

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI) established by the United Nations and administered by the United States. This alliance obligated the United States to foster the development of self-governance and promote economic, social, and educational advancement of the people of the RMI.

However, on March 1, 1954, at 6:45 a.m., at the Bikini Atoll in the Marshall Islands, the United States detonated the Bravo shot, a 15 megaton hydrogen bomb 1,000 times more powerful than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. Acknowledged as the greatest nuclear explosion ever detonated, the Bravo test vaporized 6 islands and created a mushroom cloud 25 miles in diameter.

While U.S. servicemen on Rongerik Atoll were evacuated within hours of the blast, Marshallese residents of Utirik and Rongelap were left behind for at least a day, resulting in their exposure to significant radiation. At the time of their removal, the people of these atolls were already suffering burns and loss of hair.

Also returned prematurely to their atolls, the people of Rongelap and Utirik received additional exposure causing many to believe that they were used to study the effects of radiation on human beings. Recently declassified information contains strong indications that human experimentation using the people of the exposed atolls was indeed part of the nuclear testing program in the Marshall Islands.

These tests exposed the people of the Marshalls to severe health problems and genetic anomalies for generations to come. Yet the United States has not made good on its promise to compensate citizens of the Marshall Islands for loss or damage to property and person resulting from the nuclear testing program which the Government of the United States conducted in the Marshall Islands between June 30, 1946 and August 18, 1958.

From 1946 to 1958, the United States detonated 67 nuclear weapons in the Marshall Islands, representing nearly 80 percent of all atmospheric tests ever conducted by the United States. If one were to calculate the net yield of these tests, it would be equivalent to the detonation of 1.7 Hiroshima bombs every day for 12 years.

Conducted in peacetime, the effects of the U.S. nuclear testing program in the Marshall Islands continues to be devastating and funds provided by the United States under the Compact of Free Association are grossly inadequate to provide for health care, environmental monitoring, personal injury claims, or land and property damage. I believe the survivors of U.S. atomic tests conducted in the Marshall Islands deserve just compensation and I am pleased that at a minimum H. Con. Res. 364 recognizes the historic contribution the people of the Marshall Islands have made in the cold-war struggle to preserve international peace and promote nuclear disarmament.

Today, the RMI provides use of its islands for the United States to develop a deployable missile defense system to reduce the risks of nuclear missile attacks and this is just another example of the RMI's unmatched record of working in conjunction with the leadership of the United States in pursuit of international peace and security. I commend the people of the Marshalls for their commitment to the rights and well-being of the peoples of the world and I recognize with solemn regard the

sacrifices they have made so that you and I and future generations may live in peace.

I commend Chairman RICHARD POMBO of the House Resources Committee for introducing this legislation of which I am an original cosponsor. I thank my good friend for his leadership and for recently leading a congressional delegation to the Pacific Territories where we met with island leaders, including those from the Marshall Islands. Chairman POMBO invited Secretary Gale Norton to accompany us on this visit and I commend both the Secretary and the chairman for traveling to the Pacific Territories to see firsthand the difficulties we are facing in the region.

As the ranking member of the House International Relations Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, I also want to thank Chairman JIM LEACH of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific for sponsoring this legislation and for working with Chairman POMBO and me to move this legislation to the International Relations Committee for mark-up. I also thank Chairman HENRY HYDE and Ranking Member TOM LANTOS of the International Relations Committee for their support.

Finally, on behalf of the people of American Samoa, I again recognize with solemn regard the sacrifices our Pacific Island cousins have made in pursuit of international peace and I am hopeful that one day the U.S. Congress will declare March 1 as a national day of remembrance for the survivors of U.S. nuclear tests in the Marshall Islands.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 364.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1410

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

RELATING TO THE LIBERATION OF THE IRAQI PEOPLE AND THE VALIANT SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AND COALITION FORCES

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 561, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 557) relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of House Resolution 557 is as follows:

H. RES. 557

Whereas Saddam Hussein and his regime committed crimes against humanity, systematically violating the human rights of Iraqis and citizens of other countries;

