

over \$13 million in goods and services last year. They are doing the same thing in every State that they run in.

Some people think the solution to the problem is privatizing the system. If we privatize, we will see the same thing we saw when we deregulated the airline industry. Only the lucrative routes will be maintained and routes to rural locations will be expensive and few.

I was in New York shortly after September 11 when the plane leaving JFK airport crashed into the Bronx. I, along with many of my colleagues in both the House and Senate, took Amtrak back to Washington. I realized once again just how important Amtrak is to the American people and how important it is for the Nation to have alternative modes of transportation.

This is not about fiscal policy. This is about providing a safe and reliable public transportation system that the citizens of this country need and deserve.

I am asking all of my colleagues to join me and support the full funding of Amtrak.

#### INFORMATION THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, last week H.J. Res. 55 was introduced. This resolution requires the President to develop and implement a plan for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq. The plan would be announced before December 31, 2005, with the withdrawal to commence no later than October 1, 2006.

The media and the opponents of this plan immediately and incorrectly claimed it would set a date certain for a total withdrawal. The resolution, hardly radical in nature, simply restates the policy announced by the administration. We have been told repeatedly that there will be no permanent occupation of Iraq and the management will be turned over to the Iraqis as soon as possible.

The resolution merely pressures the administration to be more precise in its stated goals and make plans to achieve them in a time frame that negates the perception we are involved in a permanent occupation of Iraq.

The sharpest criticism of this resolution is that it would, if implemented, give insurgents in Iraq information that is helpful to their cause and harmful to our troops. This is a reasonable concern, which we address by not setting a precise time for exiting Iraq. The critics, though, infer that the enemy should never have any hint as to our intentions.

Yet, as we prepared to invade Iraq, the administration generously informed the Iraqis exactly about our plans to use "shock and awe" military

force. With this information, many Iraqi fighters, anticipating immediate military defeat, disappeared into the slums and hills and survived to fight another day, which they have.

One could argue that this information made available to the enemy was clearly used against us. This argument used to criticize H.J. Res. 55, that it might reveal our intentions, is not automatically valid. It could just as easily be argued that conveying to the enemy that we do not plan an indefinite occupation, as is our stated policy, will save many American lives.

But what we convey or do not convey to the Iraqi people is not the most crucial issue. The more important issue is this. Do the American people deserve to know more about our goals: the length of time we expect to be in Iraq; how many more Americans are likely to be killed and wounded; will there be a military draft; what is the likelihood of lingering diseases that our veterans may suffer, remember Agent Orange and the Persian Gulf War syndrome; and how many more tax dollars are required to fight this war indefinitely?

The message insurgents do need to hear and believe is that we are serious when we say we have no desire for a permanent occupation of Iraq. We must stick to this policy announced by the administration.

A plausible argument can be made that the guerrillas are inspired by our presence in Iraq, which to them seems endless. Iraqi deaths, whether through direct U.S. military action, collateral damage, or Iraqis killing Iraqis, serve to inspire an even greater number of Iraqis to join the insurgency. Because we are in charge, justly or not, we are blamed for all the deaths.

Continuing to justify our presence in Iraq because we must punish those for 9/11 is disingenuous to say the least. We are sadly now at greater risk than before 9/11. We refuse to deal with our own borders while chastising the Syrians for not securing their borders with Iraq. An end game needs to be in place, and the American people deserve to know exactly what that plan is. They are the ones who must send their sons and daughters off to war and pay the bills when they come due.

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

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

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

There was no objection.

#### SMART SECURITY AND IRAQ WITHDRAWAL PLAN

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, our Constitution states that Members of Congress must be chosen by the people of the United States and Congress must represent the people of the United States. That means that we, as Members of Congress, need to listen and act when the people speak.

Well, the American people have spoken. The latest Gallup poll released last week indicates that the American people are ready for our military forces in Iraq to begin coming home.

