

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

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

IN OPPOSITION TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 557

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, today, in the floor debate on H. Res. 557, the Iraq resolution, though a member of the Committee on International Relations, I was unfortunately denied time to express my dissent on the policy of pre-emptive war in Iraq. The fact that the Committee on International Relations held no hearings and did not mark up the resolution further challenges the fairness of the process.

Mr. Speaker, I now rise to express my opposition to H. Res. 557, obviously, not because our Armed Forces do not deserve praise, but rather because our policy in the Persian Gulf is seriously flawed. An effort to commend our forces should not be used to rubber-stamp a policy of folly. To do so is disingenuous. Though the resolution may have political benefits, it will prove to be historically incorrect.

Justifying preemption is not an answer to avoiding appeasement. Very few wars are necessary. Very few wars are good wars. And this one does not qualify. Most wars are costly beyond measure, in life and limb and economic hardship. In this regard, this war does qualify: 566 deaths, 10,000 casualties, and hundreds of billions of dollars for a victory requiring self-deception.

Rather than bragging about victory, we should recognize that the war that rages on between the Muslim East and the Christian West has intensified and spread, leaving our allies and our own people less safe. Denying we have an interest in oil and that occupying an Islamic country is not an affront to the sensitivities of most Arabs and Muslims is foolhardy.

Reasserting U.N. Security Council resolutions as a justification for the war further emphasizes our sacrifice of sovereignty and Congress's reneging its constitutional responsibility over war.

This resolution dramatizes our forgetfulness that for too long we were staunch military and economic allies of Saddam Hussein, confirming the folly of our policy of foreign meddling over many decades. From the days of installing the Shah of Iran to the current worldwide spread of hostilities and hatred, our unnecessary involvement shows so clearly how unintended consequences come back to haunt generation after generation.

Someday our leaders ought to ask why Switzerland, Sweden, Canada, Mexico, and many others are not po-

tential targets of an Islamic attack. Falsely believing that the al Qaeda was aligned with Saddam Hussein has resulted in the al Qaeda now having a strong presence and influence in Iraq. Falsely believing that Iraq had a supply of weapons of mass destruction has resulted in a dramatic loss of U.S. credibility, as anti-Americanism spreads around the world. Al Qaeda recruitment, sadly, has been dramatically increased.

We all praise our troops and support them. Challenging one's patriotism for not supporting this resolution and/or policy in the Persian Gulf is not legitimate. We should all be cautious in endorsing and financing a policy that unfortunately expands the war rather than ends it.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1375, FINANCIAL SERVICES REGULATORY RELIEF ACT OF 2003

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-439) on the resolution (H. Res. 566) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1375) to provide regulatory relief and improve productivity for insured depository institutions, and for other purposes, 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 Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

IRAQ: ONE YEAR LATER

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

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Iraq, 1 year later.

First of all, I want to commend our brave troops who proudly serve our great Nation and risk their lives to preserve our freedom. I praise their courageous efforts to protect our country, and I am with them 100 percent. They are the best of the best. And I can truly say every Member of this House, this body, supports them 100 percent. What I do not support is this misleading Bush administration and this House that follows them like sheep. Let me repeat that. What I do not support is this misleading Bush administration and this House, the people's House, that follows them like sheep.

A new report has been released that shows that George Bush, DICK CHENEY, Donald Rumsfeld, and Condoleezza Rice made 237 misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq in 125 public appearances. Eighty-four of those statements misled the American people

about Iraq's chemical and biological weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I was horrified last year to learn that 44,000 of our troops were sent out to battle without proper armor. Forty-four thousand. How can we ask young men and women to trust us when we make decisions that involve life and death and then not outfit them with the best that they need to save their lives. We deployed our young men and women to Iraq with Humvees that lacked armored protection and bulletproof windows.

I personally went to Walter Reed where six troops had lost their legs while riding in Humvees. If they had been riding in the right type of vehicles, this may not have happened. This use of Humvees in Iraq was not what they were made for. We need to get our troops the equipment they need now.

And, Mr. President, you need to spend more time planning for the safety of our troops and their families in your war efforts and less time fundraising and cutting taxes for the rich country club friends of yours.

There are two or three other points that I want to make. One, many of my constituents approach me about BRACC and the base closing amendment that we will be doing in 2005. They are telling me we are looking forward to your fighting to make sure our bases are not closed in our area. And my question to them is, why do you think that this Bush administration insisted, insisted, after the House and Senate both voted down and said we should not have a base closure, or BRACC scenario, during this time of war, why do you think this administration insisted that we go through this? It is destabilizing to the families and the communities during a time of war.

I have heard that someone from the other body indicated that if they were elected that that is one of the first things they would scrap.

I also want to comment on the 2000 election, which I cannot get past because the election determined who is in charge, and certainly I do not think we are headed in the right direction. I am going to submit for the RECORD an article that was in The New York Times last week indicating that Florida could be Florida again. In other words, the problems that we experienced in the 2000 election have not been corrected. It is a disservice to the people that we serve that we do not straighten out the problems with the elections, not just in Florida but all over this country; and we have not properly funded the program.

Lastly, let me mention the coup d'etat that took place a couple of weeks ago in Haiti. It is very unfortunate that this Bush administration has chosen to go in and take out a duly elected president. Just take him out. Just take him out. The poorest country in the western hemisphere. We have to make sure that the Haitian people get the assistance that they need from the super Bush administration, after going