

Lerone Bennett, Jr. and to such publishing standards as the New Ebony Cookbook. For those who would like to know more about the life and work of John H. Johnson, they also published his autobiography, *Succeeding Against the Odds*.

The Johnson Publishing empire also encompasses Fashion Fair Cosmetics and Supreme Beauty Products, headed by Mrs. Eunice Johnson. The Ebony Fashion Fair is the world's largest traveling fashion show and raises money for scholarships and charities in the United States and Canada.

John H. Johnson has received the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Spingarn Medal, the Horatio Alger Award, the USC Journalism Alumni Association Distinguished Achievement Award, the Black Journalists' Lifetime Achievement Award and countless other awards and recognitions.

Awards are nice, but I suspect that Mr. Johnson takes the greatest pleasure in watching as his daughter, Linda Johnson Rice, joins him in managing Johnson Publishing as its president and chief operating officer.

Mr. Speaker, John H. Johnson's dream has profoundly influenced America and its people. We are all impacted for the better by his vision and his implementation of that first of our great freedoms, the freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

On September 26, Howard University will be holding its 136th opening convocation and will celebrate the accomplishments of communications pioneer John H. Johnson. In January, Mr. Johnson made a \$4 million contribution to the School of Communication at Howard, which will be renamed in his honor. Mr. Johnson, a firm believer in education, is a great contributor to the United Negro College Fund and many other charities.

Mr. Speaker, John H. Johnson may truly be said to be one of America's greatest living treasures. I congratulate him and his family for their contributions to America.

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.)

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2555, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-281) on the resolution (H. Res. 374) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2555)

making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2557, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-282) on the resolution (H. Res. 375) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2557) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 2015

NOT ALL DOOM AND GLOOM IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, this last Sunday in the Minneapolis Star Tribune on the front page of the opinion section was a picture in Iraq, and above this picture it says, "Look at this picture. What do you see?" And then it lists a couple of counterpoints, including one from myself. If you look at the picture, you see a market in Mosul, and you see some fruits up front, you see some women dressed in clean, neat clothes. You see a market with the shelves full, and you see a U.S. soldier from the 101st Airborne watching over that market and making sure that it stays secure.

Some in this Chamber have expressed doom and gloom as to what they see. As we listen to the articles in the paper and the TV and the radio, too often we hear that saying, doom and gloom. But there is a different picture that I am going to try to, with several of my colleagues, bring out today. Those who have been to Iraq, as I have, and many of my colleagues, have seen a different picture. There are two sides to this story, and I would argue that the story of advancement, of progress, of moving towards a democracy and an open government, an open economy, is the more accurate picture.

I was challenged recently by someone back home in Minnesota who said, Mark, why is not anybody else saying anything positive about Iraq? And my answer would be, well, I am not sure that anybody is reaching beyond some of the press they are getting, because not everybody is going to Iraq, not everybody is looking at other sources.

Mr. Speaker, it was Thomas Jefferson who said that you would be better educated if you read nothing than if you read nothing but papers, newspapers, and that is, unfortunately, the case in this situation.

Mr. Speaker, the press does a better job of reporting crashes than landings. We are certainly having great reporting of the crashes, but the landings and the progress that we have seen, with progress towards quality of life, progress towards getting Iraqis governing themselves, and progress towards more stability, more freedom in a country that is very diverse and has great potential is something that we are going to try to bring out here today.

As I mentioned, I will have several folks joining me, and I would, first of all, like to welcome the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) for some comments that he has.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota. The gentleman has actually been to Iraq, he has been to Baghdad, and he has seen on the ground many of these things of which we are speaking about tonight. As the gentleman points out, we are not really getting, if you rely just on 24-hour news and the newspapers and coverage, we are not really getting the whole picture, the full picture. I am glad that the gentleman was part of a group that recently was in Iraq who could see for themselves and understand that, as he points out, how much progress is being made.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of discussion, of course, about where the weapons of mass destruction are, where is Saddam Hussein, and, of course, we want answers to those questions. But what the public needs to understand is that progress is definitely being made. Nobody denies the existence of Saddam Hussein, and I think we will ultimately find him. But let me just point out a little bit of information that I think is important on this issue.

The Iraq Survey Group is tasked with the search for the weapons of mass destruction. The ISG has between 600 and 800 personnel in Iraq and is headed by former U.N. inspector David Kay. The Iraq Survey Group's highest priority is the hunt for weapons of mass destruction. They have formed quick reaction teams to explore sites indicated by intelligence. The Coalition Provision Authority has actually offered a reward of up to \$25 million for the capture of Saddam Hussein. And, of course, this same type of incentive is what led to the finding and the killing of Uday and Qusay.

So a lot of progress is being made. We have the inspectors on the ground, and we are following up on every lead. This is just one of the things that I wanted to point out, and the gentleman from Minnesota, of course, knows that because he has been there and he has seen it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, one of the first things I did

when we landed in Baghdad was I asked the general in charge there, I said, how are things here relative to what we are hearing back home? And he said, with a combination of disgust and disappointment, that it is total distortion. There are so many things that are going on positive here. We in our group saw that. We had a bipartisan group of 11 Members. We went to Mosul, to Tikrit, to Babylon. We drove around in Baghdad, visited the police academy, visited the hospital, met with folks from Iraq who had recently been elected to city councils and to provincial councils, and what we saw was progress in every direction. As we flew over Iraq at night, the lights were on. As we drove through even Baghdad, the markets were up. There were cars and, in fact, traffic jams even in Baghdad as people were getting on with their lives.

