the end of FY 2003. The Administration strongly supports passage of this emergency measure to keep the current program operating, and enable Congress to complete work on reauthorization. Without this measure, Oregon would be denied access to over $40 million in TANF funding scheduled to be made available for the fourth quarter next week.

I understand Oregon will maintain its current program while Congress completes work on reauthorization. Oregon is not in violation and based on Oregon's history is not expected to be in violation and therefore Oregon will not be subject to penalties for the next three months or until reauthorization.

Let me explain. Oregon's current TANF program has many elements, most of which are accommodated under TANF and are permissible under current law. However, I understand the State is concerned about its ability to continue operating two particular policies when its waiver expires. Oregon's waiver allows the State to count toward its required work participation rate certain types of activities, such as participation in substance abuse treatment and extended education and training, which would not otherwise be countable under TANF. Your State's waiver also permits counting of certain adults who are participating but have not attained at least 30 hours of participation per week, which is also required under TANF law.

Importantly, even without its waiver, TANF would not prohibit Oregon from engaging clients in the activities they currently do, nor does it prohibit the State from assigning hours for particular clients at levels below the current-law standard. These issues are relevant in that States must meet minimum participation rates. However, according to Oregon's current data, the State would be likely to meet its required participation in FY 2003, even though Oregon's ability to count certain activities and clients under its waiver will end at the end of this month.

Oregon achieved a participation rate for all its families of 61.1% in FY 2002. It would have achieved only an 8.0% all-family rate if it had operated the same way, but counted participation without its current waiver. However, because Oregon achieved such a dramatic reduction in TANF caseload over the past several years, it enjoys a caseload reduction credit that reduced its effective all-family participation rate requirement to 0% in FY 2002. Thus, even without its waiver, Oregon's program would have met its all-family participation requirement in FY 2002 because it effectively had no participation requirement.

Oregon's caseload reduction credit in FY 2001 was 56.2%, and in FY 2002 was 58.3%. I would anticipate that this would not change considerably in FY 2003, and because the required all-family rate for FY 2003 remained at only 50%, the State is very likely facing no participation requirement for the current year as well. Furthermore, work participation rates are measured on a full year basis, meaning that for FY 2003 Oregon's rate would be an average of what it achieved throughout the year. Given Oregon's extremely high participation rates under its waiver, and the fact it will have operated under the waiver for three of the four quarters of FY 2003, it should achieve a very high rate even if the final quarter is calculated without the waiver.

Oregon also must meet a separate participation rate for its 2-parent families. With its waiver, the State achieved a 53.8% 2-parent rate in FY 2002, but due to the caseload reduction credit it earned, only needed to meet a 31.7% standard. Again, given the State's likely high 2-parent participation for the first three quarters of FY 2003, it should meet this standard as well.

Based upon this, I am confident that Oregon can continue to operate its current TANF program through the end of this fiscal year without concerns about becoming subject to penalties for meeting its participation requirements. Should reauthorization not occur prior to the end of the fiscal year and current law be extended again, I would remain confident based on the facts that I have before me that Oregon could continue to operate its program without becoming subject to participation rate penalties.

TANF is a great program, and with your help we can make it work even better in the future. TANF provides States tremendous flexibility to fund and operate work and job preparation activities, and to provide supportive services and benefits so clients can find work, support themselves and build a better life for their families. I know you share my interest in seeing the program reauthorized as quickly as possible, and seeing that important improvements are made to enable States to engage all cases in meaningful and helpful activities so they can move into work quickly and successfully. Reauthorization is crucial for Oregon. As you know, the President's reauthorization proposal includes changes that would enable States to count various barrier removal activities toward their participation rates, as Oregon is doing now. It would also eliminate the separate 2-parent participation rate.

