

I believe it is time now for this Congress to put in place legislation that deals with earned access to legalization, to be able to say that if they have not committed a criminal act, that they are here working, they may be undocumented, they are paying their taxes, that they should have the access to being able to apply for citizenship. I believe we should pass 245(i) to reunite our families. And, yes, I believe that we should treat all people with human dignity.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues that we are the people's House. We should open our doors to this voice and the voices that cannot be heard or the picture of the young lady that was shown to me who is suffering because she cannot access a kidney transplant, and she came here as a baby and is still here at 21 years old and dying with kidney failure. How unmerciful can we be? And I would ask that my colleagues consider a real immigration policy for this Nation that deals with the security of this Nation, the justice of this Nation.

And then might I say very briefly, Mr. Speaker, we spoke today on the floor of the House about an untoward legislative initiative that would force hardworking Americans to overcome or to be able to eliminate their overtime. I said overcome. I wish we could overcome it. We won the instruction to the Labor-HHS conference to say that we do not want to eliminate America's overtime. Hardworking Americans, our first responders, restaurant workers, white-collar workers, people who are putting their children through college, the only way they do it is through overtime. What an insane proposition that we would even believe that is the right thing to do with the economy stumbling as it is.

And then, Mr. Speaker, I come to say something that I wish I did not have to do. That is to bring to task Rush Limbaugh, who has been blessed by being in this country, having the freedom to say anything he desires to say. The first amendment gives anyone the right. It protects free speech. It respects sometimes hostile speech. Rush Limbaugh decided that he had the latitude to be on ESPN and to castigate an African-American quarterback. And as I stand here today, I insist that he has the right to free speech. He has castigated those of us in public life every day of the week. He spoke with great insult of President William Jefferson Clinton. Not that he has no right to say that, but he disrespected, from my position, the position of the Presidency. But what Rush Limbaugh does, and what is an insult, is that he continues the stereotypes and stigma and does not respect the human dignity of all people.

Rush Limbaugh, I say to you, you have a first amendment right, but you have no values. You have no ethnic respect. You have no dignity and no integrity, and you do not know what it is to hurt people.

All I can say is that it is time now that we stand up against this kind of bigotry and hateful speech, and I stand, today, against it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING MONEY FOR IRAQ

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, this evening the Congressional Black Caucus is coming before this Congress to address the issue of the \$87 billion that the President just recently requested of this Nation to continue our efforts in Iraq and in Afghanistan. We certainly are a group of 39 people, and I often say 39 very gifted legislators, who are simply ordinary people called to an extraordinary mission, and in the process of doing the extraordinary, I do believe that we have become extraordinary. And we have been consistently standing up for our troops over and over and over again because they are our children, they are our brothers and sisters, they are fathers, they are mothers.

And just the other night, Mr. Speaker, at the Congressional Black Caucus annual banquet, we were very pleased to honor Sergeant Shoshanna Johnson, who of course we know was shot in both feet and taken captive in Baghdad. So tonight we come to address this \$87 billion because it is our belief that our troops must be supported, but at the same time we are very clear that we need to look at the moneys that are being spent on what I would title the resurrection of Iraq after we tore it down, and we want to look at both sides of it.

In other words, we want to look at the money that it is going to take to support our troops, but at the same time we want to look at the money that will be spent, and is being spent, for these no-bid contracts and for repairing the infrastructure of Iraq while the infrastructure of so many of our cities and our rural areas are falling apart. We want to certainly look at the issue of schools, building a new school system. And it has all been on the news here recently, particularly today and yesterday, about how the Iraqi children are now beginning their school year, and certainly we are a very compassionate group of legislators, but at the same time when we go back to our districts, we fail to understand why it is that so many of our children in our districts are sitting in classrooms with rain falling on their heads and trudging through mud because they are in

portables or they have situations where they are in overcrowded schools. So we question that.

We also come questioning the whole question of elections. It is our understanding that a substantial amount of money is going to be spent on making sure that Iraq has a wonderful election system. And then we look at what we just saw here in the United States, the fiasco down in Florida and throughout the United States with our election process in the year 2000. And we believe, as the Congressional Black Caucus, that we are asking the basic questions, the questions that anybody would ask in any very serious family matter. This is not rocket science stuff. Questions like, Mr. President, we just spent \$80 billion. What did we do with that?

□ 1830

And can you account for that and tell us what that was spent for? Questions like, it is our understanding that there is quite a bit of oil over in Iraq, and we want to know simply what that money is being spent for, because we were promised a long time ago that that money from those oil reserves would be used to resurrect Iraq but, at the same time, you now come to the American people asking them to do it.

The other thing that we are certainly concerned about is that we hear over and over again that we are fighting terrorism for the world, and we do believe that. But at the same time, we ask the question, if we are fighting terrorism for the world, if there is going to be substantial benefit to the world, why is there not substantial giving or sacrifice on the part of other countries?

And certainly we want to know the exit strategy. One of the things that the President said when he was running for office, and we certainly hold him to it, as the American people do, is that he would never go into another country, let our Armed Forces go into another country without having an exit strategy. We want to know what the exit strategy is.

