

is a sin, I am guilty as charged. I only wish that every American had the same opportunity that we had that went to Iraq. Because I know for a fact, if they went there and they could see the real and the whole story of Iraq, they would share our hope and our optimism, and they would support a very wise investment in the future of not only the Iraqi people, but of this entire world.

I would certainly encourage all of my colleagues as Members of Congress to support the supplemental, because it is a very wise investment.

AMERICAN WORKING FAMILIES BEAR THE BURDEN OF IRAQ BLUNDER

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we are all glad that Saddam Hussein has been dethroned. It is better for the world. It is better for Iraq. But the cost is too great and has been too great in dollars, and we now are considering another \$87 billion. We have already invested more than \$70 billion. The regular defense budget is also enormous, and that has been expended, and there is no end in sight. We will have more requests for more money.

The cost has been too great. We have not achieved any greater amount of security from terrorism. In fact, we are less secure from terrorism now than we were before we invaded Iraq. We have been forced to concentrate all of our energies, all of our priorities, our best minds, everything has been concentrated in Iraq, ignoring the threat in Afghanistan and the borders of Pakistan.

The overwhelming burden of the Iraq blunder, however, has been placed on the backs of working families. The actual troops out there are from working families. We all support our troops. We all want to do whatever is necessary to make certain that those troops come home. We want to do whatever is necessary to support them to guarantee that they have a chance to come home. The overwhelming burden of the Iraq blunder, however, should not remain on the backs of working families. Mismanagement should not cause more unnecessary suffering and more death among working families, relatives of people who are from working families.

The New York Times documented what we all knew already, that more than 90 percent of the members of the military are from working families. More than 90 percent of the people in Iraq are from working families. This is true for the war in Iraq, as it has been true for most other wars.

□ 2145

We know in the Civil War, the people who had money could buy their way

out of the draft and pay someone else to go in their place. But, in general, draft boards and drafts in cases of the war in Vietnam and Korea and so forth have ended up selecting large numbers of working family members.

The greatest generation that celebrated winning World War II had many components, class-wise, but the overwhelming number of people who lost their lives in World War II were also people who were in working families.

Working families are very special to America. Working families have a right to make a claim on America. And what concerns me, and the reason I am here today, is that we do not seem to understand the importance of working families, the people who are in charge, the people who are in power continue to treat working families as if they were expendable, that they are not important.

We heard some discussion of the welfare bill before today. It was technical, and it was probably difficult to understand, but that is one of the greatest harassments of working families you are going to find, the present welfare legislation, which provides a family of four is given a subsidy of \$6,000 or \$7,000 per year, while at the same time we give subsidies to agribusiness of more than \$250,000 per year. One more treatment, one more example of the treatment of working families.

We need to take a hard look at this war in Iraq and what it is doing to us. We need to stop the war for many reasons. We need to stop the war because it is absorbing large amounts of cash that can be used for other purposes, for purposes that we need here at home to improve our economy and to improve the lot of all of us, including the lot of working families.

This great Nation's survival and its freedom are directly dependent on the courage and the devotion of men and women from working families. The blunder has been committed already. We are mired in a deep pit. We cannot leave now. The sons and daughters of working families must remain on the dangerous front lines. But at least we could support those troops in a better manner, not in the current superficial manner being mouthed by so many while at the same time they undercut our troops.

We need to understand that in very concrete ways, we are betraying the troops in Iraq who are from working families. The kinds of programs that have been promulgated by the Republican leadership are outrageous. Patriotic and meaningful support means that we must address some of the following issues, and we must do it immediately:

The conflict must be better managed so that there is multinational participation in the decision-making and a clear exit strategy to bring these American troops home. The best we can do for our troops, the most important thing we can do for them, is to bring them home. It has to be an hon-

orable exit. We do not want to leave the job half done. We have to make certain that no other leader like Saddam Hussein is ever able to take control of Iraq.

We want to encourage democracy as much as possible. The first step toward doing that is to share the decision-making with other nations and have other nations get involved because they know they can participate in the decision-making. They will then commit troops and commit equipment and other things. And, most of all, they will be there to send a message to the Iraqi population that Americans are not trying to take over their country, occupy their country, and control the tremendous oil fields that lie beneath that country. That would be one way to say to working families, we care about the troops, we care about your son and daughter. We are going to make that effort.

With regard to the United Nations, this administration has only offered a cold shoulder, despite the difficulty that we are in. We are not moving to try to convince the rest of the world that we are ready to share decision-making with Iraq. We are ready to go some extra lengths, swallow our pride, do some things we said we would never do, put away our anger, and do what will promote a solution, the fastest possible solution in Iraq. That is what we can do for our troops. They deserve it.

There are some other direct benefits that the sons and daughters of working families over there deserve. They deserve adequate equipment and they deserve troops, a troop contingent, enough troops to make it safer for them. There are not enough troops in Iraq. They are not adequately equipped.

We heard some speeches before from some visitors who went over. I found them very interesting. JOHN MURTHA, who has been on the Committee on Armed Services for two decades, made the same trip, came back and was incensed and angered by the fact that the morale was so low and obvious needs in equipment and supplies were not being met. And he immediately demanded that the President fire the people who were in charge of the war in Iraq.

JOHN MURTHA, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has long experience in the Committee on Armed Services, saw an outrageous performance in terms of the leadership who planned and executed the war in Iraq.

Rotation rights have been sort of dismissed. Even in the war in Vietnam, there was a right of a soldier not to be placed at risk for more than a year. A year in combat, placing your life at risk, was all that was demanded. You could rotate out of Vietnam after a year. Those rights have not been guaranteed to the people in Iraq, soldiers, regular soldiers or Reservists.