As we went up to Mosul, we went in a garden variety tour bus, 11 Members of Congress, through the markets of Mosul, and, for the most part, most of the citizens did not really pay much attention to us. They were just going about their normal life in the progress of rebuilding. We passed by schools and hospitals that were rebuilt.

So having all of the hospitals up and running again and the schools up and running is great progress, and that is something I was very pleased to see. I know the gentleman as a physician can appreciate what we are doing on the health care side, and I think on all of those fronts we are making great progress.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, yes, and I am so glad the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) brought that up, because there are some 240-some hospitals in Iraq, and many of them are being brought back on line, and there is a lot of work that is being done. The gentleman points out the fact that schools are being built, hospitals are being reopened. Much of the infrastructure is markedly improved.

Electricity is an example. I think currently there are 3,200 megawatts of electricity being generated. The prewar level was 4,000. The national demand is estimated to be 6,000, but the Coalition Provision Authority plans to reach 4,000 megawatts by August. Baghdad is receiving, the city of Baghdad, 1,200 megawatts. Prewar levels were 2,500, averaging 3 hours on and 3 hours off each day.

So we are definitely making progress, as the gentleman points out, and not only in the infrastructure, but, as he also mentions, in health care, and in water as well. Much of Iraq is at prewar water level supply levels now. There is no critical shortage of water.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I would say the gentleman is absolutely right on all of those counts. One of the reasons that possibly explains why we get such negative press is that Iraq, like America, is a very diverse country, with a lot of different ethnic groups and different regions

throughout the country. And one of those, the Sunni Arabs from which Saddam came, represents about 15 percent or maybe 20 percent of the total population, and that group as a whole received preferential treatment. So as we compare their state today versus where they were before, it is not quite as attractive as the Shiites in the south that were really abused and tortured and done things to that one would not even want to describe in some cases, but some of them as vicious as rerouting the river so that they could not cultivate their crops. Similarly, the Kurds in the north were treated in a like fashion.

There were three electrical grids in Iraq prior to us coming in there, and even today; one electrical grid to make sure that all of Saddam's palaces, his almost 50 palace compounds, were lit up around the country. The second was for the Sunni areas around Baghdad, because Baghdad was a showcase to the world to show the world that "I have a great country here." And the third went to the southern and northern regions if there was any left over. Now today, of course, we are treating everybody equal. So in and around Baghdad, it might not be quite up to their preferential status they received before the war, but in the 80, 85 percent of the rest of the country, they are doing significantly better.

We also have a situation in Baghdad that really is not talked about enough, and that is that 100,000 criminals, we are talking murderers and rapists and thieves, were let out just before the Americans took over, and their records destroyed, so that these criminals are wandering around the city causing untold havoc to the native Iraqis, making it a much riskier environment than it was before, as well as cheap criminals for hire to go after our soldiers. So within Baghdad, it is a much more challenging situation. It is much more difficult. It is much more risky.

Unfortunately, like any capital, that is where most of the press are. But I have to tell my colleagues, when one goes out beyond Baghdad, it is a lot calmer. One does not hear the reports of the attacks on American troops out there. They are working with the natives. They are making great progress. I remember driving down one country road and having several children run down the country driveway to come waving at us and showing their appreciation. And I have talked to many Members, even on the other side of the aisle, who have said one of the things that struck them most was just how appreciative the Iraqis were, particularly outside of Baghdad.

So there is good progress. It is not evenly distributed around the country, but that is because Saddam was not evenly treating people in the fashion that Americans have come to expect.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has pointed out something that is very important in regard to the fact that Saddam Hussein, at

the outset of the conflict, just opened the prison doors. I mean, he just literally opened those prison doors and turned all of these bad guys, and when I say bad guys, I am talking about murderers, onto the streets of Baghdad, particularly in the population center. Now, one can just imagine if we did that in this country. In my home State of Georgia, if we just all of a sudden opened that Federal penitentiary in Atlanta and let all of these people out on the street, the number of attacks, assault, battery, assault with a deadly weapon, murder, rape that would occur in the city of Atlanta, and one can understand. One begins to get, I think, a better picture.

But as the gentleman points out, there is not mass chaos in Baghdad. We have, yes, some very difficult things to deal with, as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) points out, Mr. Speaker. But let me give my colleagues this information about security and force protection that we have begun to restructure.

Coalition forces are on the offensive. They are putting constant pressure on the enemy to disrupt some of these attacks. The coalition forces are also deterring attacks with aggressive patrolling, cordons, and raids based on actionable intelligence. I do not think anything is more important than intelligence, and we are beginning to get that.

Currently the Coalition Provisional Authority has actually hired some 32,000 police officers nationwide, and 28,000 are already on the streets. The ultimate goal, by the way, is some 61,000. The police are conducting joint patrols with coalition forces.