Then finally, and there are some other questions that will be raised by my colleagues, but certainly we are very interested in knowing, how do we measure success. The answer has to be very clear with regard to our schoolchildren, and he has made excellent arguments about how we need to measure how our children are doing. That is all well and good. So we come to the President asking him, exactly how do we measure our accomplishments in Iraq?

I am so glad that this evening I am joined by my colleague who sits on the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), a freshman who is just doing a great job. But the gentleman has an opportunity to look at it from an armed services standpoint, and I would like to hear from the gentleman.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am just so pleased how the gentleman from

Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), as chairman of the Black Caucus and also just as a Member of Congress, is asking the kitchen table questions. These are common questions that we took under assumption, we assumed, when the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, and the Defense Secretary, Donald Rumsfeld, came to us and said, this is the situation, this is the case at hand, this is what we need to do. Some of us agreed, some of us did not agree, but genuinely as Americans, we said that we want to support our troops and their families; and we went right to work, thinking they were going to do the right thing.

We talk about the money. Mr. Speaker, \$87 billion is an awful lot of money. That will buy quite a few new schools in our country. That will put forth quite a few opportunities as it relates to our youth in our communities. But as I look through this, finally, I just want to say to the gentleman that, finally, we got a plan, or what they call a plan, from the administration on Iraq and the reconstruction of Iraq; and that is supposed to explain the \$87 billion.

I will tell my colleagues this, that what makes this plan flawed from the outset is the fact that this administration has said, the President, Donald Rumsfeld, and other leaders in the administration have said that we are going to the U.N. and we are going to get \$12 billion from the U.N. We are talking to our friends at the U.N. Well, the President had an opportunity to go to the U.N. and make his case, but he did not make his case. He went saying the same thing that he said before to the U.N. And now, just today, just recently, the U.N. has agreed to \$234 million. Mr. Speaker, \$234 million is a far cry from \$12 billion.

We of the Committee on Armed Services talk about the future need, which this administration is very reluctant to talk about. Yesterday, I think on Tuesday, Secretary Rumsfeld went before the Committee on Appropriations as it relates to armed services or military services, defense, and was very accurate as it relates to 14,000 recruits for the Iraqi police force, and some 50-something thousand Iraqi soldiers already out there. But when we asked the question, how many troops do we have? Well, that is kind of hard to gauge right now. Well, how many coalition troops do we have, of the willing? I must add. Well, that is kind of hard to gauge also. Well, what is going to be our future for us, leave alone 12 months from now, but 6 months from now? Well, that is all so hard to predict. We are at the U.N. now trying to put together, and they talk about this coalition of countries, but the coalition of countries of the willing, they are few. There are very few countries that have come forth that have put real people and real troops on the ground. Why would they want to put troops on the ground when this administration is not willing to give up some of the decision-making in Iraq?

The gentleman from Maryland hit it right on the head when he spoke so eloquently just moments ago by saying that if there is terrorism throughout the world, we cannot solve the terrorism problem throughout the world by ourselves. We do not have the money. Can I say that again? We do not have the money to be able to spend the millions, no, billions, and we are about to get to trillions, on borrowed money.

Some of the things that have taken place are just ironic. I am so glad the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and her staff and others have gone forth to really look at the kitchen table questions, like the gentleman from Maryland mentioned. We are looking at the cost of them wanting to build two prisons over in Iraq, 4,000-bed prisons, \$50,000 per prison bed, when we build prison beds right here in the U.S. for \$26,000. What is the difference? Once again, we look at just the issue of communications. \$6,000 per radio phone. The Bush administration has requested \$1.3 million for 400 hand-held radios, when here we can go down to the local Radio Shack and buy the same thing for \$54.99.

So when we start looking at, as we finally get outside of them saying this is what we want, do not ask any questions, because if they do not answer our questions, I say to the gentleman, then when will the questions be answered? Should we just write the check and say, okay, we are patriotic, God bless America, and Mr. President, we love you, and Mr. Rumsfeld, we trust you? At no other time in recent history has the Department of Defense taken on the rebuilding of a society which we have gone into and have conquered in a battle, which the President brought us into several months ago, that the State Department does not have a say in this. The Department of Defense is still there, so we are still at war.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to continuing this conversation.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), the gentleman from Florida said something that really hit home. I too thank our leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for all of her hard work and the work of her staff. When we look at some of the information that we have been looking at here lately with regard to this whole \$87 billion, it is very interesting to know that that \$87 billion can do a lot of things with regard to our education system. Mr. Speaker, \$87 billion will hire 2 million new teachers. That is a lot of teachers. And we could spend an additional \$1,824 on each child in American public schools. We could spend seven times more than the President's proposal for title I education programs in fiscal year 2004.

The reason why we are bringing this up is because we want people to understand that we just spent about \$80 billion a few months ago, and now the President is talking about another \$87

billion. And again, one of those kitchen table questions is what should we expect in the future, Mr. President? Will you be coming back to us asking for some more money?

Some people look at it and say, oh, you are attacking the President. It is not about attacking the President. It is a question of accountability. What we want the President to do is be accountable.

