

SMITH), in a very bipartisan recommendation to the Committee on the Budget, which would have added \$3 billion next year alone for veterans discretionary programs, including medical care and research, construction and programs that fund the administration costs of other important benefits such as compensation, pension and education programs. I want to thank the gentleman for the efforts he has made in working with us in that area.

But I urge all my colleagues to do the right thing and to honor our commitment to our veterans. These cuts are irresponsible; they are shameful and unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity once again to thank the gentlewoman for taking this time tonight. It is important that we continue to talk about this issue. We cannot allow this issue to go away, because, as we stand here tonight and as we go back and talk to our veterans, I never hear one Member talk and say they are not going to be responsive. Yet Members say it is important what we do, not necessarily what we say, because what we do, and the budget says it all, that is going to be very important.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me to be here tonight with her.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I want to congratulate her for presenting to the American people the truth.

I was so impressed as I heard my colleagues come to the floor and describe the realities of what is occurring. The gentleman from Texas just alluded to the chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs and praised him for his efforts. It is fascinating to read in today's Roll Call that he was castigated and admonished by the House Republican leadership for his efforts in this regard. That, I suggest, says something loud and clear to the American people.

We know what is happening. The veterans know what is happening. But it is time for the American people to be informed, and I congratulate the gentlewoman for her efforts.

What I find particularly fascinating is sometime supposedly next week we will be considering a supplemental budget in the amount of \$75 billion, some \$63 billion of which I think we all support. It is for our troops and for the men and women that find themselves in harm's way. The rest of the money, much of it, is allocated to other nations: \$1 billion for Turkey, monies for Egypt, for Jordan. And for what reason I cannot understand. But if we can afford to take care of the rest of the world, we should be able to take care of the men and women that served us, not just in this war, not just in the Vietnam conflict, not just in Korea and World War II, but all of our veterans.

It is absolutely unconscionable. It is un-American. Those men and women

that will be coming home from the Middle East and leave the military, many of them will assume the title "veteran." While we honor them while they are there, we are disrespectful to them when they come home, and that has to stop.

We, and I know the gentlewoman has been a leader in this regard, have to design a strategy when it comes to that supplemental budget to take care of those men and women and not to continue the disrespect that has been shown to them.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I tonight rise in ardent support of our troops fighting in Iraq. As a veteran of the Korean War, I fully understand the sober task which our soldiers have undertaken. We must remember that these troops are on the front line doing their duty, saluting and following orders. They are great Americans. I want them to know, along with their families, that they have my unwavering support. It is well known that I strongly disagree with the policies that have led us to war in Iraq. It is my opinion on many, many levels that the U.S. should not be at war in Iraq. However, my support of U.S. troops is resolute.

I think it is important that support be more than just lip service. Last week I voted against the Bush Administration's budget which would have drastically reduced veteran's health care and benefit programs. Even though the President is waging this preventive doctrine war, he presented a budget to Congress that would have cut Mandatory Veterans Programs benefits by billions of dollars. Mandatory veteran's programs include disability compensation, pensions, vocational rehabilitation, and survivors' benefits. The Bush administration's budget slashes compensation for service connected disabilities and education benefits by \$15 billion and cuts veteran's health care funding by another \$15 billion over the next ten years. The Disabled American Veterans, the Paralyzed Veterans and the American Legion have all issued statements opposing the Bush Administration's budget. In fact, the Michigan Chapter of Paralyzed Veterans wrote to me, stating, "the proposal, if implemented, would have a shocking effect on VA health care services and be an affront to millions of veterans. The proposal, approximately 1.3 billion above the FY 2003 appropriation, would not even cover inflationary impact and anticipated salary increases for VA health care workers." Furthermore, "budget resolutions set spending priorities. We find it hard to fathom that veterans would not be priority to the Budget Committee, or the leadership of the House of Representatives." I submit to you that budget cuts such as these do not bode well for strengthening the solidarity of our troops to our country.