So this picture that is being painted of mass chaos and everything on the backs of our brave American fighting force, they are doing a great job; they are doing a great job, but they are not doing it completely on their own. As I point out, we are hiring, we are putting Iraqi security forces on the street, and ultimately they will do the job. They will restore order for their own country.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia is very correct. Our soldiers are doing a fabulous job. They are rightly proud of the great work they are doing, and they are not alone. We have long known that the British have had a region of the country around Basra. But while we were there, down in Babylon, also in southern Iraq, they were preparing to turn that region over from the 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, which came in with the initial assault, and turn that over to a Polish-led division, and that has happened.

□ 2030

The Spanish are helping them, and just recently this week the remaining portion around Nasref was handed over to the Spanish, which was with that Polish division. So two of the six regions of the country are already being

administered by our allies, by a group of almost 30 countries that are providing 20, 25,000 troops; but the gentleman is absolutely correct.

The solution here is to have Iraqis protecting Iraqis, and while we were in Baghdad we met with the police academy; and Bernie Kerik, the former police commissioner from the city of New York City, is there on the ground in charge of helping to train these Iraqis. One of the most emotional statements that I heard during my whole trip there was when we were talking to the Iraqi general in charge of the police that are helping to secure Iraq right now.

He says as they come through the academy and they learn about the things that we take for granted here in Minnesota from our great police forces around the country and teach them respect for civilians, not to torture, civilian authority, so many other things to keep us secure and protect our civil liberties as well, he says, When they come, I challenge them to be heroes. He says, When I tell them about what a hero is, a hero is somebody who leaves their family, leaves their wife, leaves their children, leaves their parents, lives their familiarity of home and goes to a strange land, suffer through tremendous heat, tremendous deprivations and puts their life at risk for a stranger.

Hearing from him how appreciative he was for our soldiers, our Marines that are doing that each and every day and how he holds those men and women up as their heroes was a great comfort and a great reassurance to me, but it is not just from the police. We are adding them on the border patrol. We are adding civil defense units to guard units to take our troops out of those regions and have Iraqis protecting Iraq, and we are seeing that.

We had a second unfortunate attempt to bomb the U.N. headquarters in Baghdad; and if we see who it was that unfortunately lost their life in that attempt, it was the bomber himself and an Iraqi policeman that was on guard doing exactly what my colleague was talking about, guarding the treasures of Iraq, guarding their own security and protecting their own citizens. We are moving as fast as we can in that direction. They are taking it on very willingly, and that is a very positive step.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman mentioned about the heroism of our troops and of course some 130,000; and of course, he also pointed out that there are about 25,000 from other countries, indeed some I think the gentleman said maybe 20-or-so other countries, obviously the Brits, the Poles, and that is growing every day; but there is just no question that the commitment of the coalition forces and our own troops is strong.

They know what the mission is; and obviously, loved ones back home, spouses, parents, grandparents, they are concerned. Their youngsters, their

loved ones are in harm's way. Sure, they want them to come back home and they will come back home; but they know what their mission is, just as our men in World War II and the Korean conflict and other wars that we have been engaged in, they are committed and they will stay the course. I just could not be prouder of the job that they are doing there.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. I could not be prouder either and the gentleman is right. We have 130-or-so thousand, from I think it is up to 30 countries now. It is about 55,000 Iraqis on the job making sure that Iraqis are safe, and that number is growing. I think it is the Czech Republic that stepped forward to train another 25,000-or-so on a police program up in their country and get them more on duty to guard their own country.

One of the other things that is really very gratifying is that our soldiers are working with the people to make the country better; and as they go on these raids that the gentleman spoke of earlier and they are collecting a million dollars here, a hundred million dollars there as part of those raids of money that was stolen from the American people, they are putting it back to work on projects there in Iraq. In fact, there are 6,000 projects that have been completed and these might be cleaning up the school, making it more presentable and safe and a better learning environment, helping with the hospitals. We were in a neonatal institute there in Baghdad. Helping the water be a little bit cleaner, buying a fire engine for the local fire department, buying equipment for the local police department, on and on and on these projects are going on.

My favorite was the 101st Airborne brought 10,000 Screaming Eagle soccer balls for the children to have something to play with, but these are helping to move that forward in an endless number of ways and really making it a better country each day and I think helping to really have a positive working relationship between our brave men and women in uniform and the Iraqi people.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk a little bit about the cost. Of course, the President is coming to Congress now and asking for a supplemental appropriation to continue the efforts to win this war on terrorism, not only in Iraq and Baghdad but also in Afghanistan and really in the entire world. We hear a lot of discussion obviously about, well, how can we afford 87 additional billion dollars to continue this effort, and I want to just talk to the gentleman a little bit about that and maybe get into a discussion about cost and putting this in its proper perspective.

Obviously, \$87 billion is a big number and the question comes up, we hear it all the time, can the United States afford this war and continue to do everything else the President calls for? The answer is yes, in my opinion. We can-

not afford not to do what is necessary to win the war against terror, ensure a sustained economic recovery, and secure the homeland. The funding for the war is necessary and significant; but keep in mind, it is a temporary cost, and the cost of fighting the war is well below the cost of previous conflicts. In fact, \$87 billion is less than 4 percent of the entire Federal budget.

