

"It is an immense benefit to the immigrant to change him into an American citizen. To bear the name of American is to bear the most honorable title. From his own standpoint it is beyond question that the wise thing for the immigrant is to become thoroughly Americanized. Moreover, from our standpoint we have the right to demand it. We freely extend the hand of welcome and of good fellowship to every man no matter what his creed or birthplace who comes here honestly, intent on becoming a good United States citizen like the rest of us. But we have the right and it is our duty to demand that he indeed shall become so. Above all, the immigrant must learn to talk and think and be the United States."

Not too long ago I had an opportunity to have a breakfast meeting with a Bishop Gomez, Bishop of the Catholic Church in the Denver archdiocese. And he did not agree with my concerns about immigration and about what is happening in the country with the lack of interest in citizenship and the attack on citizenship. And he said to me, Congressman, I do not know why you are so concerned about this, he said. He said, Most of the people coming here from Mexico today do not want to be Americans. And I said, Well, of course, Bishop, that is exactly the problem, is that they do not want to be and, by and large, they are not coming to be, we are witnessing, by the way, something else. Even people who are here legally are choosing not to become citizens at a far higher rate than ever before. Two-thirds of the people living here legally but who are not citizens of the United States have chosen not to pursue the citizenship route. That is another new phenomenon. And, again, I guess I could say, why should they? What is the benefit of citizenship? Why should anybody go through it? Everything obtainable under citizenship can be obtained if you simply walk across these borders. It is a dangerous thing.

There is a celebration for the Hispanic community in the United States referred to as Cinco de Mayo. It was over the weekend. It is an enjoyable celebration many people attend and certainly a large number of Hispanics in Colorado attend and enjoy it. I was listening to a radio talk show and they were talking to several of the vendors on the street. I thought it was interesting the vendor who was doing the biggest interest at Cinco de Mayo in Denver, according to this radio program on National Public Radio so it certainly had to be accurate, right, but the stall that was doing the most business was the stall selling Mexican flags. And later on that evening I saw a short clip on television show Cinco de Mayo and they were, of course, waving thousands and thousands of flags. All Mexican flags. I did not see a single American flag there.

Now, there is every reason to be prideful in the country that you are

from. I certainly am proud of my Italian heritage. I do not wave the Italian flag on any particular holiday of Italy, and I certainly never would have thought of doing so. And if I did ever put out an Italian flag for some reason, I think I would put out an American flag next to it or above it to show my commitment and loyalty is to the United States. It is just a little thing. It is not a huge thing. You cannot draw a lot of conclusions from it. I thought it was an interesting thing that that was the one stall doing the most business and it was the prominently displayed flag during this celebration.

Why should anyone care? We encourage them not to in many ways, not to care about being an American, not to care about the fact that citizenship is a privilege, conferred upon people who have strived to come to the United States, overcome tremendous obstacles, devoted their lives in many cases to attaining that wonderful goal, being so excited when they were able to do so, when they were able to raise their hands and take that oath of allegiance to the United States of America.

Interestingly enough, now that oath, even the citizenship ceremony, the INS is letting individual groups, some religious groups, actually determining who will pass the test. They put out little brochures talking about how easy it is to pass the test, so that you do not have to worry anymore. They are not going to ask you any really tough questions. We will give you the tests in your own language. Doing everything possible to simply eliminate anything that is sort of a hardship to becoming an American citizen.

Well, I think anything that is given away is not valued. And I think that we should begin to be concerned about where we are going as a Nation, and how massive immigration combined with this multiculturalist phenomenon in the United States has the tendency to tear us apart and to do great damage to this country.

My friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), when he stood up he talked about courage and that sort of thing to say these things, but really it is imperative that all of us address these issues.

I came across this, and I will just end with this. This is a speech given by Enoch Powell in England, 1968, on the issue of immigration. He said,

The supreme function of statesmanship is to provide against preventable evils. In seeking to do so it encounters obstacles which are deeply rooted in human nature. One is that by the very order of things such evils are not demonstrable until they have occurred. At each stage in their outset there is room for doubt, for dispute, whether they be real or imaginary. By the same token they attract little attention in comparison with current troubles which are both indisputable and pressing. Once the besetting temptation of all politics is to concern itself with the immediate present at the expense of the future. Above all, people are disposed to mistake predicting troubles for causing trouble,

and even for desiring trouble. "If only," they love to think, "if only people wouldn't talk about it, it probably wouldn't happen." Perhaps this habit goes back to the primitive belief that the word and the thing, the name and the object are identical. At all events, the discussion of future grave, with effort now avoidable, evils is probably the most unpopular and at the same time the most necessary occupation for the politician. Those who knowingly shirk it, deserve, and not infrequently receive, the curses of those who come after.

I choose to avoid that particular environment. I do not want to have to look back and think, I wonder how this all happened? I wonder what happened to the Nation that I knew? And I do not want to have to try to explain to my children and to my grandchildren that it happened on my watch and that I did nothing, I did absolutely nothing to prevent it.

