

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. BLACKBURN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

#### SUPPORTING OUR PRESIDENT AND MAJORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I just sat through a fairly extraordinary hour with a lot of criticism of the majority leader of the United States. And first thing I want to make clear that I am not here to question anybody's patriotism. I think we have 435 patriotic Members of this wonderful body, and we have got some delegates in addition to that that are patriotic.

What I would say is that Lord Chamberlain, Prime Minister of Britain right before World War II, was a very patriotic Brit, but his policies were very foolish. And they took the free world into some very dangerous times, and we could have lost our freedom throughout the globe.

Lady Thatcher said, as early as 1986, that terrorism thrives on appeasement, much like the problem with Lord Chamberlain's policy, not that he was unpatriotic, but his foolish policies actually encouraged and empowered the Nazis. The same is true, according to Lady Thatcher. And I would submit that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and George W. Bush, our President, are the Churchills of our time when it comes to fighting the war on terror.

Churchill took a lot of criticism leading up to World War II. Our President and our majority leader are the ones that have the courage to lay out a policy to stick to it and make sure that we do what is necessary to win the war on terror just like we won the war against the Nazis in World War II, just as, as Lady Thatcher said, Ronald Reagan won the Cold War without firing a single shot.

The question here is not whether the Republicans or Democrats are patriotic. We are all patriots in this room. The question is who is better prepared to win the war on terror. Because if we lose this war, we will lose our way of life and probably our very lives themselves. The principle is that partisan

politics ought, when we have men and women overseas, ought to stop at the water's edge.

And that does not mean nobody is arguing that the debate has to stop about what is best in terms of prosecuting the war. It does not mean that one cannot ask questions, and it does not mean that one cannot vote your conscience. But when one exploits partisan politics while there are men and women fighting for our freedom and our survival and fighting for our way of life against this threat, the international terrorist threat, then there is something fundamentally wrong.

We ought to engage in civilized debate, but what we ought not to do is to let partisan politics dominate our judgment.

Mr. Speaker, I have got a number of Members that want to say a few words about some of the partisan aspects of this debate which are very disappointing. For those of us that are supporting the President, supporting our troops, are certainly supporting our majority leader who has done a wonderful job leading the House through these days, our big question is where the vision of the other party is.

Now, I recognize in parliamentary governments around the world you often have a minority party that stands up and lays out their vision. We actually are going through a conflict where the President has laid out a plan, the majority leader has laid out a plan, we are following that plan, we have won the first part of the war, and we are doing our level best to win the peace as rapidly as possible, secure freedom for the Iraqi people, and bring our men and women home. That is the game plan. And there are lots of details to it, but that is the general game plan.

But the problem we have is that there is nothing united about the Democratic side of this debate in terms of whether or not the war on terror is critical, in terms of whether or not we should have gone into Iraq, in terms of whether or not Saddam is an evil tyrant and dictator that we should have taken down. The only thing the Democrats seem united on is that the enemy is in the White House and majority leader's office of the United States House of Representatives.

That is not the kind of leadership that I think the American people expect from the minority party. Thank goodness it is not the type of leadership that the President and the majority leader are giving.

I want to tell my colleagues as we start the opportunity for some of the other Members to express their views about the partisan nature of a lot of attacks on our President and our majority leader, I want to tell you about a great speech that Ronald Reagan gave known as the Westminster Speech, when he went to the British Parliament June 8, 1982.

□ 2145

He was referring back to World War II when he said that the island was

really struck with terror and the potential for being taken over. Ronald Reagan said Winston Churchill exclaimed about British adversaries, "What kind of a people do they think we are?"

That is a great question to ask about the international terrorists. What kind of people do they think we are? Well, Britain's adversaries found out what extraordinary people the British are, but all the democracies paid a terrible price for allowing the dictators to underestimate us. We dare not make that same mistake again.

So let us ask ourselves as Churchill, and then later Reagan said, What kind of people do we think we are? That is the message that we are trying to send international terrorists. What kind of people do the American people think we are? And are you more comfortable, ultimately, with the plans and the policies, the determination, the extraordinary courage of President Bush and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), or are you more comfortable turning it over to a disarrayed party that has no policy other than to attack the White House and the majority leader's office.

What kind of people do Americans think we are? That is what the international terrorists want to know.

Osama bin Laden said several years ago that as soon as the blood starts flowing, the Americans would pull out; and yet appeasement in the Lord Chamberlain style seems to be the policy of many of our Democratic colleagues and friends, not all but many. And I would state that we have got to stand up and we have got to insist that our majority leader not come under attack here on the House floor for the great things that he has done, for standing by our President, for standing by our troops, and for leading the effort to make sure that the wherewithal is there in Iraq to complete the war and to continue going after international terrorists elsewhere around the globe.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I want to thank him for really bringing to the attention of the American people that, indeed, at a time of war, at a time of conflict, we should be considering working together in a bipartisan manner.

It was distressing to me as I learned last week that there was going to be the presentation by the minority party here to attack the majority leader of the Republican Party, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

I am fairly new to Congress. A little bit more senior than the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) but just a little bit; and it has just been an extraordinary opportunity for me to be able to serve with somebody of the great integrity, the competence, the dedication of the gentleman from Texas (TOM DELAY).

