

letter to the Senior White House Adviser, Mr. Karl Rove, seeking his resignation.

"I write to ask you to resign from the White House staff. Recent reports have indicated that, while you may or may not have been the source of the Robert Novak column which revealed the status and the name of a covert operative, the wife of Ambassador Joseph Wilson, you were involved in a subsequent effort to push this classified information to other reporters and give it even wider currency. This itself may be a Federal crime, but regardless of that fact, your actions are morally indefensible. In my view, it is shameful and unethical that an administration that promised to govern with 'honor and integrity' and 'change the tone' in Washington has now a representative of your rank engaged in an orchestrated campaign to smear and intimidate truth-telling critics, placing them in possible physical harm and impairing the efforts and operations of the Central Intelligence Agency.

"Recent reports indicate that you told the journalist, Chris Matthews, and perhaps others, that Mr. WILSON's wife and her undercover status were 'fair game.'"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has expired.

#### IRAQ WATCH, CONTINUED

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, I am proud to be back on the House floor for another hour of what we are calling the Iraq Watch. This is a weekly effort that I have been engaged in with three colleagues for about 2½ months to raise questions each week about our policies in Iraq.

Before I get into the meat of this week's discussion, I am happy to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), who is discussing an Iraq-related matter. I am anxious to hear the remainder of his remarks.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) for his consideration, and I commend him on the special order that brings him to the floor of the House of Representatives at this hour.

Mr. Speaker, I will finish the letter that I sent to Karl Rove calling for his resignation.

"Recent reports indicate that you told the journalist, Chris Matthews, and perhaps others, that Mr. Wilson's wife and her undercover status were 'fair game.' Evan Thomas and Michael Isikoff, Newsweek Magazine, October 13, 2003. Since these initial allegations

have arisen, neither the White House nor your office have denied your involvement in furthering the leak. Repeated press inquiries into this matter have been rebuffed with technical jargon and narrow legalisms, instead of referring to the broader ethical issues. Indeed, in the same article, it appears a White House source acknowledged that you contacted Mr. Matthews and other journalists, indicating that 'it was reasonable to discuss who sent Mr. Wilson to the African country of Niger.'

"It should be noted that these actions may well have violated 18 U.S.C. section 793, which prohibits the willful or grossly negligent distribution of national defense information that could possibly be used against the United States. The law states that even if you lawfully knew of Mr. Wilson's wife's status, you were obliged to come forward and report the press leak to the proper authorities, not inflame the situation by encouraging further dissemination."

Another section of the law, 18 U.S.C. section 793(f) is used for the basis of that remark.

"Larger than whether any one statute can be read to find criminal responsibility is the issue of whether officials of your stature will be allowed to use their influence to intimidate whistleblowers.

"Over three decades ago, our great Nation was scarred by an administration that would stop at nothing to smear and intimidate its critics. I do not believe the Nation will countenance a repeat of such activities. For your role in this campaign, I would ask that you resign immediately."

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his cooperation.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his statement and for reading the letter to Mr. Rove. I congratulate the gentleman on his well-reasoned and well-researched document.

I would like to advise the gentleman of my deep concern about this leak that has been so unfair to the wife of Joseph Wilson and to tell the gentleman that Mrs. Plame, Valerie Plame, the wife of Mr. Wilson, that her parents are my constituents in suburban Philadelphia. They were recently interviewed by a local newspaper, and her father, Mr. Plame, expressed his great indignation and outrage that his daughter's cover was blown by this leak. He is demanding that the people accountable be held responsible and that appropriate penalties be levied upon them. He was quite eloquent in his anger and frustration that his daughter's career as an undercover operative for the CIA has been compromised.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for bringing this matter to the floor. I must say your approach, which is asking for Karl Rove's resignation, is one that I would be delighted to see happen. It probably has

about as much chance of succeeding as Rush Limbaugh getting a Diversity Award from the NAACP, but it would be something remarkable if someone in this White House would take responsibility for what is not just an illegal act of blowing the cover of a covert agent, but a morally reprehensible act.

I thank the gentleman, and I yield to the gentleman for further comments.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman. I had no idea there were members of the family that were in your district.

Let me point out that this may not be as remote as it may seem. There were or could be other agents whose covers have also been blown as a result of blowing hers. So it is not just one person. We do not know how far this damage may go.

It is my responsibility as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary to make sure that a fair investigation takes place, not among people who have worked together and been friends for many years and exchanged the kinds of sums of money and political activity that I have already related, but that there be a fair and independent investigation.

□ 2145

And only through a special counsel could that happen. I thank the gentleman for yielding again.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the need for an independent investigation by a special counsel. I do not think for a minute that the Justice Department is able to appropriately investigate this leak that allegedly comes from the White House. I do have faith in the career prosecutors at the Justice Department, as I know the gentleman does. But as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) pointed out a few minutes ago, there is a preexisting political relationship between Mr. Ashcroft, the Attorney General, and Mr. Rove, and for which Mr. Ashcroft paid Mr. Rove some \$700,000, appropriately done, in the course of several political campaigns. But clearly, that relationship alone should disqualify Mr. Ashcroft from being in charge of this investigation of potential leaking.

