

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

States. I believe someone needs to be marching to the Hill to ask for \$87 billion for Leave No Child Behind, for public education in this country.

Anyone that hits the floor to say that we have to fight the war on terror in Iraq so we do not have to fight the war on terror here in the United States, I kind of question that thinking because I do not believe the terrorists are saying, well, as long as U.S. troops are in Iraq, we do not have to try to penetrate the United States; or we do not have to try to carry out terrorist attacks here in the United States. I must say that you can pick up any newspaper now or watch any news show that says that terrorism has increased in Iraq since our presence there.

But the real question is, where is the exit plan? No one has an exit plan. No one wants to talk about the exit plan. And I think it is important that the American people understand that we are going beyond "we break it and we fix it," because now with this \$87 billion, we are going into a new era.

Mr. Speaker, I see my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), who I am going to be yielding to in about 4 minutes, because I know she has quite a bit to say about what is going on in the White House with some of the questions that have been brought about agents' lives being at stake because of political terms, or whatever the case may be; and so we can get into that discussion.

But I must say that in the spring of this year we gave this administration, with no questions asked, a \$79 billion blank check. No strings attached. We do not really know what the administration has spent that \$79 billion on. When you ask a question, it is almost like, how can you question me?

You talk to the Defense Department, and it is, we will get back to you. You talk to individuals at the State Department, and you may or may not get a return phone call. And if you do get a return phone call, they are not answering the questions.

Now the administration comes again and asks for \$87 billion. This Congress still has not been told of what we spent the first \$79 billion on.

Our Committee on Appropriations will meet on this Thursday. I would hope that the Bush administration will come forward to the Congress and share with the American people and the people that they elected to serve in this Congress, number one, what happened to the \$79 billion; number two, with the anticipated \$87 billion, what is really going to happen with that, and will they be back in the future to ask for more.

Early in the spring, the President and others were running around here talking about shock and awe, but in the 6 months since the preemptive strike against Iraq, only the American people have been shocked and awed. We have been shocked and awed by \$79 billion, and I have to keep saying it. We

were shocked by the fact that over 45,000 troops did not have body armor when they went on this effort in Iraq, that we could not armor our Bradley fighting vehicles, that many of the injuries at Walter Reed Hospital and at Bethesda Hospital right now, troops that are probably watching us on the floor right now, should have had and which could have avoided their injuries.

The American people have been awed by decreasing jobs that are at record rates, at tax cuts for the top 1 percent Americans, or the richest Americans in this country, at record rates. The American people have been in shock at how easy the administration has underfunded its own program, the Leave No Child Behind, that they have left millions without health insurance and watched crime increase at a rate that even makes the most patriotic American dizzy.

The American people are in awe at how the Vice President and many others in this administration, as it relates to Halliburton, so easily gained \$3 billion in Iraq contracts in just 4 months.

The American people are awed by the fact that 180 troops have lost their lives and another 1,400 have been seriously injured since the President made his inspirational landing on the U.S.S. *Lincoln* to announce the end of major fighting.

The American people have been shocked that State and local governments are strapped to the tune of over \$70 billion, but the President is willing to spend over \$8 billion in a foreign land. The American people are also awed by the request of over \$80 billion in additional spending. Once again, the middle class are left behind.

We are also shocked that soldiers are ducking bullets in Iraq for \$26,000 or less a year but they cannot take part in the child tax credit to help their families here in the U.S. That is a major shock and awe to the American people, that this Congress and this administration would leave those families behind.

The American people are also awed by the cost of just this single supplemental that dwarfs the money the President and this administration have asked for as it relates to homeland security for the entire year.

We are also shocked by the lack of diplomacy expressed by the Bush administration as it jets around the globe telling countries how they should be in good grace with us versus other countries. The President went to the U.N., and I must add this, where in *The New York Times* it reveals that he went to the U.N. And one would assume that after all this major effort against terrorism in Iraq, after going after this person that possessed chemical weapons of mass destruction, which at the time in this very Chamber we were led to believe in the State of the Union address that these chemical weapons were going to be used, and we prayed along with the American people that

our troops would be safe because chemical warfare was a major concern because of what the President, as he stood in the well where the Speaker is now and expressed this to us; and we also thought that there was some link between 9/11 and Iraq, and now all of that has evolved to be misleading statements.