I can give a personal statement as recent as last Thursday. I was very pleased that I had the opportunity in a bipartisan way to welcome Ognian Gerdjikov, who is the Speaker of the National Assembly of Bulgaria, and he is a democratically elected speaker in a country that has emerged from totalitarianism, which is now one of the dynamic Balkan democratic nations. And it was really exciting to meet with Speaker Gerdjikov. And I had contacted the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) a couple of weeks ago and told him that he would be coming, and if he could meet with him it would mean so much to the people of Bulgaria who, again, have emerged from totalitarian Communism and into democracy.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) recognized immediately how important this was. It was a wonderful meeting we had at his office with members of the National Assembly, with Ambassador Elena Poptodorova of Bulgaria. He was so positive. He was so enthusiastic, thanking the people of Bulgaria for their support of the United States in the United Nations. They are on the Security Council. Thanking the National Assembly for their strong vote to provide for an American military base to be located in Bulgaria to defend southeastern Europe and to defend the people of Bulgaria and, ultimately, to become part of NATO, and also to thank the people of Bulgaria for providing 500 troops to be currently in Iraq to provide for security and to promote the development of democracy in Iraq, which we know is mutually beneficial to the people of Iraq and the United States. Because as we work to redevelop Iraq, we are denying the terrorists a breeding ground for more terrorists, and the same standard that we used after World War II where we helped redevelop Germany so that would not be a breeding ground for communists. We defeated Communism. We will defeat terrorism, but we need to have strong leaders as we have with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

So that is my testimonial to a very fine gentleman that I am just so honored, as is the gentleman, to be serving with. And when he has made statements concerning the members of the minority, particularly their leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), there has been substance. It is not to question her patriotism, but it is to certainly question her judgment. And I know that in my service, 17 years in the State Senate of South Carolina and now my almost 2 years of service here, what I look at are the statements that I have made and the votes that I have made.

And I really want to bring to everyone's attention that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) made this statement on December 17, 1998: "Saddam Hussein has been engaged in the development of weapons of mass destruction technology which is a threat to the countries in the region and he

has made a mockery of the weapons inspection process. The responsibility of the United States in this conflict is to eliminate weapons of mass destruction, to minimize the danger to our troops and to diminish the suffering of the Iraqi people."

What the gentlewoman said then was accurate, but the difference is that, of course, there was a different President in 1998. Of course, Mr. Clinton was in office at that time. And this was the defense of what many of us would actually give him credit for and that is recognizing the threat of Saddam Hussein to world peace.

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I want to show Americans the quote that the gentleman just referred to. This is from our minority leader, who is a wonderful woman. She is a great leader from California, but we sometimes usually disagree with her policies when it comes to big issues in American politics. This is what she said and I think it is important:

"Saddam Hussein has been engaged in the development of weapons of mass destruction technology which is a threat to countries in the region and has made a mockery of the weapons inspection process."

All over America there are candidates running for President on the other ticket claiming that President Bush lied about weapons of mass destruction in 2002 in Iraq. Here, 4 years earlier, our current minority leader is telling the American people her assessment of the situation.

The question is whether George W. Bush, having spent a year or two in the White House, should have known more than leading Congress members 6 years into the process. So if the gentleman will continue, we have got some other speakers, if we can get to them.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, indeed, I want to reiterate the difference between 1998 and 2002, 2003 is that we have a new President. And I regret, I feel that the reason that the change in judgment, not patriotism is politics.

When we consider how persons are to be judged, I believe what we need to look at is how people vote. Their statements are very significant, but we see statements can be shifted and can have different meaning according to who the President is. I will state that going back on votes, and I want to cite from the Center for Security Policy, which is an organization that was created in 1988. It is nonprofit, nonpartisan, committed to stimulating and informing the national and international debates about all aspects of security policy, notably those policies bearing on foreign defense, economic, financial and technology interest in the United States. According to the Center for National Policy, national security score card, I want to bring up votes and I will go back to 1993.

This is the 103rd Congress. The gentleman and I were back in Florida and back in South Carolina. But the gentle-

woman from California (Ms. PELOSI) was right here voting.

The significance of 1993 is that when the first significant attack occurred on the United States, that was the first attack on the World Trade Center, we know later that the al Qaeda and the terrorists attacked our country in 1998 by blowing up embassies across Africa killing dozens of innocent people. And then, of course, in 2000 there was the attack on the USS *Cole* and, finally, the attack of September 11, 2001.

This was a war brought upon the United States. This was not one, as has been indicated by some people, that was contrived. We did not start this war. We are acting, I believe, in self-defense. But I want to raise some votes that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) made in 1993, which I think show her judgment as not being in the interest of national security.

First of all, there was a vote on March 18, 1993, which would have reduced defense spending by \$41.9 billion. What an extraordinary time. Can you imagine, \$41.9 billion of 1993 dollars, what that would have done to the defense in the United States. Fortunately, it was rejected, overwhelmingly rejected.