Talking about accountability, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) serves on the Committee on Homeland Security. I know the gentlewoman has a number of comments she wants to make. But when we look at what we are doing with homeland security, we are very concerned about homeland security. I get complaints, and I am sure the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) does, from our mayor and our local fire departments about the fact that they do not have the kinds of things, the equipment they need to really be true first responders. I just was wondering, how does the gentlewoman see this \$87 billion request with regard to homeland security?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman raises a very good point. I am very pleased to join my colleagues, and I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, for addressing this crucial issue. We are grateful for the expertise that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) brings to us on this issue, as a member of both the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Armed Services.

But the gentleman has really hit the nail on the head. If I might build up to that answer, because when we hear where we are in terms of dollars, and it was so good for the gentleman to cite teachers, because 2 days ago a distinguished colleague of ours down on the floor of the House said that each child starting school in Iraq, and I applaud the fact that these children are starting school, would have a book bag to take to school. And I applaud that, I say to the gentleman. But the gentleman from Maryland mentioned teachers. I do not know how many of our young children in some of these inner city districts or rural districts are given a book bag or even books, each child, to take with them to school. This does not diminish the need in Iraq. But I think what we are trying to explain to the American people is this is about choices.

Just to let my colleagues know how we are giving away money, and I am going to add some more money on top of the \$87 billion, is that we passed a continuing resolution a couple of days ago, a CR. What that does, because we have not met our obligations, and the majority is in charge, the Republicans of the Senate and the House, that means that we will spend an extra \$2.2 billion more than the 2004 funding limit because we have not yet put in

place and finished all of our appropriations and we have a CR. The CR accomplishes this feat by shifting \$2.2 billion of previously appropriated 2004 education funding back to fiscal year 2003. It is sort of a gimmick. So we have \$87 billion, and now we are spending an extra \$2.2 billion. We do not know where that is going; it is just sort of filling the gap to keep us going.

One of the reasons we are doing that is because even as the President is asking for the \$87 billion, he is not rolling back this tax cut that we have given to 1 percent of America's richest individuals. So we are spending \$1 trillion to pay them, and we are asking for \$87 billion.

Now, let me contrast that with homeland security. The gentleman is absolutely right. In this last budget, we were between 59 and \$79 billion for homeland security, leaving out, however, many of the issues that my colleague, my good friend, we discuss all the time. We are not up to par where we need to be in cybersecurity. We had one of our very fine representatives of the Homeland Security Department come and testify in the last 10 days and said, I need a Department of 800 persons. I have only 200 that are staffed up at this point. My local communities, police, and fire departments have already indicated, and I am talking about across the Nation, police and fire, that means sheriffs, constables, are still waiting for those direct funds to help them with the extra dollars that they have expended responding to our color alert. They responded to our color alert and have billed on the overtime for responding when we have upped it to an orange alert, right short under red alert. So the gentleman asks a very good question.

Let me throw all of this up against this backdrop, which is, I believe, we should bifurcate and vote separately on the resources necessary for the troops. Because the gentleman from Maryland said it, and I think the Congressional Black Caucus has been very clear in everything that we have said, because our constituents are those on the frontline. We have been very clear. We support them. We support their families. In fact, we have been on the frontline about where are the benefits for these troops that are returning home; where are the veterans benefits; where are the mental health and trauma dollars that we understand Fort Bliss in Texas are cutting back on mental health services that are needed for returning troops.

But let me just say this: the \$87 billion, I have been told, is the largest supplemental request, supplemental, because this is not in our normal budget, supplemental request in history. It totals more than the seven smallest supplemental bills that we have funded over the last term of this Congress. It is more money than we spent in Vietnam. Tragically, 50,000 of our young men and women lost their lives there. But it is more money than we have

spent in Vietnam, including all of the defense appropriations during that era from 1965 to 1975. It is more than that.

Our good friend, the gentleman from Florida, made another point. Because as the gentleman well knows, we have had a series of discussions, and there was a set of principles that I sent out, and I think our good friend from Florida, the distinguished gentleman from Florida, said it and the gentleman from Maryland said it: the President made a commitment to go to the United Nations. I was in New York when he spoke before the General Assembly, waiting for sort of the olive branch to encourage our allies to give the big dollars that we needed to truly make a dent. Just like President Bush One in the Persian Gulf had a real coalition, whether we agreed or disagreed with the war, the total spent in that war was \$62 billion; and the United States spent only a total of 7.5 in the Gulf War, where hundreds of thousands of troops that included troops from all over the world were in that war.

So what we have here is a failure of the President to heal the rift, so that we can sit down and get an extended commitment of dollars. I think \$234 million is a pittance compared to the \$12 billion that would truly have an impact on the \$87 billion.

□ 1845

So let me just finish because I see my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), has a point to make.

Mr. MEEK. I say to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) the unanswered questions are huge. These are not just small unanswered questions. We talk about deficit spending. I want to remind Americans that we are talking about borrowed money. We are not talking about money we have in our pocket. We are talking about borrowed money.

Quickly, there is still not an accounting for the \$80 billion that we passed out last spring, that we entrusted to the administration, as it relates to the deployment of 30,000 troops and reserves from their homes.