Whereas Saddam Hussein's terror regime subjected the Iraqi people to murder, torture, rape, and amputation;

Whereas on March 16, 1988, Saddam Hussein's regime had and unleashed weapons of mass destruction against Kurdish citizens, killing nearly 5,000 of them;

Whereas as many as 270 mass grave sites, containing the remains of as many as 400,000 victims of Saddam Hussein's regime, have been found in Iraq;

Whereas rape was used to intimidate the Iraqi population, with victims often raped in front of their families;

Whereas the regime punished the Marsh Arabs by draining the marshlands, which created hundreds of thousands of refugees and caused an ecological catastrophe;

Whereas the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-338), passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 360 to 38, made it United States policy to support efforts to remove from power the regime headed by Saddam Hussein;

Whereas with the Iraqi regime failing to comply with 16 previously adopted United Nations Security Council resolutions, the Security Council unanimously approved Resolution 1441 on November 8, 2002, declaring that Iraq "has been and remains in material breach of its obligations under relevant resolutions, including resolution 687 (1991), in particular through Iraq's failure to cooperate with United Nations inspectors"; and

Whereas on October 10, 2002, the House of Representatives passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243) and on March 19, 2003, the United States initiated military operations in Iraq; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) affirms that the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq;

(2) commends the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of unspeakable oppression and brutality inflicted on them by Saddam Hussein's regime;

(3) commends the Iraqi people on the adoption of Iraq's interim constitution; and

(4) commends the members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces for liberating Iraq and expresses its gratitude for their valiant service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 561, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important moment in our history. We are in the middle of a war the like of which has not been seen in recorded history. Everybody is a combatant, and the enemy works by night and works through cowardice. We do not see them. It is not like when Hitler marched through Europe with the blitzkrieg, where you could see the enemy. The enemy extends from New York City to Madrid to Indonesia. And if ever there was a time for this country, the United States of America, to be unified, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) said earlier, it is now.

Now, there are two aspects to this issue that we have here today. One is the procedure by which we got here, and that is controversial and has evoked some harsh words. And the other aspect, the one that I choose to dwell on, is the substance of the resolution.

The resolution, it seems to me, is simple, straightforward and one that everybody can support. It does four things. It congratulates the Iraqi people on withstanding the torture, the brutality, and the oppression that Saddam Hussein has visited on that country for so long.

It affirms that the United States and the world has been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime. And I understand there are some who doubt that and wish to contest that. I would suggest to them that they look at Libya and they consider that Libya has given up its pretenses to have weapons of mass destruction, its capacity to develop nuclear weapons, and is rejoining the community of nations without a shot being fired. And anyone who doubts that that is not a direct result of our intervention in Iraq, seems to me, is not a very good logician nor a student of history.

The other two things the resolution does is commend the Iraqi people on the adoption of an interim constitution. This, Mr. Speaker, is a miracle. You have Sunnis, you have Shiites, you have Kurds who have been at each other's throats for a long, long time. You have them coming together in a period of 9 weeks reaching a constitutional document. Not perfect, but a giant leap forward from where they were. This is an immense contribution towards democratizing the volatile Middle East, and they deserve recognition.

And, of course, this resolution commends the United States Armed Forces and the Coalition for their valor and

their courage in the war in the Middle East.

Now, those things, it seems to me, everybody can support. And regardless of our disagreements on process, regardless of our concerns about how we got here, I would ask, in the spirit of, dare I say, patriotism, sticking up for our country, never mind our ruffled feelings, justified or not, let us stand as one with our military people who are fighting this war, this strange, weird, deadly war, where all of us should be Americans, not Republicans and not Democrats.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, the vote in Spain was a great victory for al Qaeda, but it was simply a battle, it was not the war. The war will be a long, long war; and the voices of appeasement are being heard in Europe, but there are other voices, some from the past, voices like Churchill, voices like de Gaulle and voices like Roosevelt that caution resistance, resistance to tyranny. I would ask that Members read the resolution. It is very simple, very straightforward; read it and then put your bruised feelings aside and support it.