The worst thing is the people who are in the Reserves, who thought they were going for a 6-month stint, have now

had their time extended. Worse still for the people in the Reserves there is no economic justice. People in the Reserves gave up jobs. They were not career people. Yes, they signed up, and they knew that they would have to go in case of an emergency, but they were not career military people. And they did not want to give up their income and their jobs, leave their families indefinitely, but they had to do that. They were forced to do that.

We have behaved so abominably toward those working families that a Washington Post article of yesterday describes it as unacceptable, almost atrocious. It is a legislative atrocity that they described. I am going to read from this article in which the Washington Post described what is being done to Reservists in this war in Iraq. "A proposal to close any pay gap faced by civil service employees who are called to active duty in the military reserves will not be considered by the House and Senate negotiators working on the fiscal 2004 Defense authorization bill."

Now, this brings it home to us. We mouth our concern about supporting the troops and here is an example of how little we are supporting the troops, especially the Reservists, how we hold them in contempt really.

"In May the House Government Reform Committee approved an amendment sponsored by Representatives Tom Lantos and Chris Bell aimed at requiring Federal agencies to make up the difference between civil service and military pay for those on military duty." The provision was one of several civil service changes but, hear me carefully, a civil servant working for the Federal Government, who happens to be in the military Reserves, goes to Iraq; he is paid at the same rate as any other soldier, but he left a job that was paying far more. He left a family that had been nurtured on an income of more.

If the Federal Government still had him on the payroll, it would cost them a certain amount of money. If they continue to pay him at the same rate, it does not cost them any more money, it just keeps him at the same rate while he is off doing his duty for his country under very difficult circumstances. But they did not agree to that.

"The provision was dropped when the Armed Services panel put together the House version of the defense authorization bill. That version sets out guidelines for weapons and equipment purposes and for troop strength. The Lantos bill amendment stalled because of its cost: \$160 million over 5 years including \$75 million in fiscal 2004."

Hear me carefully: It would have cost the government, the Federal Government, \$160 million over 5 years, including \$75 million in fiscal 2004. But if those same people had remained in their jobs, they would have been paid the \$160 million over 5 years and \$75 million. And the Federal Government

was not called upon to do any more than they would have done if there had been no war in Iraq. I find that atrocious. I find the behavior of this Congress under the Republican majority leadership to be atrocious.

More important, in another outrageous observation, however, were objections from the Defense Department, which argued that making up differences in pay for civil service employees would undercut military morale. You have two sergeants, one a career military and one a Reservist doing the same job. And essentially the government is paying the civilian employee more for that service than the career military guy. That is the heart of the Defense Department objection. Listen to that carefully. It would undercut military morale to have a citizen who was earning an income at a certain level from the Federal Government, who was there against his will, he did it out of duty, has been shipped to Iraq, and he is in units along with career military people.

Now, if you are a career military person, you know what the pay scale is. You have accepted the pay scale. Your family is probably getting some benefits that the civil servant family is not getting. There are a number of ways in which a career person has adapted to a situation that they voluntarily went into. But the Reservist, who happened to have been a civil service employee for the Federal Government, has to hear that he would undercut morale if the government paid him at the same rate that they were always paying him.

About 200 private sector employers, however, and 50 State and local governments make up the difference in pay for their worker. Listen carefully: The Federal Government, the men and women in charge of the blunder in Iraq, who created a situation requiring all these Reservists to go, they are doing less than 200 private sector employers, 50 State and local governments, which now make up the difference in pay for their workers when the workers are forced to serve as Reservists.

This is outrageous. It falls right at the doorstep of us Members of Congress and Members of the other body. About 65,000 Reservists are employed by Federal agencies. Mr. Speaker, 65,000 is a large number that we are depriving of income, we are depriving those working families of their income at a certain level, forcing them to accept the pay of the military service that they are in. Sixty-five thousand Reservists are employed by Federal agencies making the government the single largest employer of Reservists. An additional 48,000 Federal technicians are required, they do not have a choice, to be members of the Guard as a condition of employment.

So we have a huge contingent of citizens, who happen to be Federal employees, who are treated like dirt. Our government, our Federal Government treats this huge number of people and their families like dirt. Working fami-

lies should not have to bear these kind of burdens. This is a legislative atrocity.

Madam Speaker, I submit this article in its entirety into the record. It is entitled "Pay Gap Remedy for Military Reserve Appears Doomed," in the Washington Post, Monday, September 29th.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 29, 2003]

PAY-GAP REMEDY FOR MILITARY RESERVES

APPEARS DOOMED

(By Stephen Barr)

A proposal to close any pay gap faced by civil service employees who are called to active duty in the military reserves will not be considered by House and Senate negotiators working on the fiscal 2004 defense authorization bill, according to congressional aides.

Most lawmakers feel that the issue was evaluated by the House Armed Services Committee during its deliberations and is now closed, the aides said.

The proposal, pushed by a group of House Democrats, ran into opposition because of its cost, as well as concern that it might cause morale problems among regular military troops.

In May, the House Government Reform Committee approved an amendment sponsored by Reps. Tom Lantos (D-Calif.) and Chris Bell (D-Tex.) aimed at requiring federal agencies to make up the difference between civil service and military pay for those on military duty. The provision was one of several civil service changes proposed for the Defense Department and forwarded to the Armed Services Committee.

But the provision was dropped when the Armed Services panel put together the House version of the defense authorization bill, which sets out guidelines for weapons and equipment purchases, military benefits and troop strength.