I appreciate the impressive work you are doing for the State of Oregon, and particularly your attention to this critical program that has become so important to helping our neediest families build better lives. The State of Oregon has done a wonderful job with its TANF program over the years, and we will continue to work with you on reauthorization legislation to see that we build the best program for Oregon and all of America.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that it has no objection to this letter from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

TOMMY G. THOMPSON.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam Speaker, this is very important legislation. It extends the TANF programs and related programs for the next 6 months so that we can try to work out a long-term, multiyear extension of the TANF programs and related programs. I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this legislation forward.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARDIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, this legislation is nearly identical to H.R. 3146, a bill the House unanimously approved last week. The only change is the addition of a 6-month extension of expiring Medicare payment provisions affecting hospitals in small cities and rural areas. These provisions need to be passed today and signed into law immediately to ensure the continued smooth operation of programs affecting health, welfare, and commerce throughout the country. I urge the support of this body.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, this Member wishes to add his strong support for H.R. 3146 and would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, for introducing this important legislation and for his efforts to extend the authorization for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, as well as related welfare reform initiatives, such as the mandatory child care program, the abstinence education program, and the transitional medical assistance program. Moreover, this Member would like to thank Chairman THOMAS for including language in H.R. 3146 to address Medicare payment disparities between rural and urban hospitals.

The Rural Health Care Coalition, which this Member currently leads as the Interim Co-Chairman, has been diligently working to bring equity to the rural health care delivery system. One of the Coalition's key priorities has been to address hospital payment disparities to ensure that facilities in rural areas and small cities can stay in business and continue serving patients who need care.

Medicare pays for inpatient services in large urban areas using a standardized amount that is 1.6 percent larger than the standardized amount used to reimburse hospitals in other areas (both rural areas and small urban areas). The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2003 (Public Law No. 108–7) provided a six-month base payment increase for rural and small urban hospitals from April 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003. Specifically, this measure raised the inpatient base rate for hospitals in rural and urban areas to the level of the rate for those in large urban areas.

The bill before us today will extend this payment increase until March 31, 2004. Such action is cruical—especially for cash-strapped rural facilities which are near the breaking point and in need of urgent aid. This policy will help maintain access to care in rural and less populated urban areas of the country by better aligning hospitals' payments to their average costs. The estimated impact of eliminating the base rate differential for six more months will result in $3.8 million for Nebraska hospitals, according to the Nebraska Hospital Association. This Member will continue to work on initiatives to bring even greater Medicare equity to Nebraska this year.

In closing, this Member urges his colleagues to support H.R. 3146. Reducing the difference in Medicare reimbursement levels between rural and urban hospitals is critical. Rural hospitals receive less Federal funding than hospitals in urban areas for providing the same services. This legislation will keep base payments at the same level as those in urban areas for six more months.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Is there objection to the initial request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE REAL STORY OF IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) has 19 minutes remaining in his Special Order.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Madam Speaker, so far we have heard from three Members

including me that have been to Iraq. We shared some of our stories. But we got back about 3 weeks ago; and in Iraq's history as a free nation, that is a very long period of time since they have only been free of the Saddam Hussein regime for about 5 or 6 months.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), a Member of Congress who just returned last night.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

The night is long; so I will be brief. But I was a part of a 17-member bipartisan delegation that left last Thursday after the last vote and then returned late last night. And as we left and as we arrived many hours later, we knew that there were people that were debating whether we should be in Iraq and how we got there. We spent the next days looking into the faces of men and women who fought there and assuring them that we were not going to cut and run, that we were going to make their sacrifices worth it and we were there to assure them that we would let them finish the job. As was mentioned earlier, General Rick Sanchez, he talked to us about what had occurred there and what needed to occur there, and he also told us the same thing, that winning this war would be winning over the hearts and the minds of the people of Iraq, and I certainly could not agree more.

What we saw in Iraq, first of all, were palaces, over a hundred of them, with beautiful crystal chandeliers and painted ceilings and gilded doors and a gilded thrown. Outside we saw statues and monuments built by Saddam Hussein and built there to glorify Saddam Hussein.

What else did we see? We visited a hospital in Baghdad, and not in my lifetime have I seen a hospital like that except in old movies, World War I and World War II, because we do not have hospitals with equipment that is that old. We saw a predelivery room with women waiting to deliver their babies in a room with a roof that leaked and air conditioners that did not work and faucets with rusted handles. We went to a power plant that was supposed to supply the power to Iraq, and it was held together with hope and rope and rust and baling wire. We were escorted there by a wonderful Marine lieutenant colonel who said as he went through that country he wondered if he would ever see a child with shoes on because none of them had shoes.