Nearly 60 percent of Americans believe that the United States should bring home some or all of our troops from Iraq. Just as revealing, the Gallup poll showed that only 36 percent of Americans support maintaining our current troop levels in Iraq. This is the lowest level of support for the war since it began in March 2003.

The American people have stated loud and clear where they stand, and their numbers are increasing. They know that the only way to keep our sons and daughters from being killed in Iraq and the only way to end the death and destruction that occur there every single day is to start the process of bringing our troops home. Clearly, the American people are way ahead of Congress on this issue.

Unfortunately, the President of the United States is way behind on the issue of Iraq. We have asked the President to come up with a plan for ending the war. He has not; so we will.

Our efforts to come up with a plan began in January when I introduced legislation calling for the President to begin bringing our troops home. Thirty-five Members of Congress support this legislation.

We continued our effort on May 25 when I introduced an amendment to the defense authorization bill calling for the President to create a plan for Iraq; 128 Members of Congress, including five Republicans and one Independent, voted in favor of this sensible amendment.

It is clear that the United States must develop a smarter agenda, an agenda for Iraq, an agenda that will go beyond when we bring our troops home from Iraq.

It is more important that we have a plan for the future than a continued military occupation, because this 2-year war has left us disturbingly weakened, weakened against the true security threats we face here at home. Let us not forget that Osama bin Laden is still at large, and al Qaeda continues to recruit new members in Iraq and elsewhere.

Once we have a plan in place to end the war in Iraq, we can start the long process of securing the United States and Iraq for the future. We can accomplish this through SMART Security.

SMART Security, which has the support of 50 Members of Congress, is a Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism for the 21st Century, and it will help us address the threats we face as a Nation.

SMART Security will prevent acts of terrorism in countries like Iraq by addressing the root conditions which give rise to terrorism in the first place: poverty, despair, resource scarcity, and lack of educational opportunities.

SMART Security encourages the United States to work with other nations to address the most pressing global issues. SMART addresses global emergencies diplomatically, instead of by resorting to armed conflict.

Instead of maintaining a long-term military occupation of Iraq, our future efforts to help the Iraqi people must follow the SMART approach: humanitarian assistance, coordinated with our international allies to rebuild Iraq's war-torn physical and economic infrastructure.

That is what I mean when I talk about SMART Security. We can defend America by relying on the very best of American values, our commitment to peace and freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for multilateral leadership.

Mr. Speaker, we must follow a smarter approach, and we must do this as we work to help the Iraqi people. That means implementing a plan to end the war in Iraq. I invite the President, all Americans, and all Members of Congress to join me in this effort.

#### MEDIA SPIN

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in this job, all of us are used to misinformation, lies and distortions and manipulation by the media. We refer to that as spin; but, Mr. Speaker, I never expected such spin to come from the no-spin zone of Bill O'Reilly.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday my staff confirmed that I was to do a television show with Mr. O'Reilly last evening. It was initially scheduled to be seven o'clock. I had a 5:15 meeting scheduled with the Secretary of Energy.

At some point in time yesterday morning, the O'Reilly show changed that appointment to 5:50. My 5:15 meeting was still in place. My staff was fully in touch with the O'Reilly show. We gave them the information, and I attended a very important meeting with Secretary of Energy Bodman in his office, a classified meeting, on the specific problems with the threats of the nuclear program and capabilities of the former Soviet states.

That meeting ran over, partly because the meeting was interrupted several times by important phone calls the Secretary had to make.

Following that meeting, which ended somewhere around 6:15, as my col-

leagues know, we had a series of six votes on the House floor.

Mr. O'Reilly proceeded to tell his national audience last night that I "snubbed" him; that I failed to call him; that I was inconsiderate; that I was rude.

Talk about spin, Mr. Speaker. So today, I sent a memo to Mr. O'Reilly explaining the facts, and I would remind Mr. O'Reilly that the Secretary of Energy and an important meeting on nuclear issues in the former Soviet States takes my top priority.

