

IRAQ AND SMART SECURITY

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Saddam Hussein faced a panel of Iraqi judges where he will finally stand trial for the crimes against humanity that were committed under his regime. Saddam Hussein is an evil person. He ordered thousands of his own people to death, and it is time that he is brought to justice for these crimes.

But anyone who suggests that Iraq is more stable or less of a threat to the United States now than it was before the war is fooling themselves. Iraq has never been less stable, and it has never posed a greater threat to the United States than it does today.

The war in Iraq has not combated terrorism as President Bush and his administration have repeatedly claimed. It has actually encouraged terrorism by providing a unified target and rallying point for those angry with our Mideast policies.

Since we invaded Iraq in March of 2003, hundreds of terrorist attacks have killed thousands of innocent people, both American soldiers and Iraqi civilians.

Most people assume that suicide terrorism of the sort that plagues Iraq on a daily basis stems from opposition to democracy in general or hatred of the United States in particular. But Dr. Robert Pape, a University of Chicago professor, reaches a different conclusion based on a comprehensive study on every act of suicide terrorism that has occurred over the last 10 years. Dr. Pape found that the common element linking all suicide attacks around the world is not religion. Rather, suicide terrorism is about pressuring another country to withdraw its military forces from the lands that the terrorists view as their homeland.

This helps to explain the intensity of the Iraqi insurgency. The insurgents resent the continued United States occupation of their land and want control over it.

If the folks in the Bush administration truly want to end the war, they must honestly convince the Iraqi people that the United States has no long-term objectives in Iraq. But to do that would require a sea change, because we currently maintain over 100 military bases in Iraq, with what certainly appears to be intentions to maintain some of them permanently.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that President Bush loves those prime time speeches to our Nation. Maybe it is time for him to eat a little crow and ask the international community to help. He needs to face the fact that the so-called Bush doctrine of preemptive war and unilateral military action just is not working. He should tell the Iraqi people that the United States has no plans to maintain permanent bases in Iraq, nor do we have any designs on controlling Iraqi oil. You could call this speech the "anti-Bush doctrine."

Mr. Speaker, there were plenty of mistakes made in Iraq, mistakes that could easily have been avoided. But now, the best thing for the President to do is cut his losses, admit he made mistakes, and change his course. He needs to seek the cooperation of our allies around the world to help Iraq get back on its feet, because we cannot do it by ourselves in the United States. The President should do that by going back to those countries we have spurned in the past like France and Germany, as well as influential bodies like the United Nations and NATO, and ask them to assist.

A true multilateral coalition could and would enable us to bring thousands of our troops home. To borrow a phrase from the President, as our allies stand up, we will stand down.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana 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.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RISING COLLEGE COSTS AND REPUBLICAN RAID ON STUDENT AID

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this week new reports from the College Board showed how much harder it is getting for families to pay for college. Since 2001, tuition and fees at a 4-year public college have risen by 46 percent. Today the maximum Pell grant is worth \$900 less when adjusted for inflation than it was in 1975 and 1976. This year, students attending 2 and 4-year public colleges are already \$10 billion short for paying for college, even after grants, work study, savings, and Federal loans are taken into account. As a result, millions of students will be forced to work long hours to take on additional debt from other sources or forgo college altogether.

What has been the Republicans' response? To make American students

and families who are already struggling to pay for college, pay even more.

In July, during the committee consideration of the Higher Education Act, Republicans voted to cut nearly \$9 billion from the student aid programs and raise interest rates and fees on student borrowers. This raid on student aid represents the largest cut to the Federal student aid programs ever, ever. As a result of these cuts, the typical borrower with \$17,500 in loan debt when they graduate will be forced to pay an additional \$5,800 more for his or her college loans. That is \$5,800 additional that they will have to pay over the life of those loans for the college education that they are seeking.

While many of the cuts were on excessive subsidies paid to student lenders, such as the 9.5 percent loan boondoggle, the Republicans only agreed to reduce some of these excessive subsidies to large lending institutions after widespread criticism from Democrats, students, and editorial writers.

But instead of reinvesting these dollars into low-interest loans and additional grants, the majority plans to use nearly \$9 billion in cuts for the alleged deficit reduction, or to pay for their tax cuts to the wealthiest people in this Nation. They are going to take \$9 billion out of the student loan account to pay for the tax cuts to the wealthiest 5 percent of the people in this country. That is their idea of economic justice.

But it gets worse. Next week, the majority plans to cut an additional \$7.5 billion from the Nation's student aid programs, the second largest cuts ever. The first largest cuts were several weeks ago. Now they are back. They are back for \$7.5 billion to take out of student loans to again pay for the \$1 trillion in tax cuts that they gave to the top 5 percent of the people in this country.

To make matters even worse, the Republican leadership has failed to provide real relief for college tuition. In fact, in their higher education bill, they would do nothing to make tuition more affordable for the first 5 years after it is enacted into law. Even after 5 years, the bill only requires colleges and universities with rapidly rising tuition to increase their reporting and disclosures.

Mr. Speaker, the public already knows how much it costs. They struggle with it every spring as they try to figure out how to pay for their children's education. What the Republicans are doing, it is not lowering the cost of tuition, not lowering the rate or the increase in the cost of tuitions; they are adding thousands of dollars, thousands of dollars in additional costs to students and to their families.