I'd like to close with a quote from George Washington, "The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be justified, shall be directly propositional as to how they perceive the veterans of wars were treated and appreciated by the Nation."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). The time of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) has expired.

## SUPPORTING OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, before we begin, let me yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), the distinguished former district attorney from Boston, to finish his statement.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend for yielding. I thank the gentleman for his spirit of collegiality.

Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to conclude with was this observation, and I direct it to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: if we are unable to work out in the course of our consideration of the supplemental budget full funding for all veterans services, then it is time for the veterans in this country to take action. Many of us have read in our history books that there was a march on Washington in the early 1930s. It is time for the veterans organizations and for the American people to march again.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we want to talk a little bit about the situation in Iraq tonight and a number of other subjects.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined by the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ), a businessman and new freshman. The gentleman is on his way to take his daughter to dinner, and, as a father of two daughters, that takes high priority. So let me yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ).

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is a pleasure to be with the gentleman tonight on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight with my colleagues to commend the tremendous progress being made by our troops in Iraq. However, I am disgusted with recent media reports proclaiming setbacks and delays of our troops in battle.

Mr. Speaker, such editorializing of the news represents a severe disconnect with reality. At this very moment we are within minutes of Operation Iraqi Freedom being just 1 week old. One week, Mr. Speaker. In one week, we have flown over 7,000 combat sorties, we have delivered 600 Tomahawk missiles with surgical precision such as never before seen in battle, we have moved numerous ground troops to within 50 miles of Baghdad, and we have killed or captured thousands of Iraqi soldiers. We have adapted, we have overcome, and, Mr. Speaker, we will prevail.

But in the din of news reports and live briefings, the fog of battle for Americans can be information overload. We learn a lot about what is happening today. But for the next couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker, I would like

to make sure that we remember what has happened before to lead us to this point.

In 1979, Saddam Hussein took control of the Iraqi Government. The next year he launched a costly 8-year war with Iran that was both inconclusive and violent.

In 1988, after his unsuccessful foray into Iran, he took on a less formidable enemy, the Kurdish people of Northern Iraq, his own people. Using chemical weapons and poison gas, he destroyed 1,000 to 2,000 of their villages. The death toll from that holocaust may have been as high as 182,000 people.

In 1990, he once again crossed international boundaries and invaded tiny Kuwait. During that exercise his soldiers carried out orders to kill any civilian who did so little as violate curfew.

In 1991, his continued aggression against Kuwait brought about the attention of the United States and the United Nations and his swift defeat during Operation Desert Storm.

In the 12 years since Desert Storm, Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has passed 17 different resolutions outlining conditions under which Saddam can stay in power. He has violated them all.

We now have further evidence that Saddam and his band of loyalist thugs have no respect for human life, common decency, nor even the international rules of engagement. The heinous treatment of our soldiers and the abuse of even his own citizens once again is absolutely despicable.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I hope the world takes note of another truth of this conflict. As Hitler was supported by the Nazi loyalists, so, too, is Saddam supported by his Baath Party fanatics.

□ 2045

My colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), stood on this floor on February 25 and outlined the atrocities of the regime in terrible, gruesome detail. He described mutilated babies, crippled children, adults without limbs, dipped in acid, torture beyond the imagination of civilized people, all at the hands of Saddam Hussein and his Ba'ath party.

Referring to these and the regime's other crimes against humanity, our President, our Commander in Chief said, "If this is not evil, then evil has no meaning." Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more. That is why Operation Iraqi Freedom is about regime change, not just about Saddam. All those that promote terror, manufacture it, and export it must be squelched before liberation can come to the Iraqi people and peace to the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the bullets are flying; and our troops are in harm's way. As we continue to be briefed on their daily progress, as we see the sacrifices being made in the field by our soldiers and back home by their families, let us keep this in proper perspective. Let us

remember why we are there: to end a regime of terror and liberate a people who have never known freedom.