I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), we have started on Iraq Watch with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) reading this evening a letter to Karl Rove asking him to resign his position, and the gentleman from Michigan was here for a 5-minute speech, and we have dragged him into the Iraq Watch this evening. We are glad that he is here, and he has made a major contribution. I am happy to yield to my good friend and cofounder of the Iraq Watch, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see the senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary here tonight speaking on an issue that has clearly captured the attention of the

American people. I applaud him for his efforts.

I think it is very important, and I did not have an opportunity to see the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) make a presentation, but there have been stories in the media that have indicated that some are suggesting that there be a revival of the so-called independent counsel statute and, I dare say, that is not the case. I think it is very important to make that distinction.

What we are seeking here is not a revival of that particular statute, which I think many of us have concluded, both Republican and Democrat, that it led to serious abuses. For example, millions and millions of dollars were spent on one particular investigation involving the former Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Cisneros, a leader in the Hispanic community in Texas and nationally, which involved the issue of whether he lied to an FBI agent about how much money he contributed to a female friend of his. I dare say that bill, as I remember it, the bill to the American taxpayer, was in excess of \$17 million. But that clearly was abusive. And that is why, under the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), and the then-chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), supported by the current chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENBRENNER), the so-called independent counsel statute was allowed to lapse. And I do not think there is a Member in this House that wants to see it return because of its potential for abuse.

But there is an option that is available, and that is the appointment of a special counsel by the Attorney General, in this case John Ashcroft, who would retain some supervisory powers, but would not be involved in the daily exercise of his prosecutorial authority. Because it would then, I dare say, lend credence to the independence of any decision and any conclusion that might be made by a prosecutor, the so-called special counsel.

Mr. Speaker, as we have been discussing now for, I think it is better than 3 months, in this whole issue of Iraq, the intelligence, the questionable intelligence that was relied on by so many of our colleagues to support the resolution to go to war, much of that intelligence has been reviewed and has been found to be unsubstantiated, uncorroborated, misleading and, in some cases, outright false, as well as the cost of our intervention into Iraq, and now, the overwhelming bills that the American taxpayers are faced with.

So we have been talking about having an independent commission. Let us depoliticize it. Let us take it out of the realm of politics. Let us not make this a Republican versus Democratic issue to determine what went wrong with our intelligence and were the American people misled, and were Members of Congress misled. Our own colleagues,

the highly regarded chairman of the House Select Committee on Intelligence, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), along with the senior Democrat on that committee, the gentleman from California (Ms. HARMAN), in a letter indicated that there were serious problems, that the intelligence was flawed.

I know what the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is doing when he puts forth the concept of a special counsel; it is to take the politics out of it. We are not in a contest with Republicans or the White House. What we are trying to do is determine what the truth is and then present it to the American people in a way that they can have confidence in the integrity of that effort. We are not suggesting that the Department of Justice is unable to do it, but what we are suggesting is that there is an issue of perception here, and that the American people want to have independence when it comes to an issue that is so vital to our national security.

Mr. Speaker, the President's father himself, upon the enactment of the statute, the applicable statute suggested that anyone who revealed the names of a CIA operative or an intelligence officer of this country was a traitor. What we are talking about here is treason. We have got to get politics out of it. This cannot be a political issue. It has to be an issue of national security. The investigation has to be done by someone who is independent of the Department of Justice, although supported by the Department of Justice and, where needed, rely on the Department of Justice for resources. But it has to be someone whose integrity and independence is not in question.

That is why I applaud my friend and colleague, the senior Democrat on the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

I see we have been joined here by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) for his comments.

Before I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), and we are delighted that he has joined the Iraq Watch this evening, but first, we have actually talked about two different special prosecutors here, or one special counsel, I should say, to review these allegations of a leak from the White House. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) has brought up again the general opinion of the Iraq Watch that we need to have a bipartisan and independent study of our intelligence-gathering regarding Iraq and the use to which that intelligence was put.

I agree with both of my colleagues on that, although I just want to say once again that while we do not want to be political, we want this to be bipartisan as it is important for our national security interests; this Member of Con-

gress, I have made up my mind about whether or not we were misled by the intelligence presented by the administration. I was misled. I was given exaggerated information. I was given misleading information.

The President and all of his top advisors in September and October of 2002 stated with complete certainty that Saddam Hussein had chemical weapons, had biological weapons of mass destruction, was reconstituting a nuclear weapons program, was going to give these weapons to al Qaeda. It turns out that not only have they not been able to find weapons, as all Americans know, but it has come out this past spring, 6 months after these statements were made, that the classified intelligence being given to the White House last fall at the time of these statements was filled with uncertainty.

The intelligence agencies were telling the President and telling the President's people they were not sure what Hussein had. The defense intelligence agency report of September 2002 said there is no reliable information, and I am quoting, "No reliable information on whether Iraq is producing or stockpiling chemical weapons, or whether Iraq has or will establish its chemical agent production facilities." No reliable information, according to the defense intelligence agency.