Well, the President went to the U.N. and we were thinking the President would go back after we told the U.N. to kind of step aside and allow us to take care of things and we went with the willing, which was very few willing, he went back and, really, no one reacted to the President because of our unwillingness to use diplomacy.

I said here on the floor the last time I was here that cowboy politics is not going to get us where we need to be. It is not just politics, it is America's future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join the gentleman this evening to continue our discussion to educate both the American people and to share with our colleagues. I indicated my respect for my colleague and the leadership he has shown on the Committee on Armed Services, and I have noted that my ranking member, ranking member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, whose vision led us in crafting what I thought was the right response to the original war resolution that dealt with the question of information and whether Congress had the challenge, the charge, and the responsibility to secure the information and then comply with the Constitution and have a constitutional vote up or down to determine whether or not we would actually declare war on Iraq.

And the gentleman is right, he is very right that the representations that were made, that caused many of my colleagues to vote their conscience; and their conscience dictated to them on the information that in order to save American lives, they needed to rush to judgment and to cast that vote. I do not stand here to indict my colleagues on that vote. I voted no, and some of my colleagues voted yes. I do not indict them because they were voting on the basis of the representation made by this administration.

So my good friend from Florida is right. He raises many viable issues. And might I just take a moment to frame where I think we are?

Part of the decision that caused us to be in Iraq was based on misleading misinformation. In fact, to a certain extent, total untruths, tragically. There was representation about an imminent attack; representation about weapons of mass destruction. There were representations, as my colleague knows all too well, that there was this connection about nuclear capacity. We come to find out now that, at best, Iraq is a long way away from the actual

production of weapons of mass destruction, biological weapons, and certainly nuclear weapons.

So I think where we are today, on Tuesday, October 7, is again a rush to judgment.

I think all of us standing here are patriots. We want to protect our Nation. The gentleman has mentioned so articulately the troops, and he has chronicled the choices we have to make, where we have no monies for No Child Left Behind. And I think that is the real issue. I believe there is no need to vote next week. Why? Because this Congress does not have the information, plain and simple.

I do not want to be caught up in the trap of misinformation so that I am, on behalf of my constituents, making a totally wrong decision because the administration has not been straight. Number one, the administration has provided us no information, no information on how they spent the \$79 billion.

And I would say as an opponent of the war, I voted, I will stand here today and say it, I voted for the funding for the troops and the defense appropriation bill. So I stand here without taking a back seat to anyone. I cast my vote to put my trust in those who represented that we are in this now and we need monies for our troops. But no more.

□ 2300

So we do not even have a report on that. Let me show the document that the gentleman was kind enough to share; it is 70 pages of fine print. As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) said last week, they were willing to spend \$50,000 per bed in prison, and now they have immediately corrected that. That is the point I am making. How much more can we refine, delete, and take out?

I am looking at a chapter that says chapter 6, "Other Activities." If you have little ones and they get to be teenagers, and they say, Dad, I am going out. You ask, Where are you going? You have a curfew. And they say, I am going to the movies, and then I am going to do other activities. I have an 18-year-old. When they leave you with "I am going to do other activities," you are not going to allow them to leave the house on the agenda of other activities.

Listed as other activities is almost \$2 billion. What it means is money in the pots of some surrounding nations, and I am not condemning them, but this is giving money like \$1.4 billion. It says something about operation and maintenance defense-wide, and that is surrounding areas that have contributed to the placement of our troops. I know there is reason for that, but that is a miscellaneous sort of sweetening the pot of others so they will help us, just like the gentleman mentioned the \$8 billion loan to Turkey. I do not believe that we have all of the details that will allow us in a short week's time to be

able to understand what we are voting on by this document.