Godspeed to our troops and God bless America.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado; and I want to commend him on words well said. I appreciate everything that he is doing to help free the people of Iraq as a new Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a number of things. I want to read a letter from an Iraqi woman. I want to read a letter from Charlie Daniels. I wanted to talk about a French company that has nearly a \$1 billion catering contract to the U.S. Marine Corps, and I want to talk about Iraqi violations of the Geneva Convention.

First, let me read a rather spirited letter from Charlie Daniels. We know Charlie Daniels is the songwriter who wrote *The Devil Went Down to Georgia*, among other things. He is great playing the fiddle, and he is a great American. So this is Charlie Daniels' letter, open letter to the Hollywood bunch. I am going to read directly from the letter.

Okay, let's say just for a moment you bunch of pampered, overpaid, unrealistic children had your way and the USA did not go into Iraq.

Let's say that you really get your way and we destroy all of our nuclear weapons, stick daisies in our gun barrels and sit around with some white wine and cheese and pat ourselves on the back, so proud of what we have done for world peace.

Let's say that we cut the military budget to just enough to keep the National Guard on hand to help out with floods and fires.

Let's say that we close down our military bases all over the world and bring our troops home, increase foreign aid, and drop all trade sanctions against everybody.

I suppose that in your fantasy world, this would create a utopian world where everybody would live in peace. After all, the great monster, the United States of America, the cause of all of the world's trouble, would have disbanded its horrible military and certainly all of the other countries of the world would follow suit.

After all, they only arm themselves to defend their country from the mean USA.

Why, you bunch of pitiful, hypocritical, idiotic spoiled mugwumps. Get your head out of the sand and smell the Trade Towers burning.

Do you think that a trip to Iraq by Sean Penn did anything but encourage a wanton murderer to think that the people of the USA didn't have the nerve or guts to fight him?

Barbara Streisand's fanatical and hateful rantings about George Bush makes about as much sense as Michael Jackson hanging a baby over a railing.

You people need to get out of Hollywood once in a while and get into the real world. You'd be surprised at the hostility you would find out here.

Stop in at a truck stop and tell an overworked long-distance trucker that you don't think Saddam Hussein is doing anything wrong.

Tell a farmer with a couple of sons in the United States military that you think the United States has no right to defend itself.

Go down to Baxley, Georgia, and hold an antiwar rally and see what the folks down there think about you.

You people are some of the most disgusting examples of a waste of protoplasm I've ever had the displeasure to hear about.

Sean Penn, you are a traitor to the United States of America. You gave aid and comfort to the enemy. How many American lives will your little fact-finding trip to Iraq cost? You encourage Saddam Hussein to think that we didn't have the stomach for war.

You people protect one of the most evil men on the face of this earth and you won't lift a finger to save the life of an unborn baby. Freedom of choice, you say?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). The gentleman should address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am reading a letter from Charlie Daniels which I think I am certainly allowed under the rules to do. Not that I would ever argue with the distinguished parliamentarian, particularly the one on your right, but I believe I can read a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman can read his letter provided it is otherwise in order.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the Speaker. I am still in quotes, Mr. Speaker, and probably it is very appropriate for the Speaker to point out that I am reading a letter, open letter to Hollywood written by Mr. Charlie Daniels, one of America's most popular entertainers. I am going to continue with that, back to the quoted letter.

Well, I'm going to exercise some freedom of choice of my own.

If I see any of your names on a marquee, I'm going to boycott the movie. I will completely stop going to the movies if I have to. In most cases, it certainly wouldn't be much of a loss.

You scoff at our military whose boots you are not even worthy to shine.

They go to battle and risk their lives so ingrates like you can live in luxury.

The day of reckoning is coming when you will be faced with the undeniable truth that the war against Saddam Hussein is the war on terrorism.

America is in imminent danger.

You're either for her or against her. There is no middle ground.

I think we all know where you stand.

What do you think?