□ 2145

I want to convince them that I tried my best and so I will come back to this well of the House and as long as I am able, on as many occasions as I possibly can, to discuss this topic and to try and get our colleagues and the American people, to get our colleagues to reflect the attitudes and the opinions of the American people, 70 percent of whom agree with everything we are saying here tonight who are asking our own government for help, like this family that I brought to my colleagues' attention earlier and like the millions of others who are seeking to deal with the massive immigration and the negative effects it has had on their lives.

The people of this country know there is something wrong. I do not think there is a bigger divide between what the people of this country want and what the government is willing to give them than it is on this immigration issue.

So we will do everything we can; and as I say, I certainly appreciate the efforts of those who have labored in this particular environment long before I came here, like my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY), and others who I know have been sounding this alarm for a long time. I join them in that chorus, and I ask for my colleagues' support.

#### LESSONS LEARNED SINCE 9/11

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I thought that I would discuss some of the lessons learned since 9/11 and discuss some of the current events that we are seeing happen on a daily basis and put them into some historical perspective.

First of all, 9/11. Let us note that 9/11 was not an unavoidable natural occurrence. 9/11, an attack upon the United

States by an organized group of terrorists, happened because past American policies toward Afghanistan were wrong and because during the Clinton administration our general policy of weakness led our enemies to the conclusion that they could attack the United States of America and murder our people by the thousands and that there would not be the type of repercussions that they have had to endure since they did attack our country on 9/11.

I have spoken extensively about the past policies about Afghanistan which led to the establishment of a Taliban, an extremist Islamic state in Afghanistan, which then was used as a base of operations for a terrorist organization that was committed to attacking the United States of America and killing as many of us as possible.

I have also spoken in the past about 9/11 representing not only a mistake in policies but also a major, major screw-up on the part of America's intelligence organizations. 9/11, while the policies that we had as a country helped lead us to that situation, we should have at least been protected by our CIA, the FBI, and the national security administration. But what happened?

We were blind-sided. We were blind-sided not just in an attack that cost the lives of thousands of Americans, but we were attacked by an organization, the al Qaeda, which had already been declared the number one enemy of the United States and the number one target of our intelligence community. The number one target of America's intelligence community, a community made up of organizations: the CIA, the FBI, the NASA, DIA and many others. These people receive tens of billions of dollars a year in order to protect us; yet the number one target of American intelligence carried off an extremely complicated plot against the United States that spent tens of millions of dollars putting a minimum of 100, if not hundreds, of people in the field who must have known about this; yet they were able to carry it off and to bring down the Trade Towers in New York and killing 3,000 of our fellow Americans. Let me add, had this happened a half an hour later or an hour later, it would have been tens of thousands of Americans and not 3,000 Americans.

Let me just note that we have learned a lesson from 9/11. The CIA since 9/11, I am happy to report, has gone to great lengths to make up for their shortcomings prior to 9/11. The same with the FBI. The same with NASA. Apparently they learned the lesson.

I remember when I worked in the Reagan administration back in the 1980s; and in 1983, almost just about 20 years, a little more than 20 years ago, right as we speak, Ronald Reagan put America's military forces on alert and sent them to the island country of Grenada in the Caribbean, which was going through a turmoil when a radical group

of Communists took over that country. I remember that inside, that was a victory supposedly for the Cold War, and we did return democracy to Grenada; but the liberation of Grenada itself was a catastrophe.

All of our military forces found that they could not communicate with one another. Most of the casualties we suffered, and we suffered almost as many casualties in Grenada as we suffered in taking on Iraq and Afghanistan and Grenada was just a tiny little country, but most of the casualties in the liberation of Grenada were friendly fire casualties. Most of those who died in our military, it was because our own military people were not cooperating. They learned that lesson, I might add.

The leaders of our military took it to heart what they had seen and how embarrassed they were that they were not being serious about their job, and they reconfigured our national military; and today we have such a superb military, headed by, I might add, a man of vision and a decisive leader, Mr. Rumsfeld; and Secretary Rumsfeld and the leadership of our military have just given us one of the most profound military victories, one of the most astounding military victories in the history not only of the United States but of the world.

We took on, with very few casualties on our part, fewer than 200 casualties, we liberated Afghanistan, and we liberated the people of Iraq and the people of Iraq and Afghanistan was, of course, thousands of warriors against us and a terrorist army of thousands. Then in Iraq, we had one of the 10 biggest armies in the world, one of the biggest armies in that region who were certainly a major force; yet we took them on in just a matter of weeks. That is because we did what was necessary to reform our system back in the 1980s and to equip our people with the technology they needed.

The CIA, the FBI, the NSA are now going through that same kind of reform and soul-searching that took place in the 80s after Grenada. Already there have been some major successes. Many of them have not been announced to the public, but our CIA, for example, I know thwarted an assassination attempt on King Zahir Shah of Afghanistan, and there were no praises sung for this; but yet people in the know realized that since 9/11 and over these last few months and last years we have seen a new attitude emerge.

Perhaps it is due to the leadership our President, President Bush, is giving; and I would certainly say that our President has risen to the occasion and since 9/11 has shown himself to be a world-class leader and historic leader of our country.

This President has learned we should, when possible, have our local allies do the fighting for us. Let them fight for their freedom, and let us be there to help them. This is what President Bush, the strategy he laid forward in Afghanistan; and it is very similar to

the strategy that Ronald Reagan laid down and was called the Reagan doctrine and how he ended the Cold War. Reagan's doctrine was let us not just do it just with the American military might, but let us depend on helping local people win their own freedom; and that is what we did in Afghanistan, and President Bush also made sure that the people of Iraq knew that our purpose was there to help them liberate themselves, not to occupy their country.

