able to ask questions. And up to this point, we had heard mostly from these religious leaders who were quite chatty through an interpreter, and this gentleman had been icily silent.

At that point I remember asking, What do you think of our decision to remove Saddam Hussein? And before any of these three could answer, the gentleman in the white headdress suddenly leaned forward and began to speak urgently in Arabic and pointing his finger in my direction with his eyes on fire. And as I waited for the translation, the interpreter explained that he had said, Saddam Hussein is a nightmare, and the day you ended his regime, you lifted a dark curtain from our people and the daylight was able to shine in. It was for me an extraordinary moment where this icy and quiet figure who was clearly suspicious of American officials traveling thousands of miles to sit down in a delegation meeting, suddenly had his moment to speak a truth from his heart, and it was a truth about a nightmare that the United States of America had brought to an end.

I yield for the gentleman's reflections.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, that was an extraordinary meeting, to see, as we were able to do, to talk with the clerics who were repressed so much over the past couple of years. The gentleman had a previous slide there when we were in the C–130 with the troops, and it reminded me of perhaps the most special time in Iraq was being able to meet with the troops at Tallil Air Base. We were able to go to the mess hall, and I was looking for any Arizonans who might be present. It turned out there were a number of them. In fact, I ran into a cousin of mine from my hometown that I did not know was there, and another one from my hometown, and pretty soon there were a dozen or so. The 222nd National Guard unit out of Flagstaff was there and

doing a great job. They had been there about 11 months and obviously were anxious to get home and see their families.

But what struck me was how they felt that they were there for a cause, and that morale was high, despite what some will tell us. It was a very difficult post for them to be in, obviously, very difficult and dangerous circumstances. But they were proud to do it, and they were proud to serve and anxious to see their families and be reunited once again. There were a lot of highlights on the trip and that was certainly one, to meet with the troops. And then we went to Baghdad and were able to meet with other troops from Arizona as well. Arizona is well represented in Iraq, and they are doing a great job; and I was just proud to be associated with them. I yield back.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to explain that. I admire the way my friend describes the morale of the troops, because I really believe it is also a good description of the enthusiasm of the Iraqis, some 60 or 70 with whom we spent a considerable amount of time that day in Basra, that regardless of the arguments that we have here on this floor and across this country and, frankly, through the course of a Presidential election year, all of which are appropriate, about evidence and information and intelligence, it struck me that that was completely irrelevant to the cause as it was understood by our soldiers that we met in Iraq and the Iraqis that we met; that this was a cause really between good and evil, between a tyrant who oppressed and murdered over a million of his own countrymen, 400,000 bodies of men and women, boys and girls who have been found in mass graves so far, over 800,000 Iraqis remain missing, people dragged from their homes in the dead of night without due process of law, never to be heard from again, versus the forces of the Western World coming together for the rule of law and for ending that tyranny. I am very grateful for my colleague's reference to a cause, because it emanated out of everything that I sensed about the people with whom we spoke.

□ 2215

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for yielding.

Another highlight of the trip, obviously, was meeting, and I believe there is a slide coming up, meeting with some of the former prisoners of war. It was just striking to talk to them and to hear about the repression that they had experienced and to hear about the work they are currently doing to try to reunite family members with others that they have not seen or at least to find the remains of family members who have been missing for so long. A difficult task for them, obviously. But these people have been through a whole lot.

For those who I heard make references earlier today to we went to Iraq, for what, because Saddam had drained the marshes or drained the swamps in Iraq, the reference to Saddam Hussein draining the area where the Marsh Arabs lived and what an ecological and societal disaster that has become, as actual as that is, it pales in comparison to the human lives that were lost: over a million killed, some gassed, weapons of mass destruction used against the Kurds, mass graves found, people buried alive. The stories go on and on and on. It was just trying to hear that.

My colleague has some experience with that.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I must tell him that that time that we spent, and this is another photograph of our time with Iraqis during this trip, but the time that we spent with former political prisoners, one man who had been jailed a dozen times in the course of 25 years, to hear not just that individuals were dragged from their homes in the dead of night if they were thought to be suspected of disloyalty of the regime, not just that those individuals were tortured by the regime of Saddam Hussein, but to hear from these men that it was routine and ordinary practice to torture prisoners' wives in front of them, their mothers, and their children in order to extract information; and that oftentimes the torture would result in the death of a loved one and then the summary execution of the prisoner; and that this happened in numbers that boggle the mind.

And I must tell my colleague that I returned with a burden on my heart to carry this message back on behalf of these good people in Iraq for whom I developed a tremendous amount of affection and respect, that they lived in a hellish environment, subject to the most unspeakable cruelty by the tyranny of Saddam Hussein.

We cannot lightly pass over that and we cannot lightly ignore that and we cannot trivialize that, regardless of whether or not the human rights record of this regime was a central focus in the public debate prior to the war. It is nonetheless a fact that cries out from over 270 mass graves that have been found so far and the remains of some 400,000 Iraqis. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. We often hear about the carnage and bloodshed since the war unofficially ended. The day after we left, there were over 200 killed in a series of bombings in mosques. Just today some 30 people were killed. So those things draw the most attention, as they should, and it is a terrible thing to happen. And our troops, we have lost a number of them. We continue to lose them. It is a very dangerous situation there.

But often overlooked are the positive and good things that are happening. I think that that is one thing that we brought back from our trip. One thing that was pointed out to us is the day, our first day there, the day prior they had set a record for oil output for a day since the war that the oil production is coming back. This is with equipment, obviously, that was neglected and abused during the past decade and is rendered almost unusable; and still, with our engineers and others, they have been able to go in and actually produce record oil output for a day.

Also, electricity we were told that we were actually producing more electricity in Iraq than was being produced not during the war but before the war. So things are happening.

It is much to the credit of our engineers and our individuals who are going over from this country doing contract work and USAID and other groups who are actually doing some very good things for the Iraqi people.

Education, I know that my colleague will want to talk about some of the education work going on, our democracy programs and whatnot. So I will yield for that.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I think it is a wonderful place for us as we approach the end of our conversation tonight to end it that I am overwhelmed by the sense of gratitude expressed by the Iraqis with whom we interacted in Basra. I mean, the touching of the heart, I came to find out virtually every Iraqi that we met ended their conversation with me, and I know with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), by touching their hearts. And I would later find that this is a form of deep respect in the Muslim and Islamic tradition. It is the touching of the heart that means the ultimate expression of gratitude.

When we met with political prisoners and we thanked them for their candor and we thanked them for being willing to meet with us, they touched their hearts and bowed to us. And in this instance here where we visited one of hundreds of democracy workshops that are taking place all over Iraq, and here you see Ana who is a young Islamic Iraqi woman, wearing an abaya, and she is presenting me one of my most treasured possessions since becoming a Congressman. It is a stack of handwritten poems in English about what freedom means to her. And she illustrated the poems with almost childlike caricatures of freedom of religion and freedom of expression and the right to vote with a small ballot box.

The enthusiasm of all the people in this room that spoke broken English was very endearing to me and profoundly inspiring. Not only had we managed in Operation Iraqi Freedom to bring to an end a darkness, as one Iraqi said to me that day in Basra, a darkness that had descended on their people, but also the daylight of democracy, the daylight of freedom and liberty streaming into Iraq. And it is being greeted with enthusiasm.

The devastating bombing that took place today claiming lives in Baghdad, the car bombs that were detonated the

day after we left Baghdad Airport, it was the bloodiest day since the end of major combat hostilities, all draw the mind to the violence.

They draw, it seems to me, the American public's focus to a very small number of Iraqis who seek to use violence to reclaim the dictatorial power they once enjoyed when this is a country of 10 million people, a sample of which we met, who were overflowing with gratitude to the people of the United States and our allies in this cause.

As this picture attests, and I hope it is on screen and, Mr. Speaker, I hope it can be seen, that you can see that enthusiasm on their faces, that enthusiasm for democracy that I encountered in Iraqi after Iraqi. And it is an enthusiasm I believe will be a foundation for a free Iraq for decades to come.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me to participate. I will say a few words and yield back to my colleague to close.

The thing that struck me after all the experiences we had in Iraq, our last picture there in Baghdad we climbed on the C–130 to fly back to Kuwait and we waited outside of our plane while the ceremony was held where the body of an Estonian soldier who was killed the day before who, I believe, was trying to detonate an explosive on the street and was killed by a sniper as he was there, was placed on our plane. And we flew out with the body of that young soldier in the belly of our plane.

And it was quite a surreal experience to fly over Iraq, to fly over ancient Babylon, the confluence of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, the cradle of civilization with the casualty of the latest conflict in our plane.

But it really made me think and ponder back about our time with the Iraqi people and about the experiences that we had where the yearning for freedom is strong; it is in the soul of every man and woman. And as our President has said, freedom is not a gift to the world; it is God's gift to mankind. It is something that is felt by everyone and certainly expressed in the gratitude that was expressed by people touching their heart when they would talk to us, that our country was able in some small way to bring that gift back to them to have them experience that God-given gift of freedom. It was a wonderful experience.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for allowing me to participate in this colloquy.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) for yielding and for his participation. And I think those words especially eloquent. Because it was the gratitude and the enthusiasm for their freedom that I found most moving among the Iraqis that we met.

I close with a picture, Mr. Speaker, that I think the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) actually took. We were visiting the second of two palaces of Saddam Hussein now being rehabilitated into a hospital for Iraqis in Baghdad. And as we were making our way, we came across regular Iraqis who were moving materials. And as you see here, and I hope it is evidenced in the picture, the enthusiasm with which we as Americans were greeted was overwhelming. People stopping, smiling, reaching out.

I did not even expect that the thumbs up symbol would be international, but it was. And you see the warmth and you see the generous spirit that is present among the Iraqi people. I say without hesitation, as I said to many people upon my return, I fell in love with the Iraqi people. They are bright, visionary, optimistic, educated, and a people that are of such strong opinions that I thought they were from the Midwest in most of our conversations.

But in the midst of all of it, I came away with an image that I had a burden, Mr. Speaker, to come back and as we consider this important resolution today, even to help finish the debate today with my colleague from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), to try and focus this debate on the real beneficiaries of Operation Iraqi Freedom, because certainly Operation Iraqi Freedom brought down a tyrant who represented, as the President concluded, a threat to the United States of America and our allies and that clear and present danger justified our decision to go to war. But the true beneficiaries are these Iraqis and the generations of Iraqis who will follow them, who will be born in a free country, that will live under not the rule of one, but the rule of law. And they will live under a constitution that is, as Ambassador Bremer said to us, not so much a revolutionary document, as for this part of the world and its torn history, a radical document, with freedom of religion, freedom of expression, freedom of speech, and equality of the genders.

This is an astonishing accomplishment. And I am here to report very simply, Mr. Speaker, that the Iraqi people that we met with, some four or five dozen in the course of our days in Basra and Baghdad two short weeks ago know that. They understand that. They are deeply and profoundly grateful to the people of the United States, to the families of our men and women in uniform for the sacrifices that have been made on their behalf.

And they are deeply hopeful and deeply enthusiastic and deeply ambitious to see democracy and a constitutional republic take hold in this beleaguered land.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

□ 2230

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, an international consulting firm that specializes in monitoring the pharmaceutical industry released a report that showed that prescription drug spending in the United States rose 11 percent last year, and Mr. Speaker, I have heard President Bush plans to highlight his health care achievements this week, and undoubtedly he will boast about the passage of his prescription drug legislation.

However, Mr. Speaker, seniors have already done the math and realize that the President's law will not help them with the ever-increasing costs of their prescription drugs.

Just consider, a senior who now spends $1,000 a year on prescription drugs will end up paying at least $857 a year under the law passed by the Republican majority here in the House and signed into law by the President. Seniors with bills of $5,000 a year will still pay at least $3,920 under the Republican law. I do not understand how the President can tout this law as helpful to seniors when you look at those statistics.

The trouble is that both the House Republican leadership and the President are having a difficult time selling this bad prescription drug law to seniors. Back when we were about to vote on this bill last year, the President was having a difficult time selling the plan to some of my fellow Republican colleagues right here on the House floor. In order to overcome the skepticism that not only most of the Democrats but even some of the Republicans had, President Bush and his administration got involved in some questionable activities that continue today.

Now, these activities are outlined in an editorial yesterday in the New York Times which was titled ''The Actuary and the Actor,'' and I do not like to read the entire editorial usually in the newspaper, but I have to this evening, Mr. Speaker, because I just think that this New York Times editorial says it all, about how this administration is essentially misleading the public with regard to this Medicare bill, just like they misled many of my colleagues on the Republican side who ended up voting for the bill that night when we sat here for almost 3 hours before the voting was closed.

The New York Times editorial is as follows: ''An Orwellian taint is emerging in the Bush administration's big victory last year in wringing the Medicare prescription drug subsidy from a balky Congress. The plan is being sold to the public through propagandistic ads disguised as TV news reports, and it turns out the government's top Medicare actuary was muzzled by superiors during the debate about the program's price tag.

''Richard Foster, one of the government's foremost Medicare experts, says

he was ordered not to provide requested information to Congress last fall when doubts were being raised about the drug benefit's cost. The administration denies this, but a ranking former official has confirmed Mr. Foster's story. As the bill was being considered, Mr. Foster privately cautioned that its cost could amount to as much as $600 billion, while the White House publicly stuck to the Congressional Budget Office figure of $400 billion over 10 years. The administration eventually conceded a cost of $534 billion, but only after the bill was safely signed into law.

''With program in hand, the administration then attempted to rally support, and take political credit, with government-produced TV ads masquerading as news reports. Actors were hired by the Department of Health and Human Services to pose as television journalists purveying faux upbeat 'news' segments about the expanded Medicare coverage.''

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that was with taxpayer dollars that was done. Is that correct?

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate the gentleman bringing it up. It is 100 percent paid for with taxpayer dollars, and these taxpayer dollars are being used to pay for these videos and these advertisements.

This is a continuation of the New York Times editorial: ''Actors were hired by the Department of Health and Human Services to pose as television journalists purveying faux upbeat 'news' segments about the expanded Medicare coverage. The hope is that TV stations will air them as their own. In one version, anchors are offered a script in which they promise that 'reporter Karen Ryan,' an actress, will explain the details of the new drug plan.

''This sleight of hand openly deepens doubts about White House credibility on a complex issue. The public deserves straightforward information about the changes in Medicare, and Federal agencies should not be engaging in political spin. This is no way to run a democracy nourished by information and taxpayers' money.''

Now, again, I am just reading my colleagues the editorial of the New York Times. As my colleague from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) mentioned, this is taxpayers' money. This is not political campaign ads on behalf of the President's reelection. These are taxpayer funds.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I think one of the fundamental questions here, and I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey's (Mr. PALLONE) leading this special order tonight and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) being here, and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), all of whom have been very involved in this Medicare issue.

I think there are two questions. One is how can you justify taxpayer dollars being spent on an ad campaign in such a politically charged issue? Second, when the Medicare benefit does not even go into effect for 2 years so that you are running these ads at taxpayer expense during the Presidential election year, informing the voters and the beneficiaries of something that is 2 years away.

I think the second question to ask is, why are they having so much trouble convincing the public the Medicare bill is a great bill? The fact is the public is not biting. The public understands intuitively, the seniors overwhelmingly, and I think people of all ages overwhelmingly, understand that George Bush and the Republican leadership have sat down with the drug industry and sat down with the insurance industry, and they went into the Oval Office, and they came into this Chamber, the drug and insurance industry, and they wrote this legislation.

A $400 billion, they told us, bill, $139 billion of that goes to increased profits or the drug industry. Another $14 billion of our tax dollars goes to the insurance industry. It is just clear this is another example of President Bush's very close allegiance to the drug industry and the insurance industry.

The word on the street in Washington is the President is going to get $100 million from the drug industry for his campaign. The drug industry loves this President. They have gotten everything they want from this President, and you can bet if that $100 million from the prescription drug industry goes to President Bush, that is one of the reasons seniors in this country are paying such a high price. No wonder it is darn near impossible to convince seniors that they got a good deal with this drug bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, if I could just interrupt for a second, what happens from my experience is when I go to the senior centers in my district and I talk to the seniors, I do not have to say anything because essentially they have already figured it out. You know how it is. Senior citizens look at everything. They read all the material, and many of them just tell me they have calculated this is a voluntary program, it does not take effect for another 2 years, very much aware of the fact that it is not going to help them for the next 2 years. They just see it as a political ploy to get through the next election.

Then when they actually sit down and figure out how much they have to pay out of pocket versus what they are going to get in terms of benefit, they say, Why would I sign up for it? It is essentially a volunteer program. You do not have to sign up for it.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I would posit that this is a great example of waste, fraud and abuse being perpetrated by this administration in trying to sell a pig in the poke to senior citizens who are not buying it, and it is waste, fraud and abuse in its most classical sense for at least three reasons.

Number one, it is not working. Seniors listen to this and almost laugh at it. I was at a meeting put on by the local chapter of the AARP in Edmonds, Washington last week, and there were about 150 seniors there, 150 seniors who had listened to this ''gobbledy-gook'' put out by the administration, trying to sell this ad to them. Not one single person out of 150 seniors, not the lobbyists who they hire, but the real seniors who supposedly need to depend on real coverage, not one person bought this as a decent plan for them. And I have got to tell you, there was fire and vigor and youthfulness in that room because they were so angry at the government trying to sell them this wasted opportunity. So first thing is the waste, because it is not going to work, because seniors are not going to buy it.

Second, it clearly is propaganda. I think the GAO has looked at this, General Accounting Office, and they cited several omissions, at least in the charitable sense of the term, of these advertisements not telling seniors what the real deal is; which is, number one, left out the fact they conveniently forgot that this legislation prohibited Uncle Sam from trying to try to get better drug prices for seniors, prohibited seniors from getting drugs from Canada, prohibiting reimportation in a safe way. Somehow they conveniently forgot that. It is waste because it is propaganda.

The third is it is simply not true. Let me tell you, it seems like every week we hear about another abuse of governmental power here. But let me tell you about one I heard about just yesterday, and that was that this administration is sending out deliberately phony alleged videos that purport to be news accounts from news reporters which, in fact, were paid models and actors who were faking like they were doing a news conference. Now if that is not an abuse of government authority, I do not know what is. Right now, the General Accounting Office lawyers are investigating this abuse and I think they are going to find a violation. I will tell you why.

This administration hired actors to pose as people. One of the people they hired, actors, who at the ending of this video that the administration is using our taxpayer dollars to send this around to all these local news stations around the country, and at the end they have this actor who says, ''In Washington, I am Karen Ryan reporting.'' Turns out she was just an actor on the take, paid for by this administration with our hard-earned dollars. It is a fraud. It is a fake. It is being investigated, and the administration should be ashamed of itself, not only for the substance of this bill which is insulting enough to seniors, but then they pay

these people to fake seniors, to think there is cheering mobs out there. They pay these people to clap for this thing when we go out and talk to real seniors that I know think it is a bunch of garbage, politely speaking.

So this is a perfect incidence of waste, fraud and abuse that I wish my Republican colleagues would write letters to the White House and tell them to knock it off because it is our taxpayers dollars that are being wasted here, and it is not going to work.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what you said, and I just wanted to go briefly, and then I would like to yield to the gentleman from Maine, back to this story with Richard Foster who was the actuary who was basically told, do not reveal the true cost of this Medicare bill, because I think we have to mention that on the night when this bill was passed, and you will all remember, we were here in the House Chamber.

It was about 3 o'clock when the votes were first posted and the bill was defeated. The majority had voted ''no'' on the bill because they knew that it was basically worthless. And there is no question in my mind that if the Republicans who were wavering that night, and their arms had to be twisted and there were all kinds of things being done by the President and the administration to try to get people to change their votes, that if they had known what Foster knew and was told not to tell us, that the actual cost of this was not $400 billion over 10 years, which was what was in the budget, but $600 billion, essentially 50 percent more, there was no way that bill would have passed.

So this is a fraudulent effort to deny the true cost of the bill to the Congress to get those votes for the bill, and even with all that, it was almost impossible. If they had not twisted arms and basically bribed a couple of people that night, they still would not have gotten the votes. That is why the Richard Foster story is so important. That is why I think he has to be commended for coming forward and telling the truth, even at this late date.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for leading this Special Order. And the case of Richard Foster, though his name may not yet be a household word, is one that needs some review. It is an example of what we have tried to explain to people, that the legislative process in this Chamber, the democratic process in this Chamber, has been corrupted by special interests. And those are strong words, but there are no kind words that fit what the Republican majority is doing in this House.

So let us just for the moment look at the case of Richard Foster. Back in June 2003, when the Medicare bill first came to the floor of this House, it came with a CBO, Congressional Budget Office, assessment that the cost would be $395 billion over 10 years. At that very time, the chief Medicare actuary, Richard Foster, had done a number of scenarios, all of which showed that the cost of the bill would be somewhere between $500 billion and $600 billion. He settled on around $550 billion.

He never told any Member of Congress what that projection showed. And why did he not tell any Member of Congress? Because his boss, Tom Scully, the head of Medicare for this country, told Richard Foster that if he told Members of Congress what his numbers showed, that it would cost $550 billion and not $400 billion, he, Tom Scully, would fire Richard Foster.

□ 2245

So here you have the chief Medicare actuary, under an ethical obligation, at least, to convey to the Congress of the United States information about what the Medicare law was likely to cost, and he could not say it because he would be fired.

Well, now look what has happened. The bill comes back in the fall and we have the long night, the 3-hour vote held open. And the process had been corrupted before that because Democratic Members from the House had been appointed to the conference committee, they were not allowed in the room. They were not allowed to attend the conference to which they had been appointed because the Republican chair of the conference would not let them in.

Now, if you try to explain this to people back home who read their textbooks about how American democracy is supposed to work, they do not believe you. They cannot believe that one party here, that the majority party would simply shut down the legislative process, would withhold information, would manipulate information.

And it continues today, because now that bill has become a law by the narrowest of margins, a bill which would not have passed if the truth had been told about its projected cost.

Now what happens? Well, Health and Human Services goes out and runs TV ads. Many people have seen them. They say same Medicare, better benefits. And it is not true. We are witnessing a concerted effort by the administration, in close collaboration with the insurance industry and the pharmaceutical industry, to move 35 percent of Medicare beneficiaries out of the fee-for-service plan they have today into private insurance.