Also, Secretary Rumsfeld, who I must say is getting very irritated with the fact that people are asking questions, he had a press conference today and chastised the press and said they are not reporting about the good things the Members of Congress that went over to Iraq had to say about what was going on. Well, you know, that is fine. We have gone to the region. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) and I, we have gone to the region. That is fine. That is okay for him to have some concern there. But do not get upset with the press.

We are getting down to the nitty-gritty of saying, Mr. Rumsfeld and President Bush, you have got to let us know what is going on. If you can be accurate on 56,000 Iraqi soldiers that our military are training and 4,000 police officers that have been recruited, the figures that he gave this past Tues-

day, but he cannot give us a count on our own soldiers, something is wrong. These are unanswered questions.

The administration, as it relates to the fine print on contractual services, remember we have \$20-plus billion in this request in the rebuilding of Iraq, and the administration is saying, you know, do not put any language in the bill that will tie our hands so they can continue to give sole-source contracts.

Now, we all know, as lovers of public education, as lovers of what we have to do to even make our homeland safe and children ready to learn when they get in school, think about how many Head Start programs who have to go through yards and yards and stacks of paper to prove their funding. I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we have that fine print there.

I am glad the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) talked about the numbers. We are taking a credit card with a very high interest rate and paying for this so-called "trust me" without the help of the rest of the world. The last time the President went to the U.N., Mr. Speaker, I must add, and left with the kind of reception that he got, which was a bad one, we ended up by ourselves. And we are by ourselves now.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If I could just finish and build on what my good friend said. He is absolutely right. I mean, the lack of interest, unfortunately, in the presentation made by this administration to the U.N. in the last 10 days, when all of the world was watching and all of the world was there and at least seemingly wanting to provide the kind of broad coalition which would be the key to the aftermath of Iraq, we did not rise to the occasion.

So I think this idea of voting separately for the rebuilding which allows us to then rebuild the friendships and move that dollar amount up from \$234 million, that shows that that is the result of an unhappy group of allies. We realize that these are all issues of permanence and all friends are tentative, but I think there is a common interest that we want to make sure that the region is secure and the region is stable. Even we are not doing that by having the kind of negotiations that this administration needs to have.

Let me conclude by saying this: We have to support the troops to the extent that they are on the front line. So it is imperative that the document that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK of Florida) was holding up is a document that has gone through a fine tooth comb.

Because what we find the greatest failure in Iraq being, besides not finding the weapons of mass destruction, as David Kay has now come back and indicated that even his team of 1,500 have not been able to document the basis upon which we say we went to war, and the fact that we were told that we were about to be imminently attacked, so that is clearly something we should pursue, but we are now there and we

are told, and I guess my friend has more of these facts because I think he was raising it, that our very troops do not have the kind of ammunition, armor, and equipment that they need to do their job.

How in the world can the Secretary of Defense be insulted by media questions? He should be here before us, before any committee of jurisdiction or a caucus of Members who have the responsibility to ask these questions for their constituents, to answer these questions.

Let me list them: Portable jammers. What does that mean? It means that those of you who are trying to, using my own term, de-explode a land mine, do not have to go up to it to do it. You can stand back and do that. That causes less of a loss of life.

A non-broke-down Humvee. We see the ones that the kids of the rich are driving, but this is a serious vehicle, broke down.

And then the other one is body armor.

These are the hard questions that I believe this special order is generating. I am grateful that we have the opportunity to dialogue on this, and I hope that our colleagues and the administration realize how serious we are in these questions and how impossible it would be to vote for the \$87 billion under these circumstances.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas).

One of the things that certainly concerns all of us and the last thing that was just talked about is our troops being properly equipped. That is why I said we are not asking rocket-scientist questions. What we are asking are basic questions that any person would ask in their family if they had a serious issue at hand. And I tell you, if your son or daughter came to you and said, mom, I got an emergency, you gave her \$80 to deal with the emergency; and then she came back and the emergency still was not dealt with, or you asked some questions about it, you are going to ask the question, what happened to the money I gave you? This is basic stuff.

So the more we look at what has happened here with the President, it seems as if the President does not want any questions asked. That is crazy. I mean, that does not even make sense.

So what we are trying to do, we want to make sure our troops are protected and make sure when they go out on that battlefield in 100-plus degree weather that they have everything they need, and we want to make sure at the same time that if we are going to be about the business of rebuilding Iraq, we would like to have a separate vote. Let us vote on the resurrection of Iraq and let us vote on the support of our troops and let us have accountability.

Speaking of accountability, the gentlewoman from Washington D.C. (Ms. NORTON) has consistently addressed

this whole issue of accountability. Being here in Washington D.C., and I do not say the capital of the Nation because, actually, it is the capital of the world, we certainly saw what happened on September 11; and when you talk about first responders, we have to make sure that it starts here.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the Members understand the vulnerability we feel here in the national capital. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is in this region as well. And, of course, there is almost no attention being paid to vulnerability at home. I am on the Select Committee on Homeland Security, and I can tell you that those issues have been moved off the screen by what is happening in Iraq, by this \$87 billion request.

I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for coming forward this evening to continue this dialogue in the way he is continuing it among the members of the Congressional Black Caucus. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK of Florida) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) for the repartee and colloquy that they have.

I see I have two of my good friends and sisters who need also to be able to speak before our time is up, so I will try and have consideration and bear that in mind as I speak briefly.

