(Mr. TURNER of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WINNING THE PEACE IN POST-WAR IRAQ

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

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, this evening I would like to talk about the situation in Iraq and discuss whether or not we are taking the necessary steps to win the peace in that country. We have just seen a remarkable and important military victory in Iraq. We were successfully able to remove the threat posed by the regime of Saddam Hussein, remove his threat that was a direct confrontation with regional peace, and even world peace, due to his murderous regime and what we believe to be his possession of weapons of mass destruction. Our Armed Forces performed brilliantly. Our young men and women in uniform were brave and courageous, did everything that their military leaders and their political leaders asked them to do, and performed in an outstanding manner. We are proud of what they have done. All of America should be proud of our armed services today.

While the military victory is ours, the military mission is not yet fully accomplished. While we have deposed Saddam Hussein, we have not yet found his weapons of mass destruction, weapons that he had in the early and mid-1990s. The United Nations inspectors were finding them then. We must find those weapons now and destroy them or find out where they have been taken or hidden and hold their new owners accountable for their safe disposal.

But now that we have achieved this wonderful military victory, the question is, can we also win the peace. I think the answer right now is that we are not yet winning the peace in Iraq. Iraq is posing very significant challenges to its own people, to the coalition partners, and to everyone in the world interested in social justice and the creation of democratic countries with economic opportunity and freedom for people.

In Iraq there are some major challenges today. Security remains a huge challenge. There has been looting, lawlessness, car-jackings, break-ins. Humanitarian aid is lagging. There is a great need for medicine, for clean water, electricity. Relief workers are reporting it hard to do their jobs because of the lack of their own personal safety in Iraq. The much-needed reconstruction has not started yet. The demands of religious and ethnic groups are loud and unresolved, and the advent of pluralism and self-government seems to be a very long way off.

Two reports today help to illustrate these problems. The International Committee for the Red Cross, in an Iraq bulletin dated today, May 13, 2003, reports in Baghdad and central Iraq, under the general situation that security is, by far, the most important concern for Iraqis. Numerous security incidents happen daily in the capital: looting, banditry, ambushes, car-jacking, physical attacks and killings. Schools have reopened, which is very good news; but most parents are concerned about their children's safety.

The International Committee for the Red Cross reports on the medical situation in Baghdad hospitals. Hospitals and health centers are open again, functioning at about 50 percent of their capacity; but in most places, the cleaning staff have not yet returned to work. The main needs at the medical facilities are fuel to run the electricity and to simply transport the staff to and from the hospitals. Salaries and specific medical and surgical supplies are in need. Water is being distributed and electricity is available in hospitals, but only for a few hours a day.

In the community, reports the Red Cross, water and sanitation is a huge issue, again because of the lack of security. The looting of essential facilities is severely obstructing normal work. The Red Cross reports that one water plant recently visited had its generator and two main pumps stolen. Electricity production has not improved over the last 10 days, and there are huge problems in economic security as well, according to the Red Cross. They are delivering blankets and distributing food and nonfood items; market prices are much higher than they were before the war. Food stocks in average households could last for up to a month, but the average family has huge problems with a lack of cash income and the shortage of fuel and gas.

Also today, Mr. Speaker, the BBC reported from Basra in a report dated May 13, 2003, of some of the problems they are having in that area. Cholera is endemic. There have been 19 cases identified in Basra in the last 2 days alone. Dirty water is being blamed for that outbreak. They have problems with a variety of gastroenteritis and even hepatitis. The BBC reports that doctors have to function and practice in ill-equipped hospitals where they have just barely enough drugs and intervenous fluids to treat the victims, but the victims are afraid to come to the hospitals because of the lack of security. Finally, in Basra, car-jacking is a crime described by the BBC as taking off. If people go out in a decent car, the chances apparently are good that they will be walking home after being car-jacked.

So, Mr. Speaker, the problems are clear. And in the last several weeks the efforts by the United States on the ground in postconflict Iraq are certainly well-meaning, but they often seem poorly planned, reactive to events rather than anticipating events, and out of touch with the reality of post-Saddam Iraq. In every major area we seem to have problems. The major challenges are peace-keeping, humanitarian aid, reconstruction, and new governance. And in every area we have problems. We are not projecting the confidence or success that we should project with the quick and unanticipated rotation of American officials that we are seeing in and out of Iraq. Apparently, every day, changes are being made. Most of us were just getting used to the notion of Jay Garner running the American operation. Well, he is out and Paul Bremmer is in. And seven or eight of the American officials that came with Jay Garner are apparently on their way out of the country as well.