God bless America.

Unquote, Charlie Daniels.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues can get this off the website. However, due to technological ethics, I am unable to give out that website number, but if somebody would call my office, I would be glad to give it to them.

Mr. Speaker, here is a guy who is one of the American-dream-type success stories, came up the hard way. I believe Charlie Daniels went to the University of Chicago, so he is not exactly just this country boy from back home on the farm that Hollywood would scoff at. But this is a guy who has really made it pretty big in the entertainment world, knows the Hollywood bunch because he calls them up front and he writes a letter like that to give us an idea of what he thinks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to read another letter by a woman named

Katrin Michael. She is member of Women for a Free Iraq, a Washington-based advocacy group. She wrote this for Newsday, but I read it in the Savannah Morning News. I am going to again quote from this.

As an Iraqi woman who wages peace and has fought in war, I am compelled to support a U.S.-led action to remove Saddam Hussein. After 26 years of resistance against Saddam, I have come to the conclusion that only forces from outside Iraq can bring an end to the nightmare of his rule.

The stories of Saddam Hussein's brutality are all true. Ethnic cleansing, summary imprisonment and execution, torture and rape are all part of the nightmare. I know this from personal experience.

My father founded an Iraqi peace movement, a crime for which he was murdered. At the time I was 14 years old. I was arrested by the regime merely because I joined the Iraqi Women's League. I was not the only young girl arrested for such a trivial offense.

Later, I joined the Kurdish resistance, even though I was, in their eyes, a mere woman and a Christian. I traveled in disguise to Baghdad and around the country to organize opposition to Saddam. When I was injured in one of his chemical bombardments against hundreds of Kurdish villages in 1987 and 1988, I was forced to flee to a refugee camp in southern Turkey where I stayed until I finally reached freedom in the United States in 1997. I continue to suffer to this day from lung, nerve and eye damage caused by these weapons.

No one in Iraq is immune from Saddam's brutality, not even the closest members of his own family. He even executed two of his own sons-in-law in 1996.

A commonly used form of torture is to bring a detainee's female relative, preferably his wife, daughter or mother, and gang rape her in front of him.

Members of the Iraqi opposition in exile receive videotape of tapes of their female relatives in Iraq being raped. Women who criticize or merely offend Saddam are accused of being prostitutes and regularly beheaded in public.

His son, Uday, often leads these beheadings. They occur in Baghdad as well as in smaller villages throughout Iraq. The heads of the executed women are hung on the doors of their houses for all to see.

I am saddened when I see people who sincerely care for the fate of the Iraqi people resist the American-led effort to remove Saddam and restore hope for the Iraqis. We cannot do it alone.

Iraqis had their closest brush with freedom in 1992 during Operation Desert Storm. I regret, as do most Iraqis, that the United States and its allies allowed Saddam to squash this resistance and remain in power. Those who care about peace and justice for the Iraqis should not make the same mistake again.

Saddam will never leave power willingly. He will never give up his weapons and allow the Iraqi people to live in freedom.

That is the end of the letter, Mr. Speaker, but I want to restate one more time that this was written by an Iraqi woman who was raised in Iraq, who was part of the peace movement, who has come to the conclusion that only a U.S.-led action will remove Saddam Hussein, and that is the only way that the world will be rid of him.

I think that is so important, Mr. Speaker, because there are a lot of well-meaning people who are against the United States action. There are a

lot who are not so well-meaning. A lot of people just have a gripe with George Bush, and they find the war a convenient vehicle to air their opinion. There are a lot of people who do not like the United States of America and, again, they find the war a convenient excuse to air their opinion on that. But then there are a lot of people who are absolutely sincere: peace first, peace only, negotiations.

Yet what this Iraqi woman is saying, who has been there and has been injured by Saddam Hussein, is we cannot do it alone, we have to have a U.S.-led coalition.