The Lantos-Bell amendment stalled because of its cost—\$160 million over five years, including \$75 million in fiscal 2004—and because it could have triggered jurisdictional questions that would have given the Government Reform Committee a voice in shaping the defense bill, a congressional aide said.

More important, however, were objections from the Defense Department, which argued that making up differences in pay for civil service employees would undercut military morale. "You have two sergeants, one a career military and one a reservist, doing the same job. And essentially the government is paying the civilian employee more for that service than the career military guy—that is the heart of the Defense Department objection," the congressional aide said.

A Pentagon spokeswoman said there would be no comment on the issue.

Supporters of the Lantos-Bell effort argue that National Guard and reserve families are increasingly at risk of financial hardship because reservists are being called up more frequently since the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. The Army recently issued a policy requiring Guard and reserve troops to serve 12-month tours in Iraq, meaning that most Army reservists will be mobilized for more than a year.

About 200 private-sector employers and 50 state and local governments make up the difference in pay for their workers and the federal government should serve as an example of the importance of assisting reservists, an aide to Lantos said. But other congressional aides said the issue needs more study. It might be more appropriate to use pay supplements to offset income loss for specific occupations or individuals rather than to take a blanket approach, they said.

Recent studies indicate that between 30 percent and 40 percent of activated reservists face a loss of income during mobilization.

About 65,000 reservists are employed by federal agencies, making the government the single-largest employer of reservists. An additional 48,000 federal technicians are required to be members of the Guard as a condition of employment.

The Office of Personnel Management has called on federal agencies to shoulder the cost of health insurance premiums for employees called to active duty. At last count, about 80 out of more than 100 federal agencies had agreed to pick up the premiums.

Madam Speaker, just treatment for working families left behind ought to be a major goal of a government that has asked people to go and fight in Afghanistan or in Iraq. Just treatment for working families left behind. What is involved in just treatment? I serve as the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. And I am on that committee which has jurisdiction over the minimum wage, over the Wage and Hour Act, and other safety programs related to persons in the workforce. We have had constant harassment since the Republican majority took control of the Congress on all of these fronts.

□ 2200

On the minimum wage, we are still at \$5.15 an hour. In the last 3 years, the Republican majority has refused to allow us to bring a bill to the floor to increase the minimum wage. That is what we think of working families that we send off to war in times of war. They go. They die. They fight. They get wounded. They are the backbone of the security for America. But we do not want to increase the minimum wage beyond \$5.15 an hour. We have had constant harassment on overtime pay and recently that was sort of intensified. But they do not want to pay people cash for overtime. They want changes in law, so that employers can pay you comp time if they so choose. It is not your choice. It is their choice. Comp time, taking the cash out of your pay check and food off your table, but offering you comp time at some future date they choose.

They pushed that very hard. And even now, although we stopped it in the Congress by executive fiat, the law is being changed to eliminate certain categories of people as being eligible for overtime.

A jobs program is not in sight. Unemployment goes galloping on, and we do not have a jobs program.

Health care, the papers all reported yesterday or today that the number of people who are uninsured in America has jumped dramatically, gone up. Those are working families that are uninsured.

Poverty, three or four days ago, it was reported that poverty has greatly increased. These are the families from which these soldiers come. These are the families that supply the troops out there that we say we care about.

Madam Speaker, at this time I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from New York for yielding to me.

I noted earlier that many of our colleagues had gone to Iraq over the weekend, and they came back and described their experiences. I went to southeastern Ohio over the weekend, and I talked to people in Shady Side, Ohio and in Bel Air, Ohio, and Youngstown, Ohio, and I heard about infrastructure needs in Ohio. I heard about schools that need to be built. I heard about water and sewer systems that small communities simply cannot afford to pay for. And I talked with teachers and principals, talked with about three or four high school classes over this last 4 or 5 days while I was in Ohio.

We are a compassionate people. I would say to my friend from New York. We are compassionate. We care about other people, but we also care about the people that we are charged to represent. And in my district, I have got so many needs.

I found out this past weekend that in one of my communities there is the great danger that we are going to lose an additional 275 good-paying jobs, union jobs, steelworker jobs. This really concerns me. I think there is a bleeding of jobs in this country.

I looked at the headlines in the Columbus, Ohio Dispatch this morning. Iraq Battle Last 8 Hours and then One in Six Uninsured, this U.S. report says. Unemployment is skyrocketing in my district and throughout Ohio. More and more of our constituents are without health insurance. Our schools are being inadequately funded.

I toured a school in my district, I would say to my friend from New York, not long ago; and after that tour was completed, one of the parents on that tour came to me and he said, Congressman, I have two children who attend this school. I had no idea it was in this condition. He said, I am a building inspector, and if I were inspecting any other commercial building that had the problems this school has, I would close it immediately. He said, I saw at least 100 safety violations in this school. And he said, there are violations that cannot be easily fixed because this school has been added on to. It has been patched together over multiple years.

Why is it that we seem so willing to accept the fact that our kids can go to dilapidated schools, our people can be without health insurance, our roads can be unbuilt, our veterans can be shortchanged in the health care we provide to them, and yet we seem so willing, almost casual in talking about billions of dollars for the rebuilding of Iraq?

I might say to my friend from New York, it is not the rebuilding of Iraq. It is the building of Iraq. The President said when he addressed the United Nations that he intends to build 1,000 new schools in Iraq. We did not destroy

1,000 schools in this war. They want to build two 400-bed hospitals in Iraq. We did not destroy hospitals during this war. Talk about nation building. This President, during the campaign, criticized efforts to nation-build. And as I said earlier when I started my comments, we are a compassionate Nation. We care about the needs that exist in other countries. We care about the people in Iraq, but we are charged primarily to represent our constituents right here at home.