I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that people understand the total cost of the 9/11 attack. We are talking about hundreds of billions of dollars in costs just from that act of terrorism, and one study even pegged the cost to our economy of well over \$2 trillion. So we know that this effort that we are conducting in Iraq, this war against terrorism there, better there than on our own soil, and our continued expenditures for homeland security, it is a big number but it is small in comparison to what it would cost us and the devastating effect on this economy should we have another 9/11 occur anytime soon.

So I think it is real important that we put that in perspective, and I would like for the gentleman to speak to that if he would.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I would absolutely agree. The issue we have is we have a situation where we have a country that is in desperate need and has traditionally been a source of frustration for its own neighbors, disrupting the security of its own neighbors and contributing to terrorism and making us less safe here at home.

The question that I would have is when FDR decided that we were going to take Hitler out of Germany, did we ask how much it was going to cost? As I hear our friends on the other side of the aisle lambasting what is going on and lambasting the costs, it is a terrible cost to pay. I do not want to have to pay anything like that. It is something we have to watch over closely and make sure it is well spent, but we cannot not afford to pay it, and when they are talking, I say what if this was FDR? What if this was World War II? Would the same thing not apply?

If we look at what we did in Germany, what we did in Japan, we had the best track record of setting a region anew, setting a country anew. In the 50 years before 1945, Germany had helped initiate two world wars where millions of people had died. In the 50 years since, they have been a great contributor to prosperity, to world peace, a great friend and neighbor and a great friend of ours. We can say the same thing about Japan.

I have the very real sense that what will happen with our success, that we cannot afford to fail, we must win, we must create a democracy in Iraq, that we will have that same stark contrast between a disruptive past and a future that will benefit the region as much as it has in the past.

Mr. GINGREY. The gentleman is so right, and of course, people want to

say, well, we have not found any weapons of mass destruction, we have not killed or captured Saddam Hussein, so we have not accomplished the mission, the reason we went there; but of course, that was never the reason. As the gentleman from Minnesota points out, the reason for being there was to rid that part of the world of a dictator, of a tyrant; and of course, although we have not found a cache of weapons of mass destruction, in the process of looking, we have certainly found lots of evidence of mass destruction, that is, bodies, mass graves, where Saddam Hussein has murdered his own people.

As the gentleman points out, the main purpose is to bring some stability to the Middle East and to that part of the world as we effect this regime change; and make no doubt about it, that mission has been accomplished, and I wanted to just speak a little bit more, continue in that vein on cost, and it is actually estimated that since the Gulf War 10 years ago that the cost of containing Saddam Hussein, and that cost would be continuing if we were not rid of him, that cost over that 10-year period cost Americans at least \$30 billion, \$30 billion from the end of the Gulf War to the beginning of Operation Iraqi Freedom, for the military forces stationed in the Persian Gulf, patrols over the no-fly zone and, of course, associated costs.

So just appeasing, or if we want to say containing, Saddam and maintaining the status quo, as so many of our allies of the United Nations, countries who have been our friends and I think will continue to be our friends, that appeasement, that stance of do nothing and taking a chance and letting a sleeping dog lie was costing us, over a 10-year period of time, \$30 billion; and those costs were just going to escalate.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. The gentleman is absolutely right. The cost of freedom is high, but the cost of not defending freedom is far greater, and I appreciate the gentleman bringing up the mass graves.

Our soldiers over there, part of what really drives the fact is that they know they are there for a reason, and they are proud of what they are doing is having seen mass graves. One stands in front of a mass grave, as we did in our group in Babylon where there was 3,000 bodies recovered, 2,100 of them identified but 900 just reburied with whatever personal effects were remaining, were left in plastic bags on top for someone to try to identify them afterwards, and that is out of what they expect to find a 3 to 500,000-people mass grave, a million three people missing. This is out of a country with a population of 26 million where most people can tell you they know somebody who is no longer around, and that is the kind of grave, grave tragedy that we have recovered them from.

I am very pleased that we have been joined today by our good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), who I know has been to Iraq

even more recently than I have and has some thoughts to share with us on this subject.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be here tonight. I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY), for asking me to be here tonight. Prior to my visit to Iraq, the gentleman was very helpful to brief me on what to expect, what to look for. He was very incisive, he was very knowledgeable, and it certainly made the visit I had very helpful.

Mr. Speaker, the central front in the war on terror is being fought in Iraq, and I was honored to be selected by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the Committee on Armed Services ranking Democrat, to serve on a delegation last week to newly liberated Iraq.

□ 2045

Our troops are heroes of an historic military victory and I was privileged to see firsthand how they are professionally conducting peacekeeping as they enable democracy to develop in Iraq.

This is not a war we sought, Mr. Speaker, but is a direct consequence of the September 11 attacks on America, leading to our fulfilling the President's plan to stop any country from harboring or supporting terrorists. As my colleague from Minnesota stated a moment ago, this is a war we must win. It is a war we can face head on in the terrorist breeding grounds overseas or it will return in full force on American soil.

As I met in Baghdad with Lt. General Ricardo Sanchez, the commander of coalition forces in Iraq, I was impressed by our military competence and resolve. At each stop we met with top military Iraqi and coalition civilian officials, but a highlight was to meet informally with troops of all ranks from our home States. I was startled that instead of patrolling streets by remote armed vehicles, our soldiers were walking the sidewalks, really getting to know the people, who are favorable 70 to 90 percent to our presence, and this has led to improved human intelligence, reducing terrorist attacks, Mr. Speaker.