Today, Mr. Speaker, in Basra, we did find out that there was an uprising and at this point it has not continued, but I think that it will, and I think in the days and weeks ahead we are going to see more and more Iraqi citizens coming out of their hiding places and facing Saddam Hussein and joining the resistance against him.

Now, I have been joined by our friend from Miami, Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART). I want to yield some time to him.

I have a couple of other topics I want to talk about surrounding Iraq. One of them has to do with a French company that has a lucrative contract with the Department of Defense feeding 55 garrisons throughout America. I also want to talk about the House Resolution that we passed today urging Iraq to comply with the Geneva Convention. But the gentleman has been a very active freshman Member of Congress and has a lot of issues he has been working on, too. So I yield to him to jump in on this or switch topics or whatever pleases him.

□ 2100

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I was listening to the gentleman's words today, and I was moved by the gentleman's statements and by the strength and veracity of that letter from that young woman who suffered the intense oppression of that brutal, crazy dictator, that dictator that is oppressing the people of Iraq.

What she says is so true: the Iraqi people have been suffering for a long, long time. They have suffered through what we really cannot even imagine, the most horrendous humiliations, tortures, murders, assassinations. That man who has killed about 1.5 million people, has gassed his own people, and other nations; who has no concern for life or for any basic principles or freedoms, and who the world was negotiating with for about 12 years.

Think about that. We all believe in negotiations. We all believe in diplomacy. I believe that we should try to negotiate; and when we have a dictator, a crazy, insane man who has committed mass genocide and murder, that we should try to negotiate, for 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, 4 years, 10 years, 12 years? When is enough failed nego-

tiations enough? When is enough failure enough?

I believe that the United Nations has a role to play. Yes, I believe we should get the United Nations resolutions to express the sentiment of the world once, twice, three times, ten times. But 17 times? How many resolutions must he ignore and continue his oppression, his assassination, and more dangerous to us, his trying to obtain nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction?

How many times should we say, or is there a time when we should say, enough? What does it take? What does it take for the world to react?

Thank God, fortunately, we have a President who stated after the attacks, those horrendous attacks that occurred on 9-11 against our people, our innocent people, he stated very clearly that those that harbor terrorism were terrorists, and that there was going to be a price to pay.

Then he tried to warn, and he did warn, Saddam Hussein. He went to the United Nations and got one last chance for Saddam Hussein from the United Nations. But there is a time, unfortunately, when one must act. That time has come. Now our brave men and women are doing what the President said he was going to do, what he was going to ask them to do if Saddam Hussein did not disarm. He was going to disarm them with our brave men and women.

They are doing an incredible job, an incredible job. This is the time to support our troops. This is the time to not vacillate in that support for our troops.

I know there are those who say, well, we support our troops, but we wish they were not there. They are there. They are performing a vital job. We have to support them wholeheartedly, not with caveats, not with reservations. We have to support them. We have to support them, and they have to do what it takes to get the job done.

It is up to us, who are living and enjoying the freedoms that those thousands of men and women in uniform for generations have fought to give us. We should utilize those freedoms to show appreciation, to show respect, to show admiration, and to say, job well done. We are with you. We are going to be with you to the end.

They are going to succeed because the vast majority of the American people supports them; because the vast majority of the American people supports our President, our Commander in Chief, in his efforts. We are so grateful.

I actually was walking through, and I heard what the gentleman was saying on the floor. I had to come by and thank the gentleman, thank the gentleman for those words, and thank him for reminding us what is at stake. When the gentleman read that letter from that young woman, I think it brought it home. It brought it home to roost. What is at stake here is so precious. It is liberty, it is life, it is everything that we care for, everything that we believe in.

Yes, unfortunately, it is expensive. It is expensive. It has been expensive for generations. But those who have to protect those lives, those freedoms are the American people. Once again, our troops are doing it with the honor, with the valor, with the talent that they have always done it. I want to thank them for what they are doing.