Next there was a vote to reduce funding for the ballistic missile defense system. Again, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) voted incorrectly. She voted to reduce the spending for the ballistic missile defense system. And of course we all knew my predecessor, the late Congressman Floyd Spence, chairman of the Committee on National Security, warned that there was the great prospect of North Korea, where I was a couple of months ago, of being able to develop a ballistic missile capability to attack the west coast, including California, of course. And at that time, the gentlewoman voted against the funding for the ballistic missile defense system.

Additionally, there was another vote which provided for increasing funding for ballistic missile defense and she was consistent. She voted against that. Then there was a vote to downsize U.S. forces in Europe. And this would have been a vote to reduce the funding for U.S. forces in Europe, a very critical part of our defense of the United States. And it was a billion dollar reduction, and she voted to reduce that which would have crippled our ability to promote the development of democracy in Central and Eastern Europe at a very crucial time, and in addition to protect the people of the United States.

Additionally, there was another vote and this was an amendment by the late Congressman Floyd Spence of South Carolina which would have limited the control exerted by a foreign national in U.N. operations which meant that the United States would maintain control of our forces. Again, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) voted incorrectly.

Another vote in 1993 was to reduce defense and technology spending. This

would have reduced the Federal spending for defense at a crucial time of \$51.5 billion over 5 years. That would have been just further crippling.

In the same session of Congress I have three more votes I want to go over and then let other people speak because the gentleman has some really talented people here tonight. I want to congratulate the gentleman on recruiting fine persons to come and address our colleagues as to the issue before us.

There was a further vote in 1994 by Congressman Bob Michel of Illinois and this would have provided prohibition of U.N. troops being under U.N. command. And again the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) voted incorrectly. Can you imagine placing U.S. troops under the command which could possibly be under the command of someone as far out at that time as Saddam Hussein but also as Kaddafi of Libya. Just, I think, incredibly irresponsible in terms of our national security and defense.

Then again in another vote in 1994 by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and that was to reduce the Defense Authorization Act. There was a provision to significantly cut defense spending to a level far below that which was being proposed, at a time in 1993, 1994, the beginning of the war on terrorism, where we were trying to maintain defenses as strong as we could provide, and I just want to reiterate that it is not a question of patriotism at all. Our leader, the gentleman from Texas (Tom DeLay), has never questioned a person's patriotism. It is judgment on votes. And those of us who have the privilege of serving the people of the United States need to be judged on our votes.

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON). I want to reiterate what he said because the whole last hour was a lot of our Democratic colleagues just terrified and enormously angry at our majority leader because he thinks that somehow he called them unpatriotic. This is not about whether you are patriotic or not. Actually, our majority leader, to quote him accurately, and none of them quoted our leader, but on July 25 of this year what he said was: "When criticized for these comments, the Democrats said we were questioning their patriotism. Not so. The Democrats' problem is not a lack of patriotism. It is a lack of seriousness. They do not hate their country. They just refuse to lead it."

□ 2200

I will never call the Democratic party unpatriotic, but I will call their current leadership unfit to face the serious challenge of the 21st century. This is not about who is patriotic. We have got 435 voting patriotic Members of this body. This is about whether the American people trust a Churchill or a Chamberlain to lead this fight, a Reagan or a McGovern during the Cold War. This is about whether they trust

George W. Bush or the appeasement wing of the Democratic party. That is what the debate is about.

With that, I would like to very quickly have one more quote if I can and then recognize our friend from Florida. I want to point out the difference between the last minority leader, who, again, we often did not agree with, and the current minority leader.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), when he was minority leader, said on September 17, right after the terrorist attacks, the following: "The terrorists who did this want us to break up and fight with one another and that is the last thing we are going to do. We are going to fight together with the President and the people who have been heroic and courageous and wonderful, and we are going to win this." That is former Leader GEPHARDT.

One more thing he said. "It is the American political tradition that politics ought to stop at the water's edge." What our current minority leader says, and again we respect her, we just disagree with her judgment, "I am devastated," the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) recalls saying on the morning after the bombing began in Baghdad, "by the fact that we are going to war." In other words, actually prosecuting the war on terrorism in Iraq was terribly offensive to her.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART), my friend.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with my colleague more. He just quoted our leader the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), and yet we have just heard for an hour our good friends on the Democrat side wailing into the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), saying that he said things, and again, they did not bring out quotes because they do not have them, saying that he said something that he did not say. He said exactly what the gentleman just quoted.

Let me quote, and I am going to read part of the quote that my colleague had up here a little while ago when he had the distinguished minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), when she says "Saddam Hussein has been engaged in the development of weapons of mass destruction technology which is a threat to countries in the region, and he has made a mockery of the weapons inspections process."

Mr. Speaker, I think this is important. She also said, and these are her words, "The responsibility of the United States in this conflict is to eliminate weapons of mass destruction, to minimize the danger to our troops and to diminish the suffering of the Iraqi people."

To me, it is kind of almost overwhelming when our good friends in the other party just from one day to another totally do a 180 to what they said. Of course, they try to put words

in our mouths, in the President's mouth that he did not say, that the majority leader did not say, and that is why we did not hear a quote on the floor from the Democrats stating what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has been very clear. He is not questioning the Democrats' motives. He is questioning their policies, but here the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) said what the United States responsibility is, and yet with her own votes, she has not done anything. She has done absolutely nothing to eliminate the weapons of mass destruction which she said the United States had a responsibility to do, or to minimize the danger of our troops which she said the United States had a responsibility to do, or to diminish the suffering of the Iraqi people. No. She voted against authorizing President Bush to use military force against Iraq.