Is this a country without natural resources and assets? Is this a country that had no other choices? No, it certainly is not that country. It is a country with oil reserves second only to Saudi Arabia, that had land that was fertile and good for agriculture, had intelligent, caring people who wanted something better than that. Remember, this is a country that helped start the World Bank and at one time had an economy equal to Australia. But what had happened in this country, or what we understood what happened in that country, is Saddam Hussein.

We also visited a mass grave, much as what the gentleman had described; and we stood there and heard the story about that mass grave of 3,000 people identified because they had to put their identification in a plastic bag that was hung around their neck. So when that was discovered along with they think are over 100 graves like that, some as large as what the gentleman said, 10,000 remains, and as they tried to identify those people and go to those families and say to the people that they thought all these years were alive and in prison were in this mass grave, shot in the back of the head and then dumped into a grave and then sometimes, either because they ran out of ammunition or just got tired, they were not shot. They were just dumped into graves. What we saw and what we understood there in Iraq were businesses that were not started and educations that were not finished and babies who did not live. This is a country that has an infant mortality that is equal to India, one of the highest in the world. We saw children whose fathers just disappeared and lives that were lived in utter terror. We saw justice that was not delivered and protection that was not given.

So we came back, I say, as a bipartisan congressional delegation. We came back united in our resolve, regardless of where we were on the resolution before, but united in finishing the job that had been started; and I have thought ever since I got back and all day today, which I cannot get out of my mind, and I know as well as those who have spoken tonight, we have an opportunity to prove who we are and what we stand for. Sure, there are challenges. There are challenges. We could talk about the cost. Is it enough? Is it too little? Where do we get it? But we have an opportunity to help the people experience what we take for granted often, and that is our freedom, our protection, our system of justice, having a future, having a future for our children and grandchildren and say they can be what I am or better, they have that opportunity.

□ 2130

We have the opportunity to help the people of Iraq have that and then, of course, leave them in charge and leave, and leave them with a future that is full of hope. I left with the wonderfully uplifting feeling of being able to do what is right, both what is right for the people of Iraq but also what is right for the people, our people who are serving in uniform there, and just what is right as men and women of principle in this House, the opportunity that we have been given by the people.

So I would say I wish every Member of this House could do what we have done, to be there and to see that and talk to the people of Iraq and talk to our men and women who serve. I am glad the American people have the opportunity for us to tell about this, because it was something that I will never forget as long as I serve in this House, or be able to walk away and say what I am proud of. I appreciate the time to be able to relate that.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much for joining us tonight and staying up late after a very long trip. But certainly I think that tells how impressed we all were after we had the opportunity to visit Iraq.

One of the things that I think struck us all was the quality of the men and women in uniform and their sense of mission. I get asked often, what is the morale? Three weeks ago when we were there, the morale was very strong. They knew why they were there, and they knew what they were doing. I am curious as to how the gentlewoman found the morale.

Ms. GRANGER. Absolutely. The highlight of any trip like that is to sit and break bread with the people who serve; and we always sit with people who are in our districts, but in my particular case the people of Texas overall. But amongst the men and women the morale was high. They knew why they were there. They were proud of what they were doing, and they could not wait to tell us. The experience and the expertise, the determination of those men and women is always something that is just astounding to me. Yes, the morale is very high. They know why they are there. They are anxious to get home to their families and get back to their jobs but very proud of what they are doing.

As one of the officers related, he said he went to the hospital to visit someone who had been injured badly, and he said he experienced what he always experiences when he says, what can I do for you. They always say, take me back to where I was; I want to finish the job.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Again, I thank the gentlewoman very much for joining us tonight, and welcome home, and I thank her for sharing her stories.

I see the gentleman from Texas is still here, and I think he may have another story he would like to share with us.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I certainly thank my colleague from Texas for taking the time to come here tonight. I know what that jet lag is like.