I want to congratulate my colleagues. I heard some of their colloquy on the troops. I am tired of talking about the war. I want to talk about the people who are being forced to make this war. Yes, they are volunteers, but none of them, none of them expected and indeed none of them were promised what has happened to them now.

We of the Congressional Black Caucus are concerned. A third of the U.S. Army is African American. About 20 percent of the armed services are all over, but when we speak about troops, we are talking about the American men and women who are in Iraq. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, they are not just in Iraq. My God, one begins to wonder where are they not? We are still in Europe and Japan. How long ago was World War II? When did the Cold War end? Nobody is talking about burden sharing anymore, about pulling them out. Korea. I guess most of the Congressmen were not even alive. Nobody is talking about going home from there. We are in Philippines, Bosnia, Kosovo, the Sinai Peninsula, Liberia. This is all that has come to mind. I have not done the encyclopedic rendition of where we are.

I am very, very frightened for my country now. Because my country is overly dependent on what we have come to call the weekend warriors. We know who the weekend warriors are. The weekends warriors are not your daughter and my son. They are not the folks who can go to college. The weekends warriors are the people who, knowing full well they may have to go

abroad to fight a war, nevertheless had no expectation, for example, of having 6 months turn into a year and then come back and have to go again.

They want more troops. They say more foreign troops. They do not have enough troops to fight this war. They say foreign troops because they do not want to tell the American people the truth: They need more folks. We know from what has happened at the U.N. they are not going to get them from France and Germany. We are paying for the troops that are there from other countries already, so we are getting no financial relief. There are drips and dabs from other parts of the country.

Where is the pool going to go come from, Mr. Speaker? There is no place else for it to come from. It is going to come from the people who are now supporting their families here that have not been called up yet. The people who are in the Reserves and in the National Guard, largely for financial reasons, and are now becoming the blood and guts of the Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe, and I think it can be easily proved, that this notion that we talked about endlessly of being able to fight two wars at the same time is any longer the case. We are hardly able to fight Afghanistan and Iraq at the same time, and there were howls about how Afghanistan was being neglected.

I defy anybody to tell me if a major war were to break out somewhere else in the world today how we would be prepared to go even a fight that war. But that was always the paradigm. We could do that. Because we invaded Iraq, a war of choice, that was unnecessary, we can no longer do that.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say why a country, not simply we who feel for the troops, should be concerned about this. For the Active Duty and the Reserves thus far, there have been no particular impact of this war; and the reason the analysts tell us is there is no impact is the bad economy. People are, in fact, still joining the Active Reserve and Active Duty because they cannot get a job at home. Thank you, Uncle Sam. What you are not providing in America, people are getting their job risking their lives in the armed services.

But watch out for the National Guard. The National Guard is already 20 percent down on meeting its goal for the year. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, do you think the average person seeing National Guard targets in Iraq would now sign up to be in the National Guard? Moreover, the parents and the relatives of those who are there now say that, in the units where their husbands are fighting, three-quarters of the unit is going to go as soon as they are able to get out.

Who is going to fight the wars at all if going into Iraq means nobody wants to be in the Reserve anymore, nobody wants to be in the National Guard?

□ 1900

Mr. Chairman, did you know that you cannot get out now when your time is up because there is something called the Stop Loss for mobilized units? So your time is off. You signed up to X date; X date is passed and you are still in. Last time I looked, that was called a draft, and yet these are supposed to be volunteers.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me indicate a particular outrage that came to public note only this week. I do not know if I were to ask the average person what employer do you think has the largest number of Reservists? And I think people might think of AT&T or General Motors. Mr. Chairman, it is the United States Government. There are 65,000 Reservists who are employed by the Federal Government, people who serve their country in a civilian capacity, serve their country as a Reservist, the single largest employer in the United States is Uncle Sam, and so it should come as no surprise that we would have more Reservists. I did not realize until recently that 48,000 Federal technicians, there are 48,000 Federal technicians who are required to be members of the National Guard as a condition for employment by the Federal Government. So you would think that we would do what we could having so many of these Reservists.

We are not among the 200 private sector employers and 50 local and State governments who make up the difference in pay between what they earned on the job and their military pay. We are not among them, although many State governments are and many private employers are. So we have a chance to close that, to say we realize there is a war no one expected to fight. We realize horrific things are happening to families, so let us do what large companies do.

Instead, this week we learn that there was no chance, indeed, the defense appropriators in conference indicated that there was no chance that there would be a provision to close the gap that the civil service employees who have been called to active duty face. It was being considered by House and Senate negotiators working on the fiscal 2004 defense authorization bill, and word came on Monday that provision is dead, and they said it costs too much money.

Let me tell you what is too much money to make up the difference, the huge financial sacrifice to families would have cost over 5 years, \$160 million dollars. We are talking about \$87 billion. The notion that we cannot find in the huge defense budget, \$160 million to do what 200 private companies do, to make sure that the sacrifice which is already horrific because you are already in the first place, would not come in dollars and cents to you and your family. So I say shame on you, Congress. Shame on the conferees for coming to the floor every day that this Congress is in session to talk about the troops. And when time comes to put up or shut up for the troops, they shut up.

