

As bad as this credit card limit is, as troubling as it ought to be to all of us, \$7.384 trillion, I have got very bad news for the Members. In the budget conference presently underway in the bowels of the Capitol, there will be an additional borrowing authority added to this country. The bill, the budget bill, to come out of conference to be voted on by the House of Representatives, will raise the credit card limit for our Nation. We do not know how much because no one is talking about this in public. No one wants the American people to realize that \$7.384 trillion is not enough, that we are going to raise it even more by \$1 trillion, more by \$2 trillion. One projection that we have seen from the majority would take the credit card limit of this Nation over \$10 trillion.

One of the things I think that is lost in financial debates is these numbers get too big and one really does not know what they mean. They are just enormous. I went recently to an instruction course on how to teach mathematics. And the presenter said 1 trillion, do we know how many seconds are in 1 trillion? If we took 1 trillion seconds, we would go back in time 16,000 years. So obviously 1 trillion is a staggering number, and we are now finding that, under the budget plans of the majority party and the administration that drive this national debt ever higher, \$7.384 trillion is not enough. I think the American people had better say it is enough.

We do not as families, we do not as families plan our financial affairs where mom and dad run up the credit cards, happily thinking the kids will pay them off. I know of families that I represent much like the family that raised me, just an awful lot of sacrifice in the mom and dad to leave things better for the kids, not tipping it on its head where we really do not care what happens afterwards, after we are gone.

If that is how we operate as families, as moms and dads worrying about making things better for our children, why should this Nation representing all the moms and dads in this country be running it a way so significantly different? Why should this Nation run up a debt like there is no tomorrow? Because there is a tomorrow, and it will be our children's tomorrow, and our children's tomorrow will be diminished by the fact that this generation is refusing to pay its way.

I am going to vote against the budget that comes out of conference because I believe it is wrong, absolutely wrong, to raise the borrowing limit for this country, leaving more debt for our children, when there is no plan anywhere in terms of how we ever get out of this mess.

The minority advanced a plan that brought us to a balanced budget in about 8 years. Some might think that is just not fast enough. That was a very difficult task. That is how far in the hole we now are. But the majority budget does not have any plan at all.

And that is why they want to raise the debt, and that is why their budget should be rejected. We owe it to our children to get our Nation's finances back on track.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

IRAQ AND SADDAM HUSSEIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, tonight I would like to spend a few minutes talking about an update on a situation on the various inquiries as to what happened before 9/11. Most importantly, the work that they are doing is taking a look at putting together a series of recommendations that will enable us to improve our intelligence capabilities and improve our response capabilities into the future.

As I was listening to some of the earlier speakers, someone said when that happens and these inquiries present their work and they make their recommendations and then Congress, of course, will have the opportunity to review those recommendations and we may or may not implement them, the comment then was made: and then we know that an event like 9/11 will never happen again.

As much as I would like to endorse that comment, I do not believe it is accurate. On 9/11 we, as a Nation, were surprised; and I believe that in the future, regardless of the recommendations that come forward, regardless of how effectively we implement them, we will be surprised again.

Let me just lead up to 9/11 and outline some of the things. What do we know today? We know this: that in March of 2003, the United States, we led a coalition of over 30 countries in Operation Iraqi Freedom. The action was undertaken as a last resort. Iraq had been in noncompliance or material breach of 16 U.N. Security Council resolutions spanning a period of 12 years to remove the threat posed by Saddam to his people, the Gulf region, and the world.

A couple of things I really want to point out here is that some have said this was an initiative by the Bush administration, and later on I will go through some of the quotes by the previous administrations and also the documentation and the data that shows that throughout the 1990s, the administration, Congress, and others saw Saddam Hussein and Iraq as a threatening menace to his own people, to the region, and to the world. A consistent pattern.

Saddam Hussein's Iraq was a constant and immediate threat to his neighbors in the Gulf region. And what did Saddam do in the Gulf region? Under Saddam, Iraq fought a decade-long war against Iran and launched an unprovoked invasion of Kuwait. After Iraq's defeat in the Gulf War in 1991, Iraq rebuilt its military strength and continued to use the threat of military action in attempts to intimidate neighboring countries.

The pattern is pretty clear. In the region Saddam Hussein treated his neighbors brutally. With his own people we know that Saddam Hussein was a mass murderer. We removed that capability from him. The day we hauled him out

of that spider hole, he no longer had the capability to again be a mass murderer. He was a mass murderer and will be held accountable for the crimes against his neighbors and the crimes against his own people.

It is estimated that somewhere between at least 400,000 and perhaps 1.2 million Iraqis were killed by his brutal regime. His security service is responsible for the disappearance of thousands of Iraqis, hundreds of thousands of Iraqis, perhaps millions, who ended up in mass graves. And his military used chemical weapons not only against Iran, but also against Iraqi citizens. For over a decade prior to Operation Iraqi Freedom, Iraq was on the U.S. State Department's list of state sponsors of terrorism. Saddam's regime attempted to assassinate former President Bush in 1993.