I want to state, I do not know if many of my colleagues or the President understand what life is like in southern and southeastern Ohio. It is an Appalachian district. Unemployment in one of my counties is 13.5 percent. People want to work. They are good people. They want to care for their families. They care about their kids as much as any Member in this Chamber cares about his or her children. They want them to get a high-quality education as much as any person in this Chamber wants their children to get a high-quality education.

If I can just take a moment before I yield back to talk about veterans. I am on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I keep reminding us in this Chamber that we are underfunding the VA health care system by at least \$1.8 billion. Think about that. We have got veterans who are going without health care, who are being denied the ability to enroll in VA health care, who are going to be asked by this administration to pay more copayments for prescription drugs. The President wants to impose a \$250 enrollment fee on Priority 7 veterans. And Priority 8 veterans are being told they cannot even enroll in the VA system. They can make as little as \$24,000 and be a Priority 8 veteran, and yet we are just, it seems, almost casually talking about spending \$21 billion to build schools and roads and bridges and clinics and hospitals in Iraq. I just do not understand what is wrong with this government. I certainly do not understand what is wrong with this President and this administration.

We have got a war going on. We are shortchanging our national needs. We are not caring for our soldiers. We have got about 40,000 soldiers in Iraq tonight that have cheap vests that are not capable of stopping bullets. The more expensive protective vests, my understanding is, cost \$571 on average. I got a letter from a young soldier, a West Point graduate. He said, Congressman, they are issuing two kind of vests over here. One is capable of stopping a bullet, and the other only stops shrapnel. My men are asking me why they have the cheap vests.

I wonder how many of our soldiers may have been wounded or killed wearing a cheap vest, inadequate protective body armor. And the British Broadcasting System has reported that we have made a deal with some of these other countries, I think Poland and some other countries, that if they will

contribute soldiers, we will provide them with these higher-cost vests. I want to make doggone sure that no foreign troops get these better vests before every single American soldier that is in Iraq has access to one of these protective garments.

I thank my friend for allowing me to express my opinion on this subject, and I yield back to him and thank him for his graciousness this evening.

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I would like to add to that discussion on veterans.

Most of us in the House of Representatives were shocked 3 weeks ago to discover that there was a provision where veterans who go to the hospital must pay for their food, their meals. And we immediately passed legislation to end that. I do not know whether it has been signed by the President yet or not. It is just one more administrative atrocity. I use the word atrocity, and I think it is appropriate. It is an atrocity to have veterans treated as they are. Some of my friends earlier are talking about "you have to go to Iraq to know exactly what is happening."

I suggest to those who want to know what is happening, go to Walter Reed Hospital and visit the wounded. The wounded also suffer. And in many cases those are wounded one week, and in a few weeks are dead. You can get a good example of what is going on if you look at veterans who, the minute they are off the roster of the Army, they will get no pay. They will be put on disability. Some have totally lost everything in terms of limbs or the capacity to work. They were put on disability, which is a far cry from the salary they earned as a soldier.

So my simple plea is that working families who fight for the security and peace abroad deserve survivable and living wages and a reasonable chance to pursue happiness here at home. We are investing tremendous amounts of money in the rebuilding of Iraq in the Armed Forces, and we are neglecting the needs of our own people in catastrophic proportions.

On March 3, I summarized my concern with the waste of American cash in a rap poem which I call Stop The War—We Need The Cash.

Stop the war, we need the cash.
Tank battles escalate into nuclear ash.
Stop the war.
We need the cash.
Give Medicaid families some of Rumsfeld's stash.
Throw the empty body bags in to the trash.
Stop the war.
Welfare mothers rush to cry.
Soldiers from the ranks of the poor will be the first to die.
Stop the war.
Vietnam had profound lessons to teach.
Empires lose when they overreach.
Stop the war.

One of the greatest monuments related to heroes is the Vietnam War Memorial monument here in Washington. That monument makes a statement that has never been made by any other military monument in the history in

the world. Instead of unknown soldiers in a tomb, they have put the names of every soldier who died in Vietnam on the wall for you to see. They have given those individuals a person. They are there. And you must confront the fact that wars take individual humans in large numbers, in the case of Vietnam, 58,000, but regardless of numbers, the individualization of a process, the Vietnam Memorial Wall does that.

The poor are up there. The youngsters who came from welfare families. The numerous youngsters who came out of the big cities because when the draft was on, the largest proportion of young men who went to Vietnam came out of our big city slums. We must stop and think for a moment about the way those soldiers and everybody who was enlisted are treated in terms of the technicalities and administrative requirements of the veterans administration.

They have categories, Category 7, 8, people who served in combat under great risk are given preference. They are different from others. But I say that anybody who has served in the military for the benefit of his country deserves equal treatment, because once you put the uniform on and you take the oath, your life belongs to the military, to the Nation. And where you go and what you do is determined by forces that you have no control over.

□ 2215

If you were needed behind the lines to catalog munitions or run a computer, then you were assigned there because you were needed there. The fact that you were not put on the front line does not make you any less than the people who were put on the front lines, because you could not make that decision.