Finally, there are obvious disturbing and harmful conflicts and jealousies between our own State Department and our own Department of Defense. We are not working from the same page.

Now, what are we going to do about all of this? What has the Bush administration proposed lately to try to resolve and address all of these problems? Well, I believe they have made a startling proposal from the White House: a draft resolution asking the United Nations to recognize the United States of America and Great Britain as occupying powers in Iraq, occupying powers, for at least 1 year's duration and, most likely, far beyond. And the question is tonight, Do we want this country to be an occupying power in Iraq or anyplace else, for that matter?

I think it is worth taking a look at some of the details of the draft proposal submitted by the United States last Friday to the United Nations, a proposal that the United States hopes the U.N. Security Council will approve after reflection and debate. It suggests that the United States of America and the United Kingdom, our great ally, be recognized as occupying powers under applicable international law. The resolution goes on to designate Great Britain and the United States as the authority and calls upon the authority to promote the welfare of the Iraqi people through the effective administration of the territory to restore conditions of security and stability so that the Iraqi people may freely determine their own political future.

Now, those are worthy goals, goals that all of us can share. The question is, do we really want the United Nations Security Council to designate the United States and Great Britain as the authority responsible for making this happen, as occupying powers? The draft resolution goes on to suggest that the Secretary General work with this new authority, the United States and Great Britain and the people of Iraq, with respect to the restoration and establishment of national and local institutions for representative governance.

The resolution further calls upon the Security Council to support the formation by the people of Iraq with the help of the authority of an Iraqi interim authority as a transitional administration. The resolution further says that

the U.N. Security Council should decide that funds in the Iraqi Assistance Fund shall be disbursed at the direction of the authority, that is, the direction of the United States and Great Britain as an occupying power. The Iraqi Assistance Fund would be set up by virtue of cooperation between the International Monetary Fund, the Arab Fund, the World Bank, and other donations. The draft resolution calls upon the Security Council to decide that all export sales of petroleum and petroleum products and all proceeds from such sales shall be deposited into the Iraqi Assistance Fund, that fund to be controlled by the United States and Great Britain as occupying powers.

Finally, the draft resolution calls upon the U.N. Security Council to recognize Great Britain and the United States for the exercise of the responsibilities set forth in this resolution for an initial period of 12 months from the date of adoption, to continue thereafter as necessary until the Security Council decides otherwise.

So this resolution would have the United States and Great Britain deemed occupying powers, referred to as the authority, and given full responsibility to implement this resolution for at least 12 months, and to continue in that capacity unless the Security Council acts affirmatively to stop that grant of authority. Certainly this authority is considered by its proponents to be of duration well beyond 1 year.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, this House has to decide whether it is in the best interest of the United States to be such an occupying power, for 1 year, for 1 month, for 10 years. Do we want that role for this country, or do we want to internationalize operations in Iraq, seek help from allies, and turn to a multilateral rather than a unilateral approach to the challenges in Iraq?

The morning after our military victory, we awoke to those four challenges I have referred to: peacekeeping, humanitarian aid, reconstruction, and governance. How we face those challenges will determine whether we win the peace, whether we win the battle for the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people, whether we enhance our status in the Muslim world and maintain our credibility as the leader of free and democratic nations.

I fear we could fail to meet those challenges if we pursue an aggressive, antagonistic, confrontational diplomacy that makes demands on our allies, but does not listen to them. We could fail if we embrace unilateralism and abandon our traditional reliance on multilateralism. And we could fail if we allow the reality or even the appearance of an American military colonial government in Iraq. And certainly asking the United Nations to designate us as an occupying power comes very close to that military colonial government approach.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest eight steps that we take as a House and as a country to deal with these challenges:

First, the State Department, not the Defense Department, should now be in charge of American policy in Iraq. It is time to turn to the diplomats who have a history of working with other countries to try to foster democracy, to try to nation-build, a term President Bush used to disparage, but now he is jumping in with both feet to embrace. I think the State Department is better suited to our needs in Iraq now that the military victory has been so well won by the Defense Department.

Secondly, we should internationalize the stabilization and reconstruction operations as much as we can and not try to do this all by ourselves or with Great Britain or just with our coalition partners.

Thirdly, American troops in the field will certainly be needed for some period of time to help keep the peace; and, in fact, military operations on a, happily, much smaller scale are still occurring, but we should move quickly to spread the burden of peacekeeping in Iraq, and I suggest we turn to NATO. NATO is a robust military alliance that has the ability and the military punch to take on peacekeeping in Iraq. NATO defeated one tyrant in Kosovo and can surely keep order in post-Saddam Iraq.