The other thing I would say, and I think the American people need to know, this supplemental is the largest in history, the largest of seven emergency supplementals that we have had. The administration says we are doing this for Iraq and Afghanistan. Might I share the pitiful amount of money going to Afghanistan which is falling back into sin. Taliban is on the rise. The country is devastated. It is a flattened area. When we talk about rebuilding infrastructure, I would think that we would not give shortchange to Afghanistan, which is percolating as the center of focus for Taliban.

The justice system, we are giving \$919 million in Iraq; we are giving \$10 million in Afghanistan. National security, \$2.1 billion for Iraq, and \$22 million for Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to meet with a very distinguished woman just about an hour ago. She knows about the Marshall Plan. She wrote at 22 the constitution for Japan after World War II. She shared with us how they took specifically the language out in terms of an offensive army or offensive defense. Japan can defend itself, and rightly so; but Japan does not have the capacity because of the Marshall Plan, and the treaty and the constitution was actually drafted post-World War II to govern Japan without this opponent. We have seen Japan put many of its resources back into technology, and it has been at the pinnacle of our technological advances.

Yet here we are talking about what Iraq did with its military, and we are now talking about rebuilding it. I think the Japan model is an excellent one, a peace model, certainly allowing them to defend themselves; but now we are giving them \$2.1 billion for national security. That is all about building up their military again. We should look at the Japan model that has worked.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that just last week we were on the floor, and I think this is kind of working, we talked about why the Department of Defense is in charge. In this after-fighting or during the time we are trying to build a democracy, why is the Department of Defense in charge? The President announced yesterday or today that National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice will be placed over this working group. The State Department is supposed to be over it. I am just getting here, but I kind of understand that.

I think it is important that the American people understand if major fighting is over and our troops are continuing to die, and I just want to add to this point, from what I understand from speaking with the appropriators, and we were in a meeting earlier, the administration hopes to have our troop number down because there was some question why Mr. Rumsfeld was not clear on the number of American troops there. There are men and

women that have left their families that signed up for the Reserves that are now 12 months-plus still in Iraq. They expect to get them down by 110 troops by next September. That means we have somewhere between 130,000 troops and 135,000 troops that are in Iraq now.

I want to let the American people know that the way things are going here in the Capitol and in the White House, that American troops will be there for some time. We are talking about dollars and cents. The Turkish parliament voted yesterday that they would send coalition troops to Iraq. I want to add to that that I voted to send appropriations to Turkey, for \$8 billion in loan forgiveness, all of these things; and some Members were split on that vote. If we have to vote for money for countries to go into Iraq, what is the difference? It reminds me on the other side of the aisle when they talk about making government smaller, and government has actually gotten bigger. But making government smaller, that means privatizing government jobs, having individuals in the private sector, so I guess that strategy has been implemented in this Iraq situation.

I want to add one other thing, because the gentlewoman hit on so many different things. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) came to the floor tonight and dropped a bomb on us with this letter that has been written as the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

And one of the shock points I have reports that the whistle was actually blown, the American people ought to know that some in the administration would blow the whistle on a CIA operative; and we are talking about someone that is willing to pay the ultimate sacrifice on behalf this country, on behalf of seeking out weapons of mass destruction, going under an assumed name, that name was made public. It was a coordinated campaign from the White House to put this lady's life in danger, and those that are working with her, on behalf of making sure that we, us Americans, are safe and our children are safe. Because they are upset, and when I say they, I am talking about the Bush White House, they are upset about the fact that the ambassador, or he used to be ambassador, has a different opinion than the administration on Iraq and the weapons of mass destruction issue. Reports have said they would put this man's wife at danger, and other CIA agents.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has to say something further about the letter because I think seeing the White House not willing to advocate on behalf of a special counsel is mind boggling to me, and I am just not a man with conspiracy theory. Other reporters, not just one individual reporter, has said they received calls about the very same information, but they did not print it. Even after the CIA said it would put

this operative report in danger, the report was still pushed on certain members of the media to report it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, let me just try to add some points to what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) has just said and emphasize why I think we are here today. Again, let me restate the fact that this Congress does not need to take this vote this week or next week on this \$87 billion supplemental.