So everybody who put a uniform on and took the oath should be treated as a hero. They are a small percentage of the rest of us. Even in World War II when such large numbers went to war, the percentage of those who actually went to war was still a small percentage of the overall population. They deserve to be treated as heroes. Those who went to Vietnam deserve to be treated as heroes, regardless of how many hours they spent in combat under fire. They were all heroes. They come from working families, as I said before, most of them; and this classification scheme, these technicalities about how much copayment you have to pay if you are a Category 8 versus Category 7, whether you are eligible at all is part of the insult that working families have been forced to endure; and we should fight against it.

Righteous indignation is in order. The treatment of working families in America is an outrageous abomination and we should fight. We fight on the front lines, and we die on the front lines. We should fight our government.

We should fight Alan Greenspan. Alan Greenspan is against the minimum wage law. Alan Greenspan has

been the economic guru of Democrats and Republicans for a long time. Did you know that Alan Greenspan thinks that we should not even have a minimum wage law? Part of the reason we cannot get a minimum wage law to the floor is we have the guru of our economic system saying we do not need a minimum wage law. This is outrageous.

Alan Greenspan happens to be a disciple of Ayn Rand, a woman who was a great individualist, who felt that government was not needed, group action was not needed except in times of war or when you need the police. So when her physical body was threatened, she believed in the group process, we should have police, we should have an Army. Any other time, individuals should be totally left alone; and if they cannot make it, let them die. So that man is a disciple of Ayn Rand, Alan Greenspan. He is one of the reasons we cannot move. Philosophically, there are too many people in Washington who agree that minimum wage laws are not important.

Examine the tax cuts of that situation in terms of what happened at the New York Stock Exchange. The New York Stock Exchange has a big brouhaha because the man who headed the stock exchange, Dick Grasso, had a severance package of \$140 million and he wanted another 48; and they made a big brouhaha, and headlines were formed about how dare he ask for another \$48 million. Well, what about the first \$140 million? These astronomical amounts of money are being tossed around by the people who belong to the kleptocracy. At the time I call them kleptocracy, call them oligarchy, whatever you want to call them. They are the ones who want a tax cut. They do not need a tax cut. It is obscene the kinds of figures that we have heard that corporations throw around among themselves, Enron, WorldCom. The head of WorldCom, one of the directors got a \$400 million loan from the company, \$400 million. Can you imagine a loan of \$400 million? Surely if you get a \$400 million loan, it is understood by those who loan it to you that you are never going to pay it back.

But this goes on, and these are the people who will show great indignation if a welfare mother gets extra food stamps. This is the kind of mental attitude that we have allowed to develop.

The workers who are on the front lines in Iraq, Afghanistan and everywhere else have to know they have to come forward and fight, fight this kind of oppression.

On Wednesday, July 16, as a result of my anger following the attempt to stop the payment of overtime to workers, I wrote the following and enter it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"Mr. Speaker, the July 10th vote to allow the expenditure of funds to implement radical changes in the overtime provisions of the Wage and Hour Act was an outrageous and devastating attack on working families.

Compounding the horror of this action is the recent announcement that our present complement of soldiers in Iraq, 90 percent of whom come from working families, will be forced into combat overtime for the indefinite future."

At the same time we were fighting overtime payment for workers here, we were announcing, the President was announcing, Rumsfeld was announcing that they would be extending the time of the soldiers indefinitely.

"Not even the 1-year rotation rule of Vietnam will be applied to relieve their long ordeal under extreme heat and guerilla warfare duress. Overtime in the dangerous defense of the Nation is being mandated without controls while at the same time overtime wages to feed working families is being subjected to new schemes to reduce take-home pay. This is an unacceptable continuation of the gross exploitation and oppression of working families by the Republican scrooges who presently dominate the Congress and the White House."

I summarize my statement in a rap poem, which is called "Let the Rich Go First."

Working Families
 Keep your soldiers at home,
 For overtime in Iraq
 No cash
 No comp time
 Not even gratitude,
 Republicans intrude
 To exempt all heroes,
 No combat rotation
 Life on definite probation
 Scrooges running the Nation.
 To the front lines
 Let the rich go first—
 For blood they got a thirst,
 Let the superstars drink it
 In the glorious trenches;
 Leave the disadvantaged on the benches.
 Working Families
 Let the rich go first:
 The battlegrounds they always choose
 Their estates have the most to lose;
 Send highest IQs to
 Take positions at the front,
 Let them perform their best
 High-tech warfare stunt;
 Working Families
 Keep your malnourished sons home—
 Harvard Yale kids should roam
 The world with guns and tanks,
 Reserve gold medals
 For the loyal Ivy League ranks.
 O say can you see
 Millionaire graduates
 Dying for you and me?
 Welfare Moms
 Have a message for the masters:
 Tell Uncle Sam
 His TANF pennies he can keep
 For food stamps we refuse to leap
 Through your hoops like beasts;
 Promise to leave our soldiers alone
 And we'll find our own feasts.
 To Uncle Sam we offer a bargain—
 Don't throw us dirty crumbs
 Don't treat us like bums
 And then demand
 The full measure of devotion;
 Our minds are now in motion
 Class warfare
 Is not such a bad notion;
 Your swindle will not last
 Recruiters we won't let pass,
 Finally, we opened our eyes—
 Each family is a private enterprise.

Each child a precious prize;
 We got American property rights,
 Before our children die in war
 This time we'll choose the fights.
 Let the rich go first:
 They worry about
 The overtime we abuse;
 The battlefields they always choose
 Their estates have the most to lose.
 Let the rich go first!

I have stated a divine right of parents that nobody's ever bothered to talk about. We assume that the government, like the kings and the queens of old, have the right to conscript in a time of war and take their sons and daughters. Why do we not have a movement which challenges that? Governments that do not bother to provide food, clothing and shelter for poor youngsters have no right to later on claim their lives in wars that they had no decision-making power to start or stop.