□ 2015

His security intelligence services maintained strong links to international terrorist groups. Prior to the Gulf War, Iraq amassed an arsenal of chemical and biological weapons, and it possessed an advanced nuclear weapons program. After the Gulf War, despite the U.N. inspections that continued through 1998, the United States, along with the United Nations and many individual countries, such as Germany and France, assessed that Iraq continued to possess and develop weapons of mass destruction.

Post-Operation Iraqi Freedom, the evidence shows that Saddam, in contravention of Iraq's responsibilities under multiple United Nations Security Council resolutions, continued to maintain elements of his weapons of mass destruction programs and had a clear goal to rebuild these programs.

It is clear: Iraq and Saddam Hussein proved an evil menace to his own people, to the people in the Gulf and to the rest of the world. It is not brand new.

As we go through this, there is a bipartisan consensus as to what this looked like. February 17, 1998, this is a speech that President Bill Clinton gave: "Iraqi agents have undermined and undercut U.N. inspectors. They have harassed the inspectors, lied to them, disabled monitoring cameras, literally spirited evidence out of the backdoors. And talking about the different types of predators of the 21st century: "They will be all the more lethal if we allow them to build arsenals of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and the missiles to deliver them. We simply cannot allow that to happen. There should be no doubt, Saddam's ability to produce and deliver weapons of mass destruction poses a grave threat to the peace of that region and the security of the world. There is no more clear example of this threat than Saddam Hussein's Iraq. His regime threatens the safety of his people, the stability of his region and the security of all the rest of us. In the next century, the community of nations may see more and more the

very kind of threat Iraq poses now: a rogue state with weapons of mass destruction, ready to use them or provide them to terrorists who travel the world. If we fail to respond today, Saddam will be emboldened tomorrow by the knowledge that they can act with impunity."

"I have no doubt he would use them again if permitted to develop them," another quote from the same speech.

One of the disappointing things that has happened, especially in the last few weeks, is that people are trying to rewrite history, rewrite who did what. President Bush after 9/11 did not go back and collect these comments from the previous President and did not go back and measure those comments versus the actions that were taken. The President said we need to move forward. We are at war. We do not have the time and the energy to look back and to try to point a finger or identify a single individual or group of individuals who failed.

The President recognized exactly the type of threat that we faced, the same type of threat that Bill Clinton identified in 1998, a rogue state with weapons of mass destruction, ready to use them or provide them to terrorists. Maybe the terrorists on 9/11 used a weapon of mass destruction that was different than what we expected when they crashed planes into buildings, but there is no doubt that there was a consistent theme that already identified this threat in the 1990s.

But our President said it is important to recognize that we are at war, and we need to get on a full-scale footing to combat this war and to win this war, and we are not into the blame game. What we have seen in the last 2 to 4 weeks is, I believe, people starting to use this and trying to use it for partisan benefit. This issue is too important and too critical to the future of this country for it to be used as a partisan weapon.

I think that President Bill Clinton in the 1990s had it right. He understood the threat. President Bush looked at the work that was done by President Bill Clinton and, after 9/11 had the opportunity to look through it through the lens of 9/11, and decided it was necessary to take a much stronger position and a much stronger role than what had ever been contemplated before, although even early in 2001, before 9/11, President Bush had indicated that it was time to take a look at our strategy and see if we should be more aggressive.

It was not only the President, but Members of Congress identified this threat. People are looking at people and saying, why did we not do this or that? Here are some quotes from the other body:

"If Saddam Hussein had nothing to hide, why would he have gone to such lengths to prevent the U.N. inspectors from doing their job? There is no doubt that since 1991 Saddam Hussein has squandered his country's resources to

maintain his capacity to produce and stockpile chemical and biological weapons. If we bomb Iraq again, he would be right back at it, claiming victory for standing up to the U.S., but no longer under the watchful eye of UNSCOM's cameras."

Another statement in 1998 from a colleague in the other body: "Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction programs and the means to deliver them are a menace to international peace and security. They pose a threat to Iraq's neighbors, to U.S. forces in the Gulf region, to the world's energy supplies and to the integrity and credibility of the United Nations Security Council." 1998.

Another quote from the other body: "We are here today to affirm that we and the American people stand with the President and the international community in an effort to end Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs and preserve our vital international interests."

The rules of the House prohibit me from mentioning the names of those individuals who made those quotes, but it is very interesting to see exactly who they are and the clarity with which they identify the threat Saddam Hussein and others posed to the United States.

Bill Clinton, February 18: "In this century we learned through harsh experience that the only answer to aggression and illegal behavior is firmness, determination and, when necessary, action. In the next century, the community of nations may see more and more the very kind of threat Iraq poses now; a rogue state with weapons of mass destruction, ready to use them or provide them to terrorists, drug traffickers or organized criminals who travel the world among us unnoticed."