When I asked General Sanchez about media reports of being mired, he responded very forcefully that this was untrue because real progress is being made. From his perspective, and that of Major General David Patraeus at Mosul, the coalition efforts are progressing much more quickly than what they had experienced in Bosnia and Kosovo.

Daily administration of Iraq is capably led by Ambassador Paul Bremer of the Coalition Provisional Authority. His leadership has coordinated recruiting over 60,000 new Iraqi security forces

and initiating over 6,000 community development programs for hospitals, schools, electrical transmission, business development, and road improvements.

From South Carolina, we are very proud that Columbia attorney George Wolfe, counsel of the U.S. treasury, is detailed to the Authority in Baghdad. He is helping coordinate currency conversion of tons of Hussein dinars to be replaced by new money beginning this month. Following World War II, it took nearly 3 years to convert German Deutschmarks, but the coalition will complete this feat in only 5 months.

The Iraqi Governing Council has been formed of 25 supporters of democracy to begin the process of self-government. It was encouraging on our delegation at the Al-Rashid Hotel to meet at a reception with Chairman Ahmad Chalabi.

Since the fall of Saddam's dictatorship, more than 90 percent of Iraqi municipalities have elected town councils, and I met courageous supporters of democracy serving as mayors, council members, and provincial governors as we toured Baghdad and then visited Al Hillah to the south and Mosul to the north. Traveling by helicopter, I could see markets filled with people, bridges left intact with heavy traffic and minimal war damage.

Visiting Al Hillah, I met the Polish general who is commanding over 20,000 coalition forces from 32 countries. In ancient Babylon, we were welcomed by religious university president Sayyed Qizwini, a descendant of Mohammed, who explained that Americans are revered as liberators. Then, as a chilling reminder of the Hussein dictatorship, the local governor escorted us to a mass grave site where thousands of women and children were slaughtered by the regime, which was cited a few minutes ago by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Following meetings at the palaces of Hussein, which have been transformed into Coalition military headquarters, I was glad to see the vibrancy of Mosul, the northern city of 1.8 million people, which had been the ancient capital of Nineveh of the Assyrian Empire. We attended the reopening of Kisik refinery, where 300 new jobs were restored. The refinery was abandoned 4 years ago, but is back on line producing fuel to trade with Syria for electricity to be sent to Baghdad as the dilapidated infrastructure is being rebuilt, ignored for decades by Saddam Hussein as he put more money into his palaces.

As our delegation returned last Tuesday, our transport carried a body bag containing a soldier who had died in Iraq, a sad reminder of the courage and sacrifice of our troops. He is a hero, protecting our homeland overseas from a hate-filled terrorist enemy, which has as its goal the destruction of modern Western democracy. His service should be an inspiration for Americans to take forcefully the new challenges we face.

Again, I would like to conclude by thanking my colleagues here tonight. They are making excellent points and ones that need to be brought to the attention of the American people. I want to thank both of them for making such a difference on behalf of our troops, our country. Civilization as we know it is under attack, and this is not the time to quibble, it is a time to stand together, and both of my colleagues are making a difference.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina. I thank him for going there and finding out the truth for himself. And I really appreciate your bringing up the elected governments, because our goal there is to get out. Our goal there is to turn over the reins to the Iraqis. But we are not going to do that until there is a constitution that protects the rights of the minorities, the Assyrian Christians, the Kurdish, and so many other minorities there, the Turkamens.

Over 90 percent, as the gentleman mentioned, of the town councils have been elected. One of the things that struck me, and maybe the gentleman got the same briefing, they have provincial councils up and running as well. And our troops helped organize those elections, and if there are, say, 30 members on the provincial council, the leaders of the town and the province would come together and elect them, but the generals would hold out, say five to appoint themselves. And that was to make sure we had women involved, that we had the minorities properly represented. And we do have women on the Iraqi governing council, women in the provincial councils.

One of the things that struck me is that the Wall Street Journal recently published the first poll that was conducted in Iraq, the Zogby and American Enterprise Magazine did this, and one of the many things that I took away from that poll is when they asked, Do you want democracy or not? Women wanted democracy by a far greater percentage than men. This is a country and a culture that has not always had the same views towards women that we have in this country. We obviously respect the great corrections that they are not only applying throughout our country here, but if you go to Iraq you see many. And I am sure the gentleman saw many service-women doing just fine jobs, great jobs, and being wonderful examples for the Iraqi people. And I think that is something that is really another great sign of progress.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. What is also very impressive, too, is that when, in fact, we talk about other countries, such as Germany, and how we helped restore democracy to Germany, we cannot say that about Iraq. Iraq has never had a democratic history. So this is a new challenge. And I think it is extraordinary, as my colleague pointed out, that the Zogby poll indicated there is a favorable desire.

What I found so impressive in talking to the troops from my home State of South Carolina, and it was an informal setting, it was not contrived, there were no ranking officers there to make sure everybody said the right thing at the right time, they told me in walking the streets of Baghdad, which was really surprising, again, that they would be walking the streets of Mosul, that the people really impressed them as to their education level and their knowledge of issues. So there is really a bright future because of the people who live in that country and who deserve a chance.

