

history. They would have had to have been somebody who is employed in the United States, has been employed satisfactorily, good recommendations by the employers, and then no felony convictions or any other major record of criminal activity or history.

So this would satisfy the argument that these people have come into this country illegally, remained here, and have gained a legal status. They would have to return to their country of origin.

So it establishes a new W visa for those who are classified as undocumented workers but have gone through these steps and stages at the present time.

Congressman PENCE has also introduced legislation which calls for illegal immigrants to leave the United States, report to centers located outside the country before reentering the country with a guest worker visa, which is somewhat similar to what I am talking about here. So this is not necessarily a novel or new idea, and many people have taken a look at it.

The requirement for all illegal immigrants to leave the United States and enter into the U.S. legally with a W visa may serve as a way to create common ground between the House and the Senate bills.

□ 1800

It is important that an immigration bill pass this year. I think the American people are expecting it and hope it will happen. Yet we are so far apart in the two bodies that this may be difficult to effect.

So H.R. 4065 may serve as a catalyst to compromise and final passage. I would like to have my colleagues at least give it some consideration because we will have to think outside the box a little bit. I think it will take some innovative solutions to this problem. It is something that again is something that is really important for this body to accomplish before the end of this session.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 861, DECLARING THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL PREVAIL IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-502) on the resolution (H. Res. 868) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 861) declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

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

FLOOR DEBATE ON GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable document showed up in our mailboxes this afternoon. It is called a "Confidential Messaging Memo" for the floor debate on Iraq and the global war on terror.

This is apparently a memo that Republican leadership provided to Members on their side so they would know how to go about rubber-stamping the President's every thought and deed and could do their best to make sure that we don't have the kind of debate that the American people deserve.

The American people deserve to have us talk about what is really going on in Iraq and how it does or does not make us safer. They deserve to have mistakes acknowledged and paths forward discussed honestly and frankly, admitting problems and working together to make things better.

They deserve a Congress that is more interested in their security than in scoring points for the November election.

According to the Republican leadership's tactical memo, this is precisely what the American people will not get. Instead, there will be confusion and intentional misdirection. There will be ad hominem attacks, and that means attacks on individuals, and attempts to make Saddam Hussein and 9/11 more or less the same thing, attempts to call Democrats' legitimate questions about the administration's rationale for war and conduct of the war into what, and I quote, "policies to concede defeat on the battlefield."

The memo is filled with advice on how to deflect, confuse, conflate and con. I would like to enter that memo into the RECORD so everyone will be able to read it and not be confused when they hear the debate begin tomorrow. They will know what the script is that the other side is following.

Mr. Speaker, let me read some portions now because I think we all have a right to know what Republicans are advising their Members to say and think.

"During this debate, our Republican Conference should be focused on delivering these key points:

"The Importance of Our Actions. It is imperative during this debate that we reexamine the conditions that required the United States to take military action in Afghanistan and Iraq in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001."

In other words, the Republicans are being told to continue the big lie that Iraq was behind 9/11 or had something to gain from 9/11, and it is all tied together in one neat package.

Secondly, the Republican leadership wants to make the point that they are smart and tough enough because they don't look back, they don't analyze, they don't admit errors, and they don't learn.

Now if they were a baseball pitcher who was this bad, Rumsfeld would have been jerked five innings ago. But, of course, our President ran the Rangers and gave Chicago Sammy Sosa, so we know his judgment in baseball.

Now to do anything else, according to their memo, is to be "prone to waiver endlessly" or "to abandon our efforts" against terrorism. It is as if the Republicans believe there is only one kind of effort against terrorism that has validity, and that any kind of thoughtful consideration of alternatives is a sign of cowardice and weakness.

"Republicans believe," the memo says, "victory in Iraq will be an important blow for terrorism." Yes, of course, it would be. But what is victory in Iraq and how do we get off the path we are on presently and onto that victory path?

We are forbidden to talk about those questions. It would be wrong for 435 fairly well-educated, loyal Americans, who have been sent here by their districts to help govern this country, to start raising questions about what we ought to do.