Yet at the same time, the President is saying in the Rose Garden, September 26, 2002 that "the Iraqi regime possesses biological and chemical weapons. The Iraqi regime is building the facilities necessary to make more biological and chemical weapons." That is the President's statement at the very time that his intelligence agencies were saying there is no reliable information. And again, before I turn to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), who is waiting patiently, I was briefed with other Members of Congress on October 2, 2002, in the White House, one of many such White House briefings that many of us took advantage of. I was with perhaps 20 Members, a bipartisan group. The briefers were Condoleezza Rice and George Tenet, and they stated with complete certainty on October 2, 2002, that Hussein had these weapons, that he had biological weapons, chemical weapons, reconstituting nukes, the whole litany. And yet they both had access at that time to classified information, some of it coming from Mr. Tenet's own agency, the CIA, that was indicating great uncertainty about the status of Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction program.

Now, we see Condoleezza Rice appointed this past weekend by the President to head up an Iraq stabilization group at the White House, because the President is concerned that too much bureaucracy is getting in the way of our program. If there is any bureaucracy in the way of our program, it is the President's bureaucracy. Congress did not set up any bureaucracy to frustrate him. He is working through the

Defense Department. Most of us think he ought to be working through the State Department and not the Defense Department. We can get into that in more detail in a few minutes. But the credibility of the administration is at stake. A huge credibility gap has grown up between the President's statements and what he was being advised, the classified information he was getting at the time he was saying with such certainty, which we now know was uncertain, and his top officials, including George Tenet and Condoleezza Rice, have the same credibility gap surrounding them. It is bad for the administration. It is bad for the Nation to have these problems.

I thank the gentleman for getting me off on this rant. You have triggered some of my frustrations.

Let me at this point turn to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO). I believe he has another aspect to discuss as to the situation in Iraq.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just restate briefly from what I have heard from the three gentlemen who have gone before me, because I think it is very important for the American people. I mean, it would be one issue if there was misjudgment that was costing the American people tens of billions of dollars. The President is asking us to borrow \$87 billion and put into debt future generations of Americans to pay it back. We do not have the money. It is going to be borrowed. Thirty years, people will work for the next 30 years to pay it back. But really not wealthy people, because they do not pay taxes anymore, but working people.

So there is a question, if someone in my administration made a mistake that was causing the American people 30, 50, 100, 200 billion dollars, maybe there would be a consequence. Then we go to the issue of lies. There was an extraordinary article in the press today which said the President said our troops have the best equipment possible; they have everything they need.

□ 2200

And we find out the young men and women over there have Vietnam-era flak jackets that will not stop bullets from AK-47s. \$400 billion budget at the Pentagon, \$80 billion from Congress last spring, and they are just now placing the orders.

Individual families have been buying these kids state-of-the-art flak jackets, available for \$500 in the private sector in the United States, and mailing them to the kids who are serving the United States of America.

So you get to the next level which is beyond someone simply made a mistake to extraordinary incompetence, extraordinary incompetence that is costing the American people tens of billions, hundreds of billions of dollars over the next 30 years. It is costing young American men and women their lives today as we speak. And yet no one has lost their job. No one who planned

this, no one who made this case, no one has been involved. In fact, they are being promoted.

As you said, Condoleezza Rice has been promoted now to be Pro-Consul over Afghanistan and Iraq because she has been doing such a great job. What has she been doing a great job on?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I am confused. I thought Mr. Bremer was the Pro-Consul. And today you are absolutely correct, we read in the newspaper that it would appear that Condoleezza Rice has taken over that particular role. I think what I see is a lack of coherent governance in a well-thought-out plan.

Now, again, to indicate to those that are watching here tonight, this is not a partisan attack, this is not a Democrat criticizing a Republican administration. Because my opinion, and the opinion that has been articulated by the gentlemen here that have already spoken, is reflected by comments that come from highly respected Republicans. Senator LUGAR, who chairs the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, actually wrote an opinion piece for the Washington Post that said exactly what we are saying. The postwar reconstruction phase represented an abysmal failure of planning.

Turn on the Sunday news shows, listen to another eminent Republican Senator, Senator HAGEL from Nebraska, he talks again about the poor planning by the administration, and also says it like it is, that this Congress was considered to be a nuisance. That is his language about the administration when it came to the issue of Iraq.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey). The Chair would remind Members that is not in order in debate to refer to or characterize a Senator's position on a proposition.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, well, I will defer to the Chair, but in another context I might take issue whether I actually characterized it in such a manner.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we will bring down in the actual quotes and not have to characterize it.

Following in this vein, you know, arguably the architect of this policy man who has been advocating a war with Iraq since the last war in Iraq ended, Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Defense Secretary, when talking about misjudgments, and this is a direct quote, not a characterization, "There is lots of money to pay for this that does not have to be U.S. taxpayer money and it starts with the assets of the Iraqi people. The oil revenues of that country could bring between \$50 and a \$100 billion over the course of the next 2 or 3 years. We are dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction and relatively soon." That is a direct quote.

Mr. Wolfowitz, held in high regard by this administration, said Iraq would rebuild itself, no cost to the American

people. So thus far, if we just add up the first reconstruction bill and the second reconstruction bill, he is wrong by \$20 billion, \$20 billion that this President is asking this Congress to borrow on behalf of the American people, indebting future generations of Americans, to build, not rebuild. Remember, much of this is not rebuilding war damage. This is building Iraq in the vision of Halliburton and all the gold-plated defense contractors.