I want to thank you, sir, for once again bringing that to light. That is why I had to come by here. I saw the gentleman on TV, and I had to come by to thank him for these words of solidarity to our troops, to the Commander in Chief; and to remind everybody why it is that we are in this battle; and that we are going to win this battle because it is so important, because so much is at stake. Yes, we are on the right side.

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to thank the gentleman for those words, Mr. Speaker.

It is interesting, today we had a great moment where all Members, Democrat and Republican, came together on the issue of Iraq complying with the Geneva Convention, which of course they are not doing. Each day there is a new revelation.

There was a very tender moment today as we in Congress saw the pictures of the prisoners, the American POWs, that Iraq had filmed. As the gentleman knows, it was very gruesome. First, the cameras panned on some dead soldiers, soldiers who at least three of them had a shot right in their forehead; young men, strong men, men in uniform, men with their dog tags around their necks and the blood that was on their chests, in some cases. It was a very sobering, very gut-wrenching scene to see.

Then, apparently in the same room, but it was not clear, were the live prisoners. Iraqi TV or whoever the reporters were were interviewing them and asking them a lot of questions. There seemed to be some pushing and shoving in the room. It seemed that there were a lot of people. We could tell by the look in these American prisoners' eyes that they did not know if they were going to be alive the next minute, or make it through the night, or what was going to happen to them. It seemed like utter confusion.

What struck me, among other things, is that even in Somalia, and we all have read or seen "Blackhawk Down," which I think was a great depiction of that battle. When they had the captive helicopter operator, he was still allowed to get the International Red Cross to come in. Yet in Iraq they do not even let the Red Cross in to see our prisoners.

Today, on a bipartisan basis, we debated, and we will vote on it tomorrow, House Concurrent Resolution 118, which I had, I guess I am not going to say the honor, which would be the usual word, but I offered it, along with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

I represent the Third Infantry in Hinesville, Georgia, and he represents

Fort Bliss in Texas, where the members of 507th Maintenance Division were from, supporting the Third Infantry.

Just to see the House come together and say, you know, this is absolutely not right, and we are going to put the folks from Iraq on notice that they will be tried as war criminals as soon as possible. If that means waiting until the war is over, fine; but if we can get them out of there before then, they will be tried as war criminals. We made that statement to them, number one.

Number two, we assured our troops that we are watching and we are with them in thought and in spirit, and we are going to do everything that we can to get them out of there alive.

Number three, we sent a signal to the international community, the French, the Germans, the Chinese, the Russians, those who were so quick to denounce the United States of America and this action. Well, there are 164 countries that have signed the Geneva Conventions going back to 1949. Let these countries now step forward and denounce Iraq, who incidentally is a signer of the Geneva Conventions; and let the world community find something that they can agree on in the form of these seven soldiers who are captured as we speak tonight.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is interesting, the gentleman mentioned some of these countries that were so quick to criticize the United States, criticize the United States for enforcing the resolutions that they unanimously supported, by the way.

Yet, we now see some of them, and I do not know why they have acted the way they have, but I can just throw some facts on the table. We now see that the Government of Russia has sold to the Iraqi Government some very high-tech military equipment.

Mr. KINGSTON. That Russian equipment sold to Iraq, Mr. Speaker, that is radar-jamming or missile-jamming technology. Is that not the case?

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART. It is highly sophisticated night vision equipment, equipment to avoid radar, missiles, and also to confuse GPS devices that are obviously a big part of a military arsenal.

Yet a lot of these things are things that were not permissible under the sanctions that those same governments supported. So on one side, they are saying, well, Iraq is a violator of all sorts of rights. They are trying to obtain weapons of mass destruction. They have supported all these resolutions in the past. On the other side of their mouths, they are selling them high-tech equipment, military equipment.

That regime that they have condemned for the human rights abuses, for the rape of the women, for the assassinations, they are selling that regime high-tech military equipment, much of it banned by the United Nations. Those countries voted to ban that equipment to the Iraqi regime.