On the floor a little while ago from our friends in the minority party, we heard them say, well, some of our troops do not have sufficient body armor. It is a serious wording. We need to make sure they are prepared, but then they vote against the \$60 billion to give our troops the necessary equipment to wage this war against terrorism.

That is what we are talking about here. I have heard of people speaking through two sides of their mouth, but two sides are not enough. There are more sides of a mouth on that side of the aisle than there are seats on that side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, and again, what we are talking about here is the policy, the policy.

What we then heard also was an hour of personal attacks, yes, personal attacks with innuendos and saying things because they could not quote them, saying that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said things he did not say. That should not surprise us, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Chair is from the wonderful State of California, and just in his wonderful State, they had an election, and I could not help but notice the smear campaign that the new Governor-elect had to endure. I heard him say that it was the puke politics, the smear politics. He said, "This is puke politics." It seems to be the modus operandi. It seems to be the way that our good friends in the Democratic party get taught when they go to campaign school, and again, what is important is that we cut through the rhetoric and look at the policy, not the puke politics, the policy.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) mentioned how this President is leading this country in this war against terrorism. The gentleman from South Carolina said it very eloquently. We did not pick this war; we were bombed. Our people were assassinated in cold blood. We did not pick this war, and we did not have an option but to now defend ourselves, and we do not

have an option but to win this war. And yes, those that want to have the politics of appeasement, I will throw out another Winston Churchill quote. He said that appeasement was like feeding an alligator, hoping that you last. You know something, that alligator has already struck. Thank God we have a leader in the White House that understands we are at war.

I want to quote another thing that the distinguished gentlewoman from the State of California, the minority leader, said about the war. She said, "I don't really consider ourselves at war," May 6, 2002. She has the right to not consider ourselves at war, but I for one, Mr. Speaker, will not forget the Americans who have died in the embassies abroad, in the USS *Cole*, in Somalia and in 9/11. This country is at war. We will not forget.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) said that we will not be divided, and that we are at war, and that we will not be fighting among ourselves. Frankly, I am a little bit upset of what I just heard over the last hour which were personal attacks. Personal attacks were leveled at the majority leader in that puke politics that we saw so evident in California.

Having heard all that, Mr. Speaker, I know and I am confident that because we have the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) as our leader and because we have George W. Bush in the White House, know, we do realize that we are at war. We do realize that there is a lot at stake, and those that want to hide their heads in the sand like an ostrich, including in violation of their own words, when the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) said, "The responsibility of the United States in this conflict is to eliminate weapons of mass destruction, to minimize the danger to our troops and to diminish the suffering of the Iraqi people," despite having to not argue, despite the fact that she is not arguing these are her words, I am confident because of the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and the White House we are going to win this war that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) does not think we are in.

We are going to win it because this country has stood up to every single challenge. This country will not stand by and let its children die with impunity, be murdered with impunity. We are at war. The President understands it. The American people understand it. If the minority leader does not understand, it is her right and our right to disagree.

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida, and I want everybody to be able to see exactly what the minority leader the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) actually said. She said it on May 6, 2002, on the Democratic show, Miles Benson. "I don't really consider ourselves at war," Pelosi said.

Now, Americans can decide whether they think we are at war or not, but I

will tell my colleagues this points out an interesting distinction to me because forever when we really have a war going on, and most of us know when we are at war, it is not hard to tell, most of us are divided between one extreme of hawks and one extreme of doves on the war.

It seems like most of the Democratic party are people running for President, the people that come down here and speak on Iraq every day, they are divided, too, between doves and ostriches, but the fact of the matter is, like a dove, you cannot fly away from terrorist attacks, and like an ostrich, putting your head in the sand will not protect you from the terrorist activity.

Why do terrorists hate us so bad? This is one of the things all of us Americans have so much trouble understanding, and I will tell my colleagues that just like the Nazis hated us, just like the Communists hated us, the fact of the matter is they are very jealous, because, after all, as they see it, we are rich, they are poor. Our people are well-fed, while their people are often hungry. We are technologically advanced, while they are mired in unsophisticated ways. We are strong, while they are weak. Our wives and daughters are free to pursue diverse careers or home making as they choose, while theirs are treated as chattel. We have individual freedoms secured by a Constitution; they are enslaved by dictators and violent religious zealots. They hate us.

Terrorists throughout the world hate us. We have to get used to it. We are at war, despite the minority leader's judgment.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on the Budget, I have heard hours and hours of testimony from Democrats about funding Federal programs.

They claim that if we do not vote for an increase in the budget of welfare, then we do not care about the needy; if we do not vote for an increase of the budget of the National Institutes of Health, we do not care about cancer patients; if we do not favor major increases for the Department of Education, we must not care about our children learning their A, B, C's. In other words, in their world, support can only be measured by money.

I have heard this line of reasoning over and over again in countless speeches by my Democrat colleagues, but when it comes to protecting the American homeland, all of the sudden the Democrats throw that reasoning out the window because now, Mr. Speaker, we are being told by the leader of the Democrats that they support our troops, they just do not support funding them. Which is it?