It comes down to a class warfare. There is class warfare in America. The rich have declared war. The powerful have declared war on the poor. The poor do not fight back. They do not know that they are being constantly abused. It is time we took a hard look at how much they are abused in times of war. Like the blunder in Iraq, it is a life and death matter. They are going to die if they do not fight back.

America is a promised land, and America's promised land is being grossly mismanaged. We are as a promised land as man can ever get, human kind will ever get. We have the greatest potential of anything that ever existed on the face of the Earth. While managing a society that provides justice for all provides the right to pursue happiness and the opportunity to pursue happiness for all. That is possible in America, but America's promise is being grossly mismanaged by this Republican administration. The war in Iraq is the most dangerous mismanagement this country has ever experienced.

Preoccupation with \$87 billion for the war dooms any realistic effort to revive the economy. There are alternatives, but this mismanagement team will never consider those alternatives.

There was a bill offered by a friend of mine, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), which says if we are going to spend 20-some billion dollars in Iraq to rebuild Iraq, then let us spend an equal amount in the cities and the States to improve our economy. That is a good idea. There are other good ideas along those lines that have been offered.

I think several months ago I offered a bill called the Domestic Budget Protection Act, H.R. 1804. The essence of the Domestic Budget Protection Act is we should have a situation where the domestic budget, the budget for education, for highways and schools, and the budget for health care is not in the same category with the budget for the war. Let the war pay for itself in some other way, and H.R. 1804 says that we should pay for it the way we paid for part of the Vietnam War and part of the Korean War and to some extent

World War II. We placed a tax on the profits of corporations. Let a tax be placed on the profits of corporations to pay for the war so that no money is taken out of the other revenue that comes in and there is no threat to the domestic budget from the war budget. That is not a radical idea. We have done it before. Let us consider it now and do it now.

I also had another act which was a twin for that, and this is called the Emergency Targeted Revenue Sharing Act of 2003, H.R. 2335, and that is a simple act which says that we should spend the same amount of money in the States and the cities on job creation programs, education, health care, et cetera, that we spend in Iraq. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) says \$20 billion, I said \$9 billion was at the time the amount we were proposing for the war in Iraq.

The principle is pretty clear, as my colleague from Ohio stated. We are suffering greatly in our cities and our towns. Our schools are suffering. People are being laid off. Terrible things are happening in terms of taxes being raised on ordinary local people. At the same time, the Federal Government is cutting income tax for the richest people, for the Dick Grassos who earn \$140 million and want another \$40 million. They are getting tax cuts for the WorldCom president who can borrow \$400 million. He is getting a tax cut. For all the Enron criminals who squandered large amounts of money, they are getting tax cuts. But for those who are out there searching for jobs, they are sinking in a quagmire of poverty. The report that came out a few days ago said poverty is increasing. The number of people who are uninsured is increasing. It is not surprising, they are both very much related.

We want to support the troops. The first way we can support them is to support their families. We should manage the war and the economy better, manage the war and the economy better.

The team now in charge is not capable of managing better. I have here an advertisement that appeared in the New York Times last Friday. It is a big, full page advertisement that reads: "Donald Rumsfeld betrayed my son and our Nation; it is time for him to go." It is written by a person who has three sons in the military, three sons in the military. Two of them are in Iraq.

□ 2230

His name is Larry Syverson of Richmond, Virginia. I am going to read it all and submit it for the RECORD.

"I am a patriotic American with three sons in the military, two serving in Iraq. Brandon is a master gunner near Tikrit. Bryce is a gunner stationed in Baghdad. I'm proud of their service, but I'm angry with those who have led us into what can only be called a quagmire.

"Donald Rumsfeld had day-to-day authority for planning the war and its

aftermath. He was the chief architect, and it is his house of cards that is tumbling today. Months after the President declared 'mission accomplished,' Americans are being killed almost daily. On April 13, Rumsfeld said: 'Every hour that goes by, it's getting better and more peaceful and more orderly in Iraq.'

"We know that is not true. Rumsfeld's bad planning has left our troops poorly equipped and vulnerable in an increasingly hostile environment, and Americans are being asked for an additional \$87 billion for Iraq. We now know that the President and those who serve him misled us about weapons of mass destruction, about Saddam's supposed nuclear program, about a link between Saddam and September 11.

"I'm in awe at the courage of my sons and the honorable service they give, but the leaders they serve have not acted honorably. They have failed my sons. They have failed all of us. At the very least, Secretary Donald Rumsfeld must go."

Now this is an ad that appeared in The New York Times and is paid for by MoveOn.org that says we can win without war.

We have a situation where very high-powered leaders with very high-powered advice, almost unlimited funds to pay for the personnel to do the planning, have placed us in a situation which is a quagmire. There is an overwhelming blunder that has taken place in Iraq. Did we not know about the dilemma of Robert McNamara in Vietnam? Were the people who did this not able to read? Did they not see the clipings and the media representations about the war in Chechnya, the Russians trying to contain a very small population, compared to the 24 million population of Iraq? Did we not see that and understand what that was all about? Did we not understand what happened to the Soviet Union in Afghanistan? Did we think the Soviet Union was driven out of Afghanistan because we supplied the Taliban, the al Qaeda at that time, the Mujahadeen? We supplied them with modern weapons. We supplied them with training. We spent billions of dollars that were never recorded in Afghanistan to defeat the Soviets.