Here is an interesting quote. A critic of the President, a critic of the first President George Bush. It seems some people are never happy. I believe this is a quote from the candidate at that time for Vice President, Mr. Al Gore. This is where Vice President Gore, Senator Gore at that time, was talking about Saddam Hussein: "He had already launched poison gas attacks repeatedly and Bush looked the other way. He had already conducted extensive terrorism activities and Bush looked the other way. He was already deeply involved in the effort to acquire nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction; and Bush knew it, but he looked the other way. Well, in my view, the Bush administration was acting in a manner directly opposite to what you would expect with all of the evidence it had available to it at the time. Saddam Hussein's nature and intentions were perfectly visible." Were perfectly visible.

You wonder if you went through this quote and used it shortly after 9/11, you could have written it something like this: President Clinton and Al Gore knew that al Qaeda had already launched attacks against the World

Trade Center in 1993, but the Clinton Administration looked the other way.

Al Qaeda and terrorist organizations had already attacked our embassies in Africa, but the Clinton Administration looked the other way.

Al Qaeda or terrorist organizations were deeply involved in the effort to attack our barracks in Saudi Arabia. The Clinton Administration knew it, but they looked the other way.

They knew that al Qaeda or terrorist organizations were involved in the attack on the USS *Cole*, but they looked the other way.

Al Qaeda, bin Laden, their intentions were perfectly clear, but can it be said that the Clinton administration just looked the other way? I am not sure that that is a fair characterization.

As I said, the attacks on 9/11 were a surprise. But if you take the language that was used against then-President George Bush in 1992 and apply it shortly after 9/11 to what happened during the 1990s and the statements that were made and the inconsistencies, you wonder why there was not more action taken.

You have heard the quotes from various Members in the other body. You have heard the quotes of then-President Bill Clinton, of candidate Al Gore.

Madeleine Albright, November 16, 1997: "Hussein's weapons will not discriminate if and when they are used, and therefore it is important for the region to understand he is a threat. Our adversaries are unlikely to avoid," and here she is talking about understanding the threat of terrorism, "our adversaries are likely to avoid traditional battlefield situations because there American dominance is well established. We must be concerned instead of weapons of mass destruction and by the cowardly instruments of sabotage and hidden bombs. These unconventional threats endanger not only our Armed Forces, but all Americans and America's friends everywhere."

Here is a very clear statement. Again, some folks are trying to rewrite history saying everything was done during the 1990s. I am not sure it was. We will talk about that a little more. They are also saying the strategy to eliminate Saddam Hussein was recent, that it was not policy of the United States.

May 23, remarks by Vice President Gore: "Despite our swift victory and our effort since the Gulf War, there is no doubt in my mind that Saddam Hussein still seeks to amass weapons of mass destruction."

People talk about the intelligence being cooked up. The intelligence maybe, and we know, was not everything we wanted it to be; but it was not cooked up. "Saddam Hussein still seeks to amass weapons of mass destruction. You know as well as I do," what a statement, "you know as well as I do that as long as Saddam Hussein stays in power, there can be no comprehensive peace for the people of Israel or the people of the Middle East." This is

Vice President Gore, May 23, the year 2000.

□ 2030

They hear us talking about what the policy was, and I think it was established a couple of years earlier. But here is what the then Vice President says about the policy of the Clinton administration. We have made it clear that it is our policy to see Saddam Hussein marginalized? That is not the word that is used. Contained? No. Reformed? No. We have made it clear, that is, the Clinton administration has made it clear, that it is our policy to see Saddam Hussein gone. That was the policy of the United States prior to a new administration coming into office, prior to 9/11, because it was stated during the Clinton administration.

It goes on: We have maintained sanctions in the face of rising criticism while improving the Oil For Food program to help the Iraqi people directly. And just as a sidebar, while improving the Oil For Food program, we found out now, as the details have come back, that that was one of the greatest rip-offs ever. It was used to fund weapons acquisition, it was used to fund palaces and to build runways in the middle of nowhere in Iraq.

Going on with this quote: We have used force when necessary, and that has been frequently, and we will not let up in our efforts. We will not let up. We will not let up in our efforts to free Iraq from Saddam's rule. Should he think of challenging us, I would strongly advise against it. As a Senator, I voted for the use of force. As Vice President, I supported the use of force. If entrusted with the presidency, my resolve will never waiver.

Madam Speaker, the statements go on. Those are the statements in the 1990s. What about in 2002?

Again, some of my colleagues, and here is a quote from the presumed Democratic nominee for President: I believe the record of Saddam Hussein's ruthless, reckless breach of international values and standards of behavior, which is at the core of the cease-fire agreement, with no reach, no stretch is cause enough, is cause enough for the world community to hold him accountable by use of force, if necessary. Senator JOHN KERRY, October 9, 2002.

Here is another quote from one of his colleagues: But that isn't just a future threat. Saddam's existing biological and chemical weapons capabilities pose real threats to America today, tomorrow. Saddam has used chemical weapons before, both against Iraq's enemies and against his own people. He is working to develop delivery systems like missiles and unmanned aerial vehicles that could bring these deadly weapons against U.S. forces and U.S. facilities in the Middle East. He could make these weapons available to many terrorist groups, third parties which have contact with his government. Those groups in turn could bring those weap-

ons into the United States and unleash a devastating attack against our citizens. I fear that greatly.