I feel obligated just to make another mention about the situation with the mass graves. I was a private citizen in 1999, but I remember the administration and I remember the news media talking about the necessity for going into Kosovo and how desperate that necessity was, because there were mass graves in Kosovo. Well, we went into Kosovo and we won that conflict, but the mass graves somehow never materialized and somehow that was unimportant. But, Madam Speaker, we found those mass graves. Those mass

graves were in Iraq. When we were busy in Kosovo, we probably should have been concentrating on the regime of Saddam Hussein.

A lot has been made about the weapons of mass destruction and the fact that we have not yet found them. I will tell my colleagues I am impressed, because of the size of the country, with the enormity of that job. But one weapon of mass destruction we have found, and that weapon was the person of Saddam Hussein, and that is attested to by all of the silent voices buried in those mass graves around his country.

I thank my friend from Indiana for yielding me the additional time, and I happily yield back.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Madam Speaker, I think there are a lot of misconceptions about Iraq, that it is a barren desert country, when in fact it is a fertile crescent, truly, and also about the mass graves. When I am at home I ask people, how many mass graves do you think we found in Iraq? And they say, oh, five, six. If I recall when we were there, they found something like 151 already; and they thought that there were maybe as many as 500, maybe over 1 million people had been murdered in these mass grave sites.

The magnitude of the horror of the regime of Saddam Hussein can only be understood by the people who lived under it. I think that is why, when we were in the area of Babylon traveling in a bus along the roadside, people would run up to the bus and give us the thumbs up. Can my colleagues imagine the situation of living under that burden of knowing that your relatives were killed in a field near your village, but you could never go there because you might find the same fate if you tried to go find out what really happened?

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, he will remember one of the estimates that we were given about the number of casualties in that mass grave in Al Hilla was based upon the testimony of a physician in that town. I was a physician in my former life. Imagine this doctor whose life was dedicated to saving lives, to healing, to giving life, watching in his village while a bus or a truck was loaded up three times a day and driven out to that site and returned empty, and this continued for a full month. And that was where they got the estimates of the numbers of perhaps in excess of 30,000 people being within that one single mass grave; and then, of course, as the gentleman knows, there are many more like that throughout the country.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Again, I thank the gentleman. As with all things, it is not important what we say or think or observe but what we do. Certainly, our action on supporting the men and women in uniform and the citizens of Iraq rebuild their country, which I think will pay dividends for generations to come, is very important.

I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania has another measure to discuss on what we should do.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Our efforts are on track in Iraq. We do have a plan. But something that is very disappointing to me and, actually, I am angry about is that is in regard to the participation or lack of participation of the world's largest peacekeeping organization.

The United Nations is an organization that was founded on international cooperation and collective security, but it has failed to assist in efforts to remove a growing threat. The failure of this organization to support our efforts against a murderous and extreme dictator is unfortunate and, at times, unforgivable.

What I have done is I have drafted a piece of legislation that I am going to introduce tonight that will take $200 million of our annual dues, which is about $330 million every year, and it directs the administration to take that money and put it towards the humanitarian situation and our troops in Iraq, to improve their environment, whether it is food or shelter or whatever the case may be. But I am to the point that I have watched for years the United Nations talk and not act. In this situation it is quite evident, the situation that occurred in Iraq, and it is quite evident that they need to be there helping us and, to this date, they have done nothing.

So my legislation, as I said, would direct the administration to take $200 million of the $330 million, I believe it is, that we pay to the U.N. annually and send it over for our troops. So I would encourage my colleagues to sign on to this bill and support it as it moves forward. Just to let my colleagues know, there is a provision that if the United Nations decides to stand up and do what is right and support this effort, to go over and take their role in Iraq the way that they should participate, then there is a provision there that will let this legislation lapse. So I plan on introducing that tonight. Again, I would urge all of my colleagues to support this, to say to the U.N., stand up and be counted in this situation.