Fourth, while emergency relief certainly must begin with the State Department and the United States Agency for International Development, which have decades of experience of relief operations, and which have strong relations with nongovernmental organizations around the world, there is no organization with more experience in humanitarian relief than the United Nations. It has vast resources, great experience and expertise. These attributes are unparalleled, and clearly the United Nations needs to be involved directly as the organization that would lead efforts for humanitarian assistance.

Fifthly, we must engage expert multilateral organizations including the United Nations, certainly the World Bank, certainly the International Monetary Fund, in the reconstruction of Iraq's infrastructure. A debt restructuring meeting is needed to help deal with Iraq's estimated $383 billion of foreign debt, compensation claims, and pending contracts.

Sixth, we should convene a donors conference soon after the military victory. Funds will be needed right away for quick-start reconstruction programs, and we ought to ask the donor nations of the world to come forward quickly for funding. And, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, this would be a wonderful opportunity for the Arab world to step forward with its resources and help to rebuild Iraq as part of this international effort.

Seventh, Iraqis must establish corruption-free control over their own oil. We need to help them establish a transparent and reformed industry, transparent in that it accounts for oil revenues and the operations of the oil companies, and an operation that would devote the profits to rebuilding the country itself.

Finally, we should urge the United Nations to sponsor a conference on the formation and direction of a transitional Iraqi-based government. I do not believe it is in our best interest for the United States to be the primary sponsor of an effort under way to set up an interim Iraqi authority. We ought to bring in our allies and our friends and ask the United Nations to do this.

This was done with great skill in Afghanistan, our military victory in Afghanistan. We built on Afghanistan's history of what is called the loya jirga, or the Meeting of Councils, and we, the United Nations, sponsored this loya jirga, and from that operation President Karzai emerged as a leader. And I believe the same thing could be successfully done in Iraq with the sponsorship of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, among many others, have pointed out that we needed to take a hard look at the reality of Iraq as a country. As Carnegie said, ''Iraq is not a political blank slate to be transformed at American will into a democratic, secular, pluralist and Federal state. Instead, Iraq is a difficult country with multiple social groups and power centers with conflicting agendas.''

We need to recognize that difficulty, Mr. Speaker. We need to involve the United Nations in our efforts. We need to build the institutions of democracy. It is absolutely the right long-term goal to be advocating for self-government and the democratic selection of self-government in Iraq, but before we can have successful elections, we need to develop the institutions of democracy. Free press. We need to establish for the first time in Iraq's history the notion of a free press, free to criticize government officials, free to speak freely. We need the notion of free speech in Iraq. Iraq does not have such a history, and no democratic elections will succeed before we establish free speech. That must come first.

We need to create a civil society in Iraq. We need to establish justice, trained lawyers and honest judges, and a justice system that works successfully to redress grievances for average citizens. There is a rule of law vacuum in Iraq, and we must fill that vacuum before we can credibly hold national elections.

We need to create economic opportunity in Iraq to help give people hope and give them a stake in society.

Mr. Speaker, we have got great challenges in Iraq, and I do not mean to minimize those challenges, but we will do best if we call upon our friends, if we institutionalize and internationalize our efforts to bring freedom and democracy to Iraq. We should not do this in a unilateral way. We should do

it in a multinational way, and we must surely guard against being perceived as a colonial military power or an occupying power in Iraq.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in Iraq and in the rest of the Middle East and throughout many areas in Europe, there is a great need for economic assistance, and I would suggest this House consider the establishment of a modern-day Marshall Plan, a plan modeled after our great success in Western Europe after World War II in which over 4 years we helped 14 countries with $13 billion of assistance to get those allies and former enemies of ours in World War II back on their feet economically. That $13 billion in the 1940s would be the equivalent of $100 billion today. That is a great deal of money, but that is an amount of money over several budget years, and with the help of our allies around the world, that is certainly achievable.

And what we can achieve with a modern-day Marshall Plan in Iraq and the rest of the world that has those kind of challenges is the establishment of not just economic opportunity where there is now grinding poverty, but the recognition that there is a sense of hopelessness among many in that part of the world, a sense that life cannot possibly be better for them as the future comes forward, a sense that many people have that things can only go downhill, and that their children will be born into more poverty with less opportunity and more hopelessness than they are currently experiencing.