Madam Speaker, it is pretty amazing, the unanimity between various sides of the aisle, the executive and the legislative branches, as to the threat posed by terrorism in the 1990s and the characterization and the threats posed by Saddam Hussein.

Here is another quote: As the attacks of September 11 demonstrated, the immense destructiveness of modern technology means we can no longer afford to wait around for a smoking gun. I do believe Iraq poses an imminent threat. I also believe that, after September 11, that question is increasingly outdated. It is in the nature of these weapons that he has and the way they are targeted against civilian populations that documented capability and demonstrated intent may be the only warning we get. To insist on further evidence could put some of our fellow Americans at risk. Can we afford to take that chance? I do not think we can.

That was the unanimity that we saw in 2002, it was the unanimity that we saw in the late 1990s, and over the last 4 to 6 weeks, folks have been trying to rewrite history in saying, no, no, I was not there. That is not where I was in 1990. That is not where I was in 1998. That is not where I was in 2002. As a matter of fact, the only person that has messed up in this whole thing is the current administration. And that is utterly false. There was a consensus, and what is now happening, and what I am concerned about is that when we are at war, and that is where I think we are, we are a nation at war.

Madam Speaker, I see my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) has joined me, and I yield to him.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, first of all, I was watching the gentleman on television and I agreed with so much of what he said, in fact, everything that the gentleman said. But one of the things that concerns me is, while I was watching the gentleman on television, I was also watching CNN and Fox and watching the news reports on what happened in Fallujah in Iraq today. And some of the people who have been commenting on what happened have said, we really out to re-evaluate, we ought to pull our troops out, and they are talking in a way that will give aid and comfort to the enemies of the free world, not just the United States, but the free world, and that concerns me a great deal.

President Bush is doing the right thing, as the gentleman has stated, in fighting this war against terror and terrorism and terrorists. This is a world war. And the American people and my colleagues and the media need to realize, this is a world war not unlike what we faced in World War I, World War II and so forth. The difference is it is a guerilla-type war

being fought by fanatics who use people as bombs, who blow up innocent civilians and kill people, and they are not going to go away.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining me, because I wanted to talk about exactly that, and I feel fine going there.

Because, as the gentleman may remember, a couple of weeks ago, maybe a couple of months ago, we got this Dear Colleague memo talking about the new strategy, and I would just highlight it tonight. Because what we saw today, and it is tragic, the loss of American lives, the loss of the foreign civilians in Iraq and what they did with the bodies. But we should have known. Again that phrase, "we should have known."

Because here is what Zarkawi said. "Someone may say that in this matter we are being hasty," remember, this is their document outlining the strategy of the terrorists against our forces and against the forces that want to move forward in Iraq, "that we are being hasty and rash in leading the Islamic nation into a battle for which it is not ready, a battle that will be revolting," I mean the acts of today, dragging the bodies and hanging the bodies is revolting, "will be revolting and in which blood will be spilled. This is exactly what we want, since right and wrong no longer have any place in our current situation."

He predicted. This is exactly, what we see today is exactly the strategy, because they believe that that is the way that they can beat us, if they are revolting, spill blood, and right and wrong makes absolutely no difference.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, they saw what happened in Somalia when Black Hawk Down happened, and the previous administration did exactly what they wanted them to do, and that was to pull out.

Now, that was an encouragement, I believe, to the terrorists around the world at that point. Now we are in a world war against them. The President has made a commitment to free the world from terrorism and to protect the American citizens against another attack like 9/11.

If we want to encourage the terrorists, and I say this to my colleagues and to the news media and everybody else, if we want to encourage the terrorists, what we need to do is pull out and give them the green light to continue to use this kind of terrorist tactic to dissuade the free world from fighting against this terrorist activity and we are going to let them have the run of the field. That is something that we cannot do, we must not do. This is a war that the free world and the United States cannot lose.

Toward that end, regarding Fallujah and what happened in the last couple of days and the terrorist attacks in Iraq, what we need to do, and I would say this if the President were here tonight, what we need to do is let our troops go

in there and go house to house and take those weapons away to pacify that area. And anyone who has a gun, arrest them. And anyone who uses weapons in the commission of a terrorist attack or a crime, arrest them, get them out of there, and let the people know over there that we are going to do what is necessary to free them from the terrorist influence. And if we do not do that, then we are going to continue to encourage them.

So I would say to the President if he were listening tonight, and he may very well be or his advisors, let us let our troops go in there and pacify that area. Let us send a very strong signal to the terrorists and their affiliates over there that we are not going to stand still and let American citizens be killed or let American military personnel be killed.

It is extremely important that this signal be sent and sent now, because if we start listening to the liberals and the media who say, pull in our horns, let us start regressing and getting out of there, then what is going to happen is there is going to be a green light to the terrorists and we are going to have a hell of a problem.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman and I have probably both talked to a lot of our soldiers from our districts who have been in Iraq.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. And the gentleman has been to Iraq, and so have I.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Yes, on three different occasions.

