

a peaceful resolution. Now, I am a Republican; I admit that. I am happy to. My father was a Truman Democrat, and if my father were alive today, I think I would have to ask him: Dad, do you ever remember F.D.R. or Truman asking for the Nazis to have unconditional resolution? Is that what we fought for? Did Ulysses Simpson Grant? Did that stand for unconditional resolution? Is this a new outcome?

The reality in Iraq is quite simple. There are two roads. There is victory and democracy, or there is defeat and Zargawi. To sit here and claim that multilateralism from the United Nations is going to help us is bereft of any knowledge of why the U.N. acts as it does. The former colonial powers of the United Nations and the current tyrannical regimes of the United Nations quite simply believe that an America with the ability to preemptively protect its citizens from terrorists is a graver threat to them than the terrorists themselves, including Saddam Hussein who, I point out, in the Oil For Food scandal made many multilateralists quite rich. If you do not understand what is undergirding the opposition amongst these people in the United Nations, then you do not realize that your plan to have them save us, to have them come to our aid with troops and with money and with good intentions, is quite simply confusing the United Nations Security Council with Santa Claus. It will not happen.

The reality remains. The U.N. will not ride to the rescue, and there is no peaceful resolution acceptable to the American people or the Iraqi people short of victory, which is a word we do not hear much from some quarters these days.

In the final analysis, I believe that the absence of the willingness to admit that we have to win is becoming quite a problem.

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

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

WAR MEANS SACRIFICE

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, as we contemplate what is happening in Iraq with the continued loss of life, the continued injuries, I would just remind my colleagues in this chamber that the only people who are being asked to sacrifice for this war are the soldiers and the people who love them. No one else is being asked to sacrifice for this war.

We are not paying for this war. The President has decided that future generations should pay for this war, so we

are using borrowed money, passing the bill on to the next generation. So the taxpayer is not being asked to pay for the war at the present time. Of course, future taxpayers will pay for it.

The President is not sacrificing for this war. No one in this chamber is sacrificing for this war. No one in the Senate is sacrificing. Well, I think we may have two colleagues out of the 535 Members of both the House and the Senate who have active duty sons or daughters in the military, but most of us do not have anyone in our families that we know who are in harm's way or who have been killed or who have been seriously injured. Yet, we stand here in this chamber and the President stands and he talks in glowing terms about, we need to stay the course and we are totally committed.

I wish we were totally committed. I wish the President was totally committed in terms of paying for this war without expecting future generations to pay. I wish the President was committed enough to continue to provide the money that our Veterans' Administration needs to provide adequate care for our veterans who are coming back from this war in desperate need of VA medical care. But no, only the soldiers and their loved ones are sacrificing or are being asked to sacrifice. I think that is very troubling.

It is easy to make decisions when it involves someone else's child. Maybe the only thing that will bring common sense back to this chamber and to this administration is to have the burden shared by all of us so that all of us who have loved ones who may be subject to military service would be asked to serve. Would that make a difference in our thinking?

I believe if the people who are so supportive of our current policies in Iraq so firmly believe that the direction in which we are going is the correct direction, I think they should be willing to see their sons and their daughters join the military, take up the battle, share the risk. And those who are not willing to have their loved ones put at risk should think very, very carefully about how enthusiastic they are about our current course of action.

We voted in this chamber, 434 to 1, I believe, when we pursued the war in Afghanistan, because we all understood that was the war on terror.

□ 2015

It was Afghanistan and the Taliban regime and Osama bin Laden that attacked our country. And somehow there has been a bait and switch. We have taken the attack upon our country, and we have used it to go into Iraq.

The President spoke for 63 minutes when he gave his acceptance speech at the Republican convention, and he never mentioned Osama bin Laden's name one time. All the talk there in New York about September 11, about the attack upon our country, but the man who was responsible for attacking our country was not even mentioned by

the President. Saddam Hussein's name was mentioned many times, but not the one who was responsible.

Tonight, somewhere on the face of God's good Earth, Osama bin Laden is walking free, planning the next attack upon our country. And our resources were diverted from Iraq and from the Taliban and stabilizing Afghanistan to Iraq. We need to rethink our policies.

TERRORISM AROUND THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the previous speaker's comments. My son was on active duty when I announced my run for office. He finished his tour of duty in June of 2002, shortly after I won my primary; and he signed up for the Air National Guard about 3 months later, and he continues to serve with the Guard. He is trying to complete his college. He does not know whether he will be called up or not.

So I wish the speakers on the other side would show some sensitivity. Perhaps we should circulate a notice of who has sons or daughters or wives or husbands on active duty or in the Guard, but I suspect it is more than one or two people in this House.

I was not in this House when the vote was taken to go into the country of Iraq, but I certainly support the President's efforts, and I understand what the President is trying to do. And I believe that the world will be a different place in 20 or 30 years' time because of our activities in that country than we would have had had we finished out Saddam Hussein's term and then allowed his sons to be the logical heirs to that reign of terror that he was perpetuating on his people. But I did not come here tonight to talk about that.

The previous speaker talked about how loved ones and innocent folks may be in harm's way, and that is a very real phenomenon. I want to introduce this House to a young man named Alan that I met this past weekend at the Federal Pediatric Hospital in Moscow, Russia. Alan is 11 years old and is a bright young boy.

Alan was in the hospital because he is recovering from surgery. He had surgery 2 weeks ago to remove a piece of metal from his chest, a piece of metal that sunk deep into his chest on Alan's first day of school in Beslan.

This piece of metal was placed in a mine that was created under the direction of a man named Skhmeel Masaif. Now, little Alan is healing now, but little Alan was perhaps lucky. More than 300 dead, over half of those children, were killed when those bombs went off in the gymnasium in Beslan. A quote from the newspaper that I read over the weekend from a towns person there in Beslan said, "We bury and bury and we still have not finished the job."