I invite anybody who would like to hear more about that to read a book called Charlie Wilson's War. Charlie Wilson's War has gotten very little publicity in terms of what it deserves. Charlie Wilson's War is a story of a Congressman named Charlie Wilson from Texas. He is still alive. He was an amazing character and should be given some kind of medal for being the Member of Congress who controlled and manipulated billions and billions of dollars. He has the record for what he controlled and manipulated, using the CIA and other mechanisms to get money into Pakistan to be used against the Russians in the war in Afghanistan.

Eventually, the modernizing of the Mujahadeen and the Taliban, including

Osama bin Laden, who was there at the time, the modernization of that group led them to the point where they were able to drive the Soviet Union out of Afghanistan. Stinger missiles were supplied in tremendous numbers through the efforts of Charlie Wilson. It is something everyone should read. But did Rumsfeld not read it?

Westmoreland, in Vietnam, kept offering optimistic reports and blowing up the body bag numbers for the enemy. Did he not read about that? Later, we found it was not true. The number of enemy that General Westmoreland claimed were being killed in Vietnam was far less than were being killed. Therefore, it threw off all our calculations, and the North Vietnamese were later to mount a tremendous counterattack, and we had to scramble to get out of Saigon. Did no one read that?

Does anybody remember the Tet offensive, the Tet offensive in Saigon? At a time when President Johnson said we were winning the war, the Vietnamese guerrillas, with the help of North Vietnam, launched a massive weekend guerrilla attack which shattered once and for all any hope that we could ever win the war in Vietnam. It was called the Tet offensive. In the environment of Iraq it will be easy to mount a Tet Offensive type operation. They have already started down that road.

The guerilla attacks are getting more intense in Iraq. There was an 8-hour firefight yesterday, an 8-hour firefight with the guerrillas yesterday. This is not a hit-and-run suicide bomber situation. They are moving into other levels.

Now, should we cut and run? That is not my proposal. I propose that we immediately move as rapidly as possible to create a situation which will head off the support for these guerrillas. The way to do that is to be able to get help from other nations. Let it be known clearly that we are not oppressors, we are not occupiers, we do not intend to stay there. We need to get help from other nations, move rapidly to establish a constitution for Iraq, and while we are doing that, send in more troops.

We cannot play games the way we are playing now, pretending we do not need more troops. The way to stop the guerrillas is to have more troops. The way to stop the sabotage of the oil wells, the way to stop the sabotage of the water systems, the way to stop the sabotage of the electricity systems is to have more troops to guard them. You cannot escape the need for more troops on a short-term basis.

Naturally, Mr. Rumsfeld does not want to be in a position of exposing that his calculations were all wrong. God forbid he should become a person who has to call for a draft. But he puts our soldiers in harm's way by playing such games, by not agreeing with the generals who are afraid to say so in public but they tell us behind the scenes they need more troops. We need more American troops while we are

waiting for those others to come from other nations, who might show up and they might not.

We must understand the degree of the mismanagement. Robert McNamara was a genius, but he got caught up in a situation in Vietnam which drove him to ignore all of his common sense and all of his genius. Lyndon Johnson was a political genius, but ego and the belief that America must never allow itself to be defeated led to a quagmire in Vietnam. Fifty-eight thousand died in Vietnam.

The numbers are much smaller in Iraq, but every life is sacred. And if we do not move now in a decisive way, the numbers will go up, and every soldier killed will have died in vain. I do not think this blunder in Iraq is worth a single American life, and since we are there, we could not avoid being there, let us try to limit the number of lives that are being lost.

So I say to the working families of America and the people who care about all of Americans, who care about our troops who are out there suffering, really care about the troops and not just waving flags but refuse to provide the kind of support the troops need, as veterans, as soldiers out there who need flack jackets at work, and there are a number of things going on which are detrimental to our troops in the field and certainly affect their morale when they look back home and see their families being treated like dirt, I say to all those people who are watching this to not give up.

Now is the time for us to come forward and place ourselves on the front lines for the defense of America. The greatest Americans are the Americans who want peace. The greatest Americans are the Americans who will tell the truth and who will fight the myths that are endangering our security. It is a myth that Iraq is a center for fighting terrorism. That is a myth. We have said it is a center, but it is only a quagmire, a trap, an ambush. The real center is still wherever Osama bin Laden and his network is located, and that network is still our greatest threat in terms of our security. That is a myth. We should fight that myth.

We should fight the myth that the United Nations has nothing to offer; that France, with its French fries and American fries, does not deserve to be a decisionmaker in this situation; that Russia only wants to get involved because it wants to get the money back for its contracts; that Iraq cannot pay for its own reconstruction. That is the biggest myth. Iraq has oil fields beneath the surface that can pay for any reconstruction they need to take. The problem is that many of the people involved in this war are trying to secure the oil of Iraq for the oil barons and the companies that already are involved. They want theirs off the top. They do not want an agreement which says Iraq should pay its own way because they have plans to take their commissions off the top.

There was a time when the Middle East oil flowed out of the Middle East and each country only got 12 cents on the barrel. The rest of it flowed to Great Britain or France or some other country, the dollars. They want to go back to that. They do not want to admit that Iraq can pay for its own reconstruction. We can set up a situation where they wait maybe 10 years, 20 years. Who cares? Charge them low interest. They can pay for their own reconstruction.

We need to come forward and be as fervent, as dedicated as the people who support Donald Rumsfeld. They have fervor. They are bold. But they are wrong.

We need to be fanatics for peace.

We are citizens who ought to volunteer to do our part.

Never mind looking for a military Purple Heart.

We are fanatics for peace.

Our holy assault must never cease.

The Constitution light still shines.

We should launch spit into the fascist face.