It was interesting, I talked to one of my soldiers today. He was back in a small town in my community of New Era, Michigan. He just came home after just about a full year in Iraq. He told me what was going on and what the highlights were. He told me that he had been sent into a small community of 15,000 people, I think right near Kirkuk, and I said, hey, you kind of acted as mayor, because he was the governing authority. We know the strategy. We send our troops in, and they are not always fighting. He said, that is exactly what I had the opportunity to do. He said, we rebuilt that community from nothing. And he said, the people are thrilled that we are there; and they are looking for us to leave, because they want their country back.

Then we had a very good dialogue back and forth.

Then I did ask him, I said, okay, you have your Congressman on the phone. You are going back. You are going to be in the country for a couple of more weeks, but you are leaving west Michigan later on this week, and in a couple of weeks you will be back in Italy. I asked him, I said, you have your Congressman on the phone. What do you want to tell your Congressman?

He said, you know, can you do anything about the news media?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Because he said, when we were in Iraq, he said, we could

get CNN. He said, we finally turned it off, because what we saw on CNN had absolutely no relationship to what we were seeing in Iraq.

The gentleman from Indiana and I are not denying that these five Americans died today. That happened, and it is tragic, and it is sad. We are not denying that the four foreigners and the rioting and the mob scene in Fallujah, that happened. But, at the same time, in much of Iraq today, and the soldier quoted to me. He said, I think 98 percent of the people are there with us, and they are working with us, and they never get any coverage.

I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, when I watched the media a while ago, they showed the people demonstrating in Fallujah and the cars burning and the people waving the victory sign and everything. I was there. The gentleman was there. That is the minority of the people. And the media continues to focus on that, instead of the things that are being accomplished; and that really, really bothers me.

The other thing is, we have lost about 500 troops over there, and that is terrible. We do not want to see one young American maimed or die. But what happened in World War II is that 50 million people were killed worldwide because we let a war get out of hand. We have an opportunity right now to win this war on terrorism and to stop the terrorists and to send a very, very strong signal to them. It is a war that is going to go on for a long time. But if we do not send the right signals to them right now, they will be encouraged, in my opinion, and we will see more death take place that would not be necessary if we did the right things now.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman and I are in total agreement that if at this point in time we step back, the terrorists will have won. And that does not mean that the terrorists will go back to their home in Afghanistan or in the remote regions of Pakistan and say, well, chalk one up for the bad guys. They will say, let us now go back, and they will say, yes, it works.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes. Let us back them up in New York or someplace else.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Let us go attack them in New York and what we will now have is we will now have a safe haven. We can plan out our attacks and we can work on our schedule and when it is appropriate to attack, we will attack. We will now have a safe haven to develop chemical weapons, biological weapons, and it is kind of like that is one direction, backing off.

That is not where we can go. We need these folks to wake up every morning and the first thing that they have to fear is that an American helicopter or American Special Ops force is going to come through their door.

□ 2045

Or that a missile is going to come from somewhere up in the sky from a

Predator, and they are never going to see it coming.

We saw that a war on terrorism can be won. I mean, who would have thought that our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), would address the General People's Congress of Libya? Who would have thought that 3 months ago? I think that happened within the last 4 years that our colleague was over there.

I was in Libya about four or five weeks ago. I think within the last month we have picked up, what, 500 tons of mustard gas and chemicals and equipment. Who would have thought that that amount of progress could have been made in that short time? This is a win for the good guys.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The gentleman makes a very good point. That is the kind of thing that the media should focus on. Here is a terrorist state, a known terrorist state that has said, okay, we are going to reject terrorism. And the reason was because they saw what we did in Iraq and Afghanistan. We sent a very strong signal.

We have had 500 troops die there in Iraq. I do not want one of those troops to have died in vain. They sent a very strong signal around the world. If the media continues on the path, and I am not talking about all the media now, but if the more liberal media continues on the path that it is on saying why should we not bring our troops home, why are we letting these sorts of things happen, they send a signal, as my colleague said before, to the terrorists that this sort of thing is working. That should not be the signal we send.

It was not the signal we sent in World War I or World War II. We should not send it now. Because this is a world war that the United States and the free world cannot afford to lose. And we cannot afford to send signals that encourage the terrorist network.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, maybe my colleague heard the quote that I read from candidate for Vice President Al Gore talking about the first Bush administration where he said, "He had already launched poison gas attacks repeatedly. Bush looked the other way. He had already conducted extensive terrorism activities and Bush had looked the other way." Can one imagine what would happen if we pulled out of Iraq and pulled out of the war on terrorism and the next terrorist attack occurred and somebody would come to us and say excuse me, they attacked the World Trade Centers, you looked the other way. They attacked our barracks, you looked the other way. They attacked the Cole, you looked the other way. They attacked our embassies, you looked the other way. They attacked the Trade Centers a second time and took them down, they attacked the Pentagon and you guys looked the other way. What were you guys thinking?

I think that we were all in this together. We recognized the risk during the 1990s; and Congress and the executive branch, I think, did not take enough direct action. And so we can go back. But I think the criticism should be why did America not act earlier against bin Laden and against these threats in a more decisive way? Because the pieces were out there that said these folks are a threat, and it is only a matter of time before they try something big in the United States. I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say that back in the mid-90s we knew from intelligence reports that there were terrorist training camps in and around Khartoum in the Sudan. We knew that. We knew Usama bin Laden was in Khartoum, and we knew of the terrorist attacks like the ones that my colleague cited a few minutes ago; and we really did not go after him, although we should have at that time.