□ 2310

Frankly, we do not have the information that would entrust to us the right responsibility and the right decision on behalf of our constituents, because we do not have the facts.

And let me just simply say, I mentioned to the gentleman that Afghanistan was thrown in the pot, I think, simply to make people think that we have not forgotten about the war on terrorism. We have forgotten about the war on terrorism. We forgot about it in Afghanistan. We forgot about it in the United States because our funding and our actions as they relate to homeland security are paltry.

If my colleagues go home to their districts, they will find out that their first responders are asking, show me the money. The ports are asking, show me the money. The intelligence community still needs the kind of reform where we can get the right intelligence because that is the first line of preventing terrorist acts.

But let me just simply say again for the record, national security for Iraq, \$2.1 billion; and again for Afghanistan, \$222 million; justice system, \$919 million; and \$10 million in Afghanistan. An electrical system, \$5.7 billion and \$45 million in Afghanistan.

So here is what I believe we should do before we engage in a vote. I believe, and I will be filing this sense of Congress resolution tomorrow, that we should have a separate vote on the military cost versus the rebuild cost, that we should not do the rebuild until the conference in Madrid, Spain, where the donors meet and we have them ante up on the table and this administration puts together a coalition that is more than the willing, but it is the strong and it gives us the amount of troops that we need.

We should not vote on this until we have full evidence of what happened with the weapons of mass destruction, as the gentleman said. Where did that information come from? And we certainly should not vote until we have a report on the personnel who determined that we are under imminent attack and that we were going forward with this war and that there were weapons of mass destruction. There should be no vote until we have all the resources we need for the returning vets, the soldiers, because some will continue to be enlisted, and their families; that we have complete trauma and mental health services for all the bases

where these troops are coming back to; and that we refine this giveaway money program and make sure that small women- and minority-owned businesses, and the gentleman had a very fine session during the Congressional Black Caucus, have the opportunity to be part of this rebuild.

And then lastly let me say that I believe it should be the sense of Congress. And likewise I would like to work with my colleagues on this resolution that I have, that a special prosecutor be appointed because the gentleman is absolutely right. Ambassador Wilson was trying to getting the Congress and the American people the truth, and he was asked to go over by the CIA to Niger to determine the uranium purchase, and he came back and said, absolutely there is no such connection, which then should have caused this administration to pull back. They did not. So in essence they wanted to cover up.

How do you cover up? You undermine the person who spoke. How do you do that? You get him at his Achilles' heel. All of our Achilles' heels are family members, but in doing so, might I say that I think research should be done; and I respect my colleague who is going to speak on the question of whether or not we have an issue of treason.

So the facts need to be told. I do understand that, and I am willing to hear the facts. But we should not move forward without getting the facts on the weapons of mass destruction or on this response regarding covert officers of the CIA, the most serious organization as it relates to national security short of our military, who require the utmost respect but also protection, that we have now uncovered a covert agent.

And as we see this unfold, we see that the person's work was more far-reaching than we thought. We understand that they are working for a CIA undercover, and this is public knowledge; so I am not giving classified information, printed in the public newspapers, business. So that has now been exposed, as well as anybody who was associated with that individual and that company has now been exposed.

I would venture to say also that what has been exposed is the way we do things. So it is beyond my understanding as to how we can move forward.

The gentleman said something that I think is very telling, to give another blank check with no restrictions and no strings attached. This is based upon the discussions that we have had that are part of the public debate.

Let me add this, as I believe the chairman is coming. This has been modeled after the Marshall Plan, this whole Iraq package. The Marshall Plan was \$11.8 billion from 1948 to 1952. That would equal, in 2003, \$89.2 billion. But the amount of nations impacted was 16 nations and 257 million people. Iraq is only one nation and 23.5 million people.