Our maneuvers will launch the human race.

Pledge allegiance to the human race.

Pledge allegiance to the civilization that our children deserve.

This is the cause we swear to serve.

Victory without blood in Ghandi's name.

Celebrate Mandela's fame.

The spirit of Martin King again will reign.

Resist a government that has now gone insane.

Commanders of abuses must face the Nuremberg nooses.

We are fanatics for peace.

Run and broadcast the brave news.

Divine mobilization is what working families should choose.

Surrender we unconditionally refuse.

Our vision will not decrease.

Our passion will never cease.

We are fanatics for peace.

We are the greatest Americans.

We want peace.

Madam Speaker, the article I referred to earlier is as follows:

I'm a patriotic American with three sons in the military, two serving in Iraq. Branden is a master gunner near Tikrit. Bryce is a gunner stationed in Baghdad. I'm proud of their service. But I'm angry with those who have led us into what can only be called a quagmire.

Donald Rumsfeld had day-to-day authority for planning for the war and its aftermath. He was the chief architect and it is his house of cards that is tumbling today. Months after the President declared, "mission accomplished," Americans are being killed almost daily. On April 13, Rumsfeld said: "Every hour that goes by, it's getting better, and more peaceful and more orderly in [Iraq]." We know that is not true. Rumsfeld's bad planning has left our troops poorly equipped and vulnerable in an increasingly hostile environment. And Americans are being asked for an additional \$87 billion for Iraq.

We now know that the President and those who serve him mislead us about weapons of mass destruction, about Saddam's supposed nuclear program, about a link between Saddam and September 11. I'm in awe at the courage of my sons and the honorable service they give. But the leaders they serve have not acted honorably. They have failed my sons. They have failed all of us. At the very least, Secretary Donald Rumsfeld must go.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 29, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on September 29, 2003 at 12:35 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits a Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of State and the Department of Homeland Security Concerning Implementation of Section 428 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

MARTHA C. MORRISON
(For Jeff Trandahl, Clerk).

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN SECRETARIES OF STATE AND HOMELAND SECURITY CONCERNING IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 428 OF THE HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 131)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Homeland Security and ordered to be printed.

Message to the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with section 428(e)(8)(A) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296) (the "Act"), I am pleased to report that the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security have completed a Memorandum of Understanding concerning implementation of section 428 of the Act. The Memorandum of Understanding will allow the Departments of State and Homeland Security to work cooperatively to create and maintain an effective, efficient visa process that secures America's borders from external threats and ensures that our borders remain open to legitimate travel to the United States.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 29, 2003.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE SECRETARIES OF STATE AND HOMELAND SECURITY CONCERNING IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 428 OF THE HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is the agreement between the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security that shall govern the implementation of section 428 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, P.L. 107-296 (hereafter the Act), by the Department of State (DOS) and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

1. INTENT OF THE PARTIES

a. The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security will work cooperatively to create and maintain an effective, efficient visa process that secures America's borders from external threats and ensures that our borders remain open to legitimate travel to the United States. Such travel is important to our international, economic, and national values and interests.

b. Accordingly, the Secretary of Homeland Security will establish visa policy, review implementation of that policy, and provide additional direction as provided by this memorandum, while respecting the prerogatives of the Secretary of State to lead and manage the consular corps and its functions, to manage the visa process, and to execute the foreign policy of the United States. The Secretary of Homeland Security will rely upon the expertise of the Department of State with respect to foreign policy, and the Secretary of State will respect the expertise of the Department of Homeland Security concerning threats to American security.

2. VISA GUIDANCE

a. Definition. As used in this MOU, the term "visa guidance" refers to regulations, Foreign Affairs Manual provisions (including all interpretive and procedural notes) and ALDACs (DOS cables to all diplomatic and consular posts) implementing the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) or other immigration and nationality laws pertaining to visas.

b. Continuity of existing visa guidance. All existing DOS visa guidance shall remain effective unless and until superseded in accordance with this MOU.

c. Issuance of visa guidance. (1) DOS may propose and issue visa guidance subject to DHS consultation and final approval as discussed below. DHS will have authority to issue or approve (hereinafter "final responsibility over" visa guidance, except for those matters that are the specific responsibility of the Secretary of State as prescribed in section 428 (c)(2) and (d)(2) of the Act, in existing statutes related to foreign policy or management of the visa process, in future statutes, Presidential proclamations and executive orders, and in paragraphs 3 and 10 of this MOU. DHS will exercise its final responsibility over visa guidance subject to consultation as discussed in paragraph 2d.

d. Notice and consultation.

(1) DHS and DOS will provide notice to the other when either determines that serious consideration should be given to development of new visa guidance. DHS will also provide notice to DOS when it begins drafting rules, policies or procedures affecting the visa process. Each will designate a point of contact for this purpose who may or may not be a liaison identified in paragraph 9a below.

(2) DHS and DOS will each offer the other the opportunity to consult regarding security, legal, operational, resource, or foreign policy or foreign relations issues associated with such guidance.

e. Publication of regulations. The Secretary of Homeland Security may elect to publish any and all visa regulations in 6 C.F.R. in an appropriate form. All visa regulations shall be published by the Secretary of State in 22 C.F.R. using State Department procedures for the issuance of visa regulations and shall become effective on the effective date specified in the Federal Register when published as interim final or final regulations. Each notice of rulemaking will indicate whether the rule is being approved by or being issued on behalf of DHS. DOS will expeditiously publish notices of rulemaking that are approved by or directed by DHS in accordance with paragraph 2c, and will expeditiously implement interim final or final