Of course, we learned, and it was confirmed, that America's investment in weapons technology was well worth it, and we did go through a time in the 1990s in our predecessor's administration when there were dramatic decreases in the defense budget; and yes, certain decreases in the defense budget were warranted after the Cold War, but we managed to keep those technology weapons alive; and those developments of the laser systems that are offshoots of missile defense and other types of programs, we managed to keep them in the budget and not just is the defense budget being used as a social welfare distributing system for different systems for different groups that were preferred that our people wanted to make political fronts with. Instead, we kept it a fighting unit; and that was one of the accomplishments of this Congress, as well as working with the Clinton administration.

What did that lead us to? It led us to fewer than 200 American deaths in liberating Afghanistan and Iraq. What an enormous achievement that was.

Let us now make sure that we pay attention to what was learned; also what have we learned from what we have gone through, what we should have learned that we should not pay attention to the liberal whiners who always have seemed to be around.

There is a myth that during the Reagan years the Cold War was ended because of some kind of bipartisan cooperation. I will tell my colleagues from the inside of the White House, we did not see much bipartisan cooperation. Yes, there were about one-fourth of the Democrats who were willing to stand by the administration when the fighting was hardest with the Communists; but by and large, every time Ronald Reagan tried to make a stand against the Communists during his 8 years as President, there was an active group of people on the other side of the aisle who were doing their best to fight those who were fighting Communism. They were anti-, anti-Communists; and it is a miracle that the President was able to succeed in the way he did with the type of people who were undermining his efforts.

The Communists invested in a whole bunch of intermediate range missiles they put into Europe and immediately said let us have a freeze and left them in a position of superiority, and then we have the nuclear freeze movement which was supported by, unfortunately, many people on the other side of the

aisle; and Ronald Reagan stepped forward and said, no way, we are not going to freeze them into a superior position, and then offered, as Ronald Reagan always does and always did, a positive alternative, let us bring the number of missiles down to zero, let us agree to eliminate the class of intermediate range of missiles in Europe which, by the way, he was called names. He was made fun of. They called him an amiable dunce. They were suggesting he does not know what he is talking about, the Russians will never agree to that; and of course, within 5 years there was an agreement signed with the Russians to do precisely that.

These whiners have been with us every time America takes a stand, and it is not just against Communism. We are talking about, these are people predicting doom whenever we try to act. It seems there are people that are part of our political system, part of our political spectrum here that have a compulsive lack of faith in America itself, and they were suggesting all kinds of horrible scenarios of what was going to happen if we took a stand and acted against Saddam Hussein; and they were the ones claiming within a very short period of time after Afghanistan started, oh, are we bogging down in Afghanistan.

After 1 week of fighting, well, remember, let us not forget these predictions and let us learn from them. It was predicted that there would be a major tank battle, Saddam's Republican Guard was going to engage us in a major tank battle outside of Baghdad. Whatever happened to that? I will tell my colleagues what happened to it. We had the technology to destroy most of those tanks before they started moving up to any position where they could threaten our troops. What tank battles there were were limited. Our people were very brave; but by and large, that major tank battle, historic tank battle that would be on the scale of El Alamein and all the rest never happened.

□ 2200

What about the gas attacks and the nuclear attacks that were going to vaporize our soldiers, this fear which immobilized so many people. We have to stop our President from putting our troops in or they were going to be gassed and vaporized by nuclear weapons. That, of course, never happened.

Some ask what happened to the weapons of mass destruction the President was talking about? Let me just note I have been a strong supporter of the President from the very beginning. I have called for eliminating Saddam Hussein for many years. When I was first elected is when we went to the war in the Gulf and I told DICK CHENEY and Colin Powell then not to start this fight unless we are going to finish it. And yes, I have been critical of President Clinton, and now let us be critical of President Bush's father. He did not

finish the job. He left us vulnerable, and left a homicidal maniac in charge of the country of Iraq. Well, that was not the responsible course of action, just like many things that Clinton did were not responsible, but we had to make up for it.

I have never suggested that Saddam Hussein had to have weapons of mass destruction for us to justify joining with the people of Iraq or helping liberate the people of Iraq from this dictator or monster because he had a blood grudge against us. It was prudent for us to eliminate that dictator before he was able to amass these mountains of money that were predicted because of the oil revenues that Iraq could expect in the future years, these tens of billions of dollars. He would have bought himself a chemical, biological or nuclear weapon. He would not have to build it; he would have bought chemical and biological weapons. He would have overthrown the Saudis with the tens of billions of dollars of oil money that he was about to reap. No, it made no sense to leave that man there.

We can be proud our President made the stand, even while everyone was throwing up their hands and nitpicking and naysaying and predicting horrible things. How many times did we hear: Why did we rush to this? The President took month after month after month trying to work it out peacefully, and then he was castigated as if he was rushing into war.