Another point that was so exciting too, as we flew over by helicopter, we could see the number of satellite dishes. Prior to March, with the fall of the Saddam Hussein regime, there were no satellite dishes. Just as in North Korea, it is illegal to have a satellite dish in a totalitarian regime. But we saw hundreds, possibly thousands of satellite dishes, where people could stay in touch with what is going on in the world. They could receive the various networks from around the world by satellite. This is a new development which I think will be encouraging for democracy.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Yes. And, Mr. Speaker, one of the things we did not see was all the planned-for catastrophes that never happened. We have challenges, yes, but the dams were not blown up, so they did not flood everybody down river. The oil refineries and the oil wells were not blown up, so they are producing. They are maybe not producing as much as they will in the future, and they are helping to offset the cost we are incurring. We did not have the tribal warfare everybody projected.

So there are so many negative things that did not happen at the same time all these positive things are happening.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. And, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is being very concise in what he is saying. He is not overstating. The gentleman did not include the predictions of mass refugee formations going into Iraq out of Iraq through different regions. And if my colleagues will remember, there were dire predictions of urban warfare; there was going to be a massive quagmire. Did not occur. Even the quagmire that had been announced when we had like a 24-hour pause due to a sand storm, that did not occur.

Then, finally, of course, there was people who made extraordinary predictions of mass starvation. That did not occur. And it did not occur because the American military made substantial planning. The American government, through U.S. Agency for International Development, did extraordinary planning. I had the privilege of being last year in Kuwait in November and learning of the plans that were being made in the event an invasion was necessary.

I was very fortunate to go back in February to Kuwait and meet with the

troops on the front lines, the 3rd Infantry Division from Hinesville, Georgia, and the 1st Marine Division, and I saw the preparation being made for the conflict and then for after the conflict to avoid the dire consequences that we had heard would occur and did not occur.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. And the gentleman spoke of the satellite dishes. They are watching all kinds of channels now that they never saw before. They are seeing the outside world.

If you ask me, Mr. Speaker, what the average Iraqi thinks, the average Iraqi is thinking, how do I get to be like Kuwait as quickly as possible? How do I become a prosperous country? How do I have everything everybody else has? And it is not just the oil Iraq has. And I am sure my other colleague saw the same thing, when we looked down from those helicopters, it was green. They actually grow rice there. They have enough water between the Tigris and the Euphrates Rivers to flood fields and grow rice. This was the old supposed Garden of Eden. This was the cradle of civilization. So we have, really, a region that has foundations for prosperity, not just oil but water, that can produce a strong agricultural base as well as industry.

I know my colleague must have in Georgia many industries that rely on water, and having that diversified economy to employ the people is something that Iraq is potentially uniquely qualified in that region to do.

Mr. GINGREY. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think it is important to point out that in Iraq we are not talking about a Third World country. We are talking about what we formerly knew as Mesopotamia, the land between the Tigris and Euphrates. It is one of the oldest nations on the face of the earth and has had beautiful civilizations.

This is a situation where a brutal dictator was suppressing, indeed even killing his own people. And not only his own people, but also the neighboring countries, where we have moderate Muslim countries that are friendly and understand the value of life, like Turkey, as an example, and we mentioned Kuwait, and, of course, other neighbors of Saddam Hussein. Under this dictator, this regime and its reign of terror, if you will, these other countries lived in constant fear. And until we rid Iraq of Saddam, there would never be any opportunity for people to feel secure.

I am real pleased that the gentleman from South Carolina joined us this evening, and I commend him. He is one of maybe only 25 percent of the Members of Congress who is actually a veteran. I know his three sons also served in the military, and no doubt his teenage boy one day will. And it is really good to hear in these colloquies, and I know the gentleman from Minnesota would agree with me, to hear from people like the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) who knows the

military, understands, and who was part of a group that just recently returned from Baghdad, along with the gentleman from Minnesota, and with his own eyes, and your own eyes, saw the tremendous job that our troops, our well-trained troops, our modern technology was able to perform. They were able to inflict maximal damage with minimal collateral damage; with laser precision attacks, protecting as many innocent men, women and children as possible and I commend you.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. And we absolutely saw that. People might ask if everything is so great over there, why do we need this money to rebuild Iraq. Well, I want to point out, it was not due to the war.

As we went through Baghdad, and I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina saw the same things, we saw specific buildings, specific floors on buildings that were targeted and that were hit, but right beside that there would be a building standing and continuing in commerce today.

□ 2100

But what has caused a need for reconstruction is the fact that Saddam Hussein spent one-third of total income on armaments, and we are constantly recovering huge caches of arms in palaces. We were in one palace complex in Tikrit that had 112 buildings on the palace compound, each one of which could be called a palace itself. When you spend money in such awful ways on destructive things and neglect the people, that is what we are recovering from. We are not recovering from the war. That damage was very tightly focused, and maybe the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) can talk about what he saw in Iraq.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, that was something very startling. I was showing pictures to my family of my visit; and I, of course, had some terrific aerial photos as we were flying by helicopter. We had a perfect view of the communities. I saw during the flights that I had six buildings destroyed. I also saw sites where rubble was pushed up, so I knew there were buildings no longer there. But the infrastructure is in place. The bridges that had to be destroyed in Serbia, that did not occur in Iraq. The bridges were in across the Tigris and the Euphrates.