We saw that the wonderful, talented men and women of the U.S. Air Force shot down missiles. Some were destined to land in populated areas of Kuwait. Those are missiles that supposedly they do not have, that Iraq does not have. What more proof do we need?

I ask a question, I ask a rhetorical question, How many violations does it take for these countries to realize that there is a problem? Of course, what we realize now is that it is not that they do not realize that they are violations. It is that they have been assisting this regime and selling them high-tech equipment that has been banned, that is unlawful, according to the United Nations resolutions. They have been assisting this regime in their oppression, in their assassinations.

I think we are going to find a lot of that. I am not telling the gentleman that is the reason why some of these countries oppose the United States' effort to free the people of Iraq, just like the United States military freed the people of France twice.

By the way, the people of France, thank God, they had the right to be free. A lot of brave young American GIs died to free the people of France. I am glad that France is free. The people of Iraq are no less human beings than the people of France. They have the right to be free, as well.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is interesting that the gentleman mentions that, because there is a degree of racism, I think, on the part of the peace activists of the world. The reason why I say racism is because would these people support a Saddam Hussein if he were in Paris? Would they do it if he were in Germany? No. They would denounce him quickly. But as long as he is in the Middle East, well, they have been fighting for years. Or if he is in, say, South Asia or something, well, they have been fighting for years; or if he is in Africa.

How many times have we heard, they have been fighting for years, we cannot bring peace in the Middle East, like the people in the Middle East do not deserve peace; but the folks in Europe, that is the high standard to live by. To me it is just a double standard. I can only summarize it with racism.

The gentleman mentioned Russia selling sophisticated, high-tech equipment to Iraq. We already are seeing in Congress that we have the supplemental budget coming, and it is going to be to fund the military operation as well as the humanitarian operation.

As a result of the humanitarian operation, I am already seeing a gold rush. I am seeing companies actually start lobbying for contracts. That bothers me a lot when we have one missing in action today, seven captured, and eight casualties American and 18 British. Yet what really bothers me is some of these countries are not American countries and they are not English countries and they are not Australian; they are not coalition countries.

I have one example, though, of a company. USAID, which is a foreign aid branch, it does a lot of good things, but it is going to let some humanitarian contracts go, and French and German companies will be eligible to compete for it. That bothers me a lot, that they will be able to profit from this war.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART. I could not agree with the gentleman more, if the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker. This is a two-fold problem. There is, first, the opposition to this effort to free the Iraqi people and to free the world from this very dangerous dictator, free the world from a dictator who is trying to get or obtain nuclear weapons, and who already has other weapons of mass destruction.

□ 2115

We are trying to free the Iraqi people while at the same time free the world from this incredible threat.

So we have to remember these countries that we are objecting to that, that even though unanimously, just a few months before, they said, hey, look, we are going to give this dictator one last chance, he has to disarm, but it is worse than that because not only are they objecting to the freeing of the Iraqi people, are they objecting to ridding of the world of this dictator who is trying to get nuclear weapons, who has ties with terrorist organizations and, by the way, including terrorist organizations that have assassinated Americans, but what is even more offensive is that at the same time they are selling this dictator high-tech equipment that he can use to further exploit, hurt, oppress, kill, murder his people and others because of his ties with terrorism.

One would hope that humanity has gone above and beyond that, and yet there are those that would like to profit even while selling high-tech equipment that they know they should not be selling because they have said it repeatedly in U.N. resolutions. So they know it, it is not by mistake, and yet they are doing so to earn a buck, to earn a buck?

Mr. KINGSTON. There is another example. Another company called Sedxho, S-E-D-X-H-O, it is a French company. It is a publicly-owned French company, but they have \$1 billion worth of food service contracts with the United States Department of Defense. Recently, they signed an \$881 million contract to feed the U.S. Marines in 55 different garrisons. We are working on a letter to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Rumsfeld, to say he needs to renegotiate this, he needs to cancel it, he needs to look into it. But can my colleague imagine, here is a French company, and France, I do not remember one division in the country of France in terms of their stance against America in the last 3 to 6 months. I do not remember anybody moderating.