This is unacceptable. What the Democrats had was a better idea that we would cut those outlandish subsidies to the lending institutions, to the banks, and to others, and we would take that money and we would recycle it into the student loan programs so

that we could increase the Pell grant by some \$500. We could take care of low and middle-income students who fall short in being able to finance their education. We would lower the cost of that debt to those students. We would make the repayment easier.

But the Republicans did not do that. They chose to take now what is almost \$16 billion when they are done next week out of the student loan program, to raid this student aid and take that and transfer that to the wealthiest people in this country through the tax cuts that they have already enacted.

It is a shameful day, and it is a sad day, when we are being told that it is more important now than ever that students in America complete a college education for the sake of their economic well-being and for the sake of the competitiveness of our economy, and the Republicans have decided to make it more and more expensive for millions of American students and their families. It is a tragic day for these students and their families.

CONGRESS GOES HOME WITHOUT COMPLETING ITS WORK

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the American people might wonder why we have gone home today at 1 o'clock on a Thursday. Are there no problems facing this country? Have we rebuilt the gulf coast? Have we dealt with the problems in Iraq? Have we dealt with everything that is troubling in this society? You have to ask yourself, where did the Congress go? Why did they go home? Why does the Republican leadership declare that no, we are not going to be here, we are not going to be here on Monday. I think this Congress is pretty much having trouble here doing their job.

□ 1300

The reason we are not here on the floor dealing with the issues today is that the issues are tough. And the Republicans do not want to go into Thanksgiving with everybody saying, well, they did it again. They took more from the needy and they gave it to the greedy.

But that is what the debate was about this week. It is about what kind of amendments, what kind of cuts. Amendments is a fancy congressional word for the fact that we are going to cut the budget.

Now, where are those cuts coming from and why can the Republicans not make up their minds what they want to cut? Well, they are looking at the Medicaid program. They want to cut \$10 billion there. They want to just raise it; now, just 1 more billion would not be very much. Just a nick out of some people.

Student loans. You just heard the gentleman from California (Mr.

GEORGE MILLER) give the facts about that issue. You are talking about a \$7 or \$8 billion cut in student loans. You know, those sick people, what can they do for themselves? Right. Take it away from them. What about the students? Take it away from them.

How about agriculture? Now you say, well, rich farmers. No. No. No. Half of the money spent in the agriculture budget is spent on the food stamp program. Buying the surpluses of our farmers and giving them to the poor of this country.

Now, why would we talk about cutting another \$4 or \$5 billion? No, they only want \$1.5 billion. Excuse me. \$1.5 billion out of food stamps. So we are taking away health care and food and ability to go to college, and then they come to the Ways and Means Committee that I sit on. Those are not even mandatory. Those are just things that that Congress said that we would do.

But when you get to the Ways and Means Committee, you come to things that are written in law, and they are called entitlements. If you are an American, you are entitled. It does not make any difference where you live, how much you have; you are entitled. And they are now going to go after those entitlements.

Now, I spoke a little bit before about a couple of them. One of the things they want to do is go after people who have had unemployment payments, unemployment insurance overpayments. They figure that they can get that back out of their taxes. That is at a very time when we have rising unemployment in this country. We are going to try and save \$1 billion going back and squeezing workers that have been out of work for 3 months or 6 months or whatever.

Anybody who is at the bottom of the pile should watch out for these guys, because they are coming after them with a sharp stick. They are going to take it away, and why are they taking it away? I mean, you have got to ask yourself, why would they cut food stamps? Why would they cut health care? Why would they cut school loans? Why would they go after the unemployed? Why would they go after grandparents who are taking care of foster kids? Why would they do that?

Did you know that we had to give tax cuts to the rich? If we do not give tax cuts to the rich, why, the rich will not be rich. Well, they will be less rich, I mean. If we do not finish those tax cuts that are before this Congress, somehow they are not going to get that \$100,000 tax cut if they make more than \$1 million.

Now, think about the tears. Think about the tears up in those apartments and those houses where those people have been expecting that \$100,000 tax cut that they were going to get. Who knows what they are going to do with it. I am sure that they are going to run out and give it to the poor.

But these decisions that are being made in this body are being made by

people who stand out here and beat their chests and talk about how much they care about family values. Is it a family values budget that cuts food and medical care and student aid? I do not think so. And they are going to find out at the next election.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE EQUITABLE COMPENSATION ACT OF 2005

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

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Equitable Compensation Act of 2005.

Over 50 years ago, the Pick-Sloan Act initiated a major flood control and reclamation project along the Missouri River Basin. The construction of dams and reservoirs flooded hundreds of thousands of acres in South Dakota, dramatically altering the basin's landscape and the river's flow.

The American Indian communities in South Dakota were some of the most severely affected by this project. Five of the nine, Lakota, Dakota, and Nakota reservations in South Dakota, border the Missouri River.

The Cheyenne River Sioux Indian Reservation is in north central South Dakota and among the largest reservations in terms of land base. For generations the Lakota bands which comprised the Cheyenne River Sioux tribe camped in the river valley and shaped their way of life to match the contours of the land and the flow of the river.

This was no less true after the Plains Indians were confined to the reservations in the late 19th century. The fertile river bottomlands remained at the center of their society, providing the tribe's best crop land, pastures and wildlife habitat, as well as an important source of timber.

Perhaps even more significantly, the fertile bottomlands remained central to many of the tribe's cultural and spiritual practices. At the outset of the Pick-Sloan Project, the United States Government used its eminent domain power to seize large tracts of the fertile