There will be one proposal with no amendments; that is it. It would be "weak" and "wavering" and a sign of "abandoning our efforts" if we attempt to make those efforts more rational and successful and relate them to the goal of making Americans safer.

We are in trouble in Iraq. We don't have a plan except to keep plowing ahead with the same old policy: a strategy that is getting Americans and Iraqis killed and driving Iraqis to despair and helplessness. We don't have a Congress that can step up and take responsibility and try to make the administration listen to reason.

The President's policy is to put the control of this in the hands of the Iraqis. When they stand up, we will stand down. Who is going to tell the Iraqis when to stand up? The clerics, of course. The Shiia and Sunni clerics will decide when they stand up. What if they don't tell them to stand up? We are there until it ends.

This is a charade. We will go through it tomorrow, but it will not shed any light on where we ought to be going as Americans.

And we don't have a Congress that can step up and take responsibility and try to make the administration listen to reason.

So the Republican leadership scheduled public relations time in the House in an effort to stop the Republican free fall in the polls.

Republican leaders cannot tell the American people what they intend to do except more of the same.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. I call on the Republicans to abandon the cynical strategy put forth by their leaders and think for themselves.

CONFIDENTIAL MESSAGING MEMO—FLOOR DEBATE ON IRAQ AND THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

This week, the House of Representatives will engage in a debate about the war in Iraq, the Global War on Terror and our efforts to strengthen our national security in a post-9/11 world.

The past week has brought news of several important, positive developments in Iraq and the Global War on Terror:

U.S. military forces eliminated the terrorist Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, al-Qaeda's top commander in Iraq and a cold-blooded killer.

The Iraqi government named new interior, defense and security ministers as part of the new government's continued progress.

Just this morning, President George W. Bush traveled to Baghdad to meet the newly appointed Prime Minister of Iraq, Nouri al-Maliki and to discuss our growing partnership with the new democratic ally.

Clearly, these positive developments are the result of steadfast support of both our military and diplomatic efforts in Iraq and across the globe. We should not refrain from touting such progress.

During this debate, our Republican Conference should be focused on delivering these key points:

THE IMPORTANCE OF OUR ACTIONS

It is imperative during this debate that we re-examine the conditions that required the United States to take military action in Afghanistan and Iraq in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001.

The attacks we witnessed that day serve as a reminder of the dangers we face as a nation in a post-9/11 world. We can no longer expect oceans between us and our enemies to keep us safe. The plotting and planning taking place in terror camps protected by rogue regimes could no longer go unchecked or unchallenged. In a post-9/11 world, we could no longer allow despots and dictators like the Taliban and Saddam Hussein to ignore international sanctions and resolutions passed by the United Nations Security Council.

So, during this debate we must make clear to the American people that the United States had to take action in the best interests of the security of our nation and the world community. As Republicans who supported military action against Saddam Hussein and terrorists around the globe, the United States had to show our resolve as the world's premier defender of freedom and liberty before such ideals were preyed upon, rather than after standing witness to their demise at the hands of our enemies.

As President John F. Kennedy once stated so eloquently:

"The cost of freedom is always high, but Americans have always paid it. And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender, or submission."

A PORTRAIT OF CONTRASTS

This debate in the House of Representatives gives our Republican Conference the opportunity to present the American people our case for strong national security policies whose purpose is to protect the nation against another attack on our own soil.

Similarly, we must conduct this debate as a portrait of contrasts between Republicans and Democrats with regard to one of the most important political issues of our era. Articulating and advocating our core principles will allow the American public to witness Members of Congress debate a fundamental question facing America's leaders:

In a post-9/11 world, do we confront dangerous regimes and the threat of terrorism

with strength and resolve, or do we instead abandon our efforts against these threats in the hopes that they will just fade away on their own?