We might get into that later. There is a wonderful little piece here I have from the administration on that.

But that is what the money is. It is going to be borrowed and spent in Iraq, not providing jobs here, infrastructure here, but building infrastructure in Iraq in the vision of Paul Wolfowitz who is wrong by a magnitude of \$20 to \$100 billion at least in addition to the lives that have been lost. But has he been held to account? No, he has been held in high regard.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Did the gentleman see over the weekend the New York Times article that set forth in great detail how overstated the administration's claims were regarding Iraqi oil revenue? It fits exactly into the point the gentleman is making.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, in fact, the intelligence information, which was available to Mr. Wolfowitz, to Mr. CHENEY, to President Bush, and all the others who formulated this policy, Ms. Rice who has been promoted to Pro-Consul now, that intelligence information which said that, in fact, the Iraqi oil infrastructure was in miserable shape, not capable of producing large amounts of oil, not capable of paying for its own reconstruction, was either not read by all of these esteemed people in this administration, or ignored, or deliberately distorted. Because they told us, the American people, do not worry; they are going to pay for it themselves.

But now they are handed a very big bill, not just to this generation. I talked to a bunch of high school kids in my district yesterday. I said, "We are giving you the bill." There is a joke going around, why do politicians smile at babies? It is because they are being given the bill to rebuild Iraq. They are the next generation.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Can I disagree with my friend, the gentleman from Oregon for just a minute. I do not know if you saw the nightly news, but there was, I think, an NBC piece that indicated that today, not in the future, there is a record number of mortgage foreclosures on homes here in America.

I heard the number, 435,000 Americans that are in the process of losing their homes. The American dream today is becoming a nightmare. You know it better than anybody, possibly, in this entire body. We have had record job losses, we have burgeoning deficits. And for the first time in our history in the entire span of American history, for 2 consecutive years the median income, the median income of American households has gone down, 2 years in a row.

Of course, poverty is increasing at the same time the number of millionaires is increasing.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If we took the \$20.3 billion the President is proposing that the American people borrow and spend and invest in Iraq, and we spent and invested that money here in the United States of America, in the same things, in sewer, water, bridges, roads, airports, stable electricity, we would create a million jobs, a million jobs here in the United States of America. But instead we are going to create obscene profits for a few contractors, maybe do a little bit on the ground for the Iraqi people. But the bottom line is, we are borrowing money and ignoring the needs here.

Yes, I know more than anybody. My district, my State has the highest unemployment rate in the Union. My State has led the country for more than a year having the highest unemployment rate in the Union. We have a \$4 billion highway bridge problem on the interstate highway system, and the President says there is no money to repair it. Well, there is \$16 billion sitting in the highway trust fund. He would not even have to borrow it. He is borrowing money to invest in Iraq, but he will not even spend money we have paid in taxes here in the United States of America to invest in our highways.

He says we do not have money to invest in the airports. There is \$4 billion in that fund. He says we do not have money for extended unemployment benefits. There is \$16 billion in the unemployment trust fund paid by taxes of employers and workers, and the President will not draw it down.

We are paying hundreds of thousands of Iraqis for no-show jobs or for the fact that they used to be part of the military over there, but we do not have money to extend unemployment benefits in this country. There is something very wrong with the priorities of this picture.

Mr. HOEFFEL. I agree with Mr. DEFAZIO. And I thank the gentleman from Oregon for reminding us that whatever we do in Iraq, whatever we spend there is borrowed money. Because our fiscal house is in such disorder, we are required to borrow every penny of what we spend.

There is agreement in a broad way about the need to support our troops, to make sure they get the support they need, if, as the gentleman said, they need improved protective gear.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Not only do they need flak jackets; they could use desert camouflage. They are not in forests. But I talked to one dad at the early part of the war. I thought this had been corrected, but I find out now it has not; we are still sending National Guard over there without even desert camouflage. We cannot afford it. We can afford all these other things, gold-plated contracts, but we cannot afford to give these young men and women, selflessly putting their lives on the line, not only flak jackets but desert camouflage so they can blend in a little better.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I appreciate the anger of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) because he made a statement about who is profiting from what is going on in terms of the so-called "reconstruction phase" in Iraq today.

While we know there will not be American workers building the bridges, constructing the hospitals, rehabilitating schools, and building affordable housing, those will not be American workers. But as the gentleman indicated, there is a story in the New York Times, dated September 30, that says that a Washington insider's new firm consults on contracts in Iraq. A group of businessmen linked by their close ties to President Bush, his family, and his administration, have set up a consulting firm to advise companies that want to do business in Iraq, including those seeking pieces of taxpayer-financed reconstruction projects. The firm, New Bridge Strategies, is headed by Joe Allbaugh, Mr. Bush's campaign manager in 2000, and the director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency until March.

Mr. HOEFFEL. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Is it not interesting in the context just established by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and that which the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) just recounted to us, that there is some mention made today about a Marshall Plan for Iraq, as if there was some analogy or some parallel to what is happening today, from what is happening today to the time of the Marshall Plan under Harry Truman.