Finally, I just want to thank my colleague from Indiana for setting up this hour this evening. I think it is important that we not only here on the floor of Congress in the House of Representatives tell the whole story, but that as we travel through our districts, making sure that the people that we represent hear firsthand and unfiltered what is happening there, and that there is a positive plan in place, and that we have young men and women who are committed to doing what is right against sometimes terrible situations, but they are doing what is right and they are doing an absolutely fabulous job. The American people need to support them and need to support this effort. So I thank the gentleman for putting this together tonight.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Again, I thank the gentleman, and I certainly appreciate his efforts. Our men and women in uniform are essentially performing many of the duties of the United Nations by liberating oppressed people and helping them rebuild their nation and really giving them the opportunity of freedom for the first time in their lives, something that I think is contagious and benefits all of us.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by pointing out that the bottom line is that Iraq is the frontline of the war on terror, and it is a war we can and must win. As the young woman in Tikrit, the young soldier that I had dinner with, pointed out, this issue is much larger than Iraq itself. It is about the future stability of the Middle East and really about the future stability of our entire world.

If Iraq can become a secular, free, democratic nation, it will give hope and optimism to a region of the world that really has very little today. They are well-equipped to win that war, they are well-equipped to help the Iraqi people build a much better future, because they have every ingredient of success. They have water. They have rich oil reserves, which was pointed out tonight. They have tremendous agriculture capabilities. They can help feed not only themselves but many of their neighbors.

So I think all of us, as Members of Congress, have an obligation to base our decisions on facts, not on rhetoric, not on politics. But with an issue as important as this that has ramifications for generations to come, it is so important that we seek the truth and seek the facts.

What I have observed from every Member who has been there, that they came back with exactly the same story. They come back with hope, they come back with optimism, they come back with support for doing what is necessary to help our men and women in uniform and the men and women, the citizens of Iraq, to help rebuild their country. They do not try to separate out what we spend money on for just guns and bullets and what we spend on infrastructure, because they are really inseparable. Because our success is not really based on firepower, although that is important. It is about winning the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people and showing them American ideals and generosity that has really changed the globe and history over the last 200 plus years.

Madam Speaker, I am sorry to say that since returning home from Iraq I have been criticized by some people for being optimistic. I have been scolded for not sharing the pessimism that we see on TV at night and read about in the paper in the morning.

As I mentioned earlier, I left home with great concern, but I came back with immeasurable hope. If having faith in the power of democracy and the power of freedom and the capabilities of our men and women in uniform

is a sin, I am guilty as charged. I only wish that every American had the same opportunity that we had that went to Iraq. Because I know for a fact, if they went there and they could see the real and the whole story of Iraq, they would share our hope and our optimism, and they would support a very wise investment in the future of not only the Iraqi people, but of this entire world.

I would certainly encourage all of my colleagues as Members of Congress to support the supplemental, because it is a very wise investment.

AMERICAN WORKING FAMILIES BEAR THE BURDEN OF IRAQ BLUNDER

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we are all glad that Saddam Hussein has been dethroned. It is better for the world. It is better for Iraq. But the cost is too great and has been too great in dollars, and we now are considering another $87 billion. We have already invested more than $70 billion. The regular defense budget is also enormous, and that has been expended, and there is no end in sight. We will have more requests for more money.

The cost has been too great. We have not achieved any greater amount of security from terrorism. In fact, we are less secure from terrorism now than we were before we invaded Iraq. We have been forced to concentrate all of our energies, all of our priorities, our best minds, everything has been concentrated in Iraq, ignoring the threat in Afghanistan and the borders of Pakistan.

The overwhelming burden of the Iraq blunder, however, has been placed on the backs of working families. The actual troops out there are from working families. We all support our troops. We all want to do whatever is necessary to make certain that those troops come home. We want to do whatever is necessary to support them to guarantee that they have a chance to come home. The overwhelming burden of the Iraq blunder, however, should not remain on the backs of working families. Mismanagement should not cause more unnecessary suffering and more death among working families, relatives of people who are from working families.

The New York Times documented what we all knew already, that more than 90 percent of the members of the military are from working families. More than 90 percent of the people in Iraq are from working families. This is true for the war in Iraq, as it has been true for most other wars.