Republicans believe victory in Iraq will be an important blow to terrorism and the threat it poses around the world. Democrats, on the other hand, are prone to waver endlessly about the use of force to protect American ideals. Capitol Hill Democrats' only specific policy proposals are to concede defeat on the battlefield and instead, merely manage the threat of terrorism and the danger it poses.

These are troubling policies to embrace in a post-9/11 world. During this debate, we need to clarify just how wrong the Democrats' weak approach is and just how dangerous their implementation would be to both the short-term and long-term national security interests of the United States.

RESOLVE WILL TRIUMPH OVER RETREAT

As a result of our efforts during this debate, Americans will recognize that on the issue of national security, they have a clear choice between a Republican Party aware of the stakes and dedicated to victory, versus a Democrat Party without a coherent national security policy that sheepishly dismisses the challenges America faces in a post-9/11 world.

Let there be no doubt that America and its allies in the war in Iraq and the Global War on Terrorism face difficult challenges. The American people are understandably concerned about our mission in a post-Saddam Iraq. There have been many tough days since Iraq's liberation and transition to a sovereign democracy.

Democrats are all too eager to seize upon the challenges we face as their rationale or motivation for retreat. As Republicans, we understand the diplomatic and national security hazards of such a move.

We must echo the American public's understanding of just how great the stakes are in Iraq and our long-term efforts to win the War on Terrorism.

Building democracies in a part of the world that has known nothing but tyranny and despotism is a difficult task. But achieving victory there and gaining democratic allies in the region will be the best gift of security we can give to future generations of Americans.

IRAQ DEBATE

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, we do have an important debate coming before this House tomorrow discussing what we are doing to defend America through what the President calls the war on terror; what I refer to as the war against Islamic extremists.

I had a colleague earlier refer to the big lie. Well, there is a big lie propagated by the left in this country that we have no enemies abroad; and beyond that, we should not fight those enemies where they are.

We are making progress in this war against Islamic extremists. Make no mistake about it, this is a generational fight. While my grandparents fought the Nazis and my parents fought the Communists, very harsh ideologies that sought to destroy our way of life, that sought to destroy who we are as Americans, we too have a generational

fight in this war against Islamic extremists.

And I will say in the last week we have seen some very positive prospects coming from Iraq. There are those who want to deny that we are making progress, and they have every right and ability to do that because we have freedom of speech here in the United States because of our constitutional freedoms. We are trying to bring that same level of freedom to those that are living in repressive regimes, which those repressive regimes are the ones that are propagating terror against us in the United States. So if we spread peace and freedom and democracy around the world, we will have fewer enemies that seek to destroy us and to kill Americans.

Now, in the last week we saw the destruction of Zarqawi, a militant extremist in Iraq, a terrorist mastermind, who was seeking to destroy our troops, to hurt our men and women in Iraq and to destroy the progress they are making for themselves in Iraq. But we did root him out. That was a wonderful, positive step. We should be proud of that action.

Beyond that, we saw progress with the government of Iraq taking shape and form with the security ministers being put into place and the final government being put into place. We are making progress there in Iraq and we should be proud of that.

Beyond that, there are extremists in Israel. There are extremists in Afghanistan and throughout the Middle East and some in this country that seek to destroy us. This is the reality of the day. Some would say we should deal with them with a legal strategy. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say that is really removed from the realities of the war that we are fighting.

Our enemy hates our values. Our enemy hates our freedoms. Our enemy hates our capitalism that we embrace in this country. So we must fight them wherever they are and by any means possible.

But the left in this country, Mr. Speaker, don't want to fight this war. They know it is hard. They know it is difficult. But I would say to the left in this country, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not fight them, the values which they cherish, the freedom of speech and the freedom of dissent which we have in this country, the right to vote, the actual equality that we strive for in this country, although imperfect, the equality that we strive for, whether it be females having a place in society which we embrace here in this country, those extremists would not want that to happen. They want burkas worn by women. They don't want their participation. They don't want them to own property or have freedom of speech, wholly removed from what is our reality here in this country, although imperfect. But we strive for those values, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, our enemy will fight us in any way possible. We must have a