We should remember that because those who were predicting weeks of house-to-house combat, building by building would have to be taken, and urban fighting. That never materialized. It never materialized. We kept saying the people of Iraq do not want to live in a dictatorship. And yes, President Saddam Hussein did have his gang of thugs that were somewhat of a threat, but the people of Iraq have by and large been on our side.

What about the massive demonstrations that were going to be precipitated by America's adventurism overseas? And of course as the war ran its course, opposition actually declined. The number of people going into these demonstrations and saying and having all of these very negative thoughts about our country and troop deployment, they decreased over the days of this military operation. And of course now that it has ended in a very successful way, no one is out demonstrating.

Remember if we did this, there were predictions that there would be chaos and destabilization throughout the Arab world and the region and there in the Persian Gulf. Oh, the instability this would create. There would be wars springing up everywhere and regimes falling and it would create a much less safe world. That did not happen, did it?

But we heard all of these predictions. Let us not forget them. Let us not forget who was making those predictions and the speeches we heard right here

on this floor by people making these very same predictions and doing their best to make sure that the American people had no confidence in their President's leadership during this vital moment in our history.

So what about the chaos and destabilization? It did not happen. What about the urban fighting that was supposed to go on for weeks? It did not happen. What about the vaporization of our troops with gas and nuclear weapons? That did not happen.

What about the Shiites rising up? There have been a few Shiite demonstrations, and most have been religious marches because under Saddam Hussein they were restricted from demonstrating their faith for 20 years. Finally, there are hundreds of thousands of them marching for their religious faith; but the left wing of this country, the news media, ends up characterizing that as being anti-American. No, the power play by some Shiites who are politically motivated in that direction numbered a couple thousand people, and we have made it clear to the people of Iraq that they are going to elect their own leaders and we are going to set up a system, we are going to work with them for a couple of years, and set up the institutions necessary for them to elect their own leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt some Shiites are going to be elected, but they are not going to be elected in the name of establishing a theocracy like Iran. They just got rid of their dictatorship. Clearly the people of Iraq would like to live in freedom; and yes, there are some powermongers there, but we are not going to let them get away with it, and the people of Iraq are not going to let them pressure their way into power.

Remember the predictions about the Turks. They were going to invade the Kurdish areas in the northern part of Iraq. These Turks were going to come in and grab the oil and there would be bloodshed and chaos. Funny thing, that prediction did not come true either. Just remember who made these predictions.

All I am suggesting is let us learn, America, from what we have just gone through so when people get up in the future and undercut a President who is trying to make a tough stand to secure the blessings of peace and liberty for future Americans we will be able to stick behind him and we will know that the naysayers will always be with us, and the naysayers will always try to undercut a President that is acting on the behalf of the United States of America perhaps because psychologically they just down deep have such little faith in our own system because they only see the flaws in America.

I see the flaws. There is no doubt that America has a multitude of flaws. Look, we had slavery in this country. We had slavery long after Great Britain eliminated slavery. We have had racism in this country over the years.

Let me point out that race relations to almost all of the other countries in the world in those days, they were just as bad as we were; but that does not excuse us, a country that Thomas Jefferson wrote down such wonderful founding principles as "Rights are given by God to every person." These are children of God, and we have not done right by many people here.

American Indians were not treated well, we know that. We know over the years we have had our share of corruption, but we know we, as Americans, have other things that we can be so proud of, that the average person has had so much more freedom here than in other countries. Even though there has been racial discrimination, we are going to try to work to end that. We have made a lot of progress in this.

Our Army during the Gulf War, if we look at who made up that Army, it was a little bit of America. Every American was there and represented, the leadership of the Army and the leadership of our country with Colin Powell and Don Rumsfeld standing side by side along with our President, George Bush.

We have throughout the administration and in Congress seen these great examples of progress, and throughout the countryside and cities throughout our country, there is not the racial hatred and animosity that there was. I personally sense since 9/11 a wonderful rebirth, if not a rebirth, maybe it is a birth for the first time, of a feeling of goodwill among all Americans. We have gone through these times before, but I think 9/11 has unified us as never before, and we are building upon that. This President is building upon that goodwill to try to help us improve this country.

One day in the Los Angeles Times, when we talk about what the President has put up with and the pessimism, and this is the day before yesterday, they had a front-page story talking about the quagmire that we are in in Iraq. Talk about naysayers. But what happened just today, look at the Los Angeles Times. The very next day they have a story detailing the emergence of new leadership in Iraq.

Something is wrong here. We cannot have a story one day where we are in the middle of a quagmire and the next day have a new democratic leadership emerging in a country that has been under a dictatorship for so long. The problem is we had critics and naysayers who have been speaking out in loud voices and repeatedly they have been wrong, they have been wrong, and they have been wrong.

What we need to do tonight and what we must do in the weeks and months and years ahead is not forget what they have been saying and how wrong they have been so we will not listen to them and take their advice and base it on pessimism, on just undue pessimism in the future.

America in the future, as we have had now, and thank God we have had a President that is not afraid to act, we

cannot be afraid to act if we are to be a prosperous people and if we are to live at peace and if our freedom is to be protected. We should have no apologies about acting in our own country's interest.