Now, I am not saying there is not enough blame to go around. Any time you get into a military conflict, especially one this extensive, there are going to be mistakes made. But the one mistake that has not been made is by our President. He has done the right thing in taking the mantle of leadership and moving forward. He is going after the terrorists wherever they hide in Afghanistan, in Iraq, wherever they are. And I commend him for that.

And this country, and the media in particular, if they are paying any attention tonight, the media in particular ought to think about the ramifications of trying to get us to pull in our horns when we are fighting a war against terrorism. They should be supporting the effort to rid the world of terrorists and the terrorist network instead of pointing out all the deficiencies.

We are in a war against terrorism, one we cannot afford to lose. We have a man at the helm right now who is doing the right things. And, by golly, he ought to be supported not just by my colleague and me, but by the entire country and, in particular, those in the media because they have such a tremendous influence on public policy.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am not looking for the media to support the President, it might be nice, or to support the country or to support the direction or support our troops. It would just be nice if they presented a balanced approach, fair and balanced approach to what needs to get done.

And it is why when I go home it is good to take a look at the local papers because the local papers will cover the stories of our soldiers that come home. The soldier that I talked to today said he has been in Iraq for 11, 12 months. He is home with his family for the first time. One would think he would say, man, I am just going to sit back on the couch and I am going to vegetate and just enjoy this. He is going to the

schools, he is going all over his community telling them about what he did and what America did in Iraq. He is proud of it. He says, I am doing it because nobody else is. We are not getting any help from the media. I am going out and I am telling the story because I was there.

And has my colleague been to Iraq?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, yes, I was there about 3 weeks ago.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We have looked into the eyes of the Iraqi people. We have shaken their hands. We have heard them speak. We have seen the sincerity. I always say this is not easy. And there are going to be other ugly days and other ugly events. We are not going to fix this all in one day. We are not going to fix it in 24 months. This takes work. These people are experimenting with a free press, representative government, free markets. They are doing this for the first time after 30 years of a brutal regime.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield. When I was over there, I am sure my colleague found the same thing, they had found 400,000 people in unmarked graves. They estimated between 1 and 1.3 million people that are unaccounted for. They were putting people in wood chipper, they were raping women. It was horrible what was going on, the torture and everything.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, one point, he is right, it is going to be somewhere over a million people probably, in a country of 27 million. That means 4 percent of the folks in that country were brutally murdered. In our country that would be about 11, 12 million people.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, if we did not do anything but free that country, that would be a great thing. But what we have done is we have sent a very strong signal to the terrorist network al Qaeda, the Taliban, the Baath Party in Iraq, and the terrorists around the world; and what bothers me now is because the media is focusing only on the negatives and not the positives, not on what we have accomplished but what we have not yet accomplished and, I believe, maybe inadvertently, they are giving aid and comfort to the enemy, the terrorist network, and that is something they should not do.

They may not agree with everything President Bush has done, but they have to admit that we have gotten rid of Saddam Hussein. We are on the heels of Usama bin Laden. We have knocked out an awful lot of the terrorist network, and there have been no more attacks on the United States of America. That does not mean we will not have them. But there have been no more attacks. That is because of President Bush, homeland security, and Tom Ridge, and because they are doing the right things. I just wish the media would focus on them.

I normally do not come down here and vent my spleen like this. I try to be a little bit more moderate, if one wants to say that; but right now I am very, very angry because all we are seeing on the screen right now is should we be there, should we not be pulling out, should we be pulling in our horns.

The one thing we must not do, and I am speaking to the media in particular right now, is we must not send the message that we are going to withdraw or cave in this war against terrorism. It is essential that we are victorious. No matter how long it takes, we have to be victorious. Just like in World War I and in World War II, we have to win this war, otherwise we are going to suffer terrorist threats and terrorist attacks for many, many, many years to come.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think that is one of the things that we as a Nation need to recognize. I was on a TV program earlier today and someone asked me what are you guys accomplishing, or who is responsible. I said, well, obviously, there is plenty of blame to go around. But not only is it the executive branch, and by executive branch I mean generic, not this President, because I agree with my colleague, this President has shown the leadership that is necessary to fight this war on terrorism, not only is there blame to go around in Congress, but there is also a certain responsibility of the American people.

Because our actions sometimes are too often guided by public opinion. And for folks to say, well, you should have done more in 1998 or you should have done more in 2001, the real question is do we really think that the American people would have embraced it.

We know that even after 2001 some of them have been restrained in their support or been openly hostile to going after al Qaeda and going after bin Laden and going into Afghanistan.

The other thing is my colleague and I both probably know that the quickest ticket to unemployment in Congress is to show any interest in foreign affairs. One goes on a trip and learns more about the Middle East or whatever, and it is, oh, you do not care about us back home anymore. The American people bear some of that responsibility because we are the world's sole superpower economically and politically and militarily. That carries an awesome responsibility with it. I think it is one of the great cases for federalism.