□ 2145

We know in the Civil War, the people who had money could buy their way out of the draft and pay someone else to go in their place. But, in general, draft boards and drafts in cases of the war in Vietnam and Korea and so forth have ended up selecting large numbers of working family members.

The greatest generation that celebrated winning World War II had many components, class-wise, but the overwhelming number of people who lost their lives in World War II were also people who were in working families.

Working families are very special to America. Working families have a right to make a claim on America. And what concerns me, and the reason I am here today, is that we do not seem to understand the importance of working families, the people who are in charge, the people who are in power continue to treat working families as if they were expendable, that they are not important.

We heard some discussion of the welfare bill before today. It was technical, and it was probably difficult to understand, but that is one of the greatest harassments of working families you are going to find, the present welfare legislation, which provides a family of four is given a subsidy of $6,000 or $7,000 per year, while at the same time we give subsides to agribusiness of more than $250,000 per year. One more treatment, one more example of the treatment of working families.

We need to take a hard look at this war in Iraq and what it is doing to us. We need to stop the war for many reasons. We need to stop the war because it is absorbing large amounts of cash that can be used for other purposes, for purposes that we need here at home to improve our economy and to improve the lot of all of us, including the lot of working families.

This great Nation's survival and its freedom are directly dependent on the courage and the devotion of men and women from working families. The blunder has been committed already. We are mired in a deep pit. We cannot leave now. The sons and daughters of working families must remain on the dangerous front lines. But at least we could support those troops in a better manner, not in the current superficial manner being mouthed by so many while at the same time they undercut our troops.

We need to understand that in very concrete ways, we are betraying the troops in Iraq who are from working families. The kinds of programs that have been promulgated by the Republican leadership are outrageous. Patriotic and meaningful support means that we must address some of the following issues, and we must do it immediately:

The conflict must be better managed so that there is multinational participation in the decision-making and a clear exit strategy to bring these American troops home. The best we can do for our troops, the most important thing we can do for them, is to bring them home. It has to be an honorable exit. We do not want to leave the job half done. We have to make certain that no other leader like Saddam Hussein is ever able to take control of Iraq.

We want to encourage democracy as much as possible. The first step toward doing that is to share the decision-making with other nations and have other nations get involved because they know they can participate in the decision-making. They will then commit troops and commit equipment and other things. And, most of all, they will be there to send a message to the Iraqi population that Americans are not trying to take over their country, occupy their country, and control the tremendous oil fields that lie beneath that country. That would be one way to say to working families, we care about the troops, we care about your son and daughter. We are going to make that effort.

With regard to the United Nations, this administration has only offered a cold shoulder, despite the difficulty that we are in. We are not moving to try to convince the rest of the world that we are ready to share decision-making with Iraq. We are ready to go some extra lengths, swallow our pride, do some things we said we would never do, put away our anger, and do what will promote a solution, the fastest possible solution in Iraq. That is what we can do for our troops. They deserve it.

There are some other direct benefits that the sons and daughters of working families over there deserve. They deserve adequate equipment and they deserve troops, a troop contingent, enough troops to make it safer for them. There are not enough troops in Iraq. They are not adequately equipped.

We heard some speeches before from some visitors who went over. I found them very interesting. JOHN MURTHA, who has been on the Committee on Armed Services for two decades, made the same trip, came back and was incensed and angered by the fact that the morale was so low and obvious needs in equipment and supplies were not being met. And he immediately demanded that the President fire the people who were in charge of the war in Iraq.

JOHN MURTHA, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has long experience in the Committee on Armed Services, saw an outrageous performance in terms of the leadership who planned and executed the war in Iraq.

Rotation rights have been sort of dismissed. Even in the war in Vietnam, there was a right of a soldier not to be placed at risk for more than a year. A year in combat, placing your life at risk, was all that was demanded. You could rotate out of Vietnam after a year. Those rights have not been guaranteed to the people in Iraq, soldiers, regular soldiers or Reservists.

The worst thing is the people who are in the Reserves, who thought they were going for a 6-month stint, have now