Let me repeat that because many of the people who are attacking our President are doing it based on some global strategy or some notion of what is going to happen in the world. We should have no compulsion about holding back when it is our country's interest, and I mean long-term interest. In the long-term interest of our country supporting the cause of freedom, supporting the cause of peace and freedom in this world, of liberty and justice for all as we say, this is in America's interest.

Ronald Reagan demonstrated that acting on the behalf of freedom, acting on behalf of liberty and justice, helping to support the various people struggling against the Soviet Union and supporting those people that believed in democracy, that helped end the Cold War; and now President Bush has clearly demonstrated that America's most powerful and successful strategy is not based on coalition building and some international acceptance or global strategy. Instead, our most powerful and successful strategy is one that is based on promoting human freedom.

Look at what happened in the last few months. Our foreign policy establishment seems obsessed with pleasing the international foreign policy establishment. Our own State Department, these are the people who are supposed to be doing our bidding, their liberal allies in the press and the leadership of the Democratic Party, had George W. Bush jumping through hoops. And as President of the United States, they had him going from here to there groveling before the United Nations and begging our NATO allies to join with us or to at least give us your approval.

Why should we need the approval of the United Nations or of our NATO allies to go forward and to do what is in our national security interest as long as that is consistent with promoting the cause of human freedom? By the way, again, if we are not furthering the cause of freedom and democracy, we probably should have second thoughts about what we are doing. But our enemies are the enemies of freedom. The Taliban in Afghanistan, al Qaeda in Afghanistan, Saddam Hussein in Iraq, these people are enemies of the United States because we represent what is best in Western civilization.

□ 2215

We do not and should not need the approval of the United Nations to defend ourselves and to support other people who are struggling for freedom and democracy in far-off lands. Unfortunately, this has almost become a cliché about the United Nations. People think of the United Nations as our best hope. The United Nations is not our

best hope. The United Nations is our worst nightmare. I hope the American people after looking at what has happened these last few months will understand that too is a lesson that we need to have learned. The United Nations is still with countries that are vicious, ugly dictatorships at the same level of Saddam Hussein. The world's worst human rights abuser, Communist China, has a veto power over anything the United Nations will do. We see the United Nations putting countries up that are dictatorships and human rights abusers. Fidel Castro ends up on the Human Rights Commission; and we end up being removed. Syria, you name it, these countries that do not have democratic governments, do not permit political opposition, end up in pivotal, decision-making positions.

Let us note that if we depend on the United Nations, we are going to pay a price anytime we have to do anything; and in this case it took so long, it almost undermined our entire effort in Iraq because it was just taking so much time, it would have put us in the middle of the summer and it would have compromised the entire military operation. But our President, trying to prove that he is going to do everything he can to bend over backwards in order to convince our allies and convince the United Nations that we respected their institutional prerogatives.

But what does it mean when you get the U.N. behind what you are doing? What it means is you have had to buy off the Communist Chinese. I do not know if we made any agreement, if our government ended up making an agreement with Communist China. I do not know. But I will tell you in the future, look very closely when people have a United Nations-based strategy. Perhaps in order for us to do something in our national security, they may demand that we never mention Tibet again. So we just write off the people of Tibet. Or how about other religious believers in China? Is that worth the price of getting their little approval in a vote in the United Nations? I say that is baloney. I say that is not worth it at all. There is no trade-off there. To get them to vote in the United Nations, that is worthy of us giving up millions of people in China who believe in God and so we will never mention it because we do not want to break our word to them that we are going to let them run their internal affairs now?

And then there are people in our State Department and throughout academe and the press who are trying to build this global strategy for America, yes, based on the United Nations which, as I say, very precarious, but then they want to, of course, set up an economic organization, the world trading organization, that will control trade and economic decisions so that we will have economic harmony, another great dream just like the United Nations. But if you look real close, it is a disaster. It is a disaster waiting to happen. We will have panels set up that

will be making decisions for what? It will be making decisions on whether or not our economic policies are consistent with the international agreements. Who will be on the policy boards and the commissions? And who will be running these structures and making these determinations? People from third-world countries, like Burma. How about Nigeria? How about Bolivia or Colombia? Do we really want countries like this to be making determinations if we are in compliance with international economic regulations and agreements? The people who will be serving on these boards from those countries will be bought off in a heartbeat by the Communist Chinese. We will not buy them off because we are moral. We want to go by the system. But they will not think twice; our enemies and the thugs of the world will not think twice about this.

You do not want to go through the U.N., and you do not want to set up a world organization run by countries that are not democratic in order to depend on a prosperity and a peace for the people of the United States of America. We also do not want to rely on NATO and our NATO allies anymore. NATO served its purpose, and its purpose was to deter the Soviets from invading western Europe and that is done. That is totally done. The Soviet Union is gone. Now we have a democratic Russia, a Russia who is struggling to be democratic. We do not need NATO to protect the peace. NATO is a bureaucracy, and now we find that our NATO allies whom we believe that we can depend upon are not dependable allies. We find out that NATO is worthless, that France, Germany and Belgium and even our neighbor Canada are fair-weather friends, fair-weather friends who we cannot depend upon to help us when our liberty is being threatened and when we feel compelled to act.