This place should focus on national security. It should focus on international trade agreements and our relationships with the rest of the world. Many other issues ought to be dealt with on a State and local level. We have a tremendous responsibility to address these issues.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I would like to say something about what my colleague said a moment ago. He was talking about, in essence, we cannot look back and talk

about the shortcomings. We have to look forward and say what are we doing now to deal with the problem; what are we going to do with it in the future.

Bobby Jones, one of the greatest golfers of all time, I will use this as an analogy, he said, You play the ball where it lies. When he was hurt, when he was dying and was physically impaired, people said, do you not feel bad about that? He said, That is life. You play the ball where it lies.

What we have to do now is realize where we are in this world and what it is all about. And there is a war against the terrorists that is in progress, and it is a war we cannot lose. So we have to start here and go forward. And the President has already started that ball moving in the right direction by taking on the terrorists, taking on Saddam Hussein, trying to make sure there are no weapons of mass destruction that are going to be used against the Middle East or the United States or the rest of the world. I think we are on the right track.

The thing we have to do now is make sure we keep the American people with us in this war against terrorism, and that is why the media is so important. They can play a very valuable role in making sure that the facts are out there, not opinion; but the facts are out there on what we have accomplished and where we are going.

As my colleague said, it does not have to be pro-Bush or against Bush, it just has to be fair reporting. If they report the progress that is being made and how the war is progressing and what we are winning instead of just the negatives, I am sure that everything will come out all right.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I love the analogy of play the ball where it lies because that is exactly what President Bush did after 9/11. He went back and took a look at what capabilities we had and the threats that were out there, but never went back to try to assess blame on something that happened 5 or 6 years ago or the Deutsch Doctrine that gutted our human intelligence. When we should have built intelligence up in the mid-1990s, it was gutted. That is exactly what happened when we get to 2001 and here we are in 2004 and we would like to have a human intelligence capability, we say, God, where did it go? We scrubbed it because we got rid of all the bad guys in 1995 and 1996 who spied for us. And one can say, well, when we are dealing with a terrorist organization, the only people that are in terrorist organizations are bad folks to begin with.

But that is not where the President was. He took a look at 9/11, took a look at where we were strategically, militarily, and what we needed to get done, and went forward, never trying to pin blame anywhere but just said, hey, I am playing it where it lies.

We will look at how it got here to make sure it does not happen again in the future, but I am not going back and

say that guy took a bad swing or he sliced it or whatever; I am going to take it and move it forward. Because, again, I think in some ways Americans are getting a little lackadaisical. There is a real threat out there. And this President and this administration, and I hope Congress in a bipartisan way, stay focused on the threat that is out there and put in place a strategy to fix it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. One of the things that was reported on briefly but should have been reported on in more detail was after 9/11 and the World Trade Center was taken down by the planes, and the Pentagon was attacked, and they were going to attack the Capitol had it not been for those heroic people in Pennsylvania that died, but the fact of the matter is planes coming from Paris, France, and from Europe were stopped from coming over here because they found out through intelligence gathering that they had potential terrorists on those planes that were going to make them into bombs to blow up more buildings in the United States.

□ 2100

So our intelligence-gathering capability has increased dramatically since President Bush took office and since Tom Ridge took over homeland security.

Things are getting better, and we are stopping terrorist attacks, but those are the things that ought to be reported upon, the things that we have stopped from happening in the United States to protect the American people, instead of dwelling just on negatives. If we just do that, I would be much, much happier.

I just want to say to my colleague, because I am going to leave the stage back to him, I want to thank you very, very much for taking this time. We ought to have a whole host of our colleagues down here talking about this tonight, but you are the guy that did it, and I want to thank you for carrying the mantle of leadership tonight. You are to be congratulated.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague; and I hope he recovers his voice soon. We would miss it if he lost his voice.

There is a lot of stuff that has happened in what we have talked about. There are a couple of other documents that I just want to talk about, and we have talked a little bit about rewriting history.

There was some testimony just from the last couple of days in front of the joint inquiry; and it really I think in many ways, from my perspective, boils down to partisan politics, partisan politics at its worst. Because national security is too important an issue to take down into the partisan battleground, and it is one of the very positive things about serving on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

There have been a couple of things in the last few weeks that have been disappointing, but, by and large, the commitment by members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is to do their work aggressively, effectively, but to leave the partisan labels at the door and to recognize that the issues that we are working on are too important to drag down into a short-term, partisan, political game because, at the end, the country loses.

Here is what Dick Clarke said. The Bush administration decided in late January to do two things: one, vigorously pursue the existing policy, including all of the lethal covert action findings. The point is, while this big review was going on, the lethal findings were still in effect. The second thing the administration decided to do was to initiate a process to look at those issues which had been on the table for a couple of years and get them decided, and that is in August of 2002.

In the spring of 2001, the Bush administration began to change Pakistani policy by a dialogue that said we would be willing to lift sanctions. So we began to offer carrots which made it possible for Pakistanis I think to begin to think that they could go down another path, which was to join us and break away from the Taliban. So that is really how it started.