Harry Truman made his reputation as a Senator of the United States by rooting out corruption and favoritism and cronyism and profiteering out of defense spending. That is how Harry Truman made his reputation. And when he was President of the United States, the Marshall Plan was free of that kind of corruption, free of that kind of cronyism, free of that kind of direction.

I have a suggestion for the gentleman from Oregon: We now have Ms. Rice in charge of stabilization. I am not quite sure what she knows about construction. She constructs sentences very well. By the time she gets finished, a house of cards is still standing. I do not know how long that house of cards is going to stand, but she does her best to construct it.

Now, perhaps she can do the same for reconstruction in Iraq. I do not know. But if she is in charge of that, presumably she will be in charge of the \$600 million that is going to be borrowed and spent to find the nonexistent weapons of mass destruction.

□ 2215

Perhaps some of the folks in the gentleman's district or State that are out of work can apply for a job over there. Not that they could do real work in Or-

gon on roads and bridges and schools, something of substance, but they can chase their shadows over in Iraq looking for nonexistent weapons of mass destruction for \$600 million.

Mr. DELAHUNT. That is on top of the \$300 billion that is already been spent. We are looking at a billion dollars for, as the gentleman says, a search for ghosts.

Mr. DEFAZIO. But we did find in a refrigerator of an Iraqi scientist purportedly one vial of botulin toxin, which, of course, you can find basically at any ag school or any research lab anywhere in the United States, but for only \$300 million we did find that and that apparently presented, according to this administration, a real and present danger to the United States of America, that one vial of toxin, which, of course, is readily available. In fact, I think you can still buy them and have them shipped in the United States of America.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I do not want you to be discouraged because help is on the way. Where did I hear that phrase before? Help is on the way. I think back around 2000 help was on the way. Well, help is on the way. My understanding is that the Turkish Parliament has voted to send troops to Iraq. Why, that is wonderful. We are going to have assistance at long last.

There is only one little problem and perhaps Condoleezza Rice can stabilize this while she is at it. The Iraqi Governing Council, our governing council, our appointees, the people we have chosen as the foundation of stabilization, political stabilization in Iraq do not want them. They told them to stay out. These people, ungrateful wretches that they are, apparently have a sense of suspicion that the Turks might have more than one agenda in mind. That if they cross over into Iraq, that perhaps the Turks might have something to do with what benefits Turkey.

Now, where would they get that idea? Does the phrase Ottoman Empire ring a bell with anybody? It is all history that has been lost. The Iraqis have had some experience with Turkish soldiers before. I keep calling on the ghost of T.E. Lawrence. Where are you when we need you?

I understand they show movies down at the White House. Maybe they ought to get Lawrence of Arabia and get that down there and show it to them.

Wake up. Help is not on the way. Three more dead today, others injured. The media is reduced to saying, but nobody has been killed since last Friday. This is the kind of marginal gain, apparently, that we are making. This is the kind of measurement that is taking place now. The news hour in the evening on PBS, at the end of it, broadcasts in silence the names, pictures and fundamental data of the latest deaths. Is this the kind of ritual that we are going to assume in this country? We are going to watch this war on television. This is the kind of sacrifice supposedly being made. This is the kind of

confrontation that needs to take place. And the reason we have Iraq Watch, the reason we are down here every week, the reason that we are speaking out now is that the American public has to know that not everybody has been buffaloed, not everyone is silent, not everyone is going to step back from speaking the truth.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to add to the gentleman's comment there. I share your outrage and admire your outrage over the continuing deaths from guerilla opposition and warfare in Iraq. And I remind my colleagues in Iraq Watch and Members of the House and members of the American public that are seeing this, that the President, last July, was asked after about 25 American soldiers had been attacked and assassinated after the May 1 declaration that major hostilities were over, he was asked in July, do we have enough force in Iraq to protect our own force? Are our own people safe enough? Do we have adequate force to protect our own troops? And he said, in what I believe to be the most reckless statement any American President has ever made, he said, Yes, we have enough force. We can stop the guerillas. Bring them on. Bring them on, he said.

And since that day, I am sad to report, adding the three dead Americans that the gentleman referenced, we have lost 65 American soldiers due to hostile attacks, assassinations, guerilla activity by the opposition in Iraq. And I wonder what the President would say to those 65 families who may ask him, Mr. President, do we have enough force to protect our own force? What about my family member, Mr. President? I do not know what the President would say to those 65 families.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Yesterday I was in Cottage Grove, Oregon, in a National Guard dispatchment from Cottage Grove, Oregon, 600 men and women are about to be deployed to Iraq for a year. And yet I hear, and I understand, that despite the protestations of this administration and the tens and hundreds of billions of dollars at their disposal, that they may not have the proper equipment, that they may not have the flak vests that will stop an AK047 bullet. They may not have the armored HUM-V's that they may need. They may not even have the desert camouflage.

So I suggest that maybe those members of this administration who are waxing so eloquent about how things are going, maybe they should go over there and wear forest green camouflage instead of desert camouflage, wear a Vietnam-era flak vest and ride in a HUM-V with canvas windows and plexiglas around the country, not in their super-armored Suburbans, air conditioned, state-of-the-art, surrounded by helicopters and everything else and then come back and say how great things are.