And why is private insurance such a problem? Well, it costs more. It costs a lot more. And Members on the other side of the aisle have come down into the well here and they have said Medicare is in financial difficulty, that we need to do something; and what we need are private insurance companies to take it over.

Well, nobody in Maine has ever said to me, you know, I am willing to give up my choice of doctors and hospitals, which I have under traditional Medicare, and what I really want is a choice of insurance plans. Send me those brochures. Send me those insurance agents. That is the way to take care of our health care for seniors. Nobody has ever said that.

The latest projections are that the insurance companies will need to be paid 20 percent more than it costs today to deliver health care to the average Medicare beneficiary. A 20 percent bonus. A 20 percent overpayment to the second biggest lobby here in Washington.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. ALLEN. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I think it is intriguing what the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is saying about the whole Medicare structure and how my friends on the other side of the aisle and President Bush, in large part at the behest of the insurance industry, which sees huge profits in this Medicare bill, say that they want to privatize it.

One of the most important facts about Medicare public versus a private insurance HMO Medicare is administrative costs. Traditional Medicare, the Medicare that we know, that 85 percent of America's seniors are enrolled in, has about 2 percent administrative costs, while private insurance has administrative costs averaging between 15 and 20 percent.

So no wonder if we have privatized Medicare, it will cost taxpayers more, yet Medicare beneficiary seniors will actually get less.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to finish right now with a couple of comparisons.

The $80 million that Health and Human Services is going to spend to advertise this law, which does not take effect until January 2006, and Secretary Thompson made it clear why he was doing it, he said because there is too much criticism of the law. People do not understand that it is really the same Medicare. Of course, the author of the law in the House was quoted on television as saying, ''To those who say this bill will destroy Medicare as we know it, my answer is, I certainly hope so.'' He has made it clear his goal is to destroy Medicare as we know it.

But I wanted just to finish up with this: $80 million in advertising to the American people. $80 million. Guess how much the President proposes to cut out of rural health care? One-half that amount, $39 million. We cannot afford $39 million to improve rural health care, but we can spend $80 million just to advertise a flawed Medicare bill to the American public.

The $80 million is more than the $58 million which the incoming FDA commissioner, Lester Crawford, says would be needed to establish a drug reimportation plan. So in other words, we are going to spend, according to the Bush administration, $80 million to run

TV ads to help his reelection campaign out of the Federal Government, to promote a bill that is flawed, $80 million to do that, when we could spend $58 million and establish a reimportation plan that would allow seniors to buy their drugs from Canada without interference, and that would reduce their present drug prices dramatically.

Those are the priorities of this administration and the Republican Congress. And I do not know of anyone in my State of Maine who says those are the right priorities for the country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments; and before I yield to the gentleman from Washington, I just wanted to say when I was listening to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and his statement about Republican abuse of power, that is essentially what this is. This is an abuse of power by the President and by the Republicans in the Congress.

And when I listened to my colleague from Maine and he talked about how the Medicare administrator, Tom Scully, had basically threatened Richard Foster that if he told the truth about the numbers that he would be fired, what the gentleman did not mention and I will add, is, of course, what happened to Tom Scully. Tom Scully during all this, while this Medicare legislation was moving in committee and moving in the House, was negotiating to get a job, which he ultimately got, with the law firm that represents the pharmaceutical industry. He actually got a waiver from the President that allowed him to negotiate for the job.

Normally, the agency rules that he worked for say that you cannot go out and seek a job and try to find yourself a job while you are still in the agency working on this legislation. So the abuse is just unbelievable, and the fact that he got the waiver and everything.

Mr. ALLEN. If the gentleman would yield just for a moment, Mr. Speaker.

There is one other finish to this story. We are not sitting here on the Democratic sides of the aisle making all this up. Yesterday, Secretary Thompson initiated an investigation into these facts: that Richard Foster was threatened with being fired if he disclosed the true cost of the Medicare bill. So now Health and Human Services itself is investigating what clearly, at least to my mind, was an ethical and perhaps a legal breach by this administration, but one that clearly was absolutely essential, absolutely essential to getting the Medicare bill to become the Medicare law.

Here again, we see a kind of distortion and misrepresentation of information that really has no place in the House of Representatives.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. I believe it is very important we bring this issue to the American people. Because in this election, the issue on which the people have to decide is if there is anything that comes out of the White House that they believe. Is there anything that comes out of the administration, anything, they can believe.

On weapons of mass destruction and connections to al Qaeda and all the reasons why we went to war in Iraq, it is clear they made it all up. Now we come to the domestic side of things; and I sit on the Committee on Ways and Means, and Secretary Thompson comes before us and admits that when they did a study on the inequities of health in this country, that they rewrote it because they did not like the way it came out. The Secretary said, well, we are going to change that. The next thing we know, the same person is calling for an investigation of his own Department on the issue of the actuary hiding the figures from the Congress.

This is the gang that cannot shoot straight. They cannot tell the truth about anything. Because if they told the truth about anything, they would have to change the way they act. They could not give all this money away in tax breaks. They would have to pay for the programs that they tell the people they are giving them.

Now, I had a very interesting experience over the weekend, and I suspect some Members will have the same experience this weekend. I went back to Seattle and had a community meeting in a retirement home with about 100 or 125 people there, and I showed them a video which has been made by the Families USA about the whole issue of the drug issue. Mr. Walter Cronkite is the narrator. Now, everybody knows Walter Cronkite. He is so believable and has so much integrity, he could tell you the sun was going to come up in the West and you would almost think it was going to because he is so believable.

Well, these 125 people, and this is an old people's home, where probably most everybody is 70 or older. So we are talking about people who are real senior citizens. They sat there and they listened to this, and they could not believe the things that are in this thing that have never come out.

So, then, we talked about these advertising statements they had been seeing on television. They said those television ads are not right, they are not telling us the truth, if Walter Cronkite says that, that we are not going to get any help until 2006, and that this drug card they are coming out with is a hoax of the first order.

These are people who some were school teachers or business people or whatever who are retired. They are now in their 70s or 80s. One of them said, you know, that drug card, I think we ought to boycott that drug card. I do not think we should even bother taking it. Why would I go and choose a card and they give me a list, and they say, now, these are the drugs that this card covers, and I pay $30 for it; and then after I got the card in my pocket, I am locked in for a year and they can take the drugs off the list.

The seniors were incredulous that this administration was trying to run some kind of game on them. I said to them, the reason you are going to get this card on the first of April is so you will have it in your hands when you go to vote in November. They want you to believe you have got something from them. But do not believe there is anything in that card. There is nothing guaranteed except that you have been sold a piece of paper for $30.

And these people said, what can we do to fix this, or what can we do to stop this? Do you think there will be some change in this Congress? I said, look, we are having an election year. Nothing in here is going to be good public policy. It is all going to be about convincing the American people that the Republicans have done everything good for them. And this drug card and this pharmaceutical bill is simply the worst of the examples, but there are all kinds of others.

The video by Mr. Cronkite shows the donut hole. You could hear the audience gasp when they realized that they were going to go for a long period of time, have to pay a premium and have no benefits. They could not believe that. And the donut hole does not stay the same. It grows. Every year it gets larger.

Finally, the crowning blow of it is what they discovered. They said, you mean when we pay this once, up to $5,100, or whatever, that we have to do it again the next year? You mean this happens every year to us? We fall into the donut hole every year? I said, yes. I said if that is what you want for public policy as senior citizens, then you ought to vote Mr. Bush back in, but I think it is a terrible hoax.

And if Members of Congress have the smarts to go out and show this video, they will have turned the whole thing around. Because these seniors watch TV, and they are being a little bit affected by those phony ads.

As I was coming over here, I was listening to my car radio. The Department admitted that they had put those out as fake news reports. They taped them in such a way that they knew if they were picked up just as they were taped, they would look like a news report.

□ 2300

They planned to fake the old folks out.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it is incredible to me. The whole idea was to take this video with the actors and hope a station would use it and think it was the real thing.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. They did it, and Fox News and all of the rest of these phony news stations picked it up and put it out there as though it was real. There is nothing real about this administration. They have misrepresented from the Iraq war all of the way through, the economy, the deficit, all

these things are all predicated on misrepresentations. I try not to use the word ''lie,'' but they have certainly misrepresented and tried to delude the people. You can fool some of the people all of the time, and some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the old people all of the time, and they are going to pay in this election for having tried to run this game on old people.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman taking the time to be out here at 11 at night putting this program on together, because it requires real dedication to come out here night after night and do this, and I thank the gentleman for what he has done.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman pointed out to me, it is only 8 p.m. in Seattle.

The other thing that I wanted to point out, we have talked about the misrepresentation and the schemes, if you will, that were being played the night when this was voted. And, of course, the numbers being wrong was certainly one of them. But one of the things was that after the vote occurred at 3 a.m. and the board was left open, and there was a majority against the bill, and we went on for 3 hours when the President and Republican majority tried to change Republican votes, one of the people whose vote they tried to change was the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH). And we heard very credible accounts from the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) and others about the chicanery that was going on, statements being made to him about since he was retiring, his son would never get to succeed him in Congress if he did not switch his vote because the money would not be there by the Republican Party to finance his campaign.

I just wanted to mention today it was announced that the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is going to investigate these allegations that were made in that regard. Until today, they had refused to take up the issue. However, they did announce today that they were going to take up the issue. I do not know what the outcome is going to be.

If we think about the way that they got Members to change votes that night and the misinformation provided about how much it was going to cost and now all of these ads being paid for by the taxpayers to convince people this is a good bill, it is just a barrage of misinformation.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today was the second shoe. The first shoe was Mr. Foster saying, I had the figures and they told me they would fire me if I gave the figures. Then we find out with the phony figures out here, they still could not get enough votes until they twisted some guy's arm into a pretzel. I think it is very important that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is looking at this issue.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, it needs to be said, too, that our colleague who made the assertion that he had been offered essentially a $100,000 bribe or something akin to that to his son's election campaign was a Republican. This was a Republican Member, a colleague, who made this assertion, and that is why it is important to find out what happened in the situation.

But I will tell Members why I am here at 11 at night and that is there is such a growing pattern of a corruption of democracy here in the Chamber that I have great respect for, the House of Representatives, the people's House. I am a relatively new Member to this Chamber, and it is troublesome to me and I can tell Members it is getting very troublesome to my constituents when they hear this repeated consistent drum beat of a corruption of the democratic process.

It is not just one thing. It is the fact they do not let Members read the bill before they vote on it, which my people believe is a corruption of the democratic process, which happened in the Medicare bill. It is the fact that when they lose, they leave the time open for 3 hours to try to break arms, like the Russians did in the Olympic Games in the 1960s when we won the game and the Russian official just put another several seconds up on the clock. My people believe that is a corruption of the democratic process. And then during that 3 hours, according to a Republican colleague, he was offered a $100,000 bribe essentially to change his vote, which he had the moral integrity not to do, by the way, and remained a ''no'' vote solidly because he believed, I suspect, this is a bad bill, as we do. This is a pattern, and it is not just isolated to the Medicare bill.

Let me tell Members about another couple of problems that trouble me. I serve on the Committee on Resources, and we had the Department of Agriculture people. They supervise our national forests. We found out due to some diligence of an investigative reporter, that of our hard-earned taxpayer money, this administration has spent almost $100,000 hiring a public relations firm to try to spin the public into accepting a forest plan that would allow more old-growth trees to be cut, which is against public sentiment in the Sierra Nevada and the Rocky Mountains, and this PR firm advised the Department of Agriculture to keep it secret. It did not want the public to find out that they had spent $100,000 to spin the public. Their memo is a classic. He said we cannot tell the public because this is, quote, ''a matter of perception.'' We should not be spending $100,000 to create misperceptions or worry about perceptions. We ought to give the public the straight scope.

That is not the only one. The Department of the Interior, I picked up The Washington Post and I see we have an investigation going on at the Department of the Interior of a gentleman who works for the Department of the Interior, who, on repeated occasions, essentially was associated with beneficial decisions for his former clients in the oil and gas industry to open up methane wells in Wyoming and in the Rocky Mountains when he was specifically ordered not to do it.

Time after time, we are finding incidents where common sense and good practices of democracies are being violated.

Let me go back to a fundamental tenet. We have disagreements in this Chamber, and our constituents have disagreements. They disagree on a lot of things and it is not unexpected that we would have disagreements about matters of great import. But Americans ought to be able to expect at least one thing from the administration and from the President: That is the truth. Even if they may disagree with it, they are entitled to the truth in exchange for paying their taxes, and they have not got it, repeatedly. I want to go down a list of some of those things.

The President's administration told the American public and the U.S. Congress that the Medicare bill would cost about $460 billion. That was false; and more importantly, it was false and known to be false by this administration. To add insult to injury, not only was it known to be false, they ordered their own actuary to refuse to disclose this information to Congress. It is one thing to commit the sin of untruth and falsehood, it is a second sin to cover it up, which they have tried to do. That is falsehood number one.

Number two, they used taxpayer money to phony up these videos, acting like it is a news report, saying it is a news reporter reporting live, Sally Smith or whatever her name was, hiring actors to act like they liked the Medicare bill; and seniors all over the country are rejecting this Medicare bill. They want to hire actors. It is a falsehood to do that, and they did this consciously. They cannot do that by negligence or mistake. They made a decision. Somebody who works for the President of the United States said, I am going to hire an actor to fake out the seniors of this country, consciously, intentionally, and it is wrong.

Mr. PALLONE. And at taxpayers' expense.

Mr. INSLEE. And third, they told us their tax cuts were going to result in large surplus. We were going to have surpluses as far as the eye could see. They cut taxes wildly for the upper class. We now have the largest deficit in American history. That is falsehood number three, and they keep making the same mistake.

□ 2310

Fourth, and to me a series that I want to go through, because it is one thing to give falsehoods to Americans when it is about money, it is another thing to give falsehoods to Americans from the executive branch of this country sworn to defend the Constitution and the United States of America when it jeopardizes and takes the lives of Americans.

I just want to read some quotes that I think we need an accounting of and some responsibility from this administration. On March 17, 2003, the President of the United States told the American people, and I quote, ''Intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised.'' That is a direct quote. It was false. Of all the information that we have gathered after hundreds of millions of dollars, the best evidence we have is that statement by the President of the United States, ''it leaves no doubt.'' America deserves an answer why the President of the United States told Americans that there was no doubt when the facts were at least there was significant doubt as reported by multiple intelligence agencies and the facts have come to bear that multiple statements by this administration were false and as a result of that Americans paid the ultimate sacrifice, one of whose family I visited this weekend whose children will never see their father again who died in the Tigris River trying to save an Iraqi policeman while serving in the United States Army. That family and the other 500 families and the other over 3,000 families of our wounded GIs and Marines and other proud service men and women deserve the truth, and they deserve to know why they did not get it.

On August 2, 2002, the Vice President of the United States, while talking to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, a group that deserves the truth after their proud service to this country, said, ''Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction.'' That statement was false. According to the best information we have after hundreds of millions of dollars spent searching for these weapons, that statement was false. Americans who served in Iraq deserve to know why that happened. We do not know why that happened. It may have been a failure of intelligence. Our intelligence agencies may have overstated the threat. They may have left out caveats in their report to the White House. Somebody in the political machinery may have stretched, exaggerated, spun; we do not know what happened and why those statements that were made were so grievously in error that cost American lives, but we deserve an answer and this Chamber deserves an answer.

On January 28, 2003, during his State of the Union address in this Chamber to us, the President stated, ''The British Government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa. Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production.'' That statement was false. Americans deserve to know the exact circumstances that led to that falsehood being given to them leading to this war.

On March 16, 2003, Vice President DICK CHENEY on an interview with NBC's ''Meet the Press'' said, referring to weapons of mass destruction, ''He had years to get good at it. We know that he has been absolutely devoted to trying to acquire nuclear weapons and we believe he has, in fact, reconstituted nuclear weapons.'' To our knowledge that statement was false.

On January 9, 2003, White House spokesman Ari Fleischer stated, ''We know for a fact that there are weapons there,'' referring to weapons of mass destruction. That statement was false.

On April 10, 2003, White House spokesman Ari Fleischer stated, ''But make no mistake, as I said earlier, we have high confidence that they have weapons of mass destruction. That is what this war was about and it is about, and we have high confidence it will be found.'' That statement may be correct in the sense that he may have had high confidence. He may have had high confidence. But the underlying statement was false. With all due respect, we are hopeful about the people of Iraq; but this war was based on false information, and Americans deserve to know why they did not get the straight scoop about this situation.

On September 19, 2002, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld stated, ''No terrorist state poses a greater or more immediate threat to the security of our people and the stability of the world than the regime of Saddam Hussein in Iraq.''

People have been saying that, well, gee, the administration is now telling us that we did not mean to actually make Americans worried by saying this was an immediate threat. But, in fact, the Secretary of Defense gave reference to an immediate threat with his own language, and on multiple occasions they have continued to make that statement. When White House communications director Dan Bartlett was asked if Saddam Hussein on January 26, 2003, was ''an imminent threat to the United States,'' he stated, ''Well, of course he is.'' This is repeated references, and we have page after page after page of statements that were false. Again, I want to repeat. The people who made these statements may have believed that they were true at the time they were making them. We do not know that. I do not know that. I like to give people the benefit of the doubt. But when this country has suffered the loss of over 500 of its sons and daughters and wives and husbands and fathers and mothers, this Chamber owes it to the United States of America to get to the absolute bottom of who is responsible for these multiple falsehoods on multiple occasions with absolutely no contrition, accountability, or responsibility.

No one has lost their job over this false information except one disc jockey. Maybe it was not a disc jockey. He was a person who was involved in political discourse. Where is the accountability? Where is the personal responsibility for these falsehoods? Where is the smallest discipline of anyone for giving Americans false information leading to the deaths of over 500 Americans? Where are the changes of procedures? Where is the joint committee in this Chamber? Where is the report of the Congress? Where is the action from the Republican Party to help us find out what happened here? It is missing in action. It is AWOL. With all due respect to our intelligence committees, and they have been doing some discussion of what is happening here, but it is sadly lacking, the type of responsibility that we need to see taken, an explanation of what happened to this information.

Let me make one suggestion when we do get to the bottom of this what we are going to find. Let me tell you about a couple of things I have found through my research. There was a statement by the administration, frankly I cannot recall if it was the President or the Defense Secretary that told Americans that Iraq had developed a drone aircraft that was capable and intended to be able to spread biological and chemical weapons, that could fly over America and spread these horrendous materials over the United States of America. Obviously, that is something we should be concerned about and we should do everything we can to prevent. The problem is that the Air Force, the experts in airplanes, had told the administration before they told Americans this information, before they told Americans the information, that these things were made out of balsa wood and almost duct tape and what they were good for is maybe taking pictures. They were not meant for this other nefarious purpose. They had that information and did not share it with us because frankly there was a lot of doubt about this. There was doubt about this. We cannot expect our intelligence service to be 100 percent, but they did not tell us that.

These aluminum tubes. The President of the United States in his State of the Union address made reference to these aluminum tubes. He said specifically, ''Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production.''

□ 2320

In fact, before the President made that statement, one of our agencies, and it was either the CIA or the Department of Energy, I cannot remember which, had concluded that that was not what these aluminum tubes were for. They were meant for other purposes.

If this was one misstatement, we would chalk it up to the fog of war and the need to be responsible as we need to be in the war on terrorism. But when it is a pattern, when it is a pattern of falsehood that continues to be consistent in their approach to the Medicare bill and the effort to clear-cut old-growth timber in the Sierra Nevada and a whole host of issues, it is

responsible for Members of the House to come and blow the whistle on this multiple corruption of the democratic process. And that is what we are here to do.

Let me suggest there is a simple answer to some of these things, these issues that we are calling for. If the President would really initiate a thorough investigation of this, we could find out why this information was false and why we found out. But do my colleagues know what he did or his people did? When this mistake was found out about this yellow cake in his State of the Union address, we found out that his statement that they were trying to get yellow cake from Africa was false, when the administration found out that was a falsehood, it was pointed out by a gentleman named Joe Wilson, who was a former ambassador who was sent by the CIA to Africa to find out whether this assertion was true, and he concluded it was not and told the administration it was not; and then the President went ahead, and somebody gave it to him. I cannot believe he did it himself and put it in the State of the Union address.

I am not faulting him for that specific failure. Somebody had to give that misinformation. But when his administration found out there had been a big mistake in the State of the Union address, one might think he might want to thank the person who helped him correct publicly this mistake because obviously none of us want to make any mistakes. We like to make sure what we are saying is credible. Does the gentleman know what the administration did? Instead, they tried to destroy the career of a CIA agent, who was Joe Wilson's wife, by outing her to destroy a citizen's career in public service who blew the whistle on this corruption of the democratic process. And that is wrong.

And we are many months passed this issue, and the President of the United States, the most powerful person in the Western World, cannot find out who in his administration did that. I am not satisfied with that. I am not satisfied unless the President picks up his phone and says I want an answer by eight o'clock tomorrow morning who did this because they are fired. And he has not done that. This is a pattern that needs to be corrected.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out, and I know what the gentleman is talking about, that the war and the loss of lives is certainly more important, but we have the same thing here with Richard Foster that we talked about earlier where he was basically told that if he revealed the correct information about the cost of the Medicare bill, he would be fired. And the irony of it is now there is a statement which he made recently where he says that ''I'm perhaps no longer in grave danger of being fired but there remains a strong likelihood that I will have to resign in protest of the withholding of important technical information from key policymakers for political reasons.'' So this poor guy who now basically came clean and explained what happened, I do not know what his career is going to be like as well, and it is just really tragic that this administration puts honest people that want to be honest with the public in danger of being fired or ultimately losing their jobs because they are just trying to be honest and tell us the truth. And we are just seeing a pattern of this continue with this administration in so many cases.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) used the word before when he talked about abuse of power. That is essentially what we have here. It is false information and the willingness of this administration to essentially say whatever is necessary, the means justifies the ends, in order for them to justify their ideology.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I suppose there are gray zones about conduct, but when the U.S. Congress is debating something as important as the Medicare prescription drug benefit and we are trying to figure out how to finance it so this deficit does not continue and the President knows that there are many people concerned about the cost of this and a good American patriot, in the fulfillment of his democratic responsibilities, figures out it is going to cost another $160 billion than the President tells us it is going to cost, and he tells the administration that and the White House and HHS and everybody else and they tell him that may jeopardize our ability to win our political battle and our political battle is more important than the truth. Because that is what this boils down to. They reached a conclusion here, and their conclusion is they are so smart and they are so gifted and they are so special that they are more important than the truth. Therefore, they ordered and they threatened to fire an American who wanted to and would have shared the truth with Americans and this Congress, Republicans and Democrats, because they concluded they were more important than the truth.

