

open investigation of the rationale for war that was used by the Bush administration to assuage public doubts about preemptive, unilateral action against Iraq." Mr. Spalding from Akron, Ohio.

From Elyria, Ohio, Linda Mitchell writes, "As an American and one of your constituents, I want to know the truth behind what led up to the grossly unjust 'war' in Iraq. It is time for Congress to shed light upon what I believe we all know was the administration's misuse of the tragedy of September 11 to meet their own greedy need for oil." Ms. Mitchell from Elyria, Ohio.

From Strongsville, Ohio, John Regetz, Junior, "I strongly urge you to vote for the establishment of the commission to investigate the validity of the evidence that the present administration used to start the Iraq war. It appears to me that, for the first time in our history," for the first time in our history Mr. Regetz writes, "we unjustly started a war without first being truly provoked. I think the American people need to know the true facts about this whole mess we now find ourselves in."

Elizabeth from Akron, Ohio, "There is little argument that the past three years have been the saddest in our Nation's history. A nonelected President and his staff callously made critical decisions that deeply affect us all today and for generations to come. One such decision," she writes, "was to end the weapons inspection program and preemptively strike Iraq, supposedly before we were struck by weapons of mass destruction.

"Now, countless civilian and soldier deaths later, yet still no evidence of weapons of mass destruction, the administration is willing to admit that the intelligence leading to this mess was flawed. At the same time, they are talking about sending even more of our military personnel into the chaos that they have created."

Susan Clements, also from Akron, Ohio. Ms. Clements writes, It really is of crucial importance that we find out the truth in the matter. Lying to the American people about anything is troubling, but to lie about something like this is outrageous. Support for this war was lukewarm at best. Even that was a result of that argument. To date, thousands of people have died, a country has been devastated, a region thrown into turmoil simply to allow Bush's cronies to make a fortune by cleaning up the mess that he made. This is unconscionable. Please support the American people and hold them accountable. Thank you.

The last letter I will share with my colleagues as my time runs out is from Ron Collins of Barberton, Ohio. Mr. Collins writes, I am certain that you, like many of us here were frightened by the statements made in public back in the State of the Union and earlier by the Bush administration. If those statements were false, we must know of this Mr. Collins writes. Please show

America that you are not afraid to stand up for the rights of the people who put you in office. Despite any pressures you may have been placed under to ignore these issues, those of us in your district implore you to live up to the oath of office you took when you were sworn in.

I thank those people in Ohio that have shared their concerns with me and, most importantly, with the members of this body and with the American people because their concerns do indeed, Mr. Speaker, need to be heard.

IN MEMORY OF SPECIALIST JEFFREY MATTISON WERSHOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Specialist Jeffrey Mattison Wershow. A member of the Florida National Guard, Specialist Wershow served admirably before his life was tragically ended by an assailant in Baghdad a little over a week ago.

Jeffrey was the son of Jonathon Wershow and Ann Marie Mattison. At 22 years old, this young man managed to create a long list of accomplishments. After graduating from High School, Jeffrey enlisted in the Army and served for three years in the 82nd Airborne at Ft. Bragg. Upon fulfilling his obligation as an active duty soldier, Jeffrey received an honorable discharge from the Army and returned to Gainesville, Florida where he began pursuing his degree at Santa Fe Community College.

Everyone who knew Jeffrey recalls his vast knowledge of history and his lifelong desire to be a soldier. One of the most impressive things about this young man is that he had enough wisdom at such a young age to pursue both of his dreams. While continuing his education at Santa Fe and becoming actively and successfully involved in local politics, he also passionately served in the Florida National Guard.

Specialist Jeffrey Wershow was a soldier, a son, a brother, and a friend. He was also a proud American who we can all remember as an example of why this country is so great. I would like to offer my most sincere condolences to his family and friends.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take that time.

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

There was no objection.

MISUSE OF FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT RESOURCES

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is an old truism that the best defense is a

good offense. We have seen that here this afternoon in a quite effective way because Republicans, unable to defend their misuse of the United States Capitol Police against Democrats meeting in the Ways and Means library, have taken the offense in what I consider a very offensive way against our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

After the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) was told to "shut up" by another member of the committee, he responded with an insult, perhaps not appropriate, but certainly after significant provocation. To suggest that the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), a man of 72, surrounded by 20-plus Republican colleagues of lesser age, posed any threat to anyone is ludicrous on its face, and though it is not ordinarily done, since it has been done and incompletely by my colleague, the transcript uncorrected though it is, of the Committee on Ways and Means reflects that after the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) was told to shut up and he insulted his colleague who made that comment, that he then proceeded to say, come on, come on over here and make me, I dare you.

The transcript then reflects that laughter occurred and that thereafter, after additional comments by the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) that the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) declared recess is over, the classroom has been resumed.

Now some Americans and undoubtedly some commentators will be inclined to trivialize this entire incident as being mere childish behavior, with wrongs on both sides. There were no wrongs on both sides today.

The Capitol Police were not called out, as the transcript indicates, as the gentleman from California's (Mr. THOMAS) silence indicates, because of anything that the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) did, said, or implied. To suggest otherwise, indeed the suggestion of my colleague from Texas (Mr. BRADY) that the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) instigated this incident is an outrageous slur on the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) who is a person of integrity, even though sometimes of sharply worded comments.

The Capitol Police were targeted not on the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), but Officer Spriggs, who came into the library, indicated they were asked to clear the library where the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) was not even present.