□ 1800

So do the six votes I had to pass last night on the defense appropriation bill for 2006.

Mr. O'Reilly, we do not need more spin. We need honesty and candor. You call for it every day. Now perhaps your staff is not providing the appropriate level of service to you.

Mr. Speaker, because I had some contacts from constituents and Members, I would put the summary of my statement to Mr. O'Reilly and the notes of my staff about their contact with Mr. O'Reilly's show into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

BILL O'REILLY, I have now witnessed the ultimate spin—from, of all people, you.

My scheduled taping last evening between 6-6:30 pm was pre-empted by a prolonged 5:15 pm meeting with the Secretary of Energy Sam Bodman regarding important National Security issues related to non-proliferation activities in the former Soviet states and by a series of 6 recorded votes on the Floor of the House that started at 6:30 pm and lasted until 7:15 pm.

Contrary to your spin, my staff did give notice to your staff of both conflicts and kept them informed of my status during the scheduled taping. In addition my staff offered for me to appear as soon as votes ended. Finally when I tried to personally reach you, your staff was not willing to provide my staff with a suitable number.

As much as I would have enjoyed returning to your show, my job as a Member of Congress and as Vice Chairman of both the House Armed Services Committee and Homeland Security Committee is to cast my recorded vote on issues that affect our nation, in this case, the 2006 Defense Appropriations bill and related amendments which will fund our troops through 2006.

I hope you understand these obligations and I apologize for any inconvenience this unanticipated series of events caused to you and your staff.

CURT WELDON.

As of Friday, O'Reilly was marked as tentative on the PR calendar and CW's calendar at 7:00 pm.

After I left on Friday the DOE meeting was set up for 5:15 pm.

At some point on Monday morning, O'Reilly was confirmed by PR and changed on their calendar to 5:50.

At 12:35 pm, I was notified of the change via e-mail from Kristina.

I spoke to Peter on the phone and asked if O'Reilly could be moved to later given Curt's 5:15 meeting. He informed me it couldn't but not to worry if Curt wasn't there right at 6:00.

The change was made to CW's calendar at 1:25 pm.

I spoke to Porter around 1:30 and informed him of Curt's schedule prior to O'Reilly (i.e. a meeting with the Sec. of DOE). I told him

Russ would be with him and gave him mine and Russ' numbers.

From 5:45-6:30 Porter called me looking for Curt and Russ. I informed him they were still in the classified meeting and I was not able to get in touch with him.

Around 6:15 I asked if they need to cancel—Porter said that wasn't an option.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). Members are reminded to address their comments to the Chair.

#### IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as I raise this issue with my colleagues, first I want to acknowledge that I believe that there are a number of efforts trying to make their way through the House and Senate on immigration reform that really should give us an opportunity to have a degree of synergism to respond to the concerns of the American people.

I rise today because I just finished a hearing in the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims on the important topic of employer sanctions. It would seem we should have agreement that employers should be penalized when they engage in the hiring of undocumented aliens. But interestingly enough, there is not agreement. The business community is particularly sensitive to this, claiming they are not able to find enough workers to fill these jobs. Then, of course, I think the AFL-CIO has a meritorious argument that when you enforce employer sanctions, employers who are unscrupulous will then enforce them against innocent persons, some documented and some undocumented, by either massively firing them or punishing them with lower wages and bad working conditions.

Interestingly enough, those who are fired will go out the door and that unscrupulous employer will then find others who are more timid to fulfill those jobs and they themselves may be undocumented. There are many issues that cannot be handled piecemeal.

Let me share another thought that came up in the hearing. There is a basic pilot program that requires employers to provide certain documentation when they hire an individual. Interestingly enough, only a few of the employers around the Nation can participate. Why? Because we have not given the Department of Homeland Security enough dollars to work the program beyond it being a pilot program.

It was also brought to our attention that maybe we should look to those who make the fraudulent documents and find a way to weed them out.

What this Nation really needs is comprehensive immigration reform. And so