Mr. Chairman, I want to invite one of my sisters to come forward now who has not had an opportunity to speak, and I would like to thank the gentleman for his leadership on this special order.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) has just spent a phenomenal amount of time along with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) on the whole issue of AIDS.

It is just interesting, again, we are trying to do a number of things this evening, but we want to put this \$87 billion in context. Before the gentlewoman comes on, I just want to note that with \$87 billion, we could spend 27 times more on AIDS research than the Federal Government spent in fiscal year 2000. We could spend \$226,000 on each individual AIDS patient in the United States, and we could fulfill the President's promise of \$3 billion for funding for AIDS in Africa this year and have enough left over to make a similar commitment for 28 more years.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the Chairman.

Let me commend the gentleman for his leadership and for insisting that the voices of reason really speak out in terms of organizing these speak-outs, and these special orders for the Congressional Black Caucus to really talk to America about the critical issues. And, of course, tonight under the gentleman's leadership, we are talking about this \$87 billion that Congress is about to appropriate in the next couple of weeks as it relates to the war in Iraq.

First of all, let me just say that I am the daughter of a military officer, 25 years, much of the time was spent in Fort Bliss, Texas. In fact I was born in El Paso, Texas, and so my support for the troops is very deep, and I understand very well the issues with regard to what makes sense in terms of the real deal in supporting the troops.

Our troops need all of the protection that they can receive, that we should provide. They need their benefits. They need their survivor benefits. They need their health care. They need the respect. They need all of the budget items that I do not really see in this \$87 billion. I do not even know what happened to that, what, first \$78 billion. Why would our young men and women need such items as toiletries. Why would they have to pay for certain items such as food at the hospitals? Why would they not receive their full retirement benefits? And all of the issues that we are talking about tonight, that first \$73 billion, I believe it was, what was in that? Was not that enough? Then you look at the military budget in total, what is that, \$400 billion or close to \$400 billion. We have got missile defense in there now. What is going on with this budget?

I think first of all, we should demand some accountability, and I think that is what, in fact, the principles that I want to applaud the Congressional

Black Caucus for putting together really enunciated. Where is the accountability for the taxpayers' money?

With regard to what was mentioned earlier in terms of the whole HIV/AIDS pandemic, we negotiated a measly \$3 billion a year. We cannot even get over \$2 billion yet. We have asked the President just to live up to his commitment. Over 100-some Members of Congress wrote a letter requesting the additional \$1 billion in the supplemental. We get a response that I do not even want to talk about it. It is pitiful the response we received.

Today we talked about Liberia in our Subcommittee on Africa and the development efforts and the stabilization requirements in terms of resources, minimally \$200 million. We cannot even figure out where that is coming from. I say we need \$500 million plus. I do not see that coming around. How do they find \$87 billion and cannot find \$1 billion for HIV/AIDS in Africa? So I think we need to do this, and this is what the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the Congressional Black Caucus is really exposing, what is really going on.

I think that is what is really going on, of course, we know in terms of this entire effort to build a country. I personally believe that if we bomb the heck out of a country, we have some responsibility to fix what we damaged. Beyond that, in terms of long-term development, when you look at Halliburton and Bechtel and contracts that are no-bid contracts, money is being made as we speak and will be made, profits, lots of money in terms of the development of a country, the construction of a country.

Here in our own communities, what are we looking at? We are looking at dilapidated schools. We have 44 million uninsured. No health care. In my own State of California, I think we are up to seven million now uninsured. Dilapidated housing, unaffordable housing. What is happening in terms of jobs in our own country? What? Three million plus unemployed now. So when we look at \$87 billion, I think that \$87 billion could be used right here at home.

Now, having said that, let me say that I believe also that in supporting our troops, we support them by bringing them home, but we also support them by developing an exit strategy, a time frame, a point in which they know they will return home. And during this transition period, we are required and should make sure that they are safe and secure. But how can we give this administration, any administration a blank check to engage in guerrilla war in perpetuity. I could not support it the first time around, the second time around, and the third time around. And this is another payment now, another quarterly payment I guess on what could end up being \$400, \$500 billion. I think that is outrageous.

I think the American people deserve some answers to why in the world, first of all, I must say why did we go to war?

And I think that we should stay here until we figure that out and demand investigations as it relates to the weapons of mass destruction. I mean, I think that is very important to know. And so we are going to insist that an independent commission be established or the select committee be established to investigate all of this. I do not think Congress should recess until we know what happened. I think the American people deserve answers.

This is our Government. We pay taxes and, of course, we want to make sure that each and every dollar we spend goes in terms of peace and security.

Let me just close by reading a quote from Dr. King. Often times we quote Dr. King and extol his virtues. He was a prophet and a visionary, but many only do that during January, but I think we should remember Dr. King's message each and every day. I want to read this quote by Dr. King who gave us this message in the 1960s. Dr. King warned us, he said, "In the wasteland of war, the expenditure of resources knows no restraint." No restraint.