We cannot allow our Federal law enforcement resources to be diverted for partisan political purposes such as occurred today. Even at this very moment, the Inspector General to the Department of Justice is investigating the misuse of the U.S. Attorney's Office, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the United States Marshal's involvement in tracking down courageous Texas State legislators who

made a stand against a similar partisan power grab. Just as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) called the Federal Aviation Administration to track down those Democrats, just as the Department of Homeland Security went after a cotton farmer from Texas to find out about his airplane, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) today diverted the Capitol Police from their important work in preserving public safety here in the Nation's capital for partisan political purposes.

This attempt to break up a meeting of Ways and Means Democrats is unprecedented for either party I believe in the history of this Congress. We did not walk out as our Texas State legislative colleagues so justly did. We attempted to walk into the process, having been handed moments before a bill that affects the pensions and the retirement security of millions of Americans, Republicans and Democrats, across this country, but yet as we attempted to walk into that process and develop and present our alternatives, the police were called here in the Capitol to stop us from doing that job.

Americans who share the concern of the abuse, indeed of the extremism, of the majority need to be concerned about what happened here. It was not some fight among Members of Congress acting childish was a serious infringement on our democracy. Americans who are worried about us becoming a Nation of citizens who are supposed to choose between saying "me too" and shutting up, these Americans cannot afford to be silent. No party, no person has a monopoly on the truth.

Dissent is not some inconvenience in this Congress or in this country, and it certainly does not warrant calling out the Feds, whether it is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) calling out for the G-men in Texas or the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) calling out for the Capitol Police in Washington.

It is the cornerstone of our democracy that we have dissent and differences of opinion in this country, and yet it is the strength of our democracy. We will not be intimidated. We will not back down. Too many Americans, working families who need our help, also need our voice.

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

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

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

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

ANTI-AMERICANISM ACCORDING TO NEWT GINGRICH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday this House of Representatives passed legislation to authorize funding for the Department of State, for the conduct of U.S. foreign policy, and to provide direction and guidance in the area of foreign policy. We are fortunate indeed to have hundreds of men and women working for the State Department here and around the world who have dedicated their lives to public service and are committed to serving our country at home and abroad.

These public servants had been recently subjected to outrageous and unwarranted attacks by the former Speaker of this House, Newt Gingrich. In a scurrilous article in the current issue of Foreign Policy, entitled *Rogue State Department*, and in an earlier speech he gave before the American Enterprise Institute, Mr. Gingrich accuses the men and women of the State Department of nothing less than undermining the status and respect of the United States around the world.

In his article, Mr. Gingrich asserts that the cause of rising anti-American sentiment around the world is that the men and women of the State Department have "abdicated values and principles in favor of accommodation and passivity." He accuses them of propping up dictators, coddling the corrupt and ignoring secret police abuse around the world. This from the man who was Speaker of this House, led this body in a three to one vote against President Clinton's Bosnia policy, a policy that started the process leading to the overthrow of the war criminal Mr. Milosevic.

Mr. Gingrich's article piggybacks on an earlier speech he gave before the American Enterprise Institute here in Washington in which he claimed the State Department was engaging in a quote "deliberate and systematic effort to undermine President Bush's foreign policy." These are extremely serious charges. Before making such serious charges, one would think that a person who wanted to be taken seriously would provide some credible evidence. He does not.

Let us start with the fact that it is the President of the United States, not the foreign service or any other career civil servants, who selects the top policy-makers at the Department of State, beginning with the Secretary of State. Indeed, the top jobs in State Department are awarded to political ap-

pointees of the President, starting with Secretary of State Colin Powell. They are the captains of the ship. They set the vision, they establish the policies and they give the orders.

If Mr. Gingrich believes what he writes, that the State Department is a culture that props up dictators, coddles the corrupt and ignores secret police, then his complaint is with President Bush who appointed the political team at the Department and who are charged with ensuring that the policies of the President are carried out.

The fact of the matter is Mr. Gingrich provides not one single example in his article of where the career foreign service or other civil servants of the Department of State have refused to carry out the policies established by the Secretary of State and the President.

What does he refer to as exhibit A in his capital case against the men and women of our State Department? He points to an internal analysis done by the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. That is the bureau within the Department of State responsible for analyzing intelligence information we collect and analyzing that information, and he suggests that the Bureau of Intelligence and Research and that that information, that some of the information collected, that our post-war challenges in Iraq are more daunting than President Bush's sunny rhetoric suggests.

Specifically, in a portion of his article entitled *Out of Sync*, he contrasts statements made in a speech given by President Bush to statements made in an internal, confidential assessment by the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. In a speech in Dearborn, Michigan, the President stated, "I have confidence in the future of a free Iraq. The Iraqi people are fully capable of self-government." The internal State Department analysis reportedly stated that "Liberal democracy would be difficult to achieve in Iraq," and that "electoral democracy were to emerge, could well be subject to exploitation by anti-American elements."

One does not have to be a rocket scientist to understand that the statements made in the INR memo are reasonable conclusions. The facts on the ground in Iraq have demonstrated clearly that liberal democracy would be difficult to achieve in Iraq, not impossible, but certainly difficult. It is a challenge ahead.

It is also obvious that elections in Iraq could be exploited by anti-American Islamic fundamentalist forces.

□ 1730

That does not mean we should not support elections. Of course we should. But we should be clear-eyed about the possible consequences.

The important point here is not so much that Mr. Gingrich is blind to the obvious accuracy of these assessments that were made in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. The issue is