It is that sense of hopelessness that we have got a moral obligation to try to change, and it is in our own national security interest that we would do so, because if we truly want to win the war on terror, which we desperately want to win, and which is certainly the greatest challenge facing us internationally today, we have to make sure we can offer hope and opportunity along with the rest of the civilized world to those countries that have such despair and hopelessness that some people turn in completely irrational ways to the life of suicide bomber or the terrorist rather than turning to a belief in social justice and a pluralistic society.

That is the goal we have for ourselves. That is the challenge we have now. We have an opportunity in Iraq to show that we believe in a multilateral approach to international challenges. We have an opportunity to say we believe in a pluralistic society that gives economic opportunity and creates social justice for people; that we will do so in a thoughtful way that avoids colonialism, avoids occupying power status, but rather turns in collaborative ways with allies in a multinational approach to give hope and opportunity to the people of Iraq and all people in the world that believe as we do in freedom and justice and democracy.

HEALTHY FOREST INITIATIVE

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CANNON. 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 my general leave.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have some graphics that I would like to use down at the other podium if I might.

Mr. Speaker, as members of the Western Caucus, we come to the floor today to discuss H.R. 1904, The Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003. This bill will be marked up tomorrow in the Committee on the Judiciary and is expected to be brought to the floor early next week.

Let me put this map up. What you see here is a map. If we can focus on the graphic here, what you see here is a map of the United States, and you can understand by looking at this map why we as members of the Western Caucus are concerned with healthy forests.

You will recognize that there is a color chart. What it indicates is that everything in yellow or green or red or the other colors other than white represent Federal lands that are managed by the Federal Government that includes also many lands from the Eastern part of the United States. And as you might guess, we have in the Western Caucus also people who are from the Eastern part of the United States.

□ 2030

We have at least a couple of people here tonight from the Western Caucus who will address some of the issues that are related to the problems of healthy forests.

If we get a fairly tight shot on this, what we can see in this graphic on the left, most of these pictures were taken from an area where there is a forest fire. The picture on the left is a picture of an area that had been thinned and prepared and did not burn. The picture on the right is the terribly scarred and destroyed timber, and by the way one cannot kill the timber by fire without killing a lot of endangered species and destroying watershed and creating huge difficulties for the environment.

That is the difference between the policy that we hope to implement through the Healthy Forest Act and what we currently have in much of our forests today. I am going to talk in particular and show some pictures later on about the effects of mud slides in a town very close to where I live in Utah, but I would like to end my piece of this introduction by quoting the President when he said, ''I have sent you a healthy forest initiative to help prevent the catastrophic fires that have devastated communities, killed wildlife and burnt away millions of acres of treasured forests. I urge you to pass these measures for the good of both the environment and the economy.''

I think if we focus on what the President said, we will realize this is a matter of major concern for all America, not just Americans who live in the West, not just for those people who live near federally managed forests in the East. This is a problem for all America, and it relates to our concerns for a healthy environment, for our concerns for endangered species and concerns for our economy.

I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER).

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on this issue.

The Representative from Utah is the chairman of the Western Caucus this year, and given the motivation by the Chief Executive to move forward on the healthy forest initiative, I join with my chairman of the caucus as well as the rest of the caucus in an enthusiastic effort to try to make sure that the healthy forest initiative goes forward.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate the healthy forest issue tonight, I am reminded that we were approaching the 100th-year anniversary of what Idahoans refer to as the ''big blowup,'' that is, the fires of 1910. It was a series of 1,763 fires that ravaged some 3 million acres and killed 85 people during August of 1910. The hardest hit areas were the Clearwater National Forest, the Coeur d'Alene national forests of Idaho, the Lolo and the Cabinet national forests of Montana.

I would like to share with my colleagues, if I might, an excerpt from ''The Big Burn,'' a book that was written on the Northwest fires by Stan Cohen and Don Miller:

''Daylight was shut out as far north as Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada; as far south as Denver; and as far east as Watertown, New York. To the west, officers of a British vessel 500 miles out of San Francisco said that they were unable to take observations for ten days because of smoke in the atmosphere caused by the big burn. Some claim that smoke from the big blaze reached one-third of the way around the world.''

This big burn started near a little town called Elk City, Idaho, a small community surrounded by dead and dying trees. That community is struggling to keep its one and only lumber mill in business. During the past 20 years, we have seen the growth of the surrounding forests double and the mortality rate from bugs and from viruses triple, all while the timber cuts steadily decline. In short, the sustainability of the forest is declining as the trees die.