And I just may add, I want to tip a hat to some of my Republican colleagues here because we have Republican colleagues that are madder than hops about this too because they were concerned about the cost of this bill because we have a $500 billion deficit and we have a number of our Republican colleagues who want to fix that problem. So they are mad about this too. They are not quite as vocal as we are in this context with their party member in the White House. But Republicans and Democrats ought to agree on one thing, and that is let us get the facts and the truth; then let us have our debate and let the chips fall where they may, and we are just happy to have that debate. But it is time for them to stop perverting the truth.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I agree. And it is important for us to continue to point this out because again we had a situation where this bill, which was a bad bill with prescription drugs, would not have passed if the truth had come out. That is abundantly clear. In fact, I cannot ever remember any legislation, and I have been here 16 years, where we have a vote on a piece of legislation and there is an absolute majority against it and we wait for 3 hours to try to change the vote. It is different maybe if the board is opened and there are some people who have not decided, but there was a majority against this bill, and now we understand all the things that were going on to try to basically make people change their minds about this.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

We are here to review today's proceedings relative to the resolution. As the gentleman is well aware, there is a group of us, and we describe ourselves as the Iraq Watch and we will be joined shortly by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), and of course the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. INSLEE) is an integral part of our conversation. And I am sure that tomorrow morning there will be some coverage of what occurred on the floor today because we did consider a resolution that was put forth by the Republican majority without any input of course from Democrats, as we talk about the process that has become the norm here in the House. Unfortunately, it has become exclusionary. And I think we can concur that that is indeed unfortunate if we want to have an open and respectful debate. So during the course of time, during the course of the debate, sometimes passions become very fierce. But I think it is important to review this resolution today for a variety of different reasons.

The resolution was about supporting troops and respecting their professionalism and their courage. We all agree on that. It also commended the Iraqi people for these early steps towards democracy.

□ 2330

IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) is recognized for the remainder of the time before midnight, approximately 30 minutes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome my colleagues, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE). We have been here doing this so-called Special Order for the past 8 months, discussing and reviewing developments in the Middle East and, specifically, what has occurred over the course of the past week involving Iraq, Afghanistan, and the war on terror.

As I had indicated earlier, there was a resolution that was considered today by the House. There was a spirited debate, and I was reviewing specific provisions for the benefit of the people that, at least here on the East Coast, are up late and surfing the channels and want to listen to the conversation that we have among ourselves. I had indicated that as part of the resolution, there is a reference, and the only reference, I find this interesting, to the issue of weapons of mass destruction because, as we know, this was the premise that was put forth by the President, the Vice President, and other administration officials for the rationale for going to war. Of course, we have discovered subsequently that the intelligence was faulty, that the premise for the war, meaning stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons simply did not exist, and the implication that was put forth by the President and specifically the Vice President, because he has reiterated it even recently, that there were links between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda, turned out to be without any substance at all.

But the one allusion to the use of weapons of mass destruction is contained in this resolution, and I will read it. It says, ''Whereas, on March 16, 1988, Saddam Hussein's regime had unleashed weapons of mass destruction against Kurdish citizens, killing nearly 5,000 of them.''

Well, this is about a city in Iraq. That city is called Halabja. And it is true that Saddam Hussein slaughtered some 5,000 Iraqi Kurds, men, women, and children. The provision in the resolution that we did debate today appears to suggest that this crime against humanity, and it is a crime against humanity, provides some justification for the invasion of Iraq 15 years later. The tragic truth is, and to our own shame, is that we did nothing, nothing in 1988, in 1989, in 1990 about this crime, this despicable act, this act of terrorism. We did not do anything because under that Bush administration, Saddam was our ally, and many of those currently serving in this Bush administration were key figures during that moment in our history.

Our Secretary of Defense, Mr. Rumsfeld, was a special envoy to Saddam Hussein. Even before his first visit to Baghdad in 1983, Iraq was removed from the terrorist list, and after his full diplomatic relations were restored and billions of dollars of loan guarantees were provided to Saddam Hussein, the sale of dual-use technology for the development of weapons of mass destruction was approved by the Reagan-Bush administration.

I would suggest that no wonder, in the aftermath of the first Gulf War, we learned that Iraq had an advanced nuclear weapons program because, in reality, we helped to build it. And we let other countries supply Saddam Hussein with American military equipment, and we even shared highly sensitive satellite intelligence with Saddam Hussein. Even though we knew that Saddam Hussein was using chemical weapons against Iran, that Bush administration prevented the United Nations from condemning Iraq.

The Vice President, this gentleman here, Mr. CHENEY, was Secretary of Defense for the first President Bush. The Secretary of State, Colin Powell, served as both National Security Adviser and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Well, according to a Congressional Research Service report, not only did we support Saddam Hussein during Mr. CHENEY's and Mr. Powell's and Mr. Wolfowitz' time in service to that Republican administration, but when the House and the Senate in 1989 and 1990 attempted to impose sanctions for the use of chemical weapons, that Bush administration blocked it. They used their influence in Congress to ensure that there were no sanctions imposed on Saddam Hussein.

I fear that we are making the same mistakes now that they made back then, the first President Bush and RICHARD CHENEY and Colin Powell and Paul Wolfowitz. Because like then, we are also today forging unholy alliances in our war on terror.

For example, in Uzbekistan, we are supporting another dictator who, according to our own State Department reports, heads an oppressive regime that perpetrates gross violations of human rights and has more than 5,000 political prisoners in custody today. The most recent, notorious, was when this individual and this regime, through torture, boiled in water a political prisoner. I am sure that conjures up memories of Saddam Hussein.

And in Turkmenistan, we are allied with another Stalinist thug by the name of Sherman Bashi who is creating a personality cult that rivals that of Saddam Hussein. He has renamed the month of January after himself and the month of June after his mother.

□ 2340

And this is who we are allying ourselves with in the war on terror, just like we allied ourselves with Saddam Hussein back in the late 1980s. And, of course, we know the results.

So I would suggest to my friends and to those that are watching at this late hour that we remember those lessons of history. And I specifically would recommend that the Vice President, who constantly refers to the fact that Saddam Hussein used chemical weapons against his own people, remember that he was part of an administration that was aware of that and did nothing back then, much to the chagrin of the rest of the world and the United States House of Representatives and Senate that served in this building and this institution back then.

And what happened? Did we encourage Saddam Hussein? I guess that is a question we will never know. But we should remember the lessons of Halabja, that city in Iraq, where chemical weapons were used against Iraqi citizens by Saddam Hussein. Because I believe if we speak of democracy and liberty, let us practice it.

And every time the President and the Vice President stand up and proclaim that we are fighting this war on terror to promote democracy, what about Uzbekistan? And what about Turkmenistan? What are we doing there, allying ourselves with despots and tyrants and thugs that at some future point could very well be the new Saddam Hussein?

Let us not ally ourselves with illegitimate heads of state if we are sincere about the war on terror, who are truly terrorists who terrorize their own people. That would be my position.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) would yield, one can only have that kind of a dialogue if we can entertain a legitimate political discussion on the issue. When those who are trying to bring these facts forward, those who have this perspective are enunciating it, are in turn denounced for failing to support our troops, denounced for failing to want to carry forward the war on terrorism, as it is always referred to, are denounced for presumably being unwilling to face up to the cold hard realities of what constitutes terrorism and its origins, then it is very difficult to do as the gentleman suggests.

I had the experience of having the Governor of my State of Hawaii taken to Iraq for purposes that are beyond my ability to understand, other than when she came back she announced that President Bush's Iraq policy should not be the subject of political discussion, that we should not politicize the war.

Now, that suggestion is as problematic, I suggest to the gentlemen in turn, as it is unrealistic. Foreign policy and defense policy are always legitimate topics for political debate. That is how we do things in a democracy. Unfortunately, today we had a resolution ostensibly addressing these issues 1 year after the invasion of, or the attack on, Baghdad, as I term it, after which a war started. The voting public has every right to a full and open airing of different points of view.

We did not get to do that today. We were unable to attempt to amend the resolution dealing with these issues. It is most particularly pertinent, I think, when we are dealing with the lives of our servicemembers and the Treasury of our Nation. The resolution that ostensibly addressed these issues today very firmly supported by the Vice President, as you mentioned who, by the way, in my judgment is the most sinister Vice President we have ever had since Aaron Burr, this resolution tells us that the Iraq policies are out of bounds for discussion. We were not permitted to make amendments or to attempt to pass amendments with regard to this resolution.

The document simply amplified the administration's viewpoint, an election-year endorsement of this policy. It will no doubt be denied and is being denied even now, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this has anything to do with politics. In fact, it is blatantly political; it is transparently political. It is in-your-face political.

Our troops deserve better than this cursory salute swaddled in suffocating layers of political celebration. Our troops have earned our gratitude for their patriotism, their courage, and their spirit of sacrifice, something particularly missing from this debate today.

More to the point, they deserve a solid commitment for their well-being and the well-being of their families. This is something that the majority today refused to do and has refused to do.

Last week in the budget committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and others proposed some simple measures along these lines. I want to recite them to you: Tri-care medical service for reservists, a boost in the imminent-danger pay, improved military housing, higher pay for senior enlisted personnel, increased family separation allowance, more funding for family support centers. All of this to be offset by a modest roll-back of the tax bonanza that we granted to people making $1 million a year and more.

What was the response of Mr. CHENEY and his party? Forget about the troops. Our allegiance is to people making $1 million a year or more.

I do not have any statistics, Mr. Speaker; but I suspect there are not too many millionaires serving in Iraq or going soon.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, if I could, clearly there is language in the resolution that we considered here today that praises the troops. But the reality is that the rhetoric does not match the action.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield on that point? My contention is that it is one thing to argue about politicizing the war. This resolution today politicized support for the troops. The characterizations that were implicit and explicit in the discussion today made it clear that not voting for this resolution somehow called your patriotism into question, somehow called your support for the troops into question, somehow called into question your capacity, ability, in fact, even your desire to conduct a war against terrorism.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to welcome our friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), as part of our conversation tonight.

It is easy to indulge in rhetoric. It is easy to involve in a resolution with laudatory words about the courage and the heroism and the professionalism of the American military. It is just a little bit more difficult to ensure that all of our veterans, from whatever struggle, from whatever war, from wherever in terms of our history, are delivered, for example, the health care that we promised.

And this administration has failed them. This administration, this Vice President and the President of the United States, is failing them. The talk is fine, and the actions are not matching the rhetoric.

□ 2350

As the commander-in-chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars recently stated within the past 2 weeks, the budget submitted by the President of the United States and the Vice President of the United States is a sham and a disgrace. So, if this resolution is about the veterans, then I dare say that should be there, support from the Vice-President and the President to ensure that the funding source for veterans' health care benefits in this country is mandatory and not discretionary. Stand up and do the right thing by our veterans and just do not simply indulge in rhetoric

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just want to let you know that this whole resolution is stomach turning for many Members, especially myself and I know the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) as ranking member on strategic forces in the Committee on Armed Services, and I am proud to serve with him in that committee, but to have a resolution that does not even recognize the men and women that have lost their lives in Iraq is just stomach turning. It is beyond comprehension on how this administration, the Republican side of this Congress, could pass a resolution and not mention those individuals that came back in a box.

I mean, I am very concerned about that, and I think what we need to focus on now is making sure that we come straight with the American people. We have to make sure that we talk about accountability. We have to make sure that we talk about troops that are coming back. I am not even addressing right now, and in this resolution does not address, those individuals that are in Walter Reed right now, right now in Walter Reed Hospital, and I think it is important, and I am glad that Iraq Watch continues to be here night after night sharing with the American people the importance of making sure that we stand on behalf of our troops, that we also make sure that we make sound decisions and we continue to change the chart.

I am concerned about some of the comments that Vice President CHENEY has made. I am concerned about some of the comments the President is making. I think that the comments of "bring it on" and "complete mission" and "I guarantee you that they will not shake the resolve of America," it is good to have a talk of confidence, but to be able to egg on these individuals, and to pass a resolution when a hotel has been leveled in Iraq, many Iraqis lost their lives, many national media individuals lost their lives, and not even recognize that and say that it is safer now, I think is a huge understatement.

So I think that we need to continue to share with the American people, if Democrats were brought in a part of this resolution, H. Res. 557, today, we could come together as a Congress, and it would be a much better resolution.

I know I voted for the first resolution commending the troops, but I think this resolution divided this House instead of bringing us together to fight against the war on terror

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I think you make an excellent point, and I see our colleague and friend the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) standing up, and I am going to recognize him in a minute.

I heard the word today on the floor "appeasement." I think it is important for those that are watching to understand, and I think I speak for every Democrat, appeasement is not part of our vocabulary when it comes to the war on terrorism, absolutely. I think there was only a single exception out of the entire body, but it was with one exception, one vote, a unanimous authorization by this body and by the U.S. Senate to authorize the attack against the Taliban and the al Qaeda in Afghanistan, and we will never surrender to terrorism. We will never indulge in appeasement of terrorism, but Mr. President and Mr. CHENEY, we insist on the truth. Never appeasement, but always the truth.

What I find fascinating is in recent testimony in the United States Senate, the CIA chief, Mr. Tenet, told a Senate committee that he had privately intervened on several occasions to correct what he regarded as public misstatements on intelligence by Vice-President CHENEY and others and that he would do so again. I would just make a simple request of this administration and the Vice President. Just tell it like it is. As David Kay, the weapons inspector, said recently in an interview in The Guardian, a British publication, "Come clean." Just level with the people.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington for any comment that he would wish to make.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, all of us have tremendous personal respect for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. Anyone who has had experience like I did, spending an afternoon with a family as I did from Bremerton, Washington, this weekend, but I want to mention a question that I have.

Tonight there is someone at large who wants to kill us. This person has killed us. This person has the capability of killing us. This person has an

organization dedicated to kill us. We have known this situation since September 11. Why is it that with the passage of years, that is, until last week, that the administration finally says they actually are going to have a 24/7 effort to catch Osama bin Laden? They launched a war and took their eye off the ball to catch this guy who is at-large, and now, last week, finally says now we are going to have an all-out effort to catch Osama bin Laden? Where have they been?

They have been in Iraq, and I have a question I want this administration to answer. I was asked by the victims families of September 11 two weeks ago. Why, after September 11, when we knew that somewhere between 12 and 15 of the hijackers who killed our people were from Saudi Arabia, did this administration allow an airplane to fly all across America, when everybody else was grounded, when you could not fly home from anywhere, why did this administration specifically allow an airplane, paid for by Saudi Arabia, to fly around this country picking up potential witnesses who could have helped us catch Osama bin Laden, including members of the bin Laden family? Why did this administration allow that?

Mr. DELAHUNT. If you know, how many Saudis were implicated in the attack on America on September 11?

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I think it was something like 15 out of the 19, and yet this administration, I want to know why they flew out these people two days after September 11 without the full, complete, comprehensive interrogation of these individuals, including blood relatives of the guy who we know did this, and several days later they are playing footsy with the ambassador down at the White House of Saudi Arabia, an organization that has been very close to the oil and gas industry? I want to know why they did that. Maybe there is a good answer. I cannot imagine what it is, but this is one of the questions that the people who are serving in Iraq and the victims of September 11 want answered.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, by the way, how many Iraqis were on that plane?

Mr. INSLEE. Zero Iraqis on that plane.

Mr. DELAHUNT. One of you noted recently that the individual who was responsible, the Pakistani who is responsible for the proliferation of nuclear weapon technology to North Korea and Iran has been identified, and what have we heard from this administration, this President and this Vice-President about that? Nothing.

Mr. INSLEE. The fact is we should have been cracking down on Saudi Arabia a long time ago. We should have been cracking down on the Pakistani fellow that we found was purveying nuclear technology all over the world and, instead we have been involved in an action in Iraq. Now, I am very happy that eventually maybe something good will come out of the action in Iraq, but our people need answers to these questions.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I believe that we have just a minute left. Perhaps you would like to sum up.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, just quickly, I want to say this to the American people and I hope that it is not the case that we value oil over American blood. I am just saying that right now, and I think it is very important to make the message very simple tonight for Americans to understand.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HASTINGS of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STENHOLM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TURNER of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MOORE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CASE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TANNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURGESS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CHOCOLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, March 24.

Mr. BURNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KING of Iowa, for 5 minutes, March 18.

Mr. FEENEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GILCHREST, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 18, 2004, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7183. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish Managed Under the Individual Fishing Quota Program [I.D. 020204C] received March 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7184. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Three Mile Island Generating Station, Susquehanna River, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania [COTP PHILADELPHIA 03-007] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7185. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Commercial Boulevard Bridge (SR 870), Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, mile 1059.0, Lauderdale-by-the-Sea, Broward County, FL. [CGD07-02-147] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7186. A letter from the FMCSA Regulatory Officer, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Transportation of Household Goods; Consumer Protection Regulations [Docket No. FMCSA-97-2979] (RIN: 2126-AA32) received March 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7187. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Collision Avoidance Systems; Correction [Docket No. FAA-2001-10910; Amendment Nos. 121-297, 125-41, and 129-37] (RIN: 2120-AG90) received March 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7188. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Ashland, OH [Airspace Docket No. 01-AGL-19] received March 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7189. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Flightdeck Security on Large Cargo Airplanes; Correction [Docket No. FAA-2003-15653; Amendment Nos. 121-299 and 129-38] (RIN: 2120-AH96) received March 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 566. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1375) to provide regulatory relief and improve productivity for insured depository institutions,

and for other purposes (Rept. 108–439). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself and Mr. MOORE):

H.R. 3980. A bill to establish a National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (by request):

H.R. 3981. A bill to reclassify fees paid into the Nuclear Waste Fund as offsetting collections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 3982. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to convey certain land held in trust for the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah to the City of Richfield, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BECERRA (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FROST, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 3983. A bill to assist low income taxpayers in preparing and filing their tax returns and to protect taxpayers from unscrupulous refund anticipation loan providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 3984. A bill to make 1 percent across-the-board rescissions in non-defense, non-homeland-security discretionary spending for fiscal year 2005; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 3985. A bill to make 2 percent across-the-board rescissions in non-defense, non-homeland-security discretionary spending for fiscal year 2005; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 3986. A bill to make 5 percent across-the-board rescissions in non-defense, non-homeland-security discretionary spending for fiscal year 2005; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H.R. 3987. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the automatic acquisition of citizenship by certain individuals born in Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Kampuchea, or Thailand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 3988. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 by strengthening and expanding the Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) in order to facilitate the transition of low-income high school students into post-secondary education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. OWENS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KLECZKA, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3989. A bill to require the Secretary of Treasury to direct the United States Executive Director at the Inter-American Development Bank to urge the Bank to release the loans approved for Haiti, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 3990. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to extend contracts for national dairy market loss payments through fiscal year 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SABO:

H.R. 3991. A bill to make supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for the Federal Air Marshals program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TANCREDO (for himself and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H.R. 3992. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to require preparation of statements regarding the environmental impacts of legal and illegal immigration; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. JOHN:

H. Con. Res. 387. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the current policy on bids for agricultural food tenders in Iraq; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. LATOURETTE (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H. Con. Res. 388. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LATOURETTE (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H. Con. Res. 389. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the D.C. Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. MATSUI):

H. Res. 564. A resolution relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BONILLA, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NUNES, Mr. POMBO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. TOOMEY):

H. Res. 565. A resolution condemning the terrorist bombing attacks in Madrid that occurred on March 11, 2004; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CANTOR (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H. Res. 567. A resolution congratulating the American Dental Association for sponsoring the second annual ''Give Kids a Smile'' program which emphasizes the need to improve access to dental care for children, and thanking dentists for volunteering their time to help provide needed dental care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FEENEY (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. OTTER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CRANE, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. HART, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. KELLER, Mr. TIAHRT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GOODE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. KLINE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. CANNON, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. OSE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. RENZI, and Mr. FLAKE):

H. Res. 568. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Judicial determinations regarding the meaning of the laws of the United States should not be based on judgments, laws, or pronouncements of foreign institutions unless such foreign judgments, laws, or pronouncements inform an understanding of the original meaning of the laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself and Mr. DREIER):

H. Res. 569. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives to the victims, their families and friends, and the people of the Kingdom of Spain for the loss suffered during the terrorist attacks in Madrid on March 11, 2004; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. OWENS):

H. Res. 570. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a Caribbean-American Heritage Month; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 31: Mr. DEMINT.
H.R. 97: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 290: Mr. FOSSELLA.
H.R. 300: Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 327: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 504: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 713: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 716: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 742: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 775: Mr. COBLE and Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 814: Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 898: Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 1043: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
H.R. 1051: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1083: Mr. LEACH.
H.R. 1097: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 1101: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1117: Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 1160: Mr. HALL.
H.R. 1214: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CRANE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1345: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1357: Mr. GRIJALVA Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BALLANCE, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1477: Mr. COX
H.R. 1501: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KIND, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1508: Mr. ROSS, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 1613: Mr. HONDA and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 1639: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1742: Mr. STENHOLM and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 1749: Mr. TURNER of Ohio.
H.R. 1769: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1812: Mr. FARR and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1822: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 1824: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1873: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 2157: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
H.R. 2339: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 2402: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2632: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 2665: Mr. STRICKLAND and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2671: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 2683: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2699: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. REGULA, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. QUINN.
H.R. 2743: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 2818: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2851: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 2900: Mr. COLLINS.
H.R. 2905: Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2924: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 2926: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2963: Mr. MICHAUD and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 3066: Mr. HERGER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. ISAKSON.
H.R. 3069: Mr. MICA.
H.R. 3085: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HOLT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. TURNER of Texas, and Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 3104: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HILL, Mr. SCHROCK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virgina, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 3111: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3178: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. SPRATT, and Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 3190: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 3192: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 3194: Ms. NORTON, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. HOEFFEL.
H.R. 3235: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 3242: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3294: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 3327: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 3350: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 3352: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 3402: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3441: Mr. FARR, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 3446: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 3473: Mr. GREENWOOD.
H.R. 3474: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 3507: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 3539: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. DOYLE, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3550: Ms. PELOSI and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 3574: Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
H.R. 3596: Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CANNON, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. FOSSELLA.
H.R. 3643: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3674: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H.R. 3695: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.R. 3707: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BACA, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3716: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. BONNER.
H.R. 3728: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 3763: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 3777: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.
H.R. 3782: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 3796: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 3815: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 3839: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 3919: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. Ballance, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WATT, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3936: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3963: Mr. FROST and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 3966: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 3972: Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. LANTOS.
H.J. Res. 72: Mr. BACA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. PETRI.
H.J. Res. 87: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Con. Res. 247: Mr. CANNON and Mr. ORTIZ.
H. Con. Res. 314: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. DOYLE.
H. Con. Res. 332: Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Con. Res. 356: Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. MENENDEZ.
H. Con. Res. 366: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. GORDON, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SABO, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. CLAY.
H. Con. Res. 371: Mr. HOEFFEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H. Con. Res. 374: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H. Con. Res. 375: Mr. ALLEN.
H. Res. 101: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. KUCINICH.
H. Res. 167: Mr. KUCINICH.
H. Res. 233: Mr. SHUSTER.
H. Res. 381: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H. Res. 402: Mr. OLVER.
H. Res. 514: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H. Res. 541: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H. Res. 542: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 543: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HOEFFEL.
H. Res. 550: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FROST, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. HAYWORTH.
H. Res. 557: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Ms. HARRIS.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1673: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ELECTION IN EL SALVADOR

HON. THOMAS G. TANCREDO

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express concern with the resurgence of the Leninist-Marxist FMLN in El Salvador. The FMLN is controversial in part because of its support for organizations such as the FARC, and for the public participation by some of its leaders in a pro-Al Qaeda rally where the U.S. flag was burned immediately after September 11, 2001. The U.S. Embassy in El Salvador was forced to condemn the written public statements related to the September 11 attacks that were issued by the FMLN and hostile toward the United States.