If they support our troops but they do not want to fund them, what are we to do? Are we to pass around collection

boxes at sporting good stores asking for donations of ammunition for our troops? Are we to start food drives at churches and synagogues and mosques in order to feed our soldiers who are in harm's way in Iraq and Afghanistan? Are we to shop at Goodwill for the uniforms that they need? I think not.

Mr. Speaker, almost a year after 9/11, the leader of the Democrats in the House said she really did not consider that we were at war. I hope she has now come to a realization that we very much are. This is the same Democrat leader that described our simple resolution to support our troops in the field as a bitter pill to swallow. The real bitter pill to swallow is the realization that so many Democrats claim to support our troops, but they will not vote to arm and equip them.

But the Democrat leader in the House is not the lone Democrat making outrageous political statements at this time in our Nation's political history. A Democrat leader in the other body stated that the war on terror is a fraud, made up in Texas.

Let us ask 68-year-old mother Zahra Khafi if this war is a fraud. After her 28-year-old son was summarily executed 2 years ago by Saddam Hussein's regime for merely practicing his religion, she said, "Should I be afraid? Is Saddam coming back?"

Let us ask Ali Khemy if this war is a fraud. After the 1st Marine Expeditionary Unit liberated his village, he said, "Americans very good, Iraq wants to be free."

Let us ask one of their religious leaders if this war is a fraud. When his country was being liberated by our troops, he said "We need freedom more than we needed air."

A recent survey showed that 70 percent of the Iraqis are clear they want our help. Clearly, the people of Iraq know that this war is about something real and tangible: freedom, democracy, security, not just theirs but, more importantly, ours.

For any Democrat who still believes that there is no war, no threat from the forces of terrorism, let us ask the families of the nearly 3,000 innocent Americans who lost their lives in the terrorist attacks after September 11. Let us ask the family members of those who recently lost their lives in terrorist attacks against the U.N. headquarters, those who lost their lives in Baghdad's Jordanian embassy or against the Shrine of Ali Mosque. Let us see if they believe that there is no war with terrorists.

There is an old adage, Mr. Speaker, that those who fail to learn the lessons of history are condemned to repeat them. Today, those who do not consider our Nation at war or consider it a fraud, clearly have not learned the lessons of history.

During 8 years under President Clinton when he deployed our troops 37 different times, Republicans came to the floor of the House and voted to support our men and women in uniform. In

those 37 deployments, Republicans gave President Clinton the funding he needed.

□ 2215

Now, if Republicans can support a Democrat President during time of war, why do so many Democrats refuse to support a Republican President during time of war? If Democrats are unwilling to recognize the war that we must confront, if they are unwilling to support our troops against these threats, then what do they propose that we do to avoid another attack against Americans on American soil? What is their solution to avoiding another potential attack with chemical, biological or a nuclear weapon that can make 9-11 pale in comparison?

Under this President, with the support of Republicans and some Democrats in Congress, we are winning and fighting the war on terror. We are restoring stability and order. Just this month, the United States military and Iraqi police conducted joint raids, arresting more than 50 terrorists and criminals. Approximately 50,000 Iraqi police officers are back to work, Coalition forces are working with 36,000 local Iraqi workers to refurbish 1,600 schoolhouses across Iraq, and last week Iraqis started a new path towards economic stabilization by introducing a new currency.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my Democrat colleagues will move beyond the political rhetoric of their party's leadership and their Presidential candidates. We must continue the hard and expensive work of seeing freedom and democracy take root in Iraq and Afghanistan. For as they do, those countries will cease to offer safe haven to terrorists and the safer America will be.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUNES). The gentleman from Florida will suspend.

The Chair must remind Members that remarks in debate may not include quotations of Senators, except as specified in clause 1(b)(2)(B) of rule XVII.

The gentleman from Florida may continue.

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to another gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS). We have several great gentlemen from Texas here tonight.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for putting this together this evening, and I certainly thank him for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I was fortunate enough to be in Iraq at the end of the summer, the last week in August. And during that trip, we talked with General Ricardo Sanchez, who talked to us about the accomplishments that had happened since the end of the major combat phase of Operation Iraqi Freedom, essentially 3 months later, the 90 days of progress.

During that 90 days, schools had completed their academic year and

conducted testing. Ninety percent of the major cities and towns had functioning town councils. At that point, over 50,000 Iraqis were contributing to their own security under uniform, that is either in the Iraqi Army or as border patrols. The prisons were on the verge of reopening. The judicial system was up and functioning. Food distribution was going on without much in the way of any hindrance. In fact, no humanitarian crisis grew as a result of the major combat phase of Operation Iraqi Freedom. The hospitals, although substandard, remained open and functional. And four and a quarter million children were immunized during those 3 months in the summer.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we sat here for a good deal of time this evening and listened as our leadership, the leadership of the administration, the leadership of this House was criticized for the lack of a plan. I would just ask you: Does this litany of accomplishments that occurred during those 90 days sound to you like the lack of a plan? And just to put it in some perspective for our friends on the other side of the aisle, all of these things that I just mentioned that were pointed out by General Ricardo Sanchez, all of these things occurred within 90 days. None of those things had happened a year after the end of combat in Kosovo. I ask you: Does it sound like there was a lack of a plan, a post-war plan in Iraq? I think not.