So I would say that I would hope my colleagues would join me in this anal-

ysis to the extent that we need not proceed this quickly to a vote without giving this Congress all of the information needed; and I would look forward to having my colleagues join me in the filing of this resolution tomorrow to delay this vote and also to have any vote that we take separated between military support and the rebuild of Iraq until these conditions are met. I believe it is extremely important.

And I thank the gentleman for allowing me to share in this discussion, and I would be happy to yield to him as he yields to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). And I appreciate the fact that she studies and that she pays very close attention to what people say and also what they do and what they do not do. And I think that her constituents and the American people will be very forever grateful.

I yield the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), one of my leaders and an inspiration here in the Congress for many years, ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am so happy to be with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) in this discussion. He and his predecessor in the Congress from Florida worked very closely with me and I am proud that he is on the Committee on Armed Services because that gives him a vantage point that perhaps we do not have; and he continues the tradition of a former colleague of ours, Ron Dellums of California, who rose to be chairman of that committee and distinguished himself with great regularity about relating military activities and costs and projections to what is the real national defense of this country.

I am happy to be with, also, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), with whom I work on a very wide variety of issues. And it seems to me that our discussion tonight with our colleagues that preceded us revolve around the importance of delaying the vote that is hanging over our heads until more information is secured of whether we should have a special counsel to independently investigate where the leak endangering not only a CIA operative, but all the others that were working with her together.

It is appropriate, especially upon the revelation of over \$700,000 in consulting business having been engaged in between Karl Rove and John Ashcroft in earlier years. This is incredible. So between the delayed vote, the request for a special counsel, the several hundred thousand dollars, plus a request for a resignation makes this a very important evening. And I am glad that I am here to join my colleagues with it.

In February of this year, former Ambassador Wilson traveled to Africa to investigate the claims that Iraq purchased uranium there.

□ 2320

In the next month, he returned and tells the CIA and State Department

that the claims were unsubstantiated. This was in February 2002 and March 2002.

In January 2003, the President claims that Iraq tried to buy uranium in Africa in a State of the Union Address delivered on this very floor.

In July, former Ambassador Wilson wrote an op-ed aptly titled "What I Didn't Find in Africa."

On July 14, the well-known veteran columnist Robert Novak mentions, among other things, that "Wilson never worked for the CIA, but his wife, Valerie Plame, is an Agency operative on weapons of mass destruction. Two senior administration officials told me Wilson's wife suggested sending him to Niger to investigate."

On July 22, Mr. Novak said in an interview, "I didn't dig it out, it was given to me. They gave me the name," he was talking to *Newsday* then, "and I used it."

Then later on in July, the Central Intelligence Agency files a crime report with the Department of Justice suggesting that the leak of former Ambassador Wilson's wife's name and covert status might entail criminal acts. We checked the statutes in the Committee on the Judiciary, and that was true. Not only leaking, but assisting or promoting leaks are also, in another section of title 18, criminal violations that carry a penalty of up to 10 years Federal imprisonment.

Then the CIA submitted a questionnaire to determine whether an investigation is warranted. They did a crime report, and now an investigation, and they decided rather quickly to pursue a criminal investigation.

Now, a source in the administration confirms that two senior administration officials contacted not just Mr. Novak, but six reporters about the identity and occupation of Wilson's wife, claiming that, clearly, it was meant purely and simply for revenge; that he was sharing the information because the disclosure was wrong and a huge miscalculation, because they were irrelevant and did nothing to diminish Wilson's credibility. This was the *Washington Post*, September 28.

On the Crossfire program of CNN, Mr. Novak explained, "Nobody in the Bush administration called me to leak this. I was in an interview with a senior administration official on the Wilson report when he told me the trip was inspired by his wife, a CIA employee working on weapons of mass destruction. Another senior official told me the same thing. They asked me not to use her name, but never indicated it would endanger her or anybody else. According to a confidential source at the CIA, Mrs. WILSON was an analyst, not a spy, not a covert operative, not in charge of undercover operatives. So what is the fuss about? Pure Bush-bashing?"