The leader of the FMLN has recently reiterated his commitment to communism. The FMLN continues to participate actively in international gatherings with violent and radical anti-U.S. organizations. Recent purges in the FMLN have reportedly left the party under the almost monolithic control of its most hard-line communist leaders.

Should the FMLN come to power in the upcoming elections, good bilateral relations between our two countries could be jeopardized. El Salvador's ARENA government provides military and intelligence cooperation, and is part of the coalition in the war on terror. The Salvadoran Government is also an active promoter of the free trade agreement with the United States.

To date, the United States Government has granted Temporary Protective Status to nearly 300,000 Salvadorans who are now living and working in the United States—workers who send home some $2 billion annually in remittances. If the FMLN controls the government of El Salvador following the presidential elections scheduled for March 2004, it could mean a radical change in United States policy as it pertains to the essentially free-flow of remittances from Salvadorans living in the United States to El Salvador.

Under an FMLN Presidency, the United States government would have no reliable counterpart to satisfy legitimate national security concerns, especially those regarding the threat posed by the FMLN's support of groups like the FARC. Therefore, if the FMLN takes control of the government in El Salvador, it may be necessary for the United States authorities to examine closely and possibly apply special controls to the flow of $2 billion in remittances from the United States to El Salvador—unfortunately to the detriment of many people living in El Salvador.

CONGRATULATING EDDIE MITCHELL ON RECEIPT OF THE CIBA SPECIALTY CHEMICALS HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL AWARD

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I rise to honor Mr. Eddie Mitchell, principal of Baldwin County High School in Bay Minette, AL, on the occasion of his being honored with the Ciba Specialty Chemicals Exemplary High School Principal Award. As one of 25 winners nationwide receiving this year's award, Mr. Mitchell becomes the first educator from Baldwin County and from the State of Alabama to have ever been afforded this honor.

The award is presented in conjunction with the National Science Teachers Association to educators for their work in promoting science education within their schools. During his tenure as principal of Baldwin County High School, and previously as principal of Daphne Middle School, Mr. Mitchell has worked tirelessly in the area of wetlands restoration and in establishing an outdoor science classroom facility at his school. His work at these schools has been instrumental in encouraging an interest in science education among students and in promoting an awareness of the preservation of the environment in which they live.

Mr. Speaker, we in this body have for many years strongly advocated the idea of promoting a strong educational system for students nationwide and providing them with every opportunity to excel in the numerous academic fields comprising their education. Teachers and school administrators are the most important people in the process of providing a quality education, and the success students achieve is a direct result of the interest and involvement of these men and women. Mr. Eddie Mitchell personifies the excellent caliber of individuals who have devoted their lives to educating our nation's young people, and he is to be highly commended for his many years of dedication to providing a quality education to these students.

Along with his many friends and colleagues, not only in Baldwin County but throughout the south Alabama educational community, I wish to extend to Mr. Eddie Mitchell my warmest congratulations on receiving the Ciba Specialty Chemicals Exemplary High School Principal Award.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 2004

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today in support of H.J. Res 87, honoring the life and legacy of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and recognizing his contributions. I am honored that I can be here to reflect upon and recognize the contributions President Franklin Delano Roosevelt made during his remarkable lifetime.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt entered public service through politics. He was elected to the New York Senate in 1910 and he was the Democratic nominee for Vice President in 1920. In the summer of 1921, at the age of 39, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was stricken with polio. Demonstrating indomitable courage, he fought to regain the use of his legs. In spite of these obstacles, Roosevelt became Governor of New York in 1928. In November 1932, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected President of the United States, the first of four terms.

Assuming the Presidency at the depth of the Great Depression, Franklin D. Roosevelt helped the American people regain faith in themselves and their government. He brought hope and inspired millions with his famous saying, "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

By March of 1924, there were 13,000,000 unemployed, and almost every bank was closed. In his first 100 days, he initiated revolutionary programs and reforms to bring recovery to business and agriculture, relief to the unemployed and to those in danger of losing farms and homes.

President Roosevelt was the first President to successfully merge government and private enterprise to form a partnership that furthered both domestic and international interests. As a result of the unique partnership, American jobs were created at a time when they were so desperately in need and the United States amassed 300,000 planes, 100,000 tanks, 2 million trucks, and 87,000 warships to the Allied cause, out producing the Allied and Axis forces combined.

Roosevelt had pledged the United States to the "good neighbor" policy, transforming the Monroe Doctrine from a unilateral American manifesto into arrangements for mutual action against aggressors. He also sought to keep the United States out of the war in Europe, yet at the same time to strengthen and provide support to nations threatened or attacked. When England came under siege in 1940, he began to send Great Britain all possible aid short of actual military involvement.

When the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, Roosevelt understood that the war was escalating out of control, and

United States involvement was crucial. Franklin Roosevelt felt that future peace of the world would depend upon relations between the United States and Russia, he devoted much thought to the planning of a United Nations, in which, he hoped, international difficulties could be settled.

As the war drew to a close, Roosevelt's health deteriorated, and on April 12, 1945, he died of a cerebral hemorrhage. President Franklin Roosevelt led our country with integrity and nobility. We would be a different Nation today if it was not for his courage and leadership through difficult times. I am honored to be here today to reflect on his legacy.

TRIBUTE AND HONOR THE LIFE OF ELMER ARNOLD BRAZELTON

HON. TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to, and honor the life of, Elmer Arnold Brazelton of Paris, Illinois. When he died on November 6th of 2003, Elmer left behind his lovely wife Patricia, four children, and eight grandchildren. Elmer was one of those people who was a joy to be around and his optimism and love of life were contagious to all of those close to him. His life, Mr. Speaker, was an excellent example of love for country and family. Elmer joined the National Guard in 1947, a full 2 years before graduating from Brocton High School in 1949. He attended both Light and Heavy Weapons Schools at Ft. Benning, Georgia and later joined up with the California Guard and was sent to Korea where he received two Bronze Stars. He left the service in 1953 and came home to his beloved Edgar County, Illinois. Over the next five decades, Elmer would raise a family, farm, manage a filling station in Hume, drive a school bus for the Urbana school district, and retire from the University of Illinois in 1993 after 33 years of dedicated service; 23 of those years spent as a Custodial Foreman. Elmer was a 50-year member of the Paris American Legion Post #211. He was also a valued member of the Edgar County Historical & Genealogical Society, the Edgar County Farm Bureau, the State Line Christian Church and the Weber St. Church of Christ to name a few of the many organizations that were important to him. I will never forget Elmer, his personality, nor his dedication to his family and his service to his community. I ask that my colleagues join me in paying tribute to the life of Elmer Brazelton who was a good and decent patriot; truly, one of the good guys.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last week, the week of March 7th, I was excused from the business of the House, however, if I were present, I would have voted in the following manner: Rollcall No. 57, "aye"; No. 56, "aye"; No. 55, "aye"; No. 54, "aye"; No. 53, "no"; No. 52, "no"; No. 51, "no"; No. 50, "no"; No. 49, "no"; No. 48, "no"; No. 47, "aye"; No. 46, "aye"; No. 45, "aye"; No. 44, "aye"; No. 43, "aye"; and No. 42, "aye."

Mr. Speaker, I request that these votes be reflected in the appropriate place of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH AND STOP VIOLENCE WEEK

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am here this week, along with many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, for National Women's History Month and Stop Violence Week. This year's theme is Women Inspiring Hope and Possibility. Last week was Stop Violence week, coordinated between Lifetime Television and the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues. This week brought to my attention that in light of all these celebrations of how far women have come over the decades, it would be naive for us to stand here and believe that we have eradicated gender based violence. Statistics keep coming in, showing that the problem is widespread for both sexual and domestic violence, and victims fear reporting the crimes to proper authorities.

In my State of Texas, nearly 2 million adult Texans, almost 13 percent of the State population, have been sexually assaulted.

In Texas, every 2 minutes, someone is sexually assaulted and two women are killed each week by their intimate partner.

Approximately 31 percent of sexual assault victims reported that a family member also has been sexually assaulted. We must raise awareness about how we as society can take care of the victims of such crimes. An estimate of 82 percent of rapes and sexual assaults go unreported because of shame, fear, hurt and anger. Nearly 80 percent of those raped know the person who raped them.

Family and friends not only help their loved one deal with the effects of an assault, and must manage their own feelings about the victimization of someone they care about. The impact of such a traumatic experience is severe. Thirty percent of rape victims contemplate suicide, and 13 percent attempt to take their own life.

I have worked with formidable organizations such as Texans Against Sexual Assault, who works to bring voices to women who have been victims of sexual crimes, and helping them along an emotional recovery. Also, the Texas Council on Family Violence, which has connected more than 15,000 Texas victims of domestic violence with emergency shelter and protection.

I am proud to be here, and grateful to these organizations and their hard work. But this does not start here. Sexual assault and violence affects all racial and ethnic groups. These victims are ourselves, our families, neighbors and coworkers. Together we must take a stand and work together for women's rights. We must work on building a brighter future, and make gender based violence a thing of the past. One week or month is not enough to do it all, but it's a beginning. Marian Wright Edelman, the founder and President of the Children's Defense Fund said, "Justice is not cheap. Justice is not quick. It is not ever finally achieved."

As a Congress, we come from different places and with diverging viewpoints. I want to thank all my colleagues, male and female, from all ends of the political spectrum who are taking measures to Stop the Violence. Working together, we can begin to make change.

HONORING CESAR CHAVEZ

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Cesar Chavez, who forged a legacy of service, conviction, and principled leadership that helped define a new decade of reform. Cesar began working early in life as a migrant farm worker during the Great Depression. He soon became involved with the Community Service Organization, a self-help group for Mexican-Americans, which sparked his desire to establish an organization solely dedicated to farm workers. His dream became a reality in 1962 when the National Farm Workers Association was established, and from that point on he dedicated the next 31 years of his life to pursuing social justice. He helped establish a 5-year strike by California grape pickers, as well as boycotts of grapes and lettuce that grew nationwide attention. Mr. Chavez will always be remembered and admired for achieving powerful change through this use of nonviolent activism. In honor of his many contributions to society he received the highest civilian awards from the United States and Mexico, the Presidential Medal of Freedom and the Aguila Azteca. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that Mr. Cesar Chavez will be honored and remembered for his lifelong contribution to not only the Hispanic community, but to all of humanity.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JAMES H. MILLER, SR., ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT AS CHIEF OF POLICE OF THE FOLEY, ALABAMA, POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I rise to pay tribute to James H. Miller, Sr., on the occasion of his retirement from the position of chief of police of the Foley, Alabama, Police Department. For the past 31 years, Chief Miller has served the families of Foley with a great deal of enthusiasm and concern for their well-being and for the well-being of the entire community. In the process of performing his professional duties, he has also gained the respect and admiration of everyone in south Baldwin County.

Following his graduation from the Alabama Police Academy in February 1973, Chief Miller joined the Foley Police Department and, as a

result of his hard work and dedication, became the first African-American officer to be promoted to chief of that department. His efforts in law enforcement and the protection of his community resulted in his receiving numerous awards during his professional career, including the keys to the cities of Baltimore, Maryland, and Tuskegee, Alabama. Additionally, Chief Miller was awarded a citation by Maryland Governor William Donald Schaefer in 1994.

In addition to his work in the field of law enforcement, Chief Miller has been active as a minister for numerous congregations in Alabama and Florida. He received his Bachelor of Theology Degree from Easonian Baptist Seminary in Birmingham, Alabama, in 1982, and his Doctor of Divinity Degree from the Tennessee School of Religion in 1996. During his ministerial career, he has served the congregations of Fannie Baptist Church in Alabama and the First Baptist Church of Warrington, Florida.

Finally, Chief Miller has been extremely active in the life of the Foley community, and has for many years been a member of the South Baldwin Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors, the Foley Boys and Girls Club, the Optimist Club, the Baldwin County Extension Advisory Board, and the Alabama Association of Chiefs of Police. He has also served as Chaplain for the Southwest Alabama Police Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing Chief James H. Miller, Sr., for his tremendous contributions to the citizens of Foley and of Baldwin County. The experience and zeal he has brought to his job and the concern and compassion he has displayed for everyone in the city are unquestioned and unparalleled. He has indeed been a genuine asset to the police department and to the thousands of men, women, and children he has assisted over the past three decades.

Make no mistake, the chief's talents and experience in the department will be sorely missed, but I am confident he will continue to remain actively involved in the life of the Foley community for many years to come. Along with his many friends and colleagues throughout Alabama, I wish to extend to Chief Miller and his family—his wife Mary Jane; his children, James, Jr., Otis, Daron, Ronald, D.J., and Nicole; and his 27 grandchildren—much health and happiness in the years ahead.

HEALTH INFORMATION INDEPENDENCE ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Health Information Independence Act. This act restores the right of consumers to purchase the dietary supplements of their choice and receive accurate information about the health benefits of foods and dietary supplements. The Health Information Independence Act restricts the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) power to impede consumers' access to truthful claims regarding the benefits of foods and dietary supplements to those cases where the FDA has evidence that a product poses a threat to safety and well-being or that a product does not have a disclaimer informing consumers that the claims are not FDA-approved.

Claims that could threaten public safety, or that are marketed without a disclaimer, would have to be reviewed by an independent review board, comprised of independent scientific experts randomly chosen by the FDA. However, anyone who is, or has ever been, on the FDA's payroll is disqualified from serving on the board. The FDA is forbidden from exercising any influence over the review board. If the board recommends approval of a health claim, then the FDA must approve the claim.

The board also must consider whether any claims can be rendered nonmisleading by adopting a disclaimer, before rejecting a claim out of hand. For example, if the board finds that the scientific evidence does not conclusively support a claim, but the claim could be rendered nonmisleading if accompanied with a disclaimer, then the board must approve the claim provided the claim is always accompanied by an appropriate disclaimer. The disclaimer would be a simple statement to the effect that "scientific studies on these claims are inconclusive" and/or "these claims are not approved by the FDA." Thus, the bill tilts the balance of federal law in favor of allowing consumers access to information regarding the health benefits of foods and dietary supplements, which is proper in a free society.

The procedures established by the Health Information Independence Act are a fair and balanced way to ensure consumers have access to truthful information about dietary supplements. Over the past decade, the American people have made it clear they do not want the Federal Government to interfere with their access to dietary supplements, yet the FDA continues to engage in heavy-handed attempts to restrict such access.

In 1994, Congress responded to the American people's desire for greater access to information about the benefits of dietary supplements by passing the Dietary Supplements and Health and Education Act of 1994 (DSHEA), that liberalized rules regarding the regulation of dietary supplements. Congressional offices received a record number of comments in favor of DSHEA.

Despite DSHEA, FDA officials continued to attempt to enforce regulations aimed at keeping the American public in the dark about the benefits of dietary supplements. Finally, in the case of Pearson v. Shalala, 154 F.3d 650 (DC Cir. 1999), reh'g denied en banc, 172 F.3d 72 (DC Cir. 1999), the United States Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit Court reaffirmed consumers' First Amendment right to learn about dietary supplements without unnecessary interference from the FDA. The Pearson decision anticipated my legislation by suggesting the FDA adopt disclaimers in order to render some health claims non-misleading.

In the years since the Pearson decision, Members of Congress have had to continually intervene with the FDA to ensure it followed the court order. The FDA continues to deny consumers access to truthful health information. Clearly, the FDA is determined to continue to (as the Pearson court pointed out) act as though liberalizing regulations regarding health claims is the equivalent of "asking consumers to buy something while hypnotized and therefore they are bound to be misled."

The FDA's "grocery store censorship" not only violates consumers' first amendment rights, but, by preventing consumers from learning about the benefits of foods and dietary supplements, the FDA's policies are preventing consumers from taking easy steps to improve their own health!

If Congress is serious about respecting first amendment rights, and the people's right to act to improve their own health, we must remove the FDA's authority to censor nonmisleading health claims, and claims that can be rendered nonmisleading by the simple device of adopting a disclaimer.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to help establish an objective process that respects consumers' first amendment rights to nonmisleading information regarding the health benefits of foods and dietary supplements by cosponsoring the Health Information Independence Act.

HONORING BENITO JUAREZ

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Benito Juarez, an influential Mexican hero who made an amazing impact during his lifetime. The son of Native American parents and the first president of Native American descent, Don Juarez worked hard to educate himself in law and to later become one of Mexico's greatest leaders. He established a new democratic government after the fall of Mexican General Antonio de Santa Anna, and he later he helped to restore this government after the French military invasion led by Austria's Archduke Maximilian.

As a national hero and President of Mexico, Benito Juarez left a legacy of liberal reforms that helped establish Mexico as a more democratic place to live. His democratic ideals were further embodied in the Constitution of 1857 which gave the Mexican people their basic rights of free speech and press. Due to significant contributions to Mexico through his service in state and national legislature and as a judge, a governor, and ultimately a president, Benito Juarez is regarded as one of the greatest heroes in Mexican history.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LUIS A. Ferré

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 2004

Mr. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great man and a great public servant. In his 96 years, Luis A. Ferré—successful businessman, art patron, and former Governor of Puerto Rico—has had a unique opportunity to witness, and influence, a period of dramatic change on his native island.

Ferré was born in Ponce in 1904, "soon after the transition of Puerto Rico from Spanish to American control. It was a time of great promise, and many Puerto Ricans believed they would soon enjoy the rights which they had been denied for so long. Ferré's father, a

Cuban immigrant and the founder of the Puerto Rico Iron Works, described to his young son how, in 1898, the people of Ponce had welcomed U.S. troops landing on the island.

The arrival of American forces did not, however, bring the immediate advantages that some had predicted. Instead, the process of political, economic, and cultural growth in Puerto Rico which began in 1898 has lasted all of Luis Ferré's life.

In 1917, when Ferré was 13 years old, the Puerto Rican people were granted U.S. citizenship. "Of course I can't remember it distinctly," he said 75 years later, "but ever since, I've been very proud of that day. I feel it is a great privilege and a great honor to be a citizen of the greatest republic that we've had in the history of the world."

Ferré's respect for the United States dates back to his years as a university student in Cambridge, Massachusetts. That period away from home was formative, both professionally and politically. He recalled much later: "I was a part of the old Hispanic community, but then I went to the mainland to study, in Boston at M.I.T., and I became completely sold on the importance of having Puerto Rico become a State of the Union, on an equal basis with the rest of the States."

Ferré returned to Puerto Rico with a degree in engineering and a firm belief in Statehood. He built his father's business into a hugely successful industrial enterprise, becoming a millionaire in the process. As his fortune grew, so did the movement among Puerto Ricans to govern themselves.

Luis Ferré entered politics at a propitious time in the island's history. In 1948, Puerto Ricans elected a governor for the first time, choosing Luis Muñoz Marín. In 1952 the year before commonwealth status and internal self-government, Luis Ferré was elected to the Puerto Rican House of Representatives. From this position, he advocated commonwealth as a stepping stone to his ultimate goal of Statehood for Puerto Rico.

Ferré saw the chance to further the cause in 1967, the year of the first political status plebiscite on the island. While commonwealth was the winning option, Ferré utilized the plebiscite to mobilize Statehood forces and establish a new political entity, the New Progressive Party (NPP).

Ferré ran for Governor of Puerto Rico as the NPP candidate in 1968, and he won a close race. His victory marked the end of 25 years of political dominance by Muñoz Marín's Popular Democratic Party (PDP), and the beginning of a new era in which the NPP and PDP would vie for the support of the Puerto Rican people.

Ferré was Governor for one term, from 1969 to 1973. However, his importance stems not so much from what he achieved in those four years, as from the precedent that he set.

After him came more Statehooders like Carlos Romero Barcelo, Hernan Padilla, and Pedro Rosselló. First under Ferré's guidance, then under his inspiration, the New Progressive Party with its statehood agenda has become a legitimate and powerful political force. As he noted in 1997, "When I became Governor of Puerto Rico, as a Statehood governor, we had 400,000 votes. Today, we won the election in 1996 with 1,600,000 votes."

Along with his political astuteness and business savvy, Ferré was also a great lover and supporter of the arts. "Art is something that enriches all nations," Ferré said in 1997. "It is very important to teach [art to] children when they're young because it opens up their minds and imagination and keeps them alive. In accordance with this philosophy, he founded the Museo de Arte de Ponce in 1965. The museum features artwork from medieval times to the present, focusing on the relevance of the European in Puerto Rico. Housed in an impressive, modern building, it is a major cultural attraction in Ferré's home city.