Dr. King knew that war would be, could be, is a bottomless pit in which this great Nation could pour all of its resources, all of its young people and really never come out safer or stronger.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Congressional Black Caucus today for remembering Dr. King and remembering his words of wisdom. He died for what was right, and I think we have a duty and responsibility as it relates to going to war, the use of force, \$87 billion worth of taxpayers' money. I think we have a duty and a responsibility that we make sure that our troops are safe, that our young people are secure and we develop an exit strategy so we know they will come home.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I would like to say that the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) just raised an issue.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is on the Committee on Armed Services. I was wondering briefly, have we heard anything about an exit strategy or how we define success in this from anybody?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Not at all. And not only has that information not been given to the Committee on Armed Services, but it has not been given to the committee in question that they are asking the money from, that is the subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Defense and also the full Committee on Appropriations. That question has not been answered, neither in the House nor the Senate.

I must add also that the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) hit on so many points. The real question is

if we vote or vote against the \$87 billion, are we supporting the troops or are we supporting the President with cowboy politics, with his cowboy politics? That is the question.

So when folks say, I have to vote for it to support the troops, of course we want to support the troops, but the troops are not at the UN. The troops are not coming before Congress and saying, Ask no questions or we question your patriotism.

The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) came in here and said, What about the individuals that are right here? There are families right now watching us here on this House floor, and there are family members over in Iraq, meanwhile, they are behind in their house note. Meanwhile, the story cannot be read by mom or dad because they are in Iraq.

So if we give the \$87 billion plus, I have to add that, to this Bush administration, then we are saying that we condone the President going to the UN and not asking nicely for help. We condone individuals that are going to be in Iraq for some time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, if I might just add this point as our colleague comes forward. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) made a good point on that. First of all, we need to stay here until the President gives a real exit strategy because what we see is that the administration has no exit strategy. So the gentleman is absolutely right.

□ 1915

We need to stay here in session and not only stay here in session but have the committees of jurisdiction, the relevant committees and this body have the time to deliberate and debate so that we are responsible to those families that are over there.

The other thing is we are absolutely right that we should not separate out how we got there, whether it was weapons of mass destruction, imminent attack, and say that is bygone. That is behind us. We have lost lives. There are children, and forgive me for calling them children. There are young people. They are enlisted persons. They are National Guard. They are Reservists. They are our constituents in these hospitals, Bethesda and Walter Reed, with amputated limbs and with missing eyes; and they went to war on the basis of imminent threat and homeland security.

Now they are telling us that, one, they have no exit strategy, and, two, we should not ask any questions, and, three, weapons of mass destruction, that is the bygone. We do not need to talk about it. We need to stay here and question David Kay extensively on his report, no weapons of mass destruction; and by the way, 1,500 people were the ones under his team that went over there, and, two, we need to have the administration not give us classified information but give to this Congress a designed, defensive exit strategy. Last-

ly, we need to know line by line how these dollars are going to help the troops and how we are going to bring them home.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The interesting thing is that I think one of the most brilliant moments since I have been here is the few weeks before we went to war, and I think just about everybody who was on the floor tonight came up, and we talked about the war. We talked about the principles and we asked the President to meet with us, and he refused to meet with us; but we wanted to raise those key questions, and I think it does have relevance to a degree of what happened before the war and the fact that no weapons of mass destruction have been found. I think what it does is it should cause us to say, well, if we went to war on that basis and weapons have not been found, then why is it that we should just sit back and not at least question how we go further into this venture? I think it is important that we do that; and as I said, these are the basic questions.

That night, I will never forget the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) stood up and gave probably the most brilliant speech I have ever heard, talking about why we are going to war, and literally did a wonderful job in just laying out her rationale; and I would be happy to yield to her, but I believe she will come back just after we finish.

I want to thank my colleagues, and now I yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) because I know you had a lot of concerns. I do not want to go back and rehash a prior war, but I just do think it has relevance because, again, we were told and I think the caucus was trying to raise the issue back then that we questioned whether or not we should be going to war, whether we should have more patience in looking for these weapons. We felt the things were working well, maybe not at the pace the President wanted them to, but at least we could have avoided the loss of life.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, if my colleagues remember, we consistently said that the inspections process was working, that weapons of mass destruction would be found, and when found, if they were found, we would make sure, the U.N. would make sure, that they were destroyed. It was a search and destroy mission. Containment was working, and I believe that it is very, very critical at this moment, at this really truly defining moment that we understand that this foreign policy doctrine of preemption, the use of first strike based on a perceived future threat is a very dangerous policy.

The President has the authority to use force in the event of an imminent or immediate attack. That is not a question. The point where we are now in our country I think is very dangerous, and we set the standard for the rest of the world in terms of our foreign policy. If it is okay for the United States to use force first, then it is okay for North Korea or it is okay for Iran,

it is okay for any other country; and so I think that this is a moment where we must go back to the drawing board, I think reevaluate our foreign policy, and reevaluate the axis of evil concept because I believe that it is provocative; and I do not believe that we are any safer, that this course that we are on and that policy will not lead to more security. I think it is very dangerous. It does not lead to peace in the world.

I want to thank the Congressional Black Caucus for making sure the American people know there are many of us who believe that.