When we talk about rebuilding, I hope the American people understand it is not because of the American destruction. The destruction is that created by Saddam Hussein. For example, in the schools, we are working very hard to show our good faith to the people of Iraq to get the schools open on October 1. When we talk about rebuilding the schools, we are not building beautiful edifices. Many of these schools are one-room schoolhouses which we are repainting. Particularly in the Shiite areas, the persons less likely to be followers of Saddam Hussein, their schools were closed or left

to be dilapidated. They are not to American standards, but they are going to be very fine schools. And very importantly, the materials they have to learn from will be modern materials. No longer will the math book have contrived subliminal messages of how bad America is and how bad the West is. Now it will deal with math, and history will be authentic. This starts on October 1.

Another part of the rebuilding that the American people should understand because it was not due to our destruction was the electrical transmission. Because Saddam Hussein had such a heinous dictatorship, there were two electrical transmission systems. This is, unfortunately, a very common occurrence in dictatorships, and that is the palaces had a system. Additionally, the Baath Socialist Party members, they were on the system that worked, and then the different government agencies were on that system, but then the general public was on another system. In fact, that system had been left in place during the 1930s and the 1940s, built by the British. That system is not only antiquated, it had rolling power service. The people who got service were the ones who paid a bribe to the people who administered the power plants. This is a bizarre circumstance.

It is very difficult, obviously, for Americans to realize there are two transmission systems. We are going in to help rebuild that system because it is crucial for economic development. One of the greatest industries of Iraq is cement production to build buildings and have commerce. That is a very high-intensive use of electricity. By getting the electrical transmission, some people perceive that as we are just trying to provide frills; but, no, we are trying to provide basic services so the economy can come back.

The bottom line is that is beneficial to America, because, as has been pointed out, after World War II we had the Marshall Plan. That was to rebuild Germany. It was not because we were fond of the Germans, but what it was is that we did not want that to become a breeding ground for communism, and the way to avoid that is for the economy to be revived. Our challenge in Iraq is to restore the economy so it will not be a breeding ground for terrorists.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman mentioned, with electricity, we are bringing forth that core concept of equal treatment under the law. No longer does the Baath Party chair or the Sunni Arabs around Baghdad get their electricity before the rest of the country. Everybody is being treated equal.

Now the children are also benefiting from those schools. We are not having Saddam Hussein's picture on every other page of the textbooks.

We have had some very vicious attacks on Iraq by terrorists recently. This is the new front for the war on terrorism. We are fighting them in

their area of strength. Patton said, do not let the enemy pick where you are going to fight, bring the battle to them, and we are. But those terrorists think they are somehow hurting America and dividing us from the American people, but I sense something completely different.

When they attack the U.N., they are attacking the people who are trying to help in Iraq. When they attack the Shiite cleric in Najaf, they are creating a common enemy. The Iraqi people and America have a common enemy, and these acts are pulling us together toward the same goal of getting to the point of security and government where everybody in Iraq, as mentioned, can be equal under the law, and that is the final goal that we have to achieve before we turn over the reins.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, pointing out the attack on the U.N. Embassy in Baghdad where most of the deaths were Iraqi citizens, and, of course, the Ambassador from Brazil who had spent his entire professional life in trying to promote humanitarian efforts not just in Iraq, but in many, many countries, and for them to just come in and blow up that U.N. Embassy, and what was the U.N. doing in Baghdad? They were not a fighting force, they were just there for humanitarian reasons, that is all; in fact, so humanitarian that they refused to defend that facility. They did not want it to be guarded. They did not want it to appear that they were in any way there as a fighting force. And look what happened to them.

As the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) has pointed out, this killing is wanton, it is indiscriminate, and so they are not just attacking our fighting men and women, the United States troops, it is their own people. And it is this reign of terror that we are having to deal with, and it is something that just could not stand, and we had to bring an end to that, and we are going to have to continue.

The President has come to the Congress, and I talked earlier about the cost, and trying to put it in the proper perspective. And I think the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) would agree with me, none of us like deficits. We do not like debt. We would love to have a balanced budget. We are all fiscal conservatives, and \$87 billion is a lot of money, but let us talk about cost and try to put it in its proper perspective.

I have heard this statement: The \$87 billion is far more than what we spend on education or other priorities. How can we justify that? That is absolutely wrong. Of course it is a lot of money, but remember this: This is a temporary expenditure. This is an investment in America's security.

In contrast, the government's sustained commitments to domestic priorities are dollars spent every year, and they grow over time which appropriately dwarf this incremental cost.

Let me just give some comparisons in the fiscal year 2004 budget: Social Security spending, \$492 billion in fiscal year 2004 and growing; Medicare, \$259 billion; Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program, \$187 billion; veterans expenditures, \$57 billion; education K-12, \$53 billion; the amount of money this country spends and we will be appropriating this year for higher education in the way of Pell grants and student aid loans to our neediest students so they can go to college, \$90 billion.