Over the past century, Puerto Rico has grown in freedom, wealth, and influence. Similarly, Luis Ferré has attained the honored positions of elder statesman and philanthropist. He is one of four Puerto Ricans to have received the Presidential Medal of Freedom. (Muñoz Marín, Antonia Pantoja, and Gov. Ferré's sister, Isolina, are the other three.) Reflecting on this distinction, he said, "I honestly believe that this was a recognition by the people of the United States to the people of Puerto Rico. After all, the people of Puerto Rico for the last eighty years [since attaining citizenship] have been contributing, in many ways, to the enrichment and the growth of our country."

TRIBUTE TO LESTER L. GOLDSTEIN

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay homage to one of Miami-Dade County's leaders, the late Lester L. Goldstein, who passed away on March 16, 2004. His passing has cast a veil of deep sadness over our community, and I would like to extend my condolences to his widow, Bella, his children, Jeff and Tina, and his grandchildren, Jason and Ian.

Lester Goldstein was a partner in the Bilzen, Sumberg, Baena Price & Alexlrod law firm in Miami, but he was so much more. He was an extraordinary man of service, a quiet but tireless and effective leader who felt at ease with people throughout our diverse community, and he devoted his life to improving their lives by his service and his example.

He served as the chairperson of the Greater Miami Service corps, the founder of the Alzheimer Care Committee of Douglas Gardens, a founder of the Miami Jewish Home and Hospital for the Aged, and a founder of the Mt. Sinai Medical Center. These are but a few of the great initiatives his humanitarian spirit willed to come to fruition, and these programs now serve to improve the lives and lessen the burdens of countless residents of our community.

He spearheaded civic fund-raising efforts to help the Miami-Dade County Public Schools, the Zoological Society of Florida, and he was a member of the American Arbitration Association, the Builders Association of South Florida, and local infrastructure and water management advisory groups.

As a highly competent professional in real estate development, zoning and land use, administrative law and environmental compliance, he conscientiously advocated protection of our environment. His counsel was sought in matters ranging from developments of regional impact to the rezoning of local projects, including coordination of efforts among community groups, government agencies, scientists and environmental regulators. Our community feels the loss of a truly decent and caring man who made it his personal business to advocate for the well-being of our community.

The numerous tributes and accolades with which government officials and various organizations have honored him during his lifetime are testimony to the utmost gratitude and respect he enjoyed from a grateful community. He truly personified the resilience and compassion of a people servant whose life exemplified what Martin Luther King, Jr. said that ". . . everybody can be great because everybody can serve."

This is the legacy Mr. Lester L. Goldstein bequeathed to us. I am privileged to have been his friend, for his genuine advocacy on behalf of the less fortunate evoked a caring heart and a compassionate humanity.

HONORING FRANCES LYLE

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Frances Lyle. Mrs. Lyle, who recently celebrated her 82nd birthday, was nominated by her fellow employees at the Henry County Library in Clinton, Missouri, for the Missouri Older Worker Award. She subsequently received the regional State award.

As an employee of the Henry County Library for the past 5 years, Mrs. Lyle has proven to be an asset and a joy to work with. She has shown her ability to relate to patrons of all ages. In an effort to serve the senior citizens in the community, she writes book reviews for the local paper, focusing on older books in the library's collection. She serves as an invaluable resource for older patrons who have read all of the books by their favorite authors. She has also become a favorite of many of the younger patrons, telling stories to the teenagers who pass through the doors.

Mrs. Lyle has taken it upon herself to organize and manage the annual library book sale. This is a major fund-raising event for the library, with all proceeds going to children's programming. Mrs. Lyle's efforts have been successful enough to bring in a nationally recognized author or storyteller to visit with the local children each of the past 3 years.

In addition to her work in the library, Mrs. Lyle is also an active member of her church. She is very involved in missionary projects, collecting books and supplies for children overseas. She also collects books for the church's annual gift drive, a project that ensures needy children in the area a special Christmas. In addition, she lends her beautiful singing voice to the church choir.

Mr. Speaker, Frances Lyle's friends and colleagues believe she is worthy of recognition, and I agree. She serves as an example, not just of the value that older Americans have to our communities but for all of us who could do so much more for our neighbors and those in need. I am sure the other Members of the House will join me in thanking her for all that she does.

HONORING THE DISTINGUISHED CAREER OF NISSAN'S EMIL HASSAN

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding automotive career of Emil Hassan, the senior vice president of North American manufacturing, purchasing, quality and logistics at Nissan North America, Inc. Emil is retiring from Nissan on April 1 after 35 years in the automotive industry.

Emil has been credited with much of the automaker's success and profitability. He began his career with Nissan when the company built its auto manufacturing facility in Smyrna, Tennessee, in 1981. The Smyrna plant, which is located in my home county, is the largest U.S. automotive production plant under one roof and has produced more than 5 million automobiles to date. It has ranked for 9 consecutive years as the most efficient auto assembly plant in North America, according to the highly regarded annual Harbour Report.

And Emil has been an active civic leader in the hometown, as well. He is chairman of the Business/Education Partnership of Murfreesboro and rutherford County and is a member of the Nashville Area Chamber of commerce and the Rutherford County Chamber of Commerce. In fact, he received the Rutherford County Chamber of Commerce Chairman's Award in 1996 for outstanding volunteer work in his home county. He has also been a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.

I congratulate Emil for his remarkable career in the automotive industry and for all he has done to help enhance the quality of life in Rutherford County and Middle Tennessee. And I wish him the very best in his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was also unavoidably absent from this Chamber on March 16, 2004. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on roll call votes 58, 59, and 60.

RECOGNIZING LAREDO DAY IN WASHINGTON

HON. CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize today, March 17, 2004, as Laredo Day in Washington. A distinguished delegation from Laredo is in our Nation's Capital this week to meet with leaders and decision-makers in Congress and executive branch. Please join me, Mr. Speaker, in welcoming them.

Settled in 1775 by Spaniards, the first Texas cattle drives transformed Laredo from a settlement of three families into a principal stop on the lower Camino Real, the Spanish royal highway.

Laredo became the first official port of entry on the United States-Mexico border in 1851. Today, Laredo handles more trade traffic than ports found in Southern California, New Mexico, Arizona and West Texas combined. As the fastest growing city east of the Rocky Mountains and the second fastest growing city in Texas, Laredo has become a vibrant and booming economic hub on the United States-Mexico border.

Much like it shares goods across the border, Laredo's culture melds both American and Mexican traditions. A prime example of this cultural fusion is Laredo's famed Washington's Birthday Celebration. The event includes over 34 events, lasts 17 days and brings together Americans and Mexicans alike. One event, the International Bridge Ceremony, takes place on the Lincoln-Juarez bridge and includes the meeting of officials, dignitaries, and children from both sides of the border. The groups share an embrace signifying the friendship and cooperation shared between the two nations. I was privileged to participate in this event earlier this year.

Helping to foster this camaraderie is the mayor of Laredo, the Honorable Betty Flores. Elected in 1998, Mayor Flores is the first female mayor to serve Laredo. She has worked diligently to improve the quality of life for all citizens of Laredo by tirelessly promoting her city without compromising the dignity of those she serves. Among the projects she has initiated are the Colonias Improvement Project, the inauguration of the Laredo Entertainment Center, and the opening of the World Trade Bridge. Mayor Flores' leadership on the state, local and national levels has brought prestige to her city.

Laredo's importance as a trade zone and cultural center is unparalleled, and its future is bright. It is my honor to recognize this city and Laredo Day 2004.

HONORING ONE OF OUR FALLEN HEROES

HON. LINCOLN DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I request the honor of distinguishing Sergeant First Class Gregory Hicks. I pay tribute to this exceptional soldier, husband, and father, who tragically died near Fajullah, Iraq on board a UH–60 Blackhawk helicopter.

Sergeant Hicks was assigned to Company B, 1st Battalion, 9th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division, based in Fort Hood, Texas. A recipient of the Purple Heart and Army Achievement Medal, among others, Sergeant Hicks had distinguished himself as a man of honor and integrity.

Campbell County and the Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee lost a great individual. It was with great personal joy when I heard the small community of Duff, Tennessee, where Sergeant Hicks was raised, rallied around the family in their time of need.

Accordingly, I would like to express my deepest sympathy to his wife, Melinda, his children, Chris and Jennifer, his mother and father, Clayton and Flora, and his siblings, Sandra, Stephen and Minnie on their tremendous loss. We honor his memory here today so that they will know that we all share their loss. Sergeant Hicks was a man devoted to his family, his country, and his community.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply honored to pay tribute to the life and memory of First Sergeant Gregory Hicks. Never withholding their services in the face of war, Tennessee's citizens have always been celebrated for their wartime valor. Sergeant Hicks fought to keep his family and country safe and for that we are forever indebted. My thoughts and prayers are with the family and friends of Sergeant Hicks. It is with much respect that as a member of Congress I may honor his service.

HONORING JOHN HEMPEL

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the dedication and years of hard work by Mr. John Hempel as he retires after more than thirty years of service to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Hempel was appointed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs as the Director of the VA Southern Nevada Healthcare System (VASNHS) in Las Vegas on January 14, 2001. As Director, Mr. Hempel directed the planning, organization, coordination, and control of patient care, administrative, and support operations. He was also responsible for maintaining and improving the healthcare system and VA relationships in the community.

In addition to years of service to the VA, Mr. Hempel also bravely served his country as a combat-wounded Vietnam veteran. He served as a platoon leader and executive officer with A Troop, 1st Armored Cavalry, Americal Division in South Vietnam from 1969–1970.

During his service in the Las Vegas area, Mr. Hempel was the driving force behind significant improvements in the VA health care system. As a long-time supporter of veterans in Nevada, it was a pleasure for me to work with Mr. Hempel serving veterans in Southern Nevada.

I am honored to join with all Nevadans in honoring John Hempel on his many accomplishments and wish him well in his retirement.

ELECTIONS COMING IN PUNJAB OPPORTUNITY TO CLAIM FREEDOM

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, elections have been scheduled in Punjab for May 10. They are part of India's national elections. The Sikhs in Punjab must seize this opportunity. Just changing the faces accomplishes nothing. Replacing one set of oppressors with another is not an exercise in democracy; it is merely proof of the need for independence from the tyranny that is the reality of daily life in Punjab.

The Council of Khalistan recently put out an open letter to the Sikhs in Punjab, Khalistan. They called for Sikhs to use these elections to elect officeholders who are committed to freeing the Sikh homeland, Khalistan.

Mr. Speaker, this is the only way to end the repression that has killed over 250,000 Sikhs since 1984, with more than 52,000 being held as political prisoners. Some of the prisoners are army officers who refused to participate in the brutal military attack on the seat of the Sikh religion, the Golden Temple, in 1984. Others are simply those who participated peacefully in the movement to liberate Khalistan.

India claims to be a democratic country. It also claims that there is no support for Khalistan. Why not simply hold a vote on the issue, the democratic way? Instead, this country that loudly proclaims that it is secular and democratic imposes the most brutal repression on the Sikhs and other minorities such as Christians in Nagaland and elsewhere, Muslims in Kas-hmir and throughout the country, Tamils, Dalit ''Untouchables,'' Bodos, Assamese, Manipuris, and others.

I join with the Council of Khalistan in urging the Sikhs and all the minorities suffering under Indian oppression to vote for honest candidates committed to freedom for their people. This is the best thing that they can do to free themselves from this brutal tyranny.

We can help by stopping American aid to India until all people's basic human rights are respected and by declaring our support for a free and fair plebiscite on the question of independence. These measures will press India to begin living up to the democratic values that they so loudly proclaim.

I would like to place the Council of Khalistan's message to the Sikh Nation regarding the elections into the RECORD at this time.

COUNCIL OF KHALISTAN,
Washington, DC, March 2, 2004.

Open Letter to the Sikh Nation

PUNJAB ELECTIONS SET FOR MAY 10 OPPORTUNITY FOR SIKH NATION TO CLAIM FREEDOM

CHOOSE HONEST LEADERSHIP COMMITTED TO SIKH FREEDOM—DON'T MISS THIS PEACEFUL, DEMOCRATIC OPPORTUNITY TO LIBERATE KHALISTAN

DEAR KHALSA JI: WAHEGURU JI KA KHALSA, WAHEGURU JI KI FATEH!

Elections in Punjab have been set for May 10. This is an opportunity for Sikhs to install honest, dedicated leadership. Choose only leaders who are committed to Khalsa Raj. Only when Khalistan is free can Sikhs live in prosperity, security, and dignity. Only when Khalistan is free of Indian occupation can Punjab's farmers get a fair price for their crops. Only when Khalistan is free will our water stop being diverted to nonriparian states. We must do everything that we can to free our homeland, Punjab, Khalistan, from Indian occupation. These elections provide an opportunity to reclaim our freedom democratically and peacefully.

The Guru granted sovereignty to the Sikh Nation, saying ''In Grieb Silkhin Ko Deon Patshahi.'' The Sikh Nation must achieve its independence to fulfill the mandate of the Guru. We always remember it by reciting every morning and evening, ''Raj Kare Ga Khalsa.'' Now is the time to act on it. Do we mean what we say every morning and evening? I urge Sikhs to unite and take action to liberate our homeland, Punjab, Khalistan.

Parkash Singh Badal disgraced the Sikh Nation by running the most corrupt government in Punjab's history. His government was so corrupt, they even came up with a new term for bribery: ''fee for service.'' If you didn't pay the fee, you didn't get the service. The Badal family was so adept at receiving bribes that Mrs. Badal could tell how much money was in a bag just by picking it up! We are pleased that Chief Minister Amarinder Singh is prosecuting the Badal family for its corruption. Clearly, the Akalis do not merit the Sikh Nation's support.

Badal also broke his campaign promises of 1997. He promised to release all the political prisoners. Yet according to the Movement Against State Repression (MASR), the Indian regime admitted to holding 52,268 Sikhs as political prisoners. They are being held without charge or trial, some of them since 1984! How can a democratic state hold political prisoners? He promised to punish police officials who have committed atrocities against Sikhs since 1984. No such action was ever taken. Where is the punishment of Swaran Singh Ghotna, who murdered Jathedar Gurdev Singh Kaunke? Where is the punishment of the police officers who kidnapped and murdered Sardar Jaswant Singh Khalra? He promised to appoint a commission to study the human-rights violations against the Sikhs. Yet when such a commission was formed by concerned Sikhs, he used the power of government to shut it down and deny it a meeting place.

The Congress Party is no better. It is the party that invaded and desecrated the Golden Temple and 125 other Sikh Gurdwaras throughout Punjab in June 1984 to murder Sant Jarnail Singh Bhindranwale and 20,000 other Sikhs, including General Shabeg Singh, Bhai Amrik Singh, and over 100 Sikh religious students ages 8–13 who were taken out into the courtyard and shot. If Sikhs will not even protect the sanctity of the Golden Temple, how can the Sikh Nation survive as a nation? No conscientious Sikh can support the Congress Party. It is the enemy of the Sikh Nation.

Sikhs must speak for, work for, and vote for candidates committed to freeing our homeland, Punjab, Khalistan, from Indian occupation. Let us take this opportunity to put people in office who will work for Sikh freedom and will work to give the Sikh Nation a free and fair plebiscite on freedom for Khalistan.

Sarbjit Singh, the son of Sikh martyr Beant Singh, has been given a ticket in a reserved constituency in Bhatinda by the Akali Dal (Amritsar.) He deserves the support of Sikh voters, but Sikhs should not support Simranjit Singh Mann, who changes his colors on Khalistan almost daily. Mann is under the control of the Indian government, as shown by his letter to the Chief Justice of India, which is reprinted in the book Chakravyuh: Web of Indian Secularism, by Professor Gurtej Singh. Mann has been in Parliament for the past few years. What has he done to advance the cause of Sikh freedom? Has he even made a single speech on behalf of freeing our homeland?

We call on distinguished Sikh leaders such as Justice Ajit Singh Bains, General Narinder Singh, Professor Gurdarshan Singh Dhillon, Professor Gurtej Singh, former MP Atinder Pal Singh, and others to run themselves or find candidates who reflect their views. And we call on them to give a ticket to deserving, educated political prisoners. This will help to get the political prisoners freed and will help to put people in Parliament who are committed to Sikh freedom and sovereignty.

Remember the words of Professor Darshan Singh, former Jathedar of the Akal Takht: ''If a Sikh is not a Khalistani, he is not a Sikh.'' The time to achieve our independence is now. India is not one country. It is a polyglot empire thrown together under one roof for the administrative convenience of the British colonialists. It has 18 official languages. History shows that such countries are doomed to fall apart. India will collapse just like the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Soviet Union, and other multinational states such as Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia.

The Indian government has murdered over 250,000 Sikhs since 1984, according to figures compiled by the Punjab State Magistracy and human rights groups and published in Inderjit Singh Jaijee's excellent book, The Politics of Genocide. India has killed over 300,000 Christians in Nagaland since 1947 and murdered priests, raped nuns, burned churches, and destroyed Christian schools and prayer halls. They expelled missionary Joseph Cooper from the country after militant Hindu nationalists beat him up so badly that he had to be in the hospital for a week. Missionary Graham Staines and his two young sons were burned to death while sleeping in their jeep by a mob of militant Hindus chanting ''Victory to Hannuman,'' a Hindu god. Since they were allied with the pro-Fascist RSS, the parent organization of the ruling BJP, they were able to commit this atrocity with impunity. Muslims were massacred in Gujarat while the police were under orders to stand aside and let the massacre occur, a frightening parallel to the 1984 Delhi massacres of Sikhs. A policeman told an Indian newspaper that the Gujarat massacre was planned in advance by the government.

India is a fundamentalist Hindu theocracy, not secular or democratic at all. Remember what Narinder Singh, a spokesman for the Golden Temple, told America's National Public Radio in 1997: ''The Indian government, they are always boasting that they are democratic, that they are secular. They have nothing to do with a secularism, nothing to do with a democracy. They just kill Sikhs just to please the majority.'' On December 5, President Bush told me ''I am aware of the Sikh and Kashmiri problem.''

Soon Kashmir will be free from Indian occupation. Now America is involved in it. As L.K. Advani predicted, ''When Kashmir goes, India goes.'' We agree with him and we urge the Indian government to hold a free and fair plebiscite on the question of independence and to sit down with representatives of the Sikh Nation to negotiate the boundaries of a sovereign, independent Khalistan. Sikhs must use the upcoming elections to elect representatives who will make certain that India does that. Sikhs must claim their birthright by liberating Khalistan. Only by freeing Khalistan will we put an end to this corruption and restore control of Punjab and its assets to the people, to whom it rightfully belongs. A sovereign, independent Khalistan is a must for the survival of the Sikh Nation and will provide an optimal environment for the Sikh Nation to progress to its optimum potential politically, religiously, and economically. Let us take this opportunity to free Khalistan.

Panth Da Sewadar,

DR. GURMIT SINGH AULAKH,
President, Council of Khalistan.

DISTURBING STATEMENTS OUT OF EL SALVADOR

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the United States grants Temporary Protective

Status (TPS) to about 400,000 citizens of El Salvador annually, and helps facilitate their sending about $2 billion home to their families each year. We do this, in part, because the United States enjoys a positive working relationship with the democratic government there.

Unfortunately, the communist candidate for the Presidency, and his political party, the FMLN, has explicitly stated their support for the communist narco-guerrilas who have been attacking the democratic government of Colombia since 1962. They have also said that upon their election to office they will immediately open full diplomatic relations with communist Cuba, a country recognized by the United States as a state sponsor of terrorism.

Based upon these disturbing statements, should the communist/FMLN candidate assume the Presidency of El Salvador, it may well be necessary for the United States to reconsider our relationship with El Salvador, the continuation of TPS for Salvadoran citizens, and our current support for their sending remittances back home.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the following statement, which I believe provides a concise overview of this matter placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my statement. I strongly urge my colleagues to read it and keep it firmly in mind as we await the results of the March 21st elections in El Salvador.

STATEMENT ON U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY REGARDING THE FMLN

TPS AND NATIONAL SECURITY

In making immigration decisions, such as the granting or extension of Temporary Protective Status (TPS) or the conversion of TPS to Permanent Resident Status or other considerations that enable foreign nationals to remain in the United States, the U.S. government must put first the national security of the United States.

TPS AND THE PRO-TERRORIST REGIMES

For that reason, the granting of TPS to nationals of a country should be immediately reviewed and, in most cases, terminated, if a pro-terrorist party wins power or enters the government of that country.

THE FMLN AS A PRO-TERRORIST PARTY

The FMLN, a political party in El Salvador, can be considered a pro-terrorist party because of its support for designated terrorist organizations, such as the FARC, and for the public participation by some of its leaders in a pro-Al Qaeda rally where the U.S. flag was burned, this taking place immediately after September 11, 2001. The U.S. Embassy in El Salvador was forced to condemn the written public statements related to the September 11th attacks that were issued by the FMLN and hostile toward the U.S.

The FMLN was created as an armed subversive communist organization that sought the violent overthrow of the Government of El Salvador in order to replace it with a pro-Castro Marxist-Leninist regime. After years of armed aggression and terrorism, the FMLN signed a peace agreement in 1992 that brought the violence to an end and led to the participation of the FMLN in the political process. The leader of the FMLN has reiterated recently his commitment to communism. The FMLN continues to participate actively in international gatherings with violent and radical anti-U.S. groups and terrorist organizations. Recent purges in the FMLN have left the party under the complete control of its most hard-line communist leaders. The FMLN is also known to organize in the United States among the Salvadoran immigrant community.

EXCELLENT CURRENT RELATIONS BETWEEN U.S.-EL SALVADOR

It must be emphasized that the United States has superb relations with the current government of El Salvador, led by the party ARENA. This friendship is based on confidence, shared values, mutually beneficial international policies and strong personal relationships. Excellent bi-lateral relations permit a high-level of cooperation on important national security matters. El Salvador provides military and intelligence cooperation and is part of the coalition that has sent armed forces to post-war Iraq. The Salvadoran government is also an active promoter of the free trade agreement with the United States.

TPS BASED ON EXCELLENT STRATEGIC RELATIONSHIP

In the context of excellent relations and close cooperation, the U.S. government was able to grant and extend TPS for the benefit of nearly 300,000 Salvadorans now living and working in the United States. For similar reasons, the U.S. government has not had special concerns about the source and use of the $2 billion per year in remittances sent by Salvadorans in the United States to their home country, allowing the free movement of that large sum. The government of El Salvador has shown itself to be a reliable and trustworthy counterpart regarding U.S. national security.