Mr. CUMMINGS. One of the things that was so interesting, I shall never forget at the State of the Union address, if my colleagues recall, there was a part of the speech the President made that showed over and over again on the television, when he said that we in our generation right now must take care of this situation and that we should not leave it to future generations to address terrorism and what have you. Basically what he was saying, too, is that we should be paying for it. It is going to be impossible for us, the living, to completely pay for this war. This war will be paid for by our children and our children's children and our children's children's children; and when we look at this \$87 billion again, one wonders where does it end, and that is why this whole question of exit strategy is so very significant.

How do we mention success? At what point do we say, okay, we have done the job, we have accomplished what we are supposed to accomplish?

I just thank the Congressional Black Caucus for coming together this evening and constantly over and over again being that conscience of the Congress and I would say the conscience of the country; and I will yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, my colleagues mentioned the human factor, and I want to take us back briefly to the Vietnam War because we know that many of our contemporaries and others, people that live in our neighborhoods, maybe some of the homeless men that we see in the streets of our cities and I do not think the Vietnam veterans would mind us expressing their plight because they come to me all the time, and I want to make it very clear that there is not one whose support that I diminish, that I take away from them because of this war or that war. They obeyed orders. They took the oath. They offered themselves for my freedom.

But we are reminded of the Vietnam War, and I see a lot of the brothers of all colors, shapes, sizes. I have spent Christmas days with them, as my colleagues all have, in homeless shelters, the aftermath of that war, the pain of that war, the pain of being subjected to guerrilla warfare, the pain of not knowing who the enemy is or was, and so they do not want to be caught up in

shooting the wrong person. I am fearful without an exit strategy, and I think the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) mentioned that this guerrilla warfare, not knowing who the enemy is and then not having an exit strategy, so not having a definitive time certain to come home to your loved ones.

And then when you come home, what I am hearing is that we have got to cut mental health services on the bases, so that means the traumatic experiences that families are having, where are the counselors? I am hearing, as was said, that we are paying for meals in hospitals. I am hearing that veterans services are being cut. I am hearing that these young men or women returning may not have the ability to go to college because Pell grants are being cut.

What are we saying to these young people coming back, no jobs, families in distress, families maybe in disarray? I am not condemning. You may come back and the family was strong and they welcome you back. What about the mourning parents who are mourning the loss of a 19-year-old, who just want some connection? They are no longer connected to the military. I do not know what they do with military families who have lost a loved one, and so I think what you are doing here tonight is so crucial because we are asking questions that apparently they are trying to cover up, hide or they are not putting the human face to.

She is not here, but I just want to say the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) recently visited one of our wounded individuals. She said that person lost their limbs and was blinded in one eye. That is the human face, why we are here tonight and talking about this issue.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK).

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, quickly, I just want to make sure Americans understand, be very quick, you need to look at your children and you need to look at your grandchildren. The administration is saying ask no questions. They are spending their future away. If your child's class size is 30, now look for it to be 50 because this government will continue to cut back so local governments will be in deficit spending.

Right now the States are \$70 billion in deficits and that will continue. So I am not looking forward to doing things on a credit card. I am looking forward to doing things the way we are supposed to do and govern, and when I hear the President say we need to fight the war on terror in Iraq and not here, being in Iraq has nothing to do with fighting the war on terror in the United States.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, we merely say to the President, be accountable, be accountable. I thank my colleagues very much.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I came to the floor this evening to join my colleagues and hoping to educate the American public about what is going on with our government and what is happening with the request for \$87 billion to continue the war in Iraq.

I think it should be very, very clear and I would like to set the record straight for myself. I will not support \$87 billion to continue this war under any circumstances. I am very clear about that. As a matter of fact, I have been concerned. When it first came to light that the President was requesting \$87 billion, I heard some of my colleagues in the other House say, we are going to ask him some tough questions; we are going to ask them all kinds of questions about what they did with the money that we appropriated before. But they all conclude by saying, but we are going to have to give him the \$87 billion.

I have not and will not reach such a conclusion, a, because the President and his representatives, whether it is Condoleezza Rice or Colin Powell or Wolfowitz or any of the rest of them, DICK CHENEY included, they will come to this Congress and they will tell us whatever they think they need to tell us in order to get what they want. They have not been truthful in any shape, form, or fashion; and they continue to defend this preemptive strike and to mislead us about what they are doing.

Madam Speaker, I do not want anybody to say that because I do not support the \$87 billion that I am unpatriotic. That old accusation has worn out. It has worn thin. The President and his representatives have threatened everybody with we are going to call you unpatriotic if you do not do or say what we want you to do or say. Well, I am not threatened or intimidated by that. I am not going to support \$87 billion, and I am more patriotic than they are.

As a matter of fact, as I stand here tonight, there is a traitor in the White House, a traitor who has outed a CIA operative, placed a woman's life on the line because they chose to be vindictive and to get back at her husband because he, in fact, helped to reveal the fact that he was the one that had been dispatched to Niger to find out whether or not Saddam Hussein had tried to get uranium to further his efforts to build nuclear warfare; and because he told the truth, the ambassador told the truth, he simply said I told the CIA that, in fact, there was no evidence to show that there had been an attempt by Saddam Hussein to get uranium from Niger, but the President put it in his speech to this House and said in so many words and led the American people to believe that it was another reason why it was important for him to