Again, \$87 billion, and I love to get the input from the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) and the gentleman from South Carolina in regard to this overall cost and putting it in the right perspective. We hear over and over that people are more concerned about jobs than they are about homeland security. Members have heard that. We see it on some of the news shows at night. But while jobs, jobs, jobs are very important, and the President has brought to us an economic growth package that is going to grow those jobs, yes, there is a little bit of lag in the policy before those small business men and women can create those jobs, but just keep in mind, and I want to throw this out to put it in the right perspective, on September 11, 2001, some 2,875 men and women that went to work that morning at the Twin Towers at the Trade Center, they had jobs. They had good jobs. They had good jobs with good benefits, and they went to work that day feeling secure. Unfortunately, they were not secure. They no longer have jobs. They no longer are with us. They lost their lives that morning.

So while jobs are extremely important, and we need to do everything we can to stimulate this economy, and I commend this President and this administration and this leadership in what we are doing, Mr. Speaker, in trying to grow those jobs, they are not worth a tinker's darn if we cannot assure these workers when they go to work every day that they are going to come home to their loved ones in the evening. So we have to put it in its proper perspective.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) helping us do that. This is the front line in the war on terrorism. We are up against people who kill men and women with no mercy and with no shame. One of the most vivid discussions I had was with the vice mayor of Mosul. He said, for you in America, this is a foreign policy issue. But for the jihadists that want to take the world back and have the women wearing veils, and have the men punished if they shave their beards, and have a few guys in beards making all of the decisions, and do what they have not been able to accomplish in so many other areas, if we succeed and have a democracy and freedom and an open economy in Iraq, they will fail and fail forever, because

just as Iraq has been a very disrupting force in the region in the past, it has the potential to be a force that expands that freedom, expands that prosperity, expands that openness and that choice to their neighbors, to Iran, to Syria, to Saudi Arabia, and what better way to make Americans secure, to make sure that they are not going to have to be worrying about their security than to plant that freedom in Iraq in that neighborhood.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, indeed what we are talking about is jobs, because in the war on terrorism, if we were to have disruption of our economy as we did on September 11, it could be immediately catastrophic.

□ 2115

With the container ships that we all very much depend on for products being sent from the United States by export, back to the United States by import, we know that there is a potential for an abuse there of explosives or whatever. So by having an interruption of our shipping, it could be absolutely catastrophic, particularly in the Northeast. If there was even a 3-day disruption of shipping, there could be a disruption of the oil and gasoline necessary for refining above New York City to the Northeast to the point where it would be catastrophic. We would have the return of the lines with the lack of fuel; people would lose jobs. In my home State, the number one industry is tourism. We already know that if we were to have a terrorist attack of some nature, that it would completely devastate the hospitality industry. This is just a ripple effect all over the United States, actually all over the world. So the war on terrorism is crucial for us to proceed. It is a war we must win. I want to thank both of my colleagues again for making this clear.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. We cannot afford to lose. This is a fight that we must win.

IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, we have come back to the floor this evening, the Iraq Watch has come back to the floor, and we are glad to be back. There is new information to discuss, the President's speech today at the United Nations to review. I am looking forward to the next hour, joined by my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL),

the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND); and I know others are on the way.

I would like to just start, though. The previous hour was taken by three distinguished Members of the other side of the aisle speaking about Iraq. I listened carefully to what they said and found myself in agreement with many of their comments. Certainly their frustrations that the press does not accurately report the good news, tends to report and dwell on the confrontations and the failures. That obviously is something we have broad bipartisan agreement on, the failures of the media to cover things the way we would like them to be covered. I would hope perhaps tonight could be the beginning of a more bipartisan discussion during this Special Order when we give our Iraq Watch hour. Perhaps in the future, the Republican Members could join us, not in a confrontational way, but in a way to see if there is common ground and, if we have disagreements, to develop those more fully. The purpose of Iraq Watch is to ask questions about our policies in Iraq, to see if there cannot be more information solicited for the Members of Congress and for the general public and to suggest policy changes that we think are necessary. Perhaps we can do that with our Republican friends in the future.

Let me take a few moments before turning to my colleagues to respond to the President's speech today in the United Nations. I should not say "respond," comment upon the President's speech. He essentially gave a summary of our role and our spending in Afghanistan, in Iraq, in the worldwide fight against AIDS and in measures to fight the traffic in humans and the sex trade. He also challenged the member nations of the United Nations to do more and join us in these efforts. It was a wonderful opportunity for the President to set forth our challenge to the United Nations, our desire for them to be involved in Iraq, to step forward, to provide leadership for the reconstruction and the security that clearly needs to be done in Iraq.

Yet the President, from my point of view, did not achieve that. I found his remarks to be flat and uninspiring. He did not set forth the role that the United Nations could assume in Iraq. He did not discuss the parameters of that role. He surely did not discuss the power-sharing that the United Nations member states have indicated they want to share in order to assume the major role in Iraq in terms of their reconstruction and their security needs. In fact, he made it clear in a reference to America working to submit a new resolution to the Security Council to bring in the U.N., the President's vision is for the United States to stay in control of the occupation in Iraq.

I think one fundamental question Congress has to ask as we consider the \$87 billion request the President has made, does the United States have to be in charge of the reconstruction?