A few minutes ago, we talked about the victory and the progress we have made in Libya. Back in 2001, the Bush administration, before 9/11, was talking about changing the policy in Pakistan to forge that partnership which then and now has enabled us. I met with the head of the Pakistani intelligence agency just a few weeks ago, right when they were sending a number of troops into their tribal areas, and they had lost a number of Pakistani troops. But who would have thought maybe even 2 or 3 years ago that by 2004 that the Pakistanis would not only be cooperating in our war on terrorism but they would be sending their own troops into these regions to find al Qaeda, to find the leadership of al Qaeda and to help us take out the Taliban and al Qaeda elements that were seeking refuge in Pakistan.

Again, I had a question today about when Condoleezza Rice and the President and this administration had really provided unprecedented support for the subcommittee that I served on in the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that did a review almost directly after 9/11, provided full support and access to the joint House-Senate inquiry and now to the independent Commission. This is a statement that the Commission made on March 30.

"The Commission welcomes the decision of the President and the Vice-President to meet in one joint private session with all 10 commissioners.

"We also commend the President for his decision to accept the Commission's request for public testimony, under oath, by the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, Dr. Condoleezza Rice."

Remember, Dr. Rice had already testified to this Commission for 4 hours in private session.

"These decisions represent a significant contribution by the President to the work of the Commission, consistent with our mandate to 'provide a full and complete accounting' of the terrorist attacks of September 11.

"The President has consistently stated a policy of strong support for the Commission and instructed the executive branch to provide unprecedented extraordinary access to the Commission."

This is what the Commission said. "The President has consistently stated a policy of strong support for the Commission and instructed the executive branch to provide unprecedented and extraordinary access to the Commission. His decisions today reflect that policy of strong support, and we welcome them."

The Commission recognizes what is going on and that the President's support has been unprecedented, and we have got to remember that this is not looking back in history and saying, well, what happened during the war on terrorism. We are still fully engaged in the war on terrorism. We are still in the middle of fighting that war, and what is unprecedented about this President's cooperation is that there have already been I think 20 witnesses from the executive branch in front of the Commission.

Now Dr. Condoleezza Rice has already testified in private, will now testify in public, but the public nature of this reviewing the decision-making process at the very time we are still conducting the war, not when it is done, but at the very time, digging into the inner reaches of an administration and asking about how they are conducting policy, how they are making decisions, and it is one thing to do it in private. It is another to do it fully in public.

Someone asked me earlier this week and said in some ways I think the administration has gone almost too far. We are at war and the information is provided in private or secret session to those folks who are entrusted to make the decisions and the recommendations that enable this country to move forward responsibly, aggressively and effectively, but I sometimes worry that there are some in the world today who take comfort and believe that they are being successful in their efforts to defeat us in this war on terrorism when they see the partisanship that we sometimes are engaged in. This issue is too big to move down into partisanship.

The last comment that I wanted to make is today I talked with one of our soldiers today who was back from Iraq. I have met with the family of one of our soldiers who was killed in Iraq. I have met with the family of one of our soldiers who was very badly wounded in an incident. In each of those cases, they have said, make sure that we win

this war on terrorism, that we dedicate the resources to this war on terrorism. But they also said, do not forget the sacrifices of the families that have been asked to sacrifice, the families that have seen a son and husband gone for a year, the family that has seen a father and a husband and a son killed on a battlefield in Iraq and the family of the son and the husband of a soldier who has been badly wounded and will live with that for the rest of his life.

But I think we need to remember all of these folks and the troops that are still serving over there, and I hope that we as a Nation, that we as a Congress, continue to remember these families and these individuals in our prayers.

THE 9/11 COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, this evening I want to discuss the serious accusations that former White House counterterrorism chief Richard Clarke has leveled at President Bush over the last week. I would also like to discuss my concern over the administration's attempts, attempts that have now been joined by several congressional Republicans, to draw attention away from the serious accusations by instead viciously attacking the messenger; and, finally, I come to the floor to highlight inconsistencies in the statements that Condoleezza Rice has made over the last week, inconsistencies that will undoubtedly be addressed when she testifies as early as next week under oath in front of the 9/11 Commission.

Madam Speaker, it is nice to see that after months of stalling the Bush administration has finally made an agreement with the 9/11 Commission to have the President, Vice President and National Security Adviser all appear before the entire 9/11 Commission. The announcement was a complete retreat from the Bush administration's previous belief that Condoleezza Rice should not testify in public.

Last evening, the President went before reporters and said that he had ordered this level of cooperation because, and I quote President Bush here, I consider it necessary to gaining a complete picture of the months and years that preceded the murder of our fellow citizens on September 11, 2001.

Madam Speaker, I think it is great that the Bush administration finally caved in and will allow Condoleezza Rice to testify, but it is somewhat disingenuous for the President to say that he has cooperated with the Commission in the past. In fact, President Bush has stalled the Commission for months on many of their requests.

Up until yesterday, the President said that he would only testify before the Commission's chair and vice chair;