Go over there and experience what our young men and women are experi-

encing over there, and maybe they will come back a little bit humbled, and maybe they will want to do a little bit more to resolve this, to safeguard our men and women and to resolve this situation, honestly, as opposed to spinning and spinning and spinning.

These people are never wrong, never wrong, no matter what. You can go back and find 15 misstatements. They can be off by \$100 billion and a couple of hundred American lives, but they were not wrong. They are never wrong.

Mr. HOEFFEL. I think my colleagues would agree that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is a passionate and eloquent and excellent addition to our efforts here. I thank the gentleman for being here.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make two points. I think the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) made an observation relevant to the Turkish Parliament supporting sending troops now to Iraq. But the other half of that story is that the United States Government just issued a loan guarantee to Turkey in the amount of \$8.5 billion.

Mr. DEFAZIO. That is not connected.

Mr. DELAHUNT. No, that is not connected and pigs fly.

The point is, when you talk about a coalition of the willing, I cannot think of such a misnomer as the coalition of the willing.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. They are willing to take the money.

Mr. DELAHUNT. They are willing to take the money.

But let us go back to the Gulf War that was managed by this President's father. There were 160,000 nonAmerican troops that were involved in that effort. That was a true coalition of the willing in the face of naked aggression by Saddam Hussein.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Briefly, I do not want to sour that because it certainly was a much better international effort, but there was an \$11 billion payoff to Egypt where we forgave their debt.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I am not suggesting that that was bribe free, but in the end, the net cost to the American taxpayers was some \$7 billion.

Now, we have already, if this war supplemental is approved, we are in this adventure in the amount of \$166 billion and well on our way, well on our way to hundreds of billions of dollars more, and we still do not know how we get out of it.

Let me just conclude by saying this. I hear about how things are going so well. We heard, of course, on the floor during the debate on the war resolution how we would be welcomed as liberators. Well, the truth is the Iraqi people want us out. They do not want us there. Even our own appointed 25-member Iraqi Governing Council have suggested that we accelerate this program because they can do it much cheaper. And I will allude to that at the end if I have any time left, but let me read what I think are some fascinating polling results that were con-

ducted by Gallup and Zogby, two well-respected American polling firms.

This is what was produced by the Gallup poll: Countrywide, only 33 percent of the Iraqi people thought they were better off then they were before the invasion, 33 percent, and 47 percent said they were worse off. And 94 percent said that Bagdad was a more dangerous place for them to live. The poll also found, and I would ask my colleagues and those that are watching to listen carefully to these statistics. The poll also found that 29 percent of Bagdad residents had a favorable view of the United States while 44 percent had a negative view. By comparison, and this pains me to say this, by comparison 55 percent had a favorable view of France. Those same Baghad residents had a negative view of President Bush, 50 percent, while 29 percent had a favorable view of him. In contrast, the French President, Jacques Chirac, a 42 percent favorable rating.

Now, this should be telling us something. This should be telling us that the postwar reconstruction phase was poorly planned. We are not getting the message across. We have appointed a governing council that is suggesting that for every billion dollars of a taxpayer's money that we spend, and this, again, are their figures, they can accomplish the same exact project for \$100 million. In other words, we are paying ten times, our taxpayers are paying ten times, while job losses mount and our infrastructure crumbles.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If I could document that for a second. Ahmad al-Barak, who is a member of the Governing Council named by the United States of America, said that "Savings could be a factor of ten. Where they spend \$1 billion, we could spend \$100 million."

He said that on the day that they canceled the \$5,000-a-day contract to feed the 25 members of the Iraqi Governing Council entered into by Mr. Bremer, the former Chief Pro-Counsel before Ms. Rice. Apparently, they were flying the food in from Sardi's from New York on 747s. I do not know how they got the price up that high, but ten cents on the dollar.

Mr. HOEFFEL. We have been joined by our colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

□ 2230

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the Congressman for his persistence and determination in telling the truth to the American people; and to my colleagues that are here, I just want to help build on what was said on several points that I think are relevant in light of the fact that we are going to be debating this question in a week's time.

First of all, I do not know if many of my colleagues realize, I was just with my good friend, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), in Seattle, Washington, and in that region; and I

think as we well know, we were discussing the great needs of homeland security and the choices that we have to make. The gentleman is located up on the northern border; I am located in Texas on the southern border. And one of the things that we realized was that we have not put in enough money for homeland security.

So what we will be debating in this next week will be a question of choices, and I think it is important for the American people but as well for our colleagues, for this Congress, to have the facts.

Let me just share with my colleagues briefly what my positions or concerns are. One, I do not believe we have all the facts. I am delighted to see my ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), who was a visionary on the debate on the war resolution dealing with the Constitution. We did not have all the facts there; but clearly, Congress does not have all the facts when we look at a document that is 70 pages long and that before the chairman's mark, as I understand it, we had jail cells that were being built for \$50,000 per bed. That is not what occurs in the United States. Then we have questions about whether or not we are spending enough money in the right areas.