And let us just talk for a minute about humanitarian crisis. Let us try to put that in some perspective. What would we have been hearing from the other side of the aisle tonight if there had been 15,000 heat-related deaths in Baghdad this summer? Well, I will tell you what we would have been hearing. We would not have wanted to hear the words that would have been coming from the other side tonight. But the reality was there were not 15,000 heat-related deaths in Iraq this summer. Was the summer harsh enough to cause 15,000 deaths? Well, how about in France, where the average high temperature was 25 degrees cooler and where they had 15,000 heat-related deaths this summer. There is your humanitarian crisis. It did not occur in Iraq; it occurred in France.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons we are here this evening is because of the criticism leveled at our majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is the duly-elected majority leader of the House of Representatives. He has a duty not just to be a leader but to maintain his majority in the House of Representatives, and it is the fact that he is so successful in doing that, and the recent redistricting in Texas points to just how successful he is in that job, that that is what leads to his criticism.

The gentleman from Florida is quite correct when he talks about people who are critical. It is largely not what we do wrong but what we are doing right

that makes others so critical. Well, I, for one, am very glad that we have the type of leader we have in Leader DELAY. It is a privilege to serve in this House with him, and I look forward to serving with him for a great many more years to come.

Mr. FEENEY. Well, I thank the gentleman for those comments.

Mr. Speaker, we have been reminding some of our Democrat colleagues of the irresponsible positions that they have taken on the war on terror and the war on Iraq. But, in fairness, not all of the Democrats in this country have been totally irresponsible. For example, the former minority leader, before the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), Congressman GEPHARDT, on September 13 in the year 2001, 2 days after the bombing, said the following: "There was no air and no light between the President and Congress and the two parties." In other words, we were together at that point on the war on terror.

And just recently our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL), said, and I quote, "Responsible Democrats should carefully avoid using the language of failure. It is false. It can be unforgivably self-fulfilling." So there are responsible things being said, but they are in the minority and they are being drowned out.

Before I turn to my colleague from Tennessee, I want to say that more like the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader, is the position of the last Secretary of State under President Clinton. And let me first state that the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs is headed by Madeleine Albright, who recently returned from a fact-finding tour in Iraq, and what they found was that throughout the north, the south, and in Baghdad, secular religious Sunni, Shiite, and Kurdish groups in both urban and rural areas there were what they called a newly formed umbrella movement. The Iraqi Coalition for Democracy said, "We already see the positive results that the Americans have brought. We are free to talk to you, to organize a movement and party, free to meet and demonstrate. And all this was made possible by the Americans."

And almost at the same time, Secretary Albright, violating the old rule of not playing partisan politics against your own country while men and women are in the fields while you are overseas, said the following, and she said it on French radio and she spoke in French. Here is what she said, translated into English: "It is difficult to be in France and criticize my government, but I am doing so because Bush and the people working for him have a foreign policy that is not good for America, not good for the world."

Thank you, Secretary Albright, for traveling the world and basically encouraging people that wish us no good.

And I would note finally that one of the other great terror threats on the

planet is North Korea, and Secretary Albright's great contribution in North Korea during her administration was to actually help facilitate the use of nuclear capabilities for power generation in North Korea. Not the kind of thing that has really been productive.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to a friend and colleague and marvelous spokesperson for the conservative and Republican-principled cause, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much. You know, the gentleman just used the quote from former Secretary Madeleine Albright, and I heard some about this this weekend while I was back in Tennessee, people who were disappointed, Democrats who were disappointed that she had chosen to make that remark of saying that our policy and our President's policy was not good for America and not good for the world.

This past weekend, I was literally all over the State in Tennessee. We were over in Memphis, in Shelby County, which is part of my district, the seventh district of Tennessee. Also part of the ninth and eighth districts of Tennessee. And then I was over with our good colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), in his district, the fourth district, and up in Knox County, with our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), in his district. And I can tell my colleague that I was very encouraged with the way Tennesseans support our President, the way they support our troops, they way they support our leadership in fighting this war on terrorism, the way they recognize that this is a global effort to destroy terrorism.

And, Mr. Speaker, the people back home are really watching this. They are listening to the news, they are getting their information on the Internet, they are paying attention. They know that there are numerous links between Iraq and terrorism, and they understand the importance that it is. They know that it is vital that we secure an ally with Iraq; that we help them build a free and open society; that we help them get the underpinnings and the foundation so that they have a productive and aggressive economy. And they are committed to working with us as we get through the war on terrorism. I even had one of my constituents this weekend say that they thought that it was only in this stratified Potomac fevered air of Washington that people did not have the courage and the commitment to see this war through.

Mr. Speaker, I was today reading some e-mails that had come to me, and one of them I thought was just terrific. It came from a gentleman who is a Vietnam veteran who said some things so very well, talking about how when he was serving in Vietnam that the liberal news media flamed the sparks of unrest and how that played on Congress and how Congress' decisions during that time affected him as a soldier.