Well, Mr. WILSON responds: "Bob Novak called me before he went to print with the report, and he said a CIA source told him that my wife was an

operative. He was trying to get a second source after the article appeared. I called him and said, 'You told me it was a CIA source. You wrote senior administration officials. What was it, CIA or senior administration?' He said to me, 'I misspoke the first time I spoke to you. That makes it senior administration sources.'" Ms. Paula Zahn, now CNN.

About his partisanship, Wilson responds, "Novak also said that I was a Clinton appointee. In actual fact, my first political appointment was as Ambassador, and I was appointed by George H.W. Bush. So I am really apolitical in all of this."

Now, questions about Rove's involvement are raised by numerous news sources. Sources close to the former President say Rove was fired from the 1992 Bush presidential campaign after he planted a negative story with columnist Robert Novak. *Countdown*, MSNBC, September 29, 2003.

Tory Clark, former spokesperson for the Pentagon, said "People are constantly aware of classified information, and Secretary Rumsfeld makes it a point to regularly and frequently speak about the problems of leaking classified information."

What we have here exposed is a case study of what a writer of information this sensitive ought not to be doing. It is very clear to Ambassador Wilson, and everyone else around him, that everyone around him knew that Rove had either leaked or had condoned the leak. So it is my hope that Mr. Rove will approach this from the point of view that it is more likely to get much deeper than it is right now. It might save us from ending up with an independent prosecutor for the CIA leak. It would certainly be a way of trying to make amends for what is going to happen.

Mr. Chris Matthews is a person of impeccable integrity and is the host of MSNBC's *Hardball*, which most of us have been on at one time or the other. A source close to Wilson said that Matthews said, "I just got off the phone with Karl Rove, who said your wife was fair game," talking to the former Ambassador. So I think the time has come.

□ 2330

This political director has probably I think come to the end of at least one of his careers. The relationship between the Attorney General of the United States and him in his political consultant capacity is pretty obvious. It meets the criteria set forth in the statute for the appointment of an independent prosecutor. So it seems to me that between one of these 2 ways, we have to get to the bottom of this as this research goes on. It fits into this whole business of misrepresentation that has characterized and has begun to create problems of morale, not just in the military, but in the intelligence agencies themselves. We are not talking about something happening over in some obscure office in the Pentagon.

This is coming out of the White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. And because of the role that the Committee on the Judiciary has played in forming this new independent counsel since we have dispensed with special prosecutors, our role is quite clear in how we must proceed and how we ought to investigate this.

It is my hope to meet with the chairman of the committee this week to determine what we can all collectively do in a matter that is very disturbing to many people in many parts of our citizenry and our government alike. I commend all of the Members who have been here tonight to engage in what I think is a long overdue discussion.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the thoughtful presentation that he has just made, the laying out, if you will, of the chronological history of where we are today, I hope it is clear to many of our colleagues that we may be on the brink of a constitutional crisis. And that is, of course, because the gentleman has suggested, or that the facts seem to suggest that we had 2 dueling deficiencies occurring. We had deficiency of all of the facts necessary or all of the truth necessary to actually have a basis of declaring a preemptive war against Iraq, and then we had the unraveling of our intelligence structure, which is the very heartbeat of a nation's national security and now, it is the heartbeat of homeland security. And if we undermine the intelligence system or structure, then what do we have? And how can any reporter, and I believe in the first amendment, and my colleagues know that the Committee on the Judiciary has its jurisdiction to protect under the Constitution the Bill of Rights; make light of the fact of which source it was or whose source it was or, I think it was analysts; it might have been that the person who was speaking to them used the term "analyst" to protect her cover or the person's cover.

So I do not believe we can move on this unrestricted, no-strings-attached \$87 billion without a full airing of the very facts that the gentleman has just asked for, or the very response or airing or truth of what occurred. Whether or not the involvement of Mr. Rove and the resignation thereto, the opportunity for all of the congressional committees of jurisdiction, which would include the Committee on the Judiciary, would have an opportunity for full hearings on every aspect of this. A deep investigation.