FMLN IN GOVERNMENT RADICALLY CHANGES THE EQUATION

If the FMLN enters the government of El Salvador following the presidential elections scheduled for March 2004, it will mean a radical termination of the conditions that permitted the granting of TPS in the first place. The U.S. government would have no reliable counterpart to satisfy legitimate national security concerns, especially those regarding the threat posed by pro-terrorist groups and the providing of funding for those groups.

FMLN IN GOVERNMENT WOULD REQUIRE TERMINATION OF TPS

Therefore, if the FMLN enters the government in El Salvador it will be necessary for the U.S. authorities to consider all available information regarding the ties of the FMLN to violent anti-U.S. groups and designated terrorist groups and, on that basis, proceed toward the immediate termination of TPS for El Salvador.

FMLN IN GOVERNMENT WOULD REQUIRE REVIEW OF REMITTANCES

In many instances, pro-terrorist groups conduct fundraising in the United States, and special controls and restrictions on the flow of funds have been applied where necessary. Given the pro-terrorist nature of the FMLN and its ties to designated terrorist groups, if the FMLN enters the government in El Salvador, it will be urgent to apply special controls to the flow of remittances from the United States to El Salvador, a sum that is currently $2 billion per year.

A TRIBUTE TO KEN MILLER, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to pay tribute to Ken A. Miller, a true pioneer in the field of public works and flood control. Mr. Miller is retiring as Director of the San Bernardino County Department of Public Works after 33 years of outstanding service to the citizens of San Bernardino County, California, the last 16 as director of the department.

The crowning achievement of Mr. Miller's distinguished career is the Santa Ana River Mainstem Project, a $1 billion project that has also been one of my top priorities for nearly two decades. Completion of the Seven Oaks Dam, the Prado Dam and Reservoir, the Mill Creek Levee and San Timoteo Creek flood control projects will protect millions of lives and billions of dollars worth of property in Southern California. Mr. Miller was the key driver for this project in San Bernardino County during most of his 33 years of public service.

Mr. Miller lent his skills and talent to a partnership with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on a range of flood control projects that have made San Bernardino County a much safer place, even as the county grew from a quiet suburb to an urban area of nearly 2 million residents.

While protecting San Bernardino County and other Southern California communities from the danger of severe flooding, Mr. Miller was a leading force behind the modernization and safety advancements of transportation routes, from remote desert highways to busy urban Interstates.

Ken Miller has been a Registered Civil Engineer in the State of California since 1973. He joined the San Bernardino County Flood Control District in 1971, following his graduation with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Civil Engineering from Cal Poly Pomona.

Ken A. Miller has served as President of the County's Management Forum and as president of the City and County Engineers Association at the county and state level. In one of his final assignments for the County of San Bernardino, Mr. Miller served as Acting County Administrative Officer, overseeing the county's workforce of more than 16,000.

Mr. Miller is a native Californian, born in Sanger and a resident of the San Bernardino area since 1951. Mr. Miller and his wife Sandy reside in Yucaipa, California. They have two daughters, Dana and Jennifer, who are currently attending college.

Under Mr. Miller's leadership, the Flood Control District was awarded the 1999–2000 American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) "Outstanding Government Civil Engineering Project" for the Seven Oaks Dam Project and also was awarded the American Public Works Association (APWA) "2000 Project of the Year Award."

Mr. Speaker, Ken A. Miller leaves an impressive legacy of public service and accomplishment. The transportation and flood control projects he made possible will stand for generations as monuments to a career dedicated to the safety and advancement of Southern California. Please join me in thanking him for his public service, and wishing him well in his retirement.

HONORING THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE NEVADA-SIERRA PERFORMANCE CLUSTER

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the dedication, hard work, and superior productivity achieved by Nevada's postal employees. Recently the Nevada-Sierra Performance Cluster was ranked as the number one cluster in the country in Overnight Delivery.

The United States Postal Service (USPS) is comprised of 79 Performance Clusters that are grouped into 9 geographical areas. The Nevada-Sierra Performance Cluster is part of the Pacific area and is serviced by two plants in Nevada, one in Las Vegas and one in Reno. These two plants process and distribute incoming mail to postal facilities throughout Nevada. Currently 96.7 percent of all Overnight Delivery mail in Nevada is delivered on time, ranking the Nevada-Sierra cluster number one in the country. In addition, as measured by the national USPS Breakthrough Productivity Index, the Nevada-Sierra Performance cluster ranks number 2 in the Nation in overall productivity.

These honors pay tribute to the work of the 5,217 career employees working for the United States Postal Service in Nevada. The productivity of Nevada's postal employees benefits all Nevadans who utilize the United States Postal Service. Each day the employees of the Postal Service reach millions of Nevadans through their work delivering the mail.

I am proud to join with all Nevadans in honoring the employees of the USPS Nevada-Sierra Postal Cluster. I wish them continued success and thank them for their fine work.

SIKHS WILL CELEBRATE 400TH ANNIVERSARY OF THEIR HOLY SCRIPTURE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, the Sikhs will celebrate the 400th anniversary of the compilation of their holy scripture, the Guru Granth Sahib, this year. As you may know, there are over 500,000 Sikhs in the United States and about 25 million worldwide.

Observances will include a seminar on June 5 at George Washington University and a parade on August 14 here in Washington.

In June 1984, the Indian government launched a military attack on the Golden Temple in Amritsar, the center and seat of the Sikh religion, and 125 other Sikh Gurdwaras throughout Punjab in which over 20,000 Sikhs were murdered. Indian forces shot bullets through the Guru Granth Sahib, which was a major desecration and an insult to the Sikh people and the Sikh religion. They took over 100 young Sikh boys outside and shot them at point blank range.

Mr. Speaker, the Golden Temple attack made it clear to the Sikhs that there is no place for them in India's Hindu nationalist theocracy. It is against this background that they declared their independence on October 7, 1987, calling their country Khalistan.

The Golden Temple attack is unacceptable to all civilized people. We must work to ensure that human rights are respected in India and that nothing like the Golden Temple attack, the Gujarat massacre, or the campaign of violence against Christians occurs there again. We can help bring that about by stopping our aid to India until it learns to observe basic human rights.

We can also help by putting this Congress on record in support of a free and fair plebiscite in Punjab, Khalistan, in Kashmir, as India promised the United Nations in 1948, in primarily Christian Nagaland, and wherever the people are seeking independence. This is the democratic way to settle the issue and India claims to be a democracy, so why are they afraid of holding a free and fair vote?

Mr. Speaker, the Council of Khalistan has published a press release on the 400th anniversary of the Guni Granth Sahib and the 20th anniversary of the Golden Temple attack. It is very informative, so I would like to insert it into the RECORD at this time.

400TH ANNIVERSARY OF GURU GRANTH SAHIB; 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF GOLDEN TEMPLE ATTACK

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 10, 2004.—On June 5, Sikhs from around the East Coast will observe the 400th anniversary of the compilation of the Guru Granth Sahib, the Sikh holy scriptures. During India's June 1984 attack on the Golden Temple in Amritsar, the center and seat of the Sikh religion, the Guru Granth Sahib was pierced by Indian Army bullets. The Sikh Nation will never forget the desecration of the Guru Granth Sahib. Political power is essential for the survival of the Sikh Nation.

The Council of Khalistan, the organization leading the Sikh struggle for independence, will hold a demonstration Saturday, June 5, from 12:00 noon to 3:00 p.m. in front of the Indian Embassy at 21st and Massachusetts Ave. NW in Washington, D.C. It will commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the attack on the Golden Temple and 125 other Sikh Gurdwaras in Punjab, in which over 20,000 Sikhs were killed, including such major Sikh leaders as Sant Jarnail Singh Bhindranwale, General Shabeg Singh, Bhai Amrik Singh, and others who had taken refuge in the Darbar Sahib complex. The Indian army killed over 100 young religious students, ages 8 to 13. They were taken out into the courtyard and asked whether they supported Khalistan. When they answered ''Bole So Nihal,'' they were shot.

''This attack, along with simultaneous attacks on 125 other Gurdwaras throughout Punjab, was the clearest sign that there is no place for Sikhs in India,'' said Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan. ''It is a brutal, tyrannical, fundamentalist Hindu nationalist theocracy,'' he said. ''Sant Bhindranwale said that if the Indian government invaded the Golden Temple, they would lay the foundation of Khalistan,'' Dr. Aulakh said. ''He was right. The movement for Khalistan is strong in Punjab. Just last year, seminars were held on the subject. The fire of freedom burns bright in the hearts of Sikhs.''

''The brutal attack on the Golden Temple and the 20-year wave of repression it set off must never be forgotten,'' Dr. Aulakh said. ''Both the Congress Party and the Akalis are complicit in this criminal act against the Sikh Nation,'' he noted. . . . ''India needs to be reminded that 20 years later, Sikhs have not forgiven nor forgotten this brutal atrocity. The younger generation must be reminded of this terrible atrocity.''

In addition to the protest, there will be a seminar on Saturday, June 5 at George Washington University to celebrate the 400th anniversary of the compilation of the Guru Granth Sahib. It will be sponsored by the International Conference on Sikh Studies along with Sikh Gurdwaras and institutions of North America.

The Indian government has murdered over 250,000 Sikhs since 1984, more than 300,000 Christians since 1948, over 85,000 Muslims in Kashmir since 1988, and tens of thousands of Tamils, Assamese, Manipuris, Dalits, and others. The Indian Supreme Court called the Indian government's murders of Sikhs ''worse than a genocide.'' According to a study by the Movement Against State Repression, 52,268 Sikhs are being held in illegal detention as political prisoners without charge or trial. Some of them have been held since 1984!

Christian missionary Joseph Cooper was expelled from India after a mob of militant Hindu nationalists allied with the Rashtriya Swayamsewarak Sangh (RSS), a pro-Fascist organization that is the parent organization of the ruling BJP, beat him so severely he had to spend a week in the hospital. In 2002, 2,000 to 5,000 Muslims were murdered in Gujarat while police were ordered to stand aside, reminiscent of the 1984 Delhi massacres of Sikhs. Indian newspapers reported that the government planned the Gujarat massacre in advance.

History shows that multinational states such as India are doomed to failure. Countries like Austria-Hungary, India's longtime friend the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and others prove this point. India is not one country; it is a polyglot like those countries, thrown together by the British for their administrative convenience. Sikhs ruled Punjab until 1849 when the British conquered the subcontinent. Sikhs were equal partners during the transfer of power from the British. The Muslim leader Jinnah got Pakistan, the Hindu leaders got India, but the Sikh leadership was fooled by the Hindu leadership promising that Sikhs would have ''the glow of freedom'' in Northwest India. The Sikhs took their share with India on that promise. For that mistake, Sikhs are suffering now. ''As Professor Darshan Singh, a former Jathedar of the Akal Takht, said, 'If a Sikh is not for Khalistan, he is not a Sikh','' Dr. Aulakh noted.

''Democracies don't commit genocide,'' Dr. Aulakh said. ''Only in a free and sovereign Khalistan will the Sikh Nation prosper. In a democracy, the right to self-determination is the sine qua non and India should allow a plebiscite for the freedom of the Sikh Nation,'' he said. ''India should also allow self-determination in Christian Nagaland, Kashmir, Assam, and the other nations fighting for freedom. This is the only way to bring lasting peace to South Asia.''

SIKHS CALL FOR AN APOLOGY FROM SENATOR KERRY

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 2004 Democratic Presidential Candidate Senator JOHN KERRY referred to "Sikhs in India" as an example of terrorists. As you know, I have been a supporter of freedom for all people in South Asia, including the Sikhs.

Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan is well known among my

colleagues as an invaluable source of information on the situation in India and Kashmir. He and his organization are committed to freeing Khalistan, the Sikh homeland, by peaceful, democratic, and non-violent means. However, the Indian government portrays their actions as terrorism. I was saddened to see that Senator KERRY apparently agreed with this mischaracterization.

The Sikhs I have met are responsible citizens. They make important contributions to many facets of American life. Dalip Singh Saund, a Sikh, even proudly served in the Congress. Many Sikhs, including Dr. Aulakh, were quite offended by the statement made by Senator KERRY, and they have asked for an apology. I hope that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will do the right thing and retract his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the Council of Khalistan's letter to Senator KERRY placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my statement.

COUNCIL OF KHALISTAN,
Washington, DC, February 11, 2004.

Senator JOHN F. KERRY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KERRY: I am writing to you today on behalf of half a million Sikh Americans and over 25 million Sikhs worldwide to say that your remarks equating Sikhs with terrorists were offensive to the Sikh community. While giving a speech in Oklahoma, you referred to ''the Sikhs in India'' as an example of terrorism.

Sikhism is an independent, monotheistic, revealed religion, not a part of any other religion. Sikhs are distinctive by our religion, language, and culture from any other people on Earth.

Sikhs ruled Punjab from 1710 to 1716 and again from 1765 to 1849. Sikhs, Hindus, Muslims, and Christians all participated in the government. Sikhs are a separate nation and people.

At the time of India's independence, three nations were to receive sovereign power: the Muslims, who got Pakistan, the Hindus, who got India, and the Sikhs. Sikhs took their share with India on the solemn promise that Sikhs would enjoy ''the glow of freedom'' in Punjab and no law affecting Sikh rights would be passed without our consent. Instead, almost as soon as the ink was dry on India's independence, Nehru sent out a directive describing Sikhs as ''a criminal class'' and ordering police to take extraordinary measures against us.

Since June 1984, India has murdered over 250,000 Sikhs, according to figures compiled by the Punjab State Magistracy and human rights groups and published in the book The Politics of Genocide by Inderjit Singh Jaijee. A report from the Movement Against State Repression (MASR) shows that India admitted to holding 52,268 Sikhs as political prisoners. Some have been in illegal custody since 1984! Tens of thousands of other minorities are also being held as political prisoners, according to Amnesty International. Indian forces carried out the March 2000 massacre in the village of Chithisinghpora, according to two independent investigations. Indian forces were caught red-handed trying to set fire to a Sikh Gurdwara and Sikh homes in a village in Kashmir. Sikh and Muslim villagers joined hands to stop them.

The book Soft Target, written by two Canadian journalists, Zuhair Kashmeri of the Toronto Globe and Mail and Brian McAndrew of the Toronto Star, shows conclusively that the Indian government blew up its own airliner in 1985, killing 329 innocent people, to blame it on the Sikhs and have an excuse for more repression.

Other minorities such as Christians and Muslims, among others, have also felt the lash of Indian repression. Over 300,000 Christians in Nagaland have been killed by the terrorist Indian regime. Nuns have been raped, priests have been murdered, churches have been burned, schools and prayer halls have been destroyed, all with impunity. A mob of militant Hindus affiliated with the parent organization of the ruling BJP murdered missionary Graham Staines and his two sons by burning them to death while they slept in their jeep, all the while chanting ''Victory to Hannuman,'' a Hindu god. India threw missionary Joseph Cooper from Pennsylvania out of the country after he was beaten so severely that he had to spend a week in the hospital. A Christian religious festival on the theme ''Jesus is the answer'' was broken up by police gunfire.

Almost two year ago, Muslims were massacred in Gujarat while police were ordered to stand by and do nothing, according to Indian newspaper reports. One newspaper quoted a policeman as saying that the Indian government planned the massacre in advance. This is an eerie parallel to the 1984 massacre of Sikhs in Delhi, in which police were locked in their barracks while the state-run radio and television called for more Sikh blood.

An Indian Cabinet minister was quoted as saying that everyone who lives in India must either be a Hindu or be subservient to Hindus. This kind of religious fanaticism as state policy is dangerous and anti-democratic. We would not want it in America; why should we support it in India?

On October 7, 1987, Sikhs declared their independence from India, naming their new country Khalistan. We are committed to liberating Khalistan by peaceful, democratic, nonviolent means. History shows that multinational states such as Austria-Hungary, the Soviet Union, and India are doomed to fall apart. We intend to see that this happens peacefully, in the manner of Czechoslovakia, not violently like Yugoslavia. Yet simply supporting a sovereign, independent Khalistan is what India calls terrorism.

The 20,000 Sikhs who were murdered in the June 1984 attack on the Golden Temple and 37 other Sikh Gurdwaras throughout Punjab were not terrorists. They were seeking refuge from the Indian government's tyranny. Yet the Indian government insists on describing them as ''terrorists,'' as if repeating it often enough will make it true.

Senator Kerry, we respectfully request that you apologize to the Sikh Nation and the Sikh community in the United States for your remark. I urge you to support measures to bring freedom to all the people of the subcontinent. Sikhs share the commitment to freedom you showed when you fought in Vietnam and in your service in public office. There was even a Sikh member of Congress in the late 1950s, Dalip Singh Saund of California. We look forward to working with you in the future to bring the blessings of liberty to everyone in the subcontinent.

If you would like any further information or would like to meet about these issues, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

DR. GURMIT SINGH AULAKH,
President.

ACTION NEEDED ON ANIMAL ID SYSTEM

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member commends to his colleagues the following editorial from the March 3, 2004, Lincoln Journal Star. The editorial emphasizes the need to develop an animal identification system in an expeditious manner. Clearly, an effective system to track livestock would benefit producers as well as consumers. It is time for action.

[From the Lincoln Journal Star, Mar. 3, 2004]

QUICK ACTION NEEDED ON LIVESTOCK IDS

A continued sense of urgency is needed in the effort to establish an animal identification system to improve food safety.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has been working to develop a program for several years, but it's still far from implementation.

Meanwhile, the ability of the livestock industry to track sick animals is in woeful condition.

The USDA never did track down all the cattle in the herd in Washington state where a cow with mad cow disease was detected. Officials finally gave up and admitted they could not find 11 cows.

With technology that's available today, that's inexcusable.

A good starting place would be the bill introduced by Sen. Chuck Hagel, which would give U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Ann Veneman authority to implement the system the department has been working on for the past several years.

The program was designed to give inspectors the ability to identify all the farms and other animals that had contact with a diseased animal within 48 hours.

Compare that with the frustrating weeks that inspectors spent on the recent case of bovine spongiform encephalopathy. Tests confirmed the result on Dec. 23 last year. The investigation was not closed until Feb. 9.

The USDA is recommending the use of radio frequency identification devices, but other approaches, such as implantable microchips and retinal scanning, are also possible.

The device is a tag that is stapled to the base of the animal's ear. Each tag has a unique numerical code. The tag would be scanned at each stage of the production chain for tracking purposes. Information on the devices would be stored in a national database.

The program deserves industry support for reasons that should be obvious. The discovery of single case of mad cow cost the industry an estimated $4 billion in lost sales, according to agricultural economists.

It won't be cheap to establish the program. Officials estimate the costs could run around $100 million a year. Although a portion of the cost ultimately will be borne by the industry and passed along to consumers, tax support would be appropriate during the transition phase to the new system.

The good news is that some producers are already using the radio frequency identification tags.

The USDA currently plans to phase in the program this summer and begin issuing animal identification tags next year. First priority would be given to tracking beef and dairy cattle.

Progress on that timetable should not be allowed to slip. The livestock industry needs prompt action to protect consumer safety.

FREEDOM FOR PABLO PACHECO AVILA

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about Pablo Pacheco Avila, a prisoner of conscience in totalitarian Cuba.

Mr. Pacheco Avila works as an independent journalist with the agency Avileña Cooperative of Independent Journalists, because he believes it is his obligation to expose the factual realities of totalitarian Cuba.

Due to Mr. Pacheco Avila's desire to communicate the truth about the nightmarish reality of Castro's repressive regime, he has been constantly harassed by the dictator's thugs. According to Amnesty International, in November 2002, Mr. Pacheco Avila was detained by Castro's agents of repression for six hours after attempting to video two totalitarian police officers mistreating two women. In March 2002, he was detained for providing news coverage on a peacefeul pro-democracy meeting.

Unfortunately, under the tyrannical dictatorship, freedom is banned and repression is law. Mr. Pacheco Avila was arrested in Castro's brutal March 2003 crackdown on peaceful pro-democracy activists. After a summary, sham trial he was sentenced to 20 years in the totalitarian gulag.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pacheco Avila is a great example how the dictator torments and commits aggression against those who advocate for truth and democracy. Today marks the one year anniversary of Castro's infamous March 2003 crackdown on Cuba's prodemocracy activists. Amnesty International recognizes 75 prisoners of conscience from this condemnable March 2003 crackdown. Currently thousands of freedom-loving Cubans languish in Castro's totalitarian gulags because they refuse to accept the nightmarish oppression in Cuba. Today, I extend my solidarity to Mr. Pacheco Avila and the thousands of Cuban men and women who are shackled and suffering because they desire to see freedom reign in Cuba.

Mr. Pacheco Avila suffers today in an inhumane dungeon because he believes in writing and reporting the truth. My colleagues, on the one year anniversary of the brutal, March 2003 crackdown on pro-democracy activists in totalitarian Cuba, we must demand the immediate release of Pablo Pacheco Avila and every prisoner of conscience suffering in the gulags of totalitarian Cuba.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO RANDY AND CLARICY RUSK

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Randy and Claricy Rusk for the contributions they have made to their community and the State of Colorado. Recently, Randy and Claricy Rusk were presented the prestigious Leopold Conservation Award for their land conservation efforts. It is with great satisfaction that I congratulate Randy and Claricy for their well-deserved award, and thank them for their significant contributions to Custer County and the State of Colorado.

For five generations, the Rusk Hereford Ranch has sought out progressive conservation techniques in range management. Their efforts include improved range and riparian management, wildlife habitat enhancement, resource management planning, and creating conservation easements to prevent second home development. The Leopold Conservation Award is named after famed conservationist Aldo Leopold, and includes a $10,000 cash prize and a crystal statute of Aldo Leopold on horseback.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Rusks have a legacy of strong commitment to the ranching community in Custer County and the State of Colorado. Randy and Claricy's efforts to keep this great tradition of conservation vibrant is worthy of recognition before this body of Congress and this nation today. It is my privilege to extend to Randy and Claricy my sincere congratulations on receiving the Leopold Conservation Award, and to wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO CATHY L. SCIORTINO, IRA D. CALVERT DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community of Corona, California are exceptional. Corona, and surrounding communities, has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated business and community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make their communities a better place to live and work. Cathy Sciortino is one of these individuals. On March 27, 2004, Cathy will be honored at the annual YMCA Ira D. ''Cal'' Calvert Distinguished Service Awards Dinner.