We have just spent in the last decade billions of dollars to help these NATO allies out in the Balkans, which is part of Europe, part of their responsibility. Yet we spent billions of dollars, put our military people at risk, and they in return gave us the back of their hand. By the way, we still have thousands of troops in Kosovo, thousands of troops in Kosovo. Yet our German, our French, our Belgian and other allies cannot get themselves to help us at a time like this. We did have, and I will say something inspiring, a new concept. As the President moved forward, he said we will have an alliance of the willing. That was extraordinarily inspiring. Great Britain, of course, stood with us. Yes, I think Tony Blair should be given an honorary citizenship in the United States of America. He and the rest of the British people are our great friends. But the people of Spain stood with us. Poland. We found our friends in Bulgaria and the Czech Republic and, yes, we found that our Aussie friends, the Australians, stood by us and proved themselves to be there when it counted.

Let me note, when the Australians come to us, I may be a bit suspicious about the World Trade Organization and setting up a grand alliance with everybody in the world, democratic or not, and having those rules apply and be applied by an international organization controlled by all these countries. I have no problem with the free trade agreement with Australia. They have proven themselves to be our friends and they are democratic.

What about one other country that I have not mentioned here a bit, a lesson that we may have learned in these last few months? What about Russia? They were not with us, were they? I have paid close attention to Russia; and I have separated it out from the rest in terms of an analysis of their potential and how we should relate to them. The Russians, I believe, first and foremost wanted to be on our side in the crisis from which we have just emerged. They requested, however, that if they would be on our side in any attack on Iraq, that the \$8 billion that Iraq owes to Russia should not be canceled. They have a very weak economy right now. They are struggling in Russia. It was a very reasonable request for them to make, that if they were going to stand side by side with us, that we not let their economy take the \$8 billion hit of a cancellation of the debt the Iraqis owed the Russians. They also said, let us be part of rebuilding Iraq. Those were two reasonable requests. We did not follow through.

We could have had Russia and the United States standing together. It would have been an awesome picture to the world. It would have presented a picture of strength that would have been very difficult for anyone ever to ignore. It would have shown a new alliance for democracy in the world. It was just a very sad thing; and I believe that if the administration has made mistakes, and all of us do, it was a mistake in passing up this opportunity and not following through on it and putting the energy into making it work with Russia as we could have. Just as I say, the vision of Russia and the United States standing there would have so overshadowed the French and the Germans and the other whiners in Belgium and elsewhere, that everyone would have known it is a totally new world. But with Russia, sort of playing games with them and being sort of part of their team, it did give a greater image of strength to those opposing us than need be.

Let me just note this. That does not mean we had to just go along. We could be creative. We could just go along and say, The Iraqis can't cancel their debt to Russia. I understand some of our diplomats were saying that, saying if they end up having to pay the debt to Russia, that is, if they end up paying the debt, it will be a burden around the new democratic Iraqi government's neck. We cannot burden the Iraqi people with having to pay back Russia so that is why we did not take them up on

that offer. That is what I have heard. That is just a one-dimensional look at this issue. If we honestly felt that we wanted to have a democratic Iraq that was capable of acting without having to have that type of burden around their neck, we should have then told Russia, we will support your cancellation of Soviet-era debts to the German and French banks. That has been a burden around their neck all this time. We could have fulfilled their desire in a different way using a creative approach by letting the Russians cancel the debt to the German and French banks. That would have sent a very good message and at the same time protected the new democratic government in Iraq from having too much debt and a millstone around its neck. But we did not do it. As I say, it is something that is past now; but we are going to have to work to make up for that what, I believe, is a mistake.

There are ways that we can work with Russia. We need to help the reformers in Russia. I know that just a couple of weeks ago there was a liberal reformer who was assassinated in Russia, showing us that we have got to stand by the good people in Russia who are struggling and even putting their lives at risk to try to build a more democratic and more decent place in what was the Soviet Union. So let us give the Russians a way to work in partnership with us and not to be considered an outsider. We did not do that during this Gulf War, this Gulf War II; we did not go out of our way to do that as we should have. The Columbia shuttle disaster, however, let me note, I am not only on the Committee on International Relations but I am also the chairman of the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee of Science, so I oversee NASA.

Let me say, the Columbia shuttle disaster, yes, it was a horrible thing and sometimes, as the Chinese say, opportunity and challenges are part of the same word. We have great opportunities in how we are going to deal with the shuttle disaster Columbia. It permits us a chance to work even closer with Russia in the satellite area and in the area of the international Space Station and space transportation. They have rocket engines in Russia that are superior to the rocket engines of the United States. We need not spend money to develop rocket engines in the United States when we can buy that type of capability from the Russians themselves. Let us let them get into the game of selling their services to the world; and when they do have something to sell, let us not cut them out by protecting our own industries. Our industries have to compete with them. Instead of spending money replicating what the Russians can do, let us spend our research dollars developing newer technologies and leapfrog technologies that will put us ahead of the game.

I know that there are some restrictions on Russia, especially in cooperating with Russia in this arena, in the

space arena, because Russia is building a nuclear power plant for the Iranians. I agree, they should not be doing that. The Iranians have oil and natural gas. They do not need a nuclear power plant. There is only one reason that they would want that and that would be to build a nuclear weapon and we will not permit that to happen. But we cannot just lay it on Russia. It is in our interest not to have the nuclear power plant built, and walk away, just like we were saying to them, you are going to have to join us and have the risk of losing that \$8 billion in Iraq, you are going to have to absorb the cost.