My colleagues know that we have yet to be able to secure the independent commission; they will not even bring that to the floor on the issue of weapons of mass destruction. I do not believe that we can move forward on the supplemental without those facts being brought to the table, and who the actual personnel or the parties that were

engaged in this process. So the gentleman has made a very good point.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleagues that I have seen this Congress, when I was in the State legislature, go to great extents for far less in questioning what is happening right now. This is not speculation; these are the lives of CIA operatives, the very lives that are in countries where Americans and those who help Americans are not applauded. On behalf of not only the safety, but the sovereignty of this country, I think the gentleman's letter is well within order. I brought about questions in my own heart and mind when I did not hear the President and others who were in the White House saying listen, independent counsel? That is fine. Because we want the individual who leaked the information to be found, prosecuted, what have you. Fired is not good enough for me personally. I think the individuals who have leaked this information knowingly and willingly, revenge, political revenge, need to be punished and prosecuted. And the only way we are going to get to that, I believe, is through an independent counsel. So I think the gentleman's letter is well within order. And Mr. Rove, as far as I am concerned, politics has nothing to do, or should not have anything to do with it. Thus, as red-blooded Americans voicing our opinion and informing the American people.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, if I could say to the gentlewoman from Texas and the gentleman from Florida, the truth ultimately always comes out. I do not know why so many people hide, run for cover, obfuscate, manipulate, spin, but in the end, it may take a little longer and they may be able to put it off, they may be able to do it long enough to get out of town, but in the end, there are too many people of conscience and talent that are looking at these same situations that we have to deal with in our working lives. And you are not going to get very far, not in today's global technologically advanced society. It is going to come out. It always does. It never fails. There will be books upon books upon investigation upon articles, and they just will not come forward and make a complete candid discussion. The American people are not going to be fooled.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for all of his contributions here tonight and to be here this time of night sharing with the American people, and the gentleman is to be commended.

I just wanted to say that the gentlewoman did hit on the donors conference that is happening on October 23. I think this Congress should hold back on the \$87 billion. If we give \$87 billion, then why are we having a donors conference? We went from \$12 billion, saying that the donors from other places are down to \$6 billion. Now there is some question about \$3 billion.

I am here tonight definitely on behalf of the American people of being able to share with them what they need to know. But \$87 billion as it relates to Florida means \$4.5 billion that we will not receive, which could equate to \$672.7 billion in school construction. The governor down there is hollering about we need more money for schools. Mr. Speaker, 6,062 in new affordable housing units that could create 4,839 jobs and also 769.7 million in local and State roads and bridges that could create 27,099 jobs; 8,8,970 new firefighters and health care coverage for 434,452 people.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that both of my colleagues are here tonight.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just as the gentleman closes and the time is ending, let us put a face on this. We are standing here because we are trying to save lives of the young men and women on the front lines in Iraq.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. BERKLEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 8 on account of a family medical emergency.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of flight delays.

Ms. ESHOO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 8 on account of personal reasons.

Ms. HARMAN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 8 on account of a death in the family.

Ms. LOFGREN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 8 on account of personal reasons.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 8 on account of personal reasons.

Ms. SOLIS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 8 on account of personal business.

Ms. WOOLSEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for September 23, October 7 and 8 on account of medical reasons.

Mrs. BONO (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness in the family.

Mr. CASTLE (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of attending a CODEL in Iraq.

Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of attending to family business.

Mr. HAYWORTH (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. PUTNAM (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of attending a CODEL in Iraq.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALLEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARKEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIERNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LYNCH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OBEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HENSARLING) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FEENEY, for 5 minutes, today and October 8.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today and October 8.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RANGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1642. An act to extend the duration of the immigrant investor regional center pilot program for 5 additional years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on October 2, 2003, he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 1925. To reauthorize programs under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.