Cathy was born in Akron, Ohio where she attended school and graduated from Youngstown State University in Youngstown, Ohio. After graduation, she worked for May Co. Corp. in Youngstown, Ohio for eleven years as a buyer of women's ready to wear clothing. In 1985, Cathy and her husband moved to Yorba Linda, California and a year later they bought a house in Corona.

After the birth of her first child, Carly, Cathy became a stay at home mom and was very active in the school system. She joined the PTA and served on the board for 14 years. In 1995, Cathy was elected to the Corona-Norco Unified School Board and served as the president in 1997–1998 and 2002–2003. She also served as the delegate for the California School Board Association Assembly and as the Corona-Norco School Board Representative. She has also served as a chairmember on the Corona Regional Medical Center Governing Board; was a founding member of the Unity Advisory Board; the Centennial High School PTSA President; board member of the Choices for Success advisory board; and board member of the ADV advisory board.

Cathy has been the recipient of the PTA-Honorary Service Award and the Soroptimist-Woman of Distinction Award for Education.

Cathy has set a standard of excellence and commitment in his work in the community. Her tireless passion for community service has contributed immensely to the betterment of the community of Corona, California. Her involvement in the community makes me proud to call her a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many community members are grateful for her service and salute her as she receives the Ira D. Calvert Distinguished Service Award.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 16, 2004, I was unable to cast my floor vote on rollcall numbers 58, 59, and 60. The votes I missed include rollcall vote 58 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree to H. Res. 551, Thanking C–SPAN for its service to the House of Representatives; rollcall vote 59 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 3733, the Myron V. George Post Office Designation; and rollcall vote 60 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree to H. Res. 433, Honoring the life and legacy of Luis A. Ferré.

Had I been present for the votes, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall votes 58, 59, and 60.

THE HELPING THE PEOPLE OF HAITI ACT

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Helping the People of Haiti Act, a bill to renew United States financial assistance to Haiti and to urge the international community to support Haiti's economic recovery.

As the international community intervenes to restore peace in Haiti, I encourage all of my colleagues to concern yourselves with the suffering of its people. The health and welfare of millions of Haitians and the stability of a region close to our shores will only get worse if we do not seize the opportunity to act responsibly now.

My bill, the Helping the People of Haiti Act, requires the Secretary of the Treasury to direct the U.S. Executive Director at the Inter-American Development Bank to release the loans already approved for Haiti. These funds, amounting to $146 million, provide for health, education, water, sanitation, and transportation developments that are critical to stabilizing Haiti and improving the plight of its people. This bill also requires the Secretary of State to encourage foreign governments to strengthen their financial support and help with Haiti's economic development.

For too long, the United States and the international community did not intervene to

alleviate the situation in Haiti, conditioning financial assistance on the strengthening of democratic institutions, free and fair elections, and transparent and accountable government. But it is reasonable to assume that these requirements for financial aid will now be met, given the international community's intimate involvement in Haiti's political affairs for the near future.

Let us work to alleviate all of Haiti's problems—environmental degradation, extreme poverty, starvation, and social chaos—not just the political crisis. This is critical to stabilizing the country, preventing a mass exodus of refugees, and ensuring that future political crises will be weathered not by street violence but by the rule of law and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, where the United Nations once called Haiti a ''silent emergency,'' the plight of this country screams out for our assistance. We have a moral imperative to uphold democracy in Haiti, and to ensure that Haiti's people do not starve, that the environment is not obliterated, and that instead Haiti will become a nation of stability and opportunity. Haiti is a success story waiting to happen.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO VIRGINIA ERICKSON

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today to pay tribute to Virginia Erickson for her selfless dedication to the community of New Castle, Colorado, and congratulate her on being recognized by the Garfield County Commissioners and the Glenwood Springs Post Independent as their 2003 Countywide Humanitarian of the Year. Virginia received this honor in recognition of her outstanding work with numerous civic organizations. It is an honor to pay tribute to Virginia for her well-deserved award, and her ongoing efforts to better her community.

As an active member of her community, Virginia dedicates her time to a vast array of civic functions. She serves as an emergency medical technician for the New Castle Volunteer Ambulance Service and as a member of the New Castle Historical Museum. An active advocate for New Castle seniors, Virginia also serves as a New Castle Councilwoman. Her enthusiasm for taking part in these organizations comes from the joy she receives in giving back to the community she loves.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize Virginia before this body of Congress and this nation for her dedication and commitment to the New Castle, Colorado community. She has done much to improve her community, and I congratulate her on her recent honor as the 2003 Countywide Humanitarian of the Year. I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO WAYNE KEITH, IRA D. CALVERT DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community of Corona, California are exceptional. Corona, and surrounding communities, has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated business and community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make their communities a better place to live and work. Wayne Keith is one of these individuals. On March 27, 2004, Wayne will be honored at the annual YMCA Ira D ''Cal'' Calvert Distinguished Service Awards Dinner.

Wayne has been an active member of the community since he moved here in 1969. He began work as the general manager of ALCOA's Premium Casting Division in Corona. There is hardly an organization that hasn't benefited from his participation. Wayne has served as President of the Corona Rotary Club, the Western Municipal Water District and the Navy League. He has been on the Board of Directors of United Way, Corona Chamber of Commerce, Corona Community Hospital Foundation, UCR Foundation, Good Samaritan Boys Club and California Manufacturers Association.

A longtime member of the First Congregational Church, he has held a number of church positions from choir member to vice president of the board of directors. Wayne has also donated countless hours to Peppermint Ridge, serving three terms on its board of directors and chairing several committees. He also directed renovations of the Woman's Improvement Club clubhouse, and chaired fundraising activities for the Corona-Norco Family YMCA.

Wayne began his career in 1945 with ALCOA after receiving his B.S. in Mechanical Engineering. He stayed with ALCOA over 40 years. During his career he was active in professional associations, has written on the subject of aluminum, and is co-holder of a patent for stair treads.

For all his volunteer efforts, Wayne has been recognized with several awards. In 1975, he was named Citizen of the Year by the Corona Chamber of Commerce; received the Chamber's ''George'' Award; was chosen, along with his wife Evie, Corona Community Hospital Volunteers of the Year; and was recipient of the Golden Hinge Award—only the second one given—by Peppermint Ridge.

Wayne has set a standard of excellence and commitment in his work in the community. His tireless passion for community service has contributed immensely to the betterment of the community of Corona, California. His involvement in the community makes me proud to call him a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many community members are grateful for his service and salute him as he receives the ''Ira D. Calvert Distinguished Service Award.''

LOW-INCOME TAXPAYER PROTECTION ACT OF 2004

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce companion legislation to S. 685, a bill sponsored by Senator JEFF BINGAMAN (D–NM) and Senator DANIEL AKAKA (D–HI) to assist low-income taxpayers in preparing and filing their tax returns and to protect taxpayers from unscrupulous refund anticipation loan providers. In particular, the provisions of this legislation will benefit taxpayers eligible for the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) who must fill out dauntingly complex forms—the EITC instructions run 53 pages alone—and, because of the dearth of free tax preparation services to help navigate the process, are heavy users of commercial tax preparers.

The problems addressed by the Low-Income Taxpayer Protection Act of 2004 have been ignored for too long. The National Taxpayer Advocate's FY2002 Annual Report to Congress notes that in 2000, only 1 percent of filers with incomes below the EITC income limit received free tax preparation assistance from either the IRS Taxpayer Assistance Centers or volunteer sites affiliated with the IRS. The remaining low-income filers who had their forms filed for them used a commercial preparer. While many commercial preparers provide a very valuable, necessary service, the work of these men and women is too often overshadowed by those who peddle refund anticipation loans (RALs)—usurious short-term loans secured by the taxpayer's tax refund, including the EITC. In fact, it is estimated that 53 percent of EITC recipients who went to a paid tax preparer ended up with a RAL.

According to a report prepared by the Consumer Federation of America and the National Consumer Law Center and entitled ''All Drain, No Gain,'' refund anticipation loan fees cost consumers about $1.14 billion in 2002, up almost $200 million from the year before. Additional fees for electronic filing, ''document preparation,'' and ''applications'' added another $406 million to the total. Our constituents who can afford it the least are suffering a $1.5 billion drain on their tax refunds.

Mr. Speaker, let me take a moment to break down these estimates from the cumulative to the individual using an analysis found in ''All Drain, No Gain.'' Based upon the prices for RALs in 2004, a consumer might pay the following in order to get a $2,100 RAL—the average refund—from a commercial tax preparation chain this year: (1) A loan fee of $99.95, which includes a $24.95 fee supposedly for the ''dummy'' bank account used to receive the consumer's tax refund from the IRS to repay the RAL; and (2) a system administration fee that averages $32 per loan. Combine that with tax preparation fees, which average about $120, and the total is about $250. The effective APR on this RAL would be 182 percent.

The Office of the Taxpayer Advocate acknowledges that there are several factors that drive low-income taxpayers to pay for tax preparation, including: (1) Inconvenient location or hours of VITA sites; (2) lack of bank accounts for direct deposit of refunds; (3)

need or desire for immediate cash; and (4) inability to prepare one's own taxes due to limited language, literacy, or computer skills.

This bill takes a two-pronged approach aimed at curtailing the drain on the EITC program by first regulating income tax preparers and refund anticipation loan providers and, secondly, creating IRS-administered grant programs for free tax preparation for low-income taxpayers and to help individuals establish a bank account for the first time.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DAVID DAVIS

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today to pay tribute to photographer David Davis and the outstanding work he has done to promote our Native American culture in Colorado. David is constantly challenging himself as an artist, and his recent project focusing on Native Americans has garnered national attention. While I would like to congratulate David on his recent accomplishment, I would also like to recognize his selflessness in donating proceeds of the project to Native Americans.

David first became interested in the Native American culture in 1993, when he did a photo shoot of a Native American wedding dress for an advertisement. Since then, he has traveled around southwestern Colorado and the neighboring states taking photographs of Native Americans against the breathtaking backgrounds of the Colorado Plateau. David made a DVD of his photographs entitled ''Native Faces—Desert Light,'' and his work on this project will be shown at a Native American film festival in Tuba City, Arizona. Some of the proceeds from the project have been donated to endeavors encouraging Native Americans to take up photography, and his work is sold at stores on reservations.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to bring the selfless work of David Davis to the attention of this body of Congress and this nation. He has helped to promote this historically rich culture, and has brought to light the majesty of this land and its native peoples. I wish David all the best with this project and his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, consider this scenario: ''The formation of a free and democratic society is being hampered by internal and external strife. The drafting of a constitution encounters opposition and various parties within the country are struggling for power. The economy is underdeveloped and there is little order. The people are unsure of their future and this promise of democracy. It would take decades for this democracy to truly flourish and become the republic that it is today.'' That's the history of America, Mr. Speaker. The people of Iraq, a year after their liberation, are facing many of the same obstacles of early Americans. However, they have accomplished more in one year than the United States accomplished in a decade—they have drafted a working constitution that guarantees freedom of religion and worship, freedom of expression, freedom to peacefully assemble and demonstrate, freedom to organize political parties, freedom to join unions and the right to equal treatment under the law. This progress is unprecedented.

365 days ago, our troops, along with other coalition forces, entered the country of Iraq to liberate a badly battered and abused population. Our troops performed with determination and tenacity: they were given their mission and performed brilliantly. Now, because of their accomplishment, 24 million people live in a country that has voiced its dedication to freedom and democracy. Unfortunately, there are those in this country that lack the same resolve to freedom and democracy. At the first sign of opposition and test of honor they run and hide behind words such as ''quagmire.'' This wavering support is disheartening at best and it undermines the incredible accomplishments of our troops, especially those that have made the ultimate sacrifice. It also undermines the determination of the Iraqi people to establish a democracy—deeming them incapable and incompetent.

Even as we speak here today, progress is being made in Iraq. As chairman of the Water and Power Subcommittee I've visited Iraq and witnessed first-hand their accomplishments. With our help, they have surpassed prewar peak electrical generation levels and are on track to be generating at 140 percent over their prewar level by June. Water facilities are currently operating at 65 percent of prewar levels, mostly due to years of neglect, electricity shortages and post-war looting of plant and emergency generators. Current projects include the rehabilitation of 15 water treatment facilities and portions of the Sweet Water Canal to Basrah. These projects will benefit over 14.5 million Iraqis and provide a future for water reliability.

One year ago this country, along with our allies, made the decision to topple a tyrannical regime, liberate a people, and help build a democracy in the heart of a terrorist breeding ground. Our troops have done, and continue to do, their part. It is time for all leaders in America to do their part: we must stand by the Iraqi people and government as they begin their long and challenging journey towards freedom. Our own past demonstrates that democracy is messy; at times there will be setbacks and frustrations, but in the end, freedom is worth every sacrifice.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JOAN BOWMAN, MAYOR OF LENEXA, KS

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, I attended the funeral of an outstanding public servant who was taken from us too soon. Former Lenexa, KS, Mayor Joan Bowman died on March 11 after 26 years of dedicated public service to the community that is my home.

Joan Bowman died after a long battle with cancer. This longtime community leader, volunteer and advocate for education and individuals with disabilities was elected Lenexa mayor in 1995 and 1999. She was first elected to the Lenexa City Council in 1987, the same year she was inducted into the Lenexa Volunteer Hall of Fame. Her career in public office began in 1978 as a member of the Shawnee Mission West High School Advisory Board. In 1981, she began the first of two terms on the Shawnee Mission Board of Education, where she served as board president for 2 years. In her honor, flags at Lenexa city hall were flown at half staff.

Last month, the people of Lenexa dedicated to former Mayor Bowman a 7-foot, bronze statue of Na Nex Se, the Shawnee Native American woman after whom Lenexa was named. Dedicated to Bowman for her leadership and service to our community, the statue was funded with city resources and through a local letter writing campaign, which ultimately raised $8,000 more than was needed. I hope that Joan Bowman's legacy, as embodied in the Na Nex Se statue, will inspire future generations of Lenexans to make significant contributions to our community. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD for your review a copy of the Kansas City Star's obituary regarding this remarkable, dedicated public servant.

[From the Kansas City Star, Mar. 12, 2004]

FORMER LENEXA MAYOR DIES

(By Eugene Scott)

Former Lenexa Mayor Joan Bowman, who was an advocate for education and persons with disabilities in her 26 years of public service, died Thursday after battling cancer. She was 63.

Bowman was respected as a volunteer and an officeholder, and news of her battle with cancer had been widespread in recent years.

In February, city officials dedicated a statue of Na Nex Se, the Shawnee American Indian woman after whom Lenexa was named, to Bowman in honor of her service and leadership.

Bowman was elected mayor twice, in 1995 and 1999. She was elected to the city council in 1987, the same year she was inducted into the Lenexa Volunteer Hall of Fame.

Current Lenexa Mayor Mike Boehm said Bowman's desire to implement projects in Lenexa's best interest greatly enhanced the city.

''Her biggest impact on Lenexa was that she took a reasonable approach. Joan would study every issue brought before her, and give it the necessary attention,'' he said.

Leawood Mayor Peggy Dunn worked with Bowman on the Johnson County/Wyandotte County Council of Mayors and developed a personal friendship.

''She was an outstanding leader, and a wonderful mentor to those of us who knew her,'' she said. ''She was always ready to listen, and to give . . . wise counsel.''

While Bowman formed friendships with other political leaders, Dunn said her ability to separate professional and personal relationships made her an effective leader.

''Her ability to see the big picture in every situation, to rise above personal feelings and do what was really the best thing for the greater good encouraged others to do so as well,'' Dunn said.

Rich Becker, Lenexa's mayor when Bowman was elected to the city council, admired her strong work ethic. ''She was the toughest woman I ever met in my life,'' he said.

''She was very meticulous, and she wanted to make sure that all the i's were dotted and all the t's were crossed.''

While demanding, Bowman was humble, Becker said, and realized that being a team player would lead to success for everyone involved.

''She liked to involve as many people as she could in making decisions. She was involved in so many things, and very easy to work with. She was the kind of person you look up to and say 'nice job,'' he said.

Her career in public office began in 1978 as a member of the Shawnee Mission West Advisory Board. In 1981, she served the first of two terms on the Shawnee Mission Board of Education. She was board president for two years.

Julie Miller, a Shawnee Mission school board member for 16 years, met Bowman when the two served on the district's advisory boards. She remembers Bowman being consistently well-informed and dependable. ''She was a brilliant person. You could always count on Joan,'' she said.

Before beginning her career in public service, Bowman taught math at junior high schools in the Shawnee Mission district. She graduated from Pittsburg State University in 1962.

David Watkins, Lenexa's city administrator for 19 years before leaving to accept a position as city administrator in Auburn, Ala., said Bowman's experience in education allowed her to communicate effectively with community members while listening to their concerns:

''She could take complex issues like the watershed program, and take all that technical info and reformat it to citizen groups in a manner that they can understand.''

She was on the Lenexa Convention and Visitors Bureau board, the Lenexa Chamber of Commerce's board of directors, and was a member of the Lenexa Historical Society.

Council member Diane Linver said that despite Bowman's numerous offices and accolades, she would want to be remembered as a person who cared about her family and her community.

''She was a wonderful wife, a wonderful mother and a wonderful friend,'' she said.

Survivors include her husband, Ed, and two sons.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MAYOR VAN WILLIS

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to pay tribute to the life and memory of Mancos, Colorado, Mayor Van Willis who passed away recently at the age of eighty-seven. Van was a true American patriot, and a beloved friend and colleague to many in his Colorado community. In his years spent in public service, Van embodied the ideals of integrity and courage that we, as Americans, have come to expect from our public servants. As his family and community mourn his passing, I believe it is appropriate to recognize the life of this exceptional man, and his many contributions to his community, state and country.

Van lived an immensely rich and full life, always holding firm to his beliefs in serving his community and country. He spent ten years serving his nation in the Army, earning a reputation as a solid and dependable leader. After moving to Bayfield in 1947, he embraced the pioneering spirit of Colorado, running a ranch there, and later in Mancos. Van dedicated his efforts towards the betterment of his Mancos community, spending twelve years as the mayor of Mancos, serving on the board of the Chamber of Commerce, and serving as president of the Mancos Community Development. He also held a post command in the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and was a member of the American Legion.

Mr. Speaker, we are all at a great loss because of Mayor Willis' passing, but can be comforted in knowing he helped make Mancos a better place for future generations. I would like to extend my heartfelt sorrow to his sister Margaret, his children, Linda and Dean; his grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Mayor Willis' selfless dedication to Mancos, the State of Colorado, and the United States has helped ensure a promising future for our great country and I am deeply honored to bring his life to the attention of this body of Congress and this nation. I am proud to have known such a great man who enriched the lives of his family, community and nation.

TRIBUTE TO PROFESSOR RANDOLPH L. BRAHAM

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to a brilliant and remarkable scholar, Professor Randolph L. Braham. Dr. Braham is Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Political Science from the City College and the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, where he is also Director of the Rosenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies. He is a distinguished member of the Academic Committee of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council. Professor Braham is an outstanding scholar and chronicler of the Hungarian Holocaust whose sixtieth anniversary we are commemorating this week.

His two-volume work, The Politics of Genocide: The Holocaust in Hungary, won the Jewish National Book award in 1981, and earned him citations in the New York State Assembly. In 1995, he was awarded the Order of Merit Officer's Cross of the Hungarian Republic.

Born in Romania in 1922, Professor Braham received a traditional Jewish upbringing in Dej, a small town in Transylvania. His parents and many relatives perished in the Holocaust. He spent 1943–45 in a forced labor battalion with the Hungarian and German armies in Ukraine. Later, he was captured and incarcerated in the gulag where he experienced the horrors of Soviet labor camps.

After the war, Professor Braham came to the United States on a Hillel Fellowship at the Graduate Faculty of the New School University and encountered many of the émigré luminaries, including Frieda Wunderlich, Arnold Brecht, Erich Hula, and Boris Mirkineguetzevitch.

Professor Braham has spent over forty years as a professor at the City College of New York. He is the author or co-editor of forty-two books on the Holocaust in central and eastern Europe including his all important documentation The Nazis' Last Victims: The Holocaust in Hungary. Professor Braham has made a most significant contribution to the scientific historiography of the Holocaust in general and the tragedy of Hungarian Jewry in particular.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to Dr. Randolph Braham for his remarkable achievements and scholarly contributions in documenting the persecution of Jews in Europe, particularly his extensive history of the Hungarian Holocaust. The life's work of Dr. Randolph Braham is a major contribution to the understanding of the history of the twentieth century, and therefore it deserves to be recognized and honored by the Congress of the United States.

As George Santayana reminded us, ''those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.'' Dr. Braham's important legacy should help all future generations to learn the dark lessons of the past and thus enable them in the future to create societies based on justice and on values that will always include respect for the rights of the minorities and human rights in general.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CARIBBEAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH LEGISLATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution designating a Caribbean-American Heritage month. This resolution acknowledges the contributions of Caribbean-Americans from the inception of our country to the present.

Alexander Hamilton, Hazel Scott, Sidney Poitier, Jean Michel Basquiat, Eric Holder, Colin Powell, Edwidge Danticat, Jean Baptiste Point du Sable, Sidney Ponson, Maryse Condé, Harry Belafonte, Sidney Poitier, Celia Cruz, Mervyn Dymally and Shirley Chisolm are just a few of the many Caribbean-Americans who helped shape American government, politics, business, arts, education, science, and culture.

Many of us in Congress focus on ''hot spots'' in the Caribbean—Cuba and Haiti—and forget that we have many constituents with roots from Suriname to the Bahamas and from Belize to Barbados.

The recent revitalization of a bi-partisan Congressional Caribbean Caucus forced many of us to re-evaluate the policy between CARICOM and the United States, and to discuss proposed and pending U.S. legislation that will have a direct impact on bilateral relations.

It is also important that we remember that our policies in the Caribbean affect the relatives of our constituents. I wrote this resolution to remind the American public that there are Caribbean-Americans who reside in every state of the union, and make sure that are recognized and celebrated.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure to honor the Caribbean-American community, and create a month designated to annually acknowledge their service to our society.