This is a country that is just struggling to have a decent economy to help their people raise their standard of living which has been going down for years. Now they have a chance to raise it. We should not be trying to undercut them, but let us use some creativity here. If they cannot build a nuclear power plant for Iran because Iran is controlled by hostile powers, let us help the Russians build a nuclear power plant for Turkey. Or how about Australia? Or how about the Philippines?

□ 2230

These are countries that need electricity. We could probably arrange and guarantee a loan from the World Bank, and it would not even cost us any money. We would just have to help guarantee it and arrange the business deal, and then the Russians could build that; and they would be building something that would not be a threat to us like it is in Iran, and then we could move forward with a number of space-related projects in which both countries would benefit. But it takes creativity and a commitment to freedom in American foreign policy. And the struggle for freedom, the direction of Russia, is one of the pivotal fights in our time. If Russia goes in the way of democracy in the West and builds up these economic relations with the people in the Western democracies, especially in the United States, our world will prosper and will live in peace. If it goes the opposite direction, if it begins to more align itself with China, which has an anti-view of Western Civilization and is a belligerent country to democracy or if it starts to align itself with the thugs of the world, then there will be a lot of trouble in the world ahead and the Russian people and the American people will suffer because of it. So let us have a freedom-based policy and work with those people in Russia and elsewhere looking to promote a freer society.

Unfortunately, that is not the basis of what our State Department uses to decide upon American foreign policy. After looking at the American State Department up close now for about 15 years, actually probably more like 20 years now because it has been 7 years in the Reagan White House, I would say that if there is one word that is the

goal of the State Department, it is not globalism, it is stability. They believe in a foreign policy which they call a pragmatic foreign policy, which is based on a formula for stability.

Ironically, and this is what is so ironic, pragmatism as a strategy does not work. It is idealism and the ideals of freedom and democracy that work, that help to build a more stable world. We receive stability when we put freedom and liberty and justice into the equation while we are trying to figure out what we should be doing in various parts of the world; and it is only when we have liberty and justice as part of that decision-making concept that we will find that peace is possible.

For example, in Kosovo here we are still. Years and years and years we have been in Kosovo. I remember when I was down on the floor predicting that it was going to be a decade before we got out of Kosovo, and we were assured by all those people who voted for this at President Clinton's request, it will be 1 year, a 1-year deployment. Sure. We should not forget that either. We should remember all the lessons we have learned over these last few years. We are still in Kosovo, and do the Members know why we are in Kosovo? We have got thousands of troops in Kosovo because our State Department has basically convinced themselves that we cannot recognize Kosovo's right to have their own country. In Kosovo 90 percent of them are Muslims; they are Albanian extraction. They want to have their own country just like the Croatians want their own country, just like the Slovenians want their own country, and they have got their own little country; and there is no reason why they cannot, except that would make the Serbs really mad. So in order for the Serbs not to get angry, to make sure that there is not a crisis, to ensure stability of the moment, we have kept our forces in Kosovo all of this time.

We should have worked a long time ago in order to build a consensus and reach compromises within the Kosovo society for there to be free elections and there to be a referendum; and the people of Kosovo should decide with a vote, with their own vote, whether or not Kosovo should be independent. I have no doubt that they would vote for their independence, and then we should support them in building their own defense forces to protect their borders and just let the Serbs know that, I am sorry, they cannot attack the Kosovars. They cannot attack the Macedonians; and whatever they declare their national sovereignty, they cannot attack the Slovenians, the Bosnians. I am sorry, but Serbia has got to be enough for them. By the way, each one of those countries has a map of a greater Serbia or a greater Albania or a greater Croatia, claiming that their borders used to be way down here and thus they should control it even though the vast majority of the people in those areas are no longer Croatian

or Serbian or whatever, no. Where the majority of people want to be part of a government, we let them vote on it; and if they want their independence, they have a right to declare their independence. God gave them the right to control their own destiny through the ballot box.

That is what the United States of America is supposed to be all about. We developed a system which works. It is practical, but the basis of the system is an understanding that people have a right to control their own destiny through the ballot box, and they have a right to live in peace and freedom and dignity.

In Afghanistan we are making the same kind of mistake as we are making in Kosovo. And our State Department has again proven itself totally incapable of appreciating America's experience and America's ideals of how we solve things. In Kosovo they will not let these people have their own country even though the vast majority of them want their own country because it might make the Serbs mad. In Afghanistan there are many, many different ethnic groups. And in Afghanistan the major ethnic groups, they call them the Northern Alliance right after we were attacked, and this Northern Alliance is an alliance of ethnic groups, which compose about 50 percent of the population; they were the ones who fought the Taliban, those people, and they have militias. And their militias and their generals, which they call them warlords, which is very pejorative, they fought the Taliban and kicked the Taliban out while a huge chunk of the population of Afghanistan did not fight the Taliban. They sort of sat it out. They are called Pashtans, and the Pashtans of course share Pakistan and Afghanistan. And guess what? Now our State Department, so we do not make the Pakistanis mad, we have to have the Pashtans in power in Afghanistan.