So here is my proposition to this floor. One, this debate should be delayed. We should have a debate when all of the facts are on the table. What is now the new proposal of Condoleezza Rice, as I understand it, over the rebuilding of Iraq? What is the exit strategy? What will happen to the Reservists and others that are beyond their 6-month period? What are we doing for the families who are now suffering because their loved ones are away on the front lines? What are we doing for returning veterans or those who are wounded?

Then I was interested in hearing what my good friend from Massachusetts was speaking about with respect to Turkey. There is going to be a donor conference in 2-weeks in Madrid. Why are we rushing to have this debate without knowing who are the willing coalition or the coalition of the weak or the coalition of the strong and how much are they going to offer? That is what the American people need.

So my proposition is, one, delay this debate, delay this vote, get the facts as to the amount of money needed by the military. I understand that they have enough to keep them going, if you will, because we do not want to undermine our front liners; but we believe that there are enough resources. I have voted for that \$79 billion and for the defense appropriations. Then let us set out the vote. Let us make sure we have the vote for the military personnel and needs there, but let us find out about these donor countries and why we are not having Iraq fund some of the rebuild. Finally, why are we not using the Iraqi people, as my good friend said, in order to bring down the cost

and so that we can create jobs here in the United States by resources and investing in our infrastructure here in the United States?

I believe we should delay this debate. I believe the Congress does not have all the facts that it needs to have, as evidenced by this document and changes being made; and I believe that we must first go to our allies in this conference in Madrid, Spain, bring back to the Congress the results there, and then we can have a very intelligent debate on this issue.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) has a comment.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, if I can just respond because I think that the gentlewoman from Texas' (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) observation and suggestion is a very valid one, but let me submit this.

What I found particularly unsettling when the discussion of the donors' conference in Madrid was being reviewed by various pundits was that it was written that the European Union's contribution and the figures now are projecting a \$100 billion long-term effort, that the European Union's contribution this year was going to be \$230 million.

Mr. DEFAZIO. M.

Mr. DELAHUNT. M, not billion. We are talking billions on the American taxpayers. Let us be honest. We are in this alone. We are doing it alone. Nobody is helping us.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Absolutely.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Nobody is helping us. American taxpayers, American military, American veterans, American education, American health, we are making sacrifices and we are doing it alone, without anybody, because of poor planning and going into a war under false pretenses.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, and every penny of those billions will be borrowed, not only hitting hard at the needs today and causing cuts in the budget today and giving the President an excuse to say we do not have the money to rebuild our bridges and highways and waste water systems or do adequate homeland security and port security and we do not have enough money for education and we do not even have enough money for flak jackets for the young men and women over there, but every penny of those billions will be borrowed, indebting future generations of working Americans to pay for this misadventure, with no consequences.

The people who were so wrong. Mr. Wolfowitz, who I quoted earlier, who said Iraq would pay for itself, they are still making policy and spinning out fantasies at the White House. There are no consequences for making mistakes that cost the American people \$20 billion in this White House.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield on that

point, I know we are near the end of our time. I just want to indicate and perhaps we can take this up at another time.

Just so the American people understand, our colleagues understand, the suggestion was made to Mr. Bremer by myself when we were in the first group to actually be able to leave the airport and get into Baghdad and subsequently up to Kirkuk in the north, I think really the first conference that was held after Mr. Bremer's appointment in Baghdad, we suggested and I for one suggested that the Iraqi Army not be disbanded; that it be utilized as a workforce, turned into a kind of CCC operation; that it was going to be very dangerous for us to simply take these folks who after all were conscripted into the army anyway. It is not as if these guys were eager volunteers. Then I said we can pay them if there are going to be any payments made. Let us let them do the rebuilding of Iraq. Let them set the standard for it. Let Iraqis do the rebuilding. Of course we can assist them. That way we can get them on our side and not cause a huge fissure in Iraqi society; and, of course, that suggestion was ignored.

I just want it on the record that the administration knew full well that there were Members who had reservations about the war but who, of course, wanted to have the best possible outcome once the attack was over, who made a suggestion that it was very, very important not to dismember Iraqi society in order to accommodate profiteering on the part of companies in the United States.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

We have about a minute and a half left to go. Any final comments from any of my colleagues?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I just want to say one point about what the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) said that the Iraqi people want to help rebuild. They want to help rebuild, and I think it is extremely important that we engage the Iraqi people in this process, and we have not done that.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for another lively discussion during the Iraq Watch. I think we all agree that we need the President to level with the American people. We need information. We need a plan. We need a plan for institutionalizing the situation in Iraq, both the security and the reconstruction. I said institutionalizing. I meant to say internationalizing. That is, I think, a goal that the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is talking about, including what kind of donor support we will get from the international community.

We need to know how to get Iraqis back in charge of Iraq and how soon that will happen, and we need an exit strategy for the United States. We do not want to leave and leave a vacuum. None of us want to do that, but we need to know what is in store, how much

time and how much money and the future prospects.

We are out of time. I thank my colleagues. The Iraq Watch will be back next week, and I thank the Speaker for his cooperation.

#### THE COSTS OF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I welcome any of the Members that are here from the Iraq Watch group. I think not only are they watching Iraq, I think the American people are watching what is happening in Iraq and not happening here in the U.S., and I was in my office and I heard such an outstanding discussion on some of the things that we know here in the Congress, that we need to continue to share with the American people, which are truly dollars and cents; and many times when we are talking about dollars and cents, we are talking about American lives.