It was interesting to sit here and to read all of this. He went on in his e-mail and he used the Patrick Henry quote that I absolutely love: "Give me liberty or give me death." And as he has watched the war in Iraq, he said this had come back to him so many times and how he thought that that is so true, that without that personal freedom, which is the foundation of our constitution and of our society, then nothing else means as much, and how important it is that we recognize what a threat terrorism is; how important it is to win this war in Iraq; how important it is to build an ally with Iraq.

And, of course, we have talked much tonight about the gentlewoman from California, the minority leader, and her comments in December of 1998 when she gave her floor speech characterizing Saddam Hussein as a tyrant, which we all believe he is; and a threat to international security, which we all agree that he is. We have been through that quote tonight, but I want to go back into it. There is plenty of proof he had engaged in the development of weapons of mass destruction. I agree with what the minority leader said at that time; we all do.

We need to realize that in 1998 Bill Clinton was the President. Today, we do have a different President. And President George Bush is leading us in this war on terror. Our colleague from Texas just talked about the great work that the men and women are doing over in Iraq and the difference that they are making. I look forward to going and seeing this firsthand.

Now the minority leader is coming along and she is questioning what we are doing in Iraq, and she is charging the administration with having a failed plan. The only thing this administration has failed to do, I believe, is to foresee how quickly Saddam Hussein's regime was going to collapse. To some extent, I think they have been victims of their own success. Because as our colleague from Texas pointed out, things have moved rather quickly. No one expected Baghdad to fall that quickly. They thought it was going to take months instead of weeks.

I would like to quote from another Member of the minority party, who, unlike Minority Leader PELOSI, is considering the big picture. This is a quote from the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), he is a Democrat, and he is considering the big picture. This is what the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) had to say in September of 2003, this year, in the publication "The Hill," and I quote.

□ 2230

"The media stresses the wounds, the injuries, and the deaths, as they should, but for instance in Northern Iraq, General David Petraeus," and I will pause here and say General Petraeus commands the 101st Airborne from my district, "has 3,100 projects, from soccer fields to schools to refineries, all good stuff and that is not

being reported. Failure is not an option. Should the reconstruction effort fail, Iraq would become a snake pit, a haven for terrorists."

Mr. Speaker, we have learned the lessons of World War I. We learned from the successes of World War II. We know it is incredibly important that we see Iraq through to being firmly planted and seated on a firm foundation so they can be a success. I do not think it is patriotic for us to sit back and let terrorism take hold there or come over here and take hold on our shores. I do not think it is patriotic to let tyrants kick dirt in our faces for a decade. I know the people in my district are tired of America choosing rhetoric over action, and they are pleased with the action that they are seeing. September 11 gave us cause for action.

There is a great song that one of my friends and songwriter, David Worley has written. The song is Have You Forgotten, and that song is a reminder to each and every one of us that September 11 occurred, that men and women lost their lives, that terrorism brought its war to our shores, and it is important that we support the reconstruction in Iraq and support our leadership as they lead through this.

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this.

Again, to point out, the two big debates tonight are not whether or not you are patriotic, the question is whether you are fit and responsible in the fight against the war on terror. The sad thing for a lot of us that enjoy working with our Democratic colleagues is that traditionally when there is an international war going on and America is heavily involved, and our security and lives are potentially at stake, are you a hawk and tend towards the hawkish side, or are you a dove and tend towards the dovish side, but in much of the Democratic caucus, the debate is between whether or not you are a dove or an ostrich.

The terrorists came and found us on September 11, and they will do it again. Fortunately, there are some responsible Democrats that say responsible things. Unfortunately, we have not seen a lot of leadership out of the minority leader's office. I want to share a quote that talks about the fight to water down the resolution to fight the war on terror in Iraq. Minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), fought to tone down support for Bush and delete other passages opposed by antiwar Democrats.

But at the same time, you have the second ranking person in the Democratic caucus, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) who basically said he would vote for the bill that his leader opposed. I am glad there are Members who put partisan politics aside and support our President, even though all of us have questions how we can do things better. That ultimately is not the question.

I want to go back to the question whether or not we are at war with terrorism, and again the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) suggested we are not at war, and that while the war has not been officially declared by the United States Congress, we have not had one since I believe the Korean War, in over 50 years, this war is a declared war. The terrorists declared this war on the United States, and they did it in a resounding, ugly, atrocious way on September 11.

But this threat is not new. In 1986 during the great Libya debate in the House of Commons, Lady Thatcher defended American's strike against Libya as she said, "Terrorism thrives on a free society. The terrorist uses the feelings in a free society to sap the will of a civilization to resist. If the terrorist succeeds, he has won and the whole of free society has lost." Like Lord Churchill, Lady Thatcher is prescient, and she issued warnings a decade before the war was launched on America, much like Prime Minister Netanyahu in his book *Fighting the War on Terrorism* warned that ultimately the target of international religious zealot terrorism is not Israel, they are the temporary target. Ultimately, the great Satan is the United States.