That is not what this is all about. We believe in democracy. We believe in people controlling their own destiny through the ballot box. Our State Department is pushing the French model in Afghanistan. The French model is when there is a strong central government and it appoints the police chiefs, the head of the local schools, the people who provide local services; and they do not have local government really. They have a strong central government. What do the Members think about these five ethnic groups that fought alongside the United States against the Taliban and we are telling them they have to disarm and basically let the strong central government, which is now dominated by another ethnic group who did not fight the Taliban, control them?

I recently went to Afghanistan and helped work out a compromise, and the compromise is very easy. The warlords supposedly, their ethnic groups or their militias, will disband their armies. They will demobilize. They will disarm. But they have to be guaranteed

the right to elect their own mayors and city councils, to elect their own provincial governors, just like here in the United States. Why is it the State Department cannot understand what made America successful? This is what made America successful. We do not centralize power in order to bring about a more peaceful society. We diffuse power and we let everybody share in it, and we have people electing the people who will most affect them.

I will tell the Members I do not understand why the State Department does not understand, but they are pushing the wrong way in Afghanistan. It will not work there, and it is going to cause more trouble and it is not working. It is keeping us tied up in Kosovo. We need to make some decisions here, and we should not be leaving it up to the professionals of the State Department. The professionals at the State Department, when they are negotiating, they are not negotiating, as I have just pointed out, from the idea of what is best for America or even what is most consistent with the American way of government. Instead, they have an ideal of their own in mind. It is a worldwide pragmatic organized world based with United Nations, with the WTO, with all of these world health organizations, world trade organizations, and this is the dream of the people who are representing us. So when we go into negotiations and we try to have our government directed one way or the other, we end up not having America's interest and America's ideals in place. They are not part of the bargaining table. The people on the other side of the bargaining table, they know that they are bargaining for what is good for their country. Our people are bargaining for what is good for the world, what is good for the global vision of the world.

A few years ago the Euro was in trouble. The Euro was in trouble. The dollar of the European Economic Alliance was in trouble. Why is it in our interest to help them build an economic coalition that is aimed at undercutting us? Why should we build our competitors up in Europe? Why should we help them build a currency that permits them to undercut the United States of America? Why did we do this? And this was about 4 years ago, the Euro was collapsing, and we took money from our own account here in the United States that should be aimed at stabilizing the American dollar, and we took it over there and we stabilized the Euro. We should not want our competitors to do well. Our job is to watch out for the people of the United States of America. Instead of these large grandiose worldwide treaties based on economics, we should be going individually to countries like Australia, for example, and having agreements, Japan and elsewhere, having bilateral agreements that we will insist on being enforced with other democratic countries rather than putting ourselves at the mercy, at the mercy, of organiza-

tions that will be controlled by people from countries that do not share our ideals. Yet our own State Department has this type of world as their goal.

Let me just note that during the time when our President was trying to do the bidding of the State Department and trying to jump through the hoops, trying to have a strategy based on what they wanted him to do, things seemed to bog down. It looked like we were weak and that our President lost his purpose and was not going to be following through. He kept saying that he was, but it became tiresome. It was frightening for a moment to think that he might back down. Instead, that all changed when the President gave a speech before the American Enterprise Institute, and that is when he outlined the moral basis, not just the pragmatic basis. They were going to have regime change. Remember? They were going to have regime change. That was their goal. When he spoke at the American Enterprise Institute, and I believe that was the end of February, he outlined for the people of the world and for the people of Iraq that our goal was freedom and justice for the people of Iraq and that we will only stay there long enough to help them build a democratic system.

After that our effort was energized. After that there was no stopping the United States of America because we were the freedom fighters, and those who opposed Saddam Hussein and wanted democracy were our allies, and the President allied himself with those people all over the world who believed in freedom and justice and democracy, and most importantly he allied himself with the people in Iraq who believed in those things.

Yes, it is when we stay true to our ideals, it is when we have a morally based, a freedom-based foreign policy that America becomes unstoppable because our goal is not to dominate the world but to create, yes, a better world that is based on freedom, not based on more bureaucratic organizations, but on freedom and on people treating each other decently, on liberty and justice for all, as we have said many times.

□ 2245

We would hope that as we face these challenges in the future, that the people of the United States remember what we just went through and learn the lessons. Our military learned the lessons of the seventies and eighties. Our CIA and our intelligence agencies have learned the lessons of 9/11. But the American people need to learn the lessons of what we have just been through.

There will always be naysayers. There will be pessimists, people who do not believe in our system. There will be people who believe in a global approach, but not believe in America as a leader. But we must lead the way.

The President of the United States is doing a terrific job for us, but we as the American people must stand behind

any President that is willing to act in the cause of freedom. We must lead the world, because, if we do not, there will be no courage on the part of the people who believe in freedom and justice anywhere in the world, unless they know that the United States is with them, and we are with everyone throughout the world who would side with liberty and justice and against tyranny.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of primary elections in the district.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and May 7 on account of personal reasons.

Mr. BONNER (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of transportation delays.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WYNN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAUL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, for 5 minutes, May 7.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BASS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, May 7, 8, and 9.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, May 8.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WICKER, for 5 minutes, May 8.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, May 7.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, May 7, 8, and 9.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 7, 2003, at 10 a.m.