I had some comments here that definitely I wanted to share, but I could not help but seeing at the top of the hour the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) here, our ranking member in the Committee on the Judiciary, and his letter to the White House and asking for Mr. Rove's resignation; and I think when we look at the politics of the matter, at any time I will be willing to yield for additional comments from my colleague as it relates to his letter that he sent today, I think goes to the very root of the reason why we are in this Chamber tonight.

I am a newcomer to the Congress. I see so many Members here that are professional experts, not only in the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), but other Members that are here, members of the Committee on Armed Services that were on that committee when I was in junior high school, but we will leave that for another time.

I just want to say very quickly, just some very open and preliminary comments, that we talk about the cost of this war, and I cannot help but refer to a letter that our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), sent out recently to Members of the Congress and mentioning that Desert Storm and the first Persian Gulf War only cost \$6.1 billion. The United States' share of that was \$7.4 million. That was our share, which was 12 percent; and I believe that that war was definitely one that was shared by many, that we actually had a true coalition. We had a coalition economically. We had a coalition troop-wise. This time we went to war with the willing and we footed the whole bill, I must add.

This current supplement, and before we get into that, we gave \$79 billion

that was added to this effort from the beginning which we still cannot account for. This Thursday when the Committee on Appropriations will meet, hopefully some of those things will come to light of what happened with the \$79 billion.

Now the Bush administration's asking for \$87 billion, which is mind boggling in and of itself, which gets us to \$166 billion. This continues to go up and up and up, 12 percent of the costs of almost the cost of \$20 billion.

However, the administration's decision of the go-alone strategy, we may say go-with-the-willing strategy, has gotten us where we are now and got us to the \$166 billion issue now, which is going to be \$6.6 billion in the end of just interest alone, at some \$128 million a week in interest. That is not even talking about the \$4 billion that we are spending right now. Let me just say that again for someone that might have gone to the refrigerator to get a soda, \$128 million in interest. That is just interest alone, and I think that is something that the American people should really take heed to and understand.

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I really applaud the gentleman for taking this time and an hour. I would just try to enlarge the context, because it is clear that this Nation has an economy that is at risk. As my colleague well knows, the number of Americans that are now below the poverty line is historic in terms of its numbers. In addition to that, we have record job losses ever since 2001. We have lost in a net way over 2 million jobs; but most importantly when we talk about these exploding deficits, it is important to remember that when this President came to office there was a \$5.6 trillion surplus projected for the year 2011.

Today, when we project forward to 2011, we are talking about a deficit, an accumulated deficit in that space of time in excess of \$2 trillion. We have lost somewhere out there \$8 trillion, some \$8 trillion; and now we are continuing to add to that debt that will have to be paid, that becomes a drag on our economy because we have to pay interest, as my colleague well knows, on that debt. So these points that the gentleman is making, I think, are very important.

□ 2245

And clearly those that are viewing us here tonight and those of us that are speaking have to understand that the sacrifice is unfortunately not just about young men and women who are giving their lives and are being wounded and will suffer themselves personally for the rest of their lives; but almost as important, the American economy and future generations of Americans are going to suffer economically because of what we are doing.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his comments and his commitment to sharing what we need to share with the American people as Members of Congress.

I think it is also important for us to remember that when we combine all these budgets together, that we had a deficit before we went into Iraq. And I just have to continue to say that to the Members of this Congress and to the American people, because some would lead us to believe that Iraq got us into the situation where we are now.

But we will talk about a trillion dollar tax cut for the top 1 percent of Americans. And I must add that everyone in America has given and contributed to this war, whether it be a child or a husband or a son or a daughter going to Iraq to fight in this effort. The President said there has been an end to major fighting. I think there is major fighting going on as we speak. We just lost three soldiers, just today in Iraq.

But I just want to get back to the dollars and cents. I care about it because not only am I concerned about what is happening to this country domestically, and I am concerned about homeland security, but I am also concerned about the money that local governments are spending on behalf of homeland security, the front-land security there in their cities that is not going into the things that work towards the very fiber of our country and work towards the very reason why we are Americans.

We care about one another. We care about what happens to our elderly. We care about what happens to our children. We care about having an honest and fair education and good public education for our children.

But while we are carrying out this effort that we are carrying out now, with no questions answered, and you better not ask a question or we will test your patriotism, this is dangerous to the country.

But back once again to the dollars and cents. The Bush administration has not explained how we are going to pay for this in the long run, outside of borrowing the money and making the deficit even larger and deeper. The Department of Education in this year's budget, \$59.7 billion; Transportation, \$51.5 billion; Homeland Security, my colleagues, homeland security, American people, \$35.8 billion.

The supplemental cost for the war just blows all these numbers off the table. We are asking for \$87 billion. Or the administration is asking for \$87 billion.

Now, we are not asking for \$87 billion to help local governments foot the bill for homeland security, we are not asking for \$87 billion for States to be able to protect the ports, our deep-water ports that we have now. We are not asking for \$87 billion to bring about safe air travel here in the United