In America we had division. We had a pro-war and an anti-war group, and the

world knew that. But, in France, it seems like they were all united against the United States and against this war.

Apparently, that is not a problem to Sedxho, because they are a French company. And yet here are the Marines, the brave and the honorable Marines who are the ones who discovered this hospital today, allegedly a hospital, and yet 55 different garrisons in the United States of America, when an 18-year-old Marine sits down for lunch, a French company is making a profit from that. That is unbelievable, and I call on the Department of Defense to cancel that contract.

Listen, there are reasons sometimes we have to buy from an enemy. There are reasons that somebody has something unique, but we are talking catering. I am sure there are good companies in Florida and Georgia and all over America that can do the catering service for the U.S. Marine corps, but a French company, it is unbelievable.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. If the gentleman would yield, I think we are going to find a lot of that. I think we are going to find a lot of companies that are profiting from selling goods to the United States, including to the United States Armed Forces and armed services, as the gentleman just pointed out, who, by the way, are probably also making a hefty profit selling products to Iraq, even though there are sanctions there and probably even some high-tech equipment to the tyranny in Iraq.

I think it kind of explains some of the ferocity of the argument, some of the aggressiveness of some of those that were objecting to the United States' noble stance to help free an oppressed people and also help rid the world of these weapons of mass destruction and the possible obtaining of nuclear weapons to this dictator. I think we are going to see a lot of that.

The thing that surprised me, and it does not surprise me anymore because we are starting to see why, and my colleague just mentioned it, we are starting to see why but, surprisingly, the ferocity of the argument and how France, for example, not only do they object to any resolution that was not of their liking in the U.N. recently and they said so, but, also, they went lobbying. They actually were talking to every nation possible to try to stop this movement to free the people of Iraq and to free the world from this dictator who has caused so much grief.

I think we are starting to see why, but it is sad, it is sad that it looks like one of the main reasons or at least one of the reasons may be because they are making a buck off of this dictator.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, also, are they not making a buck or profit, things like that, but they have had a lucrative oil contract in Iraq they did not want to disturb. That it is clear France is not after some noble or high ground about peace, but it simply boils down to profit.

If the gentleman would like to make any closing comments, I need to actually make an engagement.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentleman from Georgia. Again, I had to come to the floor today once I was hearing what he was talking about. I had to come here and thank the gentleman, thank him for standing up for our troops, thank him for supporting our troops, thank him for supporting the President of the United States, Commander in Chief in such a difficult time. Our troops are going to prevail because of their honor, their integrity, their decency and because they are the best people, best troops and the best human beings that this world has ever seen, and they are well led, and their cause is just.

I wanted to thank the gentleman again for his words. They were humbling, and they were touching, and I wanted to come here and thank him tonight for his words.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate everything the gentleman is doing.

#### SALUTING OUR TROOPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, this evening, members of the Congressional Black Caucus wanted to take a moment to salute our troops. These are men and women who have voluntarily put on the uniform of the United States of America to make sure that we maintain our way of life, maintain our constitutional rights, maintain our privileges; and they have put their lives on the line to keep us safe.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great sadness today to start off my remarks by having to pay tribute to a great American hero who died in the line of duty while serving his country in pursuing the American dream. Originally from my hometown of Baltimore, Marine Staff Sergeant Kendall Damon Waters-Bey, age 29, was one of the four U.S. Marines who died when their CH-46 Sea Knight helicopter crashed near the Iraqi-Kuwait border.

I would like to start off by first expressing my deepest condolences to the Waters-Bey family during this very, very difficult time. I mourn their loss, along with the other members of the Maryland Federal delegation.

Our prayers are with Sergeant Waters-Bey's 10-year old son, Kenneth; his