We were told in 1995 by Prime Minister Netanyahu that we would, in fact, be the target. But we do not have to believe our friends and allies on the topic of terrorism being a threat to our children, our grandchildren and our very civilization, if fact, it was over a decade ago that Osama bin Laden declared, "We with God's help call on every Muslim who believes in God and wishes to be rewarded to comply with God's order to kill the Americans, and plunder their money whenever and wherever they find it. We also call on Muslim leaders, youths, and soldiers to launch the raid on Satan's U.S. troops and the devil supporters aligned with them, and to displace those who are behind them so they may learn a lesson."

We have been warned over and over again that they are coming to do us evil. We know it, and yet putting our heads in the sand is not an effective response, and hope is not a strategy.

Winston Churchill said in the 1930s, warning about Hitler's Germany, if you give into aggression, there will be end to humiliation you have to suffer.

Remember, it was Abraham Lincoln who basically said in terms of having to complete the war to put the Union back together, let us strive on to finish the work we are in.

But again, we have great leadership from our President in very difficult, very challenging times. We have wonderful support and leadership from our majority leader who came under intense attack tonight, and where is the plan of the opponents of the President, where is the plan of the opponents of our majority leader, where is the plan of the opponents of the people who want to prosecute, fight and win the war on terror and to establish a free

constitutional democracy in Iraq that is not a threat?

Well, candidly, the Democratic party is very divided. The gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) split from his own father in criticism his father leveled against President Bush for attacking Iraq. The gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) said the country is better off without Saddam Hussein. His quotes are, "I do not agree with his stance," speaking about his father. "I believe that the United Nations needs to be a viable international organization, and the only way it is viable is if its proclamations and resolutions are enforced."

Despite all that warning about the fact that we cannot wait on permission from people in the U.N. to protect ourselves, there are still people attacking the President for the preemptive war on terrorists. This is a responsive war given the fact that Saddam Hussein has tried to export terrorism at every opportunity.

It is not just the Democrats fight amongst themselves, sometimes the same Democrat is on both sides of the issue, like General Wesley Clark, depending on what day it was. Early in the campaign, he could not decide whether he was fully supportive of the President and our troops, or whether he would have voted against the resolution. It just depends on which version of General Clark's statements that we hear, now as he is running for President, and again using partisan rhetoric in trying to undermine the President in a time of war.

Governor Dean has no such problem. He has been very consistent. In that old battle of hawks versus doves, the fact of the matter is that I think it is pretty clear that Mr. Dean is in fact on the ostrich side of that debate. He opposes the war, he opposes the doctrine of preemptive war, which means we have to wait, according to the doctrine of Mr. Dean, who is apparently one of the frontrunners for nomination for President, we have to wait until the next set of bombs, perhaps filled with nuclear weapons, hits an urban center in New York or Detroit. Maybe we have to wait until poison water in Los Angeles or in Miami poisons millions of our citizens. Terrorists maybe will have to drop nerve gas on population centers in Atlanta or Seattle before we can defend ourselves, and even at that point Governor Dean regularly suggests that we need to ask the United Nations before we defend ourselves.

Let me remind Members that means that Libya, led by Colonel Quadafi, who declared basically a terrorist war on America 15 years ago, Libya controls the chairmanship of the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations. Maybe we should have to ask Syria, a state that sponsors terrorism on a regular basis and that serves on the Security Council of the United Nations, one of the top 15 votes in the United Nations. We should not have to ask for permission to defend ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say, hopefully, this debate can return to not who said what when, but who believes we need to stand up and fight to do the right thing to protect Americans to secure our interests and to ultimately bring our men and women from Iraq home as we continue to prosecute this war on terror.

I will go back to what I started with tonight, in a great speech President Reagan gave to the British Parliament in 1982 called the Westminster Speech, he said, "During the dark days of the Second World War, when this island was incandescent with courage, Winston Churchill exclaimed about Britain's adversaries, 'What kind of a people do they think we are?'"

Mr. Speaker, all over the world, terrorists are watching to see what kind of people we think we are. Ultimately, it is the President of the United States, sometimes imperfectly, ultimately it is the majority leader and it is the leadership of the Republican Party in the United States House that the terrorists fear and know can defeat them, and the whole world is watching to see whether we back down to this terrorist threat.

Mr. Speaker, I know what kind of people I think Americans think we are. We are ready for this challenge, and it is not easy; but the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and President Bush are our leaders.

---

#### SOCIAL ILLS SEEN AS RUIN OF NATIONS

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to hear British Prime Minister Tony Blair speak in this Chamber a few months ago, and one comment he made particularly caught my attention. He said, "As Britain knows, all predominant power seems for a time invincible, but in fact, it is transitory." I think what he was saying is that essentially nothing lasts forever, including great nations.

History teaches us that, most of the world's great powers are not overcome by external force, but rather disintegrate internally. And let us take a quick study of three such examples.

Rome, of course, 2,000 odd years ago, stood astride the then-civilized world and appeared to be invincible. Yet it fell from preeminence, and the reasons historians have given us, there was a general decline in morality, increasing corruption and instability in leadership, an increasing public addiction to ever more violent public spectacles, an increase in crime and prostitution, and a populace that had become more self-absorbed, apathetic, and unwilling to sacrifice for the common good.

Then, of course, the country that Tony Blair was referring to, Great Britain, had a colonial empire that dominated much of the world through