HONORING MR. LENNY MARTINELLI OF BOULDER, COLORADO

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Lenny Martinelli of Boulder, Colorado for his exemplary service to the Colorado community.

In 1987, two cities on opposite sides of the world, in countries on opposite sides of the political spectrum, collaborated to bring their respective traditions, culture, and history to one another in a peaceful manner. During a time of great conflict and tension, the cities of Boulder, Colorado, and Dushanbe, Tajikistan, united as the Sister Cities. Over the next three years, dozens of Tajikistani painters, woodcarvers, and ceramicists worked on completing Dushanbe's gift to Boulder, the Boulder Dushanbe Teahouse. The result was a magnificent structure and a wonderful restaurant that offers exquisite cuisine and atmosphere.

The success and beauty of the Teahouse would not have been possible without the leadership and management of Lenny Martinelli. For six years, Lenny has provided the direction, character, and culinary expertise for one of Colorado's most impressive restaurants. As proprietor of the Teahouse, Lenny has been responsible for maintaining the impressive reputation and quality of the Soviet Union's largest gift to the United States.

But Mr. Martinelli's dedication to the Sister Cities reaches beyond the walls of his restaurant. Every year he organizes a community cultural celebration on the Persian New Year of Navrus. He holds annual fundraisers to help finance Dushanbe's Cyber-Cafe, which is Boulder's gift to its sister city. A very positive and talented man, Lenny also is a constant advocate for worldwide unity and global awareness.

Mr. Speaker, the Boulder Dushanbe Teahouse is a world-class facility. Its lovely architecture and artwork make it the largest example of ancient Persian art in the country. Its food is an awesome assimilation of the greatest tastes from across the East. As the name indicates, it has one of the most impressive collections of teas in the world. Adding to the overall excellence of the Teahouse is Mr. Martinelli's great proprietorship which has kept the Teahouse as one of the premiere dining facilities in the Rocky Mountain region.

Through his role in the Boulder Dushanbe Teahouse, Lenny Martinelli has demonstrated the greatest attributes of a global community. I urge my colleague to join me today in honoring him for his accomplishments.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO NICK ALCORTA

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to pay tribute to the life and memory of Nick Alcorta. Nick touched the lives of many in his Basalt, Colorado community, dedicating his time and efforts to teaching the sport of baseball to youths. His tragic death at age thirty-nine is a loss to us all, and as the Basalt community gathers to celebrate the life of such an exceptional person, I would like to take this opportunity to honor a beloved Coloradoan.

Nick loved teaching and mentoring children, especially his two boys Dominick and Derek. He was involved in numerous youth sports programs, serving as the recreation director for Basalt from 1997 through 2002, serving as head coach of the Basalt High baseball team, and as assistant coach of the Basalt High girls basketball program. When the town of Basalt was forced to lay off Nick due to a tight budget, Nick volunteered his time for the kids who meant so much to him while their parents rallied at Town Hall to support the man who meant so much to their children.

Mr. Speaker, we are all at a great loss because of Nick Alcorta's passing, but can be comforted in knowing he made a lasting impact as a superb role model for the youth in Basalt. I am deeply honored to bring his life to the attention of this body of Congress and this nation today. My thoughts are with Nick's wife Debbie, his two children, and the entire Basalt community during this difficult time of bereavement.

EL SALVADOR

HON. DANA ROHRABACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the result of the election in Spain was a major setback in the War on Terror and is a setback in our relationship with the people of Spain. There is another election, which will be taking place shortly in this our hemisphere, in El Salvador. The communist/FMLN political party derives from the communist guerillas who waged war for years to establish a communist dictatorship in El Salvador. They could win this election in part because of reported covert assistance they are receiving from foreign communists and pro-Castro regimes.

If the communist/FMLN presidential candidate wins, the great spirit of cooperation we have had with El Salvador would be put in jeopardy. The FMLN has promised to immediately open full diplomatic relations with communist Cuba, which is a state sponsor of terrorism. They will do that at the expense of El Salvador's relationship with the United States.

If a new communist/FMLN government in El Salvador acts as it promises to do it could well cause the United States to reconsider its grant of Temporary Protective Status (TPS) to about 400,000 Salvadorans who live there. These citizens of El Salvador living in the U.S. also send about two billion dollars to their home country each year. A hostile communist/FMLN regime in El Salvador would likely lead the United States to reconsider our policies which permit the sending of such a bounty to El Salvador.

It is important for the people of El Salvador to understand that their decision at the polls will have consequences for their future relations with the United States. A victory for the communist/FMLN will most likely open a regrettable gulf between our countries after years of cooperation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. FRANK W. BALLANCE, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. BALLANCE. Mr. Speaker, due to an emergency, I was not present for Rollcall votes Nos. 48 and 49. Had I been present, on Rollcall vote No. 48, I would have voted "aye"; on Rollcall vote No. 49, I would have voted "aye."

PAYING TRIBUTE TO SOUTHWESTERN BEVERAGE COMPANY

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise before this body of Congress and this nation to pay tribute to the Southwestern Beverage Company's impressive tradition of business excellence and philanthropy in Durango, Colorado. Recently, the Durango Chamber of Commerce recognized the company with the Spirit of Durango award for its history of service to the community. It is with great pride that I congratulate Southwestern Beverage for its well-deserved award, and thank them for their significant contributions to their community.

The Southwestern Beverage legacy began when Arthur Welsh founded the company in 1963. From the beginning, the Welsh family was committed not only to distributing beverages across Southwest Colorado, but also to contributing profits to scholarship and recreation events in the Durango community. The company has sponsored numerous local events, including the Iron Horse Bicycle Classic and the Durango Grand Prix. The Welsh family has always believed that as their business grew, so should their civic responsibility to the community.

Mr. Speaker, the drive the Southwestern Beverage Company and Welsh family have shown in their business and charitable activities have made them true civic leaders in their community. For over forty years, they have left an indelible mark of excellence on the Durango community and the State of Colorado. It is my privilege to pay tribute to the company before this body of Congress and this nation today and congratulate them on receiving the Spirit of Durango award.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

The House agreed to H. Res. 557, Relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces.

House Committees ordered reported 12 sundry measures, including the following: the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2005; the Spending Control Act of 2004; and the Highway Reauthorization Tax Act of 2004.

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. It will next meet at 12 noon, on Monday, March 22, 2004.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Measures Introduced: 13 public bills, H.R. 3980–3992; and 9 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 387–389, and H. Res. 564–565, 567–570 were introduced. **Page H1229**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1229–30**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 566, providing for consideration of H.R. 1375, to provide regulatory relief and improve productivity for insured depository institutions, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 108–439). **Pages H1228–29**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Bass to act as Speaker Pro Tempore for today. **Page H1119**

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Hastings of Florida motion to adjourn by a yea-and-nay vote of 36 yeas to 377 nays, Roll No. 61. **Page H1129**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Honoring the life and legacy of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt: Debated on March 16, H.J. Res. 87, Honoring the life and legacy of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and recognizing his contributions on the anniversary of the date of his birth, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 398 yeas to 5 nays with 6 voting "present", Roll No. 65. **Page H1202**

Suspensions Postponed: The House completed debate on the following measures to suspend the rules. Further proceedings were postponed until Thursday, March 18.

Counter-Terrorism and Narco-Terrorism Rewards Program Act: H.R. 3782, amended, to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to increase the maximum amount of an award available under the Department of State rewards program, to expand the eligibility criteria to receive an award, to authorize nonmonetary awards, to publicize the existence of the rewards program; and **Pages H1133–35**

Recognizing more than five decades of strategic partnership between the U.S. and the people of the Marshall Islands: H. Con. Res. 364, to recognize more than 5 decades of strategic partnership between

the United States and the people of the Marshall Islands in the pursuit of international peace and security. **Pages H1135–42**

Recess: The House recessed at 1 p.m. and reconvened at 2:10 p.m. **Page H1142**

Liberation of the Iraqi people and the service of the U.S. Armed Forces and Coalition forces: The House agreed to H. Res. 557, relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces, by a recorded vote of 327 ayes to 93 noes with 7 voting ''present'', Roll No. 64.

Pages H1122–29, H1130–33, H1142–H1202

H. Res. 561, the rule providing for consideration of the measure was agreed to by a recorded vote of 228 ayes to 195 noes, Roll No. 63, after agreeing to order the previous question by a yea-and-nay vote of 217 yeas to 197 nays, Roll No. 62

Pages H11332–33, H1133

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings today. There were no quorum calls.

Pages H1129, H1132–33, H1133, H1201–02, H1202

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 12 midnight.

Committee Meetings

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FDA AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies held a hearing on Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the USDA: J.B. Penn, Under Secretary, Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services; James R. Little, Administrator, Farm Service Agency; A. Ellen Terpstra, Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service; Ross J. Davidson, Jr., Administrator, Risk Management Agency; and Stephen B. Dewhurst, Budget Officer.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary and Related Agencies held a hearing on the Supreme Court. Testimony was heard from U.S. Supreme Court Justices Anthony Kennedy and Clarence Thomas.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on the FBI. Testimony was heard from Robert S. Mueller, III, Director, FBI, Department of Justice.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on the Navy/Marine Corps Budget Overview. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Navy: Gordon R. England, Secretary; ADM. Vernon E. Clark, USNm Chief, Naval Operations; and GEN Michael W. Hagee, USMC, Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps.

The Subcommittee also met in executive session to hold a hearing on Navy/Marine Corps Acquisition. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Navy: John J. Young, Jr., Assistant Secretary, Research, Development and Acquisition; and VADM John B. Nathan, Deputy Chief, Naval Operations, Warfare Requirements and Programs.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development held a hearing on Science, Nuclear Energy and Renewable Energy. Testimony was heard from Robert Card, Under Secretary, Energy, Science and Environment, Department of Energy.

HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing on Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Testimony was heard from Michael Garcia, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior held a hearing on the U.S. Geological Survey. Testimony was heard from Charles G. Groat, Director, U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

LABOR, HHS, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies held a hearing on Older American Programs. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: Josefina G. Carbonell, Assistant Secretary, Aging; Richard Hodes, M.D., Director, National Institute on Aging; and David Dye, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training; and David Eisner, CEO, Corporation for National and Community Service.

TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Treasury, and Independent Agencies held a hearing on the FAA. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Transportation: Marion C. Blakey, Administrator, FAA; and Kenneth M. Mead, Inspector General.

VA, HUD, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies held a hearing on U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims. Testimony was heard from Judge Donald Ivers, U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims.

The Subcommittee held a hearing on Community Development Financial Institutions. Testimony was heard from Wayne Abernathy, Assistant Secretary, Financial Institutions, Department of the Treasury.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness. Testimony was heard from Phillip Mangano, Executive Director, Interagency Council on Homelessness.

COMBATING PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Committee on Armed Services: Ordered reported the following measures: H.R. 3966, amended, To amend title 10, United States Code, and the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve the ability of the Department of Defense to establish and maintain Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps units at institutions of higher education, to improve the ability of students to participate in Senior ROTC programs, and to ensure that institutions of higher education provide military recruiters entry to campuses and access to students that is at least equal in quality and scope to that provided to any other employer; S. 2057, To require the Secretary of Defense to reimburse members of the United States Armed Forces for certain transportation expenses by the members in connection with leave under the Central Command Rest and Recuperation Leave Program before the program was expanded to include domestic travel; H.R. 3104, To provide for the establishment of campaign medals to be awarded to members of the Armed Forces who participate in Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom; and H. Con. Res. 374, amended, Expressing the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense, Federal banking agencies, the National Credit Union Administration, and the Federal Trade Commission should work to mitigate the financial hardships experienced by members of the reserve component as a result of being called to active duty.

The Committee also held a hearing on Combating the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST—TRANSPORTATION COMMAND'S AIRLIFT AND SEALIFT PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Projection Forces held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2005 National Defense Authorization budget request—the U.S. Transportation Command's (USTRANSCOM) Airlift and Sealift Programs. Testimony was heard from GEN John W. Handy, USAF, Commander, U.S. Transportation Command, Department of Defense.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST—UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE AND UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2005 National Defense Authorization budget request—Department of Defense Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle (UCAV) and Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Programs. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Glen Lamartin, Director, Defense Systems, Office of the Secretary; MG James D. Thurman, USA, Director, Army Aviation Task Force; and LTG Walter E. Buchanan, III, USAF, Commander, Central Command Air Forces and Commander, 9th Air Force; and the following officials of the GAO: Neal Curtin, Director, Defense Capabilities and Management; and Paul L. Francis, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management.

CONCURRENT BUDGET RESOLUTION; SPENDING CONTROL ACT

Committee on the Budget: Ordered reported the following measures: the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2005; and H.R. 3973, amended, Spending Control Act of 2004.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND FEDERAL CONSOLIDATION LOANS

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Held a hearing entitled "Fiscal Responsibility and Federal Consolidation Loans: Examining Cost Implications for Taxpayers, Students, and Borrowers." Testimony was heard from Cornelia M. Ashby, Director, Education, Workforce and Income Security, GAO; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Ordered reported the following measures: H.R. 27, amended, Small Public

Housing Authority Act; H.R. 1914, Jamestown 400th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act of 2003; H.R. 2131, To award a congressional gold medal to President Jose Maria Aznar of Spain; H.R. 2768, John Marshall Commemorative Coin Act; and H.R. 3277, Marine Corps 230th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Civil Service and Agency Organization approved for full Committee action, as amended, the following bills: H.R. 3737, Administrative Law Judges Pay Reform Act of 2004; and H.R. 3751, To require that the Office of Personnel Management study and present options under which dental and vision benefits could be made available to Federal employees and retirees and other appropriate classes of individuals.

WORLD RADIO CONFERENCES—U.S. PREPARATION

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats and International Relations held a hearing on U.S. Preparation for the World Radio Conferences: Too little, too late? Testimony was heard from Jeffrey N. Shane, Under Secretary, Transportation Policy, Department of Transportation; William Readdy, Associate Administrator, Space Flight, NASA; Michael Gallagher, Acting Assistant Secretary, Communications and Information, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Department of Commerce; Kathleen Abernathy, Commission, FCC; Ambassador David Gross, U.S. Coordinator, International Communications and Information Policy, Department of State; Lin Wells, Acting Assistant Secretary, NII (Networks and Information Integration), Department of Defense; and public witnesses.

U.S. AND ASIA: CONTINUITY, INSTABILITY AND TRANSITION

Committee International Relations: Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing on the United States and Asia: Continuity, Instability, and Transition, Testimony was heard from public wintesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES; CURRENT SITUATION IN SERBIA

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Europe approved for full Committee action the following measures: H. Res. 543, House Commission For Assisting Democratic Parliaments Resolution; and H. Res. 558, amended, Welcoming the accession of Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on the Current Situation in Serbia. Testimony was heard from D. Kathleen Stephens, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, Department of State; Daniel Serwer, Director, Balkans Initiative, U.S. Institute of Peace; and a public witness.

DESIGNATION OF FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS REFORM ACT

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on International Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Humans Rights approved for full Committee action H.R. 3978, Designation of Foreign Terrorist Organizations Reform Act.

EXAMINE NEW APPRAISAL OFFICER

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands held a hearing to examine how the Department of Interior's new Appraisal Officer is functioning and how land exchanges are being evaluated. Testimony was heard from Lynn Scarlett, Assistant Secretary, Policy, Management, and Budget, Department of the Interior.

FINANCIAL SERVICES REGULATORY RELIEF ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice, vote, a structured rule providing one hour of general debate on H.R. 1375, Financial Services Regulatory Relief Act of 2003, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill (except those arising under provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 other than section 302(f), prohibiting consideration of legislation providing new budget authority in excess of a committee's 302(a) allocation of such authority). The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute (except those arising under provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 other than section 302(f), prohibiting consideration of legislation providing new budget authority in excess of a committee's 302(a) allocation of such authority). The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. The rule provides that the amendments printed in the report may be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by

a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Oxley, and Representatives Leach, Kelly, Gillmor, Frank of Massachusetts, Waters, Jackson-Lee of Texas and Weiner.

GREEN CHEMISTRY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Committee on Science: Held a hearing on H.R. 3970, Green Chemistry Research and Development Act of 2004. Testimony was heard from Arden Bement, Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce and Acting Director, NSF; Paul Gilman, Assistant Administrator, Research and Development, EPA; and public witnesses.

COMPUTER-ASSISTED PASSENGER PRESCREENING SYSTEM STATUS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held an oversight hearing on the Status of the Computer-Assisted Passenger Prescreening System (CAPPS II). Testimony was heard from David M. Stone, Acting Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security; Norman J. Rabkin, Managing Director, Homeland Security and Justice Division, GAO; and public witnesses.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS—INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing to examine the Department of Veterans Affairs Information Technology program. Testimony was heard from Linda Koontz Director, Information Management Issues, GAO: James C. Reardon, Chief Information Officer, Military Health System, Office of the Assistant Secretary (Health Affairs), Department of Defense; Robert N. McFarland, Assistant Secretary, Information and Technology; Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

HIGHWAY REAUTHORIZATION TAX ACT

Committee on Ways and Means: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 3971, Highway Reauthorization Tax Act of 2004.

NATIONAL GEO-SPATIAL AGENCY PROGRAM BUDGET; COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to hold a hearing on National Geo-spatial Agency Program Budget. Testimony was heard from departmental witnessers.

The Committee also met in executive session to consider Committee business.

BORDER AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY BUDGET PROPOSAL

Select Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Infrastructure and Border Security held a hearing entitled "The Department of Homeland Security's Border and Transportation Security (BTS) Budget Proposal." Testimony was heard from Asa Hutchinson, Under Secretary, Border and Transportation Security, Department of Homeland Security.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 2004

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans Affairs to examine the legislative presentations of the Air Force Sergeants Association, the Retired Enlisted Association, Gold Star Wives of America, and the Fleet Reserve Association, 10 a.m., 345 CHOB.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Agency and Related Agencies, on Food Safety and Inspection Service, 9:30 a.m., 2362A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary and Related Agencies, on Patent and Trademark Office, 10 a.m., and on State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance, 2 p.m., H–309 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, on International HIV/AIDS Assistance Request, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Homeland Security, on Office of Domestic Preparedness, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, on Oversight: Presidio Trust, 10 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, on Department of Education, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, hearing on H.R. 1741, To redesignate the position of the Secretary of the Navy as the Secretary of the Navy and the Marine Corps, 8 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Readiness and the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities, joint hearing on the Fiscal Year 2005 National Defense Authorization budget request—Training Transformation—

Examination of the Joint National Training Capability, 1 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing on the Department of Energy's Atomic Energy Defense Activities Budget, 10 a.m., 2216 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Total Force, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2005 National Defense Authorization Budget Request on Defense Health Programs—Current and Future Issues, 9 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations, hearing entitled ''Reforming and Strengthening Defined Benefit Plans: Examining the Health of the Multiemployer Pension System,'' 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection, hearing entitled ''Reauthorization of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration,'' 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Inter-governmental Transfers: Violations of the Federal-State Medicaid Partnership or Legitimate State Budget Tool?'' 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, hearing entitled ''Successful Homeownership and Renting through Housing Counseling,'' 10 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''The Hunt for Saddam's Money: U.S. and Foreign Efforts to Recover Iraq's Stolen Money,'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, to consider the following; H.R. 3917, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 695 Marconi Boulevard in Copiague, New York, as the ''Maxine S. Postal United States Post Office;'' and pending Committee business; followed by a hearing on A Prescription for Safety: The need for H.R. 3880, Internet Pharmacy Consumer Protection Act, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, hearing on U.S.-Russia Relations in Putin's Second Term, 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Claims, oversight hearing on US VISIT: A Down Payment on Homeland Security, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, hearing on H.R. 3883, To reauthorize the Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, hearing on The Presidential Awardees for Excellence in Math and Science Teaching: A Lesson Plan for Success, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing on NASA-Department of Defense Cooperation in Space Transportation, 1 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Workforce, Empowerment and Government Programs, hearing entitled ''The Benefits of Health Savings Accounts,'' 10:30 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2005 Budget Request for the Department of Homeland Security's Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate, the Office of Domestic Preparedness, and First Responder Funding, 1 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on Health Quality Initiatives, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Social Security, hearing on the SSA's Management of the Ticket to Work Program, 10 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Select Committee on Homeland Security, to mark up H.R. 3266, Faster and Smarter Funding for First Responders Act of 2003, 10:30 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Joint Meetings: Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentations of the Air Force Sergeants Association, the Retired Enlisted Association, Gold Star Wives of America, and the Fleet Reserve Association, 10 a.m., 345 CHOB.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

12 noon, Monday, March 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 2 p.m.), Senate will resume consideration of S. 1637, Jumpstart Our Business Strength (JOBS) Act.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

10 a.m., Thursday, March 18

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Postponed votes on suspensions:

H.R. 3782, Counter-Terrorism and Narco-Terrorism Rewards Program Act; and

H. Con. Res. 364, to recognize more than 5 decades of strategic partnership between the United States and the people of the Marshall Islands in the pursuit of international peace and security.

Consideration of H.R. 1375, Financial Services Regulatory Relief Act (subject to a rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Ballance, Frank W., Jr., N.C., E402
Becerra, Xavier, Calif., E398, E399
Bereuter, Doug, Nebr., E397
Bonner, Jo, Ala., E389, E390
Burton, Dan, Ind., E394, E396
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E398, E399, E400
Davis, Lincoln, Tenn., E393
Diaz-Balart, Lincoln, Fla., E398
Frost, Martin, Tex., E390, E391
Gordon, Bart, Tenn., E393
Gutierrez, Luis V., Ill., E393
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E398
Jackson-Lee, Sheila, Tex., E389, E390, E391
Johnson, Timothy V., Ill., E390
Lantos, Tom, Calif., E401
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E401
Lewis, Jerry, Calif., E395
McInnis, Scott, Colo., E398, E399, E400, E401, E402, E402
Meek, Kendrick B., Fla., E392
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E390
Moore, Dennis, Kansas, E400
Paul, Ron, Tex., E391
Porter, Jon C., Nev., E393, E396
Rodriguez, Ciro D., Tex., E393
Rohrabacher, Dana, Calif., E402
Skelton, Ike, Mo., E392
Tancredo, Thomas G., Colo., E389
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E393, E396
Udall, Mark, Colo., E402

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.