If we want to go into bruised feelings, both sides have ample cause, we certainly do, being called, and I say this in sorrow not anger, crooks and liars and having it suggested that the war was started by the President. Those kinds of ideas are not conducive to getting together and embracing each other in the unity that must prevail if we are to win. We do not dare lose this war. What can we do to help win it? I ask Members that, and I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to give it heartfelt thought and support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution we are considering today is deeply flawed. The way it was handled was meant to be divisive, and it has achieved that goal. None of us in this House knows if next January we will have a KERRY administration or a Bush administration, but we do know that whoever is in the White House must ensure the success of U.S. policy in Europe. Success in time of war requires cohesion and unity. We do not need a divisive, partisan resolution. This may be the way to prepare a Republican tax bill, but it is not the way to prepare a foreign policy resolution to win broad bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, the conflict in Iraq should not be a partisan issue. The soldiers who are fighting in Iraq are Democrats and Republicans and Independents. The soldiers who are wounded and killed in Iraq are Democrats and Republicans and Independents. The families who grieve for their sons and daughters who died in Iraq are Democrats and Republicans and Independents. The citizens of this country who

are paying for this war are Democrats and Republicans and Independents.

Mr. Speaker, it is totally unacceptable that not a single amendment to this resolution was made in order. This was a Republican resolution, drafted with partisan intent by the Republican leadership. Many of us in this House who have been committed to and who have worked for a bipartisan foreign policy for decades know that this is a slap in our face.

A resolution that commends our troops ought to receive the unanimous support of this body, but this resolution has been written specifically to prevent that result.

Mr. Speaker, war is a time for shared sacrifice, a time when we are all united in a common struggle. This is not shared sacrifice. Some Americans are being killed, some are being wounded, some are asked to leave their families and risk their lives far from home; and some at the very top of the income scale are being asked to accept massive tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution commends the troops, but it does not acknowledge the supreme sacrifice of many who are fighting. This resolution makes no reference to the more than 550 service men and women who have died in Iraq. It makes no reference to the thousands more who have been wounded. It offers no condolences to the families of those who have been killed. It makes no reference to the sacrifices of the families whose members are away from them serving in Iraq for many months or over a year. It makes no reference to the many civilian and humanitarian workers who risk their lives daily. It makes no reference to the contribution of our allies who have thousands of troops in Iraq, and it makes no mention of the death and casualties they have suffered. And it makes no reference to the Iraqi civilians who have lost their lives and suffered injuries, including dozens who were killed today.

Mr. Speaker, there are other serious omissions in this resolution. We should spend our time today debating substantive legislation to fix these problems. The American people have not sent us here just to be an "amen" chorus for this administration. There are serious problems, and we should be debating serious solutions.

There is no mention in this resolution of the flawed intelligence that was the basis of the administration's argument for going to war in the first place. We should be debating the establishment of a truly independent commission to examine the shortcomings of U.S. intelligence and the way it was used.

The members of this commission must not be appointed solely by the President, and the commission should make its findings known before Election Day. Only a truly independent investigation, and an investigation that the American people perceive to be independent, can bridge the credibility

gap in our intelligence both here at home and abroad.

The failure of this Congress to deal with the problems facing our intelligence agencies will ultimately harm our national security, the war against terrorism, and our fight against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, we are commending our troops but we are not taking action that we can and should take to make their lives and to make the lives of their loved ones easier. The sacrifices being made by our National Guard and reservists in Iraq and elsewhere are extraordinary. Many National Guard and Reserve families have suffered serious financial losses because of the pay gap between their military pay when they are called up and their private sector pay. With longer rotations, Guard and Reserve families are facing dramatically increased financial burdens while their loved ones risk their lives far away from home. One of the consequences is a serious problem with reenlistments in the Reserves and the National Guard.

My legislation, H.R. 1345, legislation that I introduced 1 year ago this week, would fill that pay gap. My bill would ensure that government and private sector employees can continue to defend our country without being forced to worry about their families facing financial disaster.

Words of support for our troops ring hollow when substantive legislation to improve their conditions is sandbagged by the leadership on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I very much regret that this resolution in its present form is brought before the House today. This should be a time for bipartisan unity and cohesion, not a time for partisanship. This should be a time for us to deal substantively with serious problems we face in Iraq and in our foreign policy. This should be a time for us to take serious action to help our service men and women. All of us join in commending our brave men and women of our Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), a leading member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. Let us review and remember the history of Saddam Hussein, a history of torture, murder and massive abuse of human rights. Saddam was not only an aggressor against his neighbors, but he murdered his own people. This is an outrage against all humanity.

Under Saddam Hussein, torture was widely used. Rape was a standard practice to intimidate and punish families, an outrage against women and all humanity. Murder was common. Truckloads of bodies took away victims. Ethnic cleansing was practiced with precision and effective organization, again an outrage against humanity.

The mass graves he created could barely hide the devastation of Saddam Hussein. Let us remember that Saddam Hussein was known in his own neighborhood, the Middle East, as The Butcher of Baghdad. Back in 1998, Saddam Hussein made a poison cocktail for the town of Halabja, using a combination of nerve agents, mustard gas and conventional munitions to kill 5,000 innocent Iraqi civilians, again an outrage against humanity.

And from 1983 to 1988, he went on an ethnic cleansing rampage against Iraqi Kurds, killing nearly 30,000 and wiping out 60 individual villages.

If you were not marked for death, Saddam Hussein was a master at torture and these were his favorite tools of torture, electric shock, drip acid on victims' skin, gouging out eyes, pulling out fingernails, suspending individuals from rotating ceiling fans, and for those who spoke ill of Saddam Hussein, they ripped out those victims' tongues. This is all an outrage against humanity.

There are over 400,000 unidentified bodies being unearthed in Iraq which call out for justice. I have a photo of a woman searching the remains of a mass grave for a loved one. Tell me this is not a just cause for freeing Iraq from Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress, this President, and our American military men and women had the leadership, the courage, and made the sacrifice to liberate Iraq from the mad, mad man, Saddam Hussein. It was the right step to take for all humanity.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I will support this resolution. I will support it as an expression of our Nation's gratitude and pride in our men and women in uniform who have performed with brilliance and valor in Operation Iraqi Freedom. To date, 565 Americans have given the ultimate measure of devotion to our country in Iraq, including a young soldier from my district, Jason C. Ford who was killed just a few days ago by a roadside bomb, 2 weeks after arriving in Iraq.

We mourn the loss of Jason and all other fallen patriots, and extend our most profound sympathies to their loved ones. We also pray for the full recovery of the more than 3,200 servicemen and -women who have been wounded there.

□ 1430

And to the approximately 110,000 Americans still in Iraq, we must offer this pledge: we will do everything within our power to ensure your success and safe return home.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution should have simply expressed the support of this House for our Armed Forces now

in harm's way. Regrettably, however, the majority has handled this resolution in a manner which inevitably led to division. Our troops and the American people expect and deserve better. On a matter of the highest national importance, the majority has undermined the democratic process in this House, treated those who hold different views with disdain, and created a bludgeon where it should have built a bridge. This is the same approach that has guided the current administration's foreign policy and which has undermined our Nation's credibility and driven many allies away from us. This is a time to bring together, to consult, to be unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, I share the view that the Middle East and the world are better off with Hussein in custody and his Baathist regime on the run. But our mission in Iraq has not been accomplished. Even as we speak here, a car bomb has rocked Baghdad and killed more than 20 people. This comes on the heels of attacks on our troops, civilians and even innocent worshippers. Success must be our only exit strategy. And only when our objectives are accomplished can we say with certainty and conviction that the world has been made safer. As today's events in Baghdad and last week's horrific attacks in Spain make clear, this war has not been won. Yet. But we send an unequivocal message to those who perpetrate such madness: we will not retreat from our objective to eliminate the source of terrorism and those who perpetrate it. The legacy of the men and women who have committed the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq demands that we do no less. It should also demand that we do so united, united by common resolve and not divided by efforts to achieve political advantage.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the debate on Iraq today I think confuses the American people. After all, one side focuses solely on parliamentary procedure or when they do on substance they focus solely on the tough times and the challenges that we face, which are very real. But its message all too often is devoid of any mention of progress. Sometimes it even suggests that we are not better off, we are not safer since Saddam's capture. However, the other side, Mr. Speaker, the side that I am on, talks openly of our soldiers' historic victories, how just 1 year after the start of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Saddam is in a dark cell, Osama is in a dark cave, and General Qaddafi is learning to play better with others.

The good news for the American public is that soon they will not have to rely on the media or the politics from either side of the aisle as the troop rotations take place. The public will get to hear from the soldiers themselves, our hometown heroes. And the story that they are going to hear is moving, it is amazing, it is historic. On the sobering side, the public will hear of

mass graves discovered and death cells shut down. On the thrilling side, they will hear about some of the things I saw myself when I was in Iraq just a few months ago. The public will hear of schools and universities that are open and operating, clinics and hospitals that are open and serving, and democratically elected governing councils that are open and governing. They will hear that well over 100,000 Iraqis now serve in the military and the police and that water projects and economic development are well under way. In Mosul when I was there, I saw a sign on the wall of the headquarters of the 101st which read: "We are in a race to win over the Iraqi people. What have you done to contribute to victory today?" The answer from our magnificent troops is clear, a lot, an unbelievable amount. And Lord willing, the public is going to hear more each and every day about just what these fantastic brave men have done.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the gentleman from Florida, let me remind the gentleman from Wisconsin that national unity and cohesion are not matters of parliamentary procedure. They are at the core of uniting the United States and the American people at a time of war.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, while I strongly support the brave American soldiers risking their lives to defend security and freedom, I rise in opposition to this politically motivated resolution because it is a farce and anyone who says otherwise is too blinded by politics to see the truth. The truth is Iraq was not an imminent threat to America. There were no chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons; and there was no link between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein. The only mushroom cloud resulting from the war in Iraq is that represented by the Bush administration's barrage of deception and lies. While President Bush considers himself a war President, he is actually a self-made President of war. The President created the pretext for the war in Iraq. He planned for it before September 11, and he misused and fabricated intelligence to sell it to the American people. Instead of debating this empty resolution of praise for President Bush, Congress should investigate the President's unconscionable misuse of power and manipulation of the truth.

Despite this second declaration of "mission accomplished" in Iraq, history will tell the true story as it did in Vietnam. The mission is far from being accomplished, and President Bush will be judged harshly for the tragic events of the past year.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as a political refugee from a brutal, sadistic regime, I know of the terrible crimes that dictators commit against their own people. Yet after talking to survivors of Saddam Hussein's regime and speaking with the teams who uncovered Iraq's mass graves, I was left speechless in the face of such atrocities. The Iraqi dictatorship indiscriminately slaughtered Iraqis but the women were among the most vulnerable. The notorious Fedayeen beheaded women in public, dumping their severed heads at their families' doorsteps. According to the September 2001 report of the United Nations Special Rapporteur, at least 130 Iraqi women were beheaded between June 2000 and April 2001, in just 1 year. The regime used widespread rape to extract confessions from detainees and would intimidate members of the opposition by sending them videotapes of the rapes of their female relatives. At times, family members were forced to watch those tapes.

However, Saddam Hussein's legacy of terror knew no boundaries. Even small children were not spared the butchery as evident from the tiny skeletons found in mass graves throughout Iraq. In 1998, the evidence of the Iraqi regime's threatening behavior continued to mount and we as Members of the United States Congress in a unified manner overwhelmingly approved the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998, calling for the regime of Saddam Hussein to be removed from power and replaced with a democratic government. By 2003 after 6 more years of Saddam's oppression, the death toll had reached frightening proportions. The U.S. could not watch idly and do nothing. As a Nation which stands for freedom, democracy and human rights, we were compelled to act. Today as a result of the President's resolve in Iraq and the courageous dedicated service of our troops, the Iraqi people are free.

As Iraq's new female minister of Municipalities and Public Works said last week to us: "On April 9, 2003, Iraqis were offered the opportunity to begin to dream their future." To determine if going to war in Iraq and liberating the Iraqi people was the right decision, just ask Dr. Khuzai, a member of the Iraqi Governing Council and National Council on Women. After being prisoners in their own country for 35 years, she told us: "For the Iraqi women, the morale is so high that you can't understand it unless you go and see. All the Iraqis are very grateful to Mr. Bush and to the U.S. for liberating us from the dictatorship regime. We will be grateful forever."

Today, the United States is helping Iraqi women reintegrate themselves into Iraqi society and, indeed, the outside world. Toward this end, the administration has embarked on the Iraqi Women's Democracy Initiative to train Iraqi women in the skills and practices

of democratic public life. It has also established the U.S.-Iraqi Women's Network, helping to mobilize the private sector.

This is just the beginning. We will have a better, safer world for the Iraqi people, especially for the Iraqi women, and for all.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the distinguished chairman of the Democratic Caucus and an important member of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I hear my colleagues now talk about human rights and brutality, and there is no question about that; but there is human rights and brutality in many parts of the world, and that has not caused American troops to intervene in those countries. One year after the U.S. invasion of Iraq, it is time to focus on the truth. Yet this resolution leaves out the administration's most important justification for the war in Iraq, weapons of mass destruction. This administration systematically misled the American public and Congress into believing that there were weapons of mass destruction and that we were under an imminent threat. According to the Carnegie Endowment For International Peace recent report, the administration systematically misrepresented the threat from Iraq's weapons of mass destruction by presenting the case as solid instead of expressing the uncertainty that existed in the intelligence assessments, and making the threat seem dire rather than minor by misrepresenting the inspector's findings.

In fact, a report by the minority staff of the Committee on Government Reform found the administration made over 200 misleading public statements on the Iraqi threat.

The truth is that this administration will not have the American people know what really happened with the intelligence until after the November elections, a year from today. Most importantly, this Republican Iraq resolution, crafted with no input from Democrats, makes no mention of the over 565 American men and women who gave their lives in Iraq to date and over 3,500 others who are wounded. I say we should honor those who gave their lives, not ignore them. This resolution should commemorate that ultimate sacrifice.

In the wake of the recent attacks in Spain, it is shameful that Republicans are acting as dividers, not uniters. It is shameful that the Republicans without input from Democrats on a crucial resolution that could express our collective sentiment as we did after September 11 seek partisan gain out of what should be a national embrace.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS).

(Ms. HARRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARRIS. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 557, which reaffirms the morality and justice of Operation Iraqi Freedom. One year ago, our brave men and women in uniform began to liberate a proud and resilient nation from an unspeakable 30-year nightmare. They also delivered a clear message to terrorists and tyrants alike: the United States will not tolerate a regime that pursues tools of mass murder and destruction. Operation Iraqi Freedom reversed more than a decade of failed diplomacy which exacted a devastating price. Because the world permitted Saddam Hussein to violate 16 U.N. resolutions with impunity, the terrorists became convinced of our weakness. Meanwhile, Saddam continued to murder, torture, mutilate and rape men, women and children by the millions. After routing Saddam Hussein's forces from Kuwait in 1991, we urged the Iraqi people to rise up and rebel against this brutal dictator. Then, because United Nations and international opinion required us to leave Saddam in power, we betrayed them.

During the Pryce delegation's mission to Iraq last fall, we listened to the victims and witnesses describe the horrors of this wicked regime. Incredibly, however, the faces of the Iraqis with whom we met reflected a new hope, born from the blood, sacrifice, heroism, and successes of our troops. Even as they endure the attacks of the enemies of freedom, they know that by working together, we will win the twilight struggle for their future.

□ 1445

In the heart of the Middle East, we are replacing the oppression and despair that breeds terrorists with the freedom and hope that defeats them. Mr. Speaker, this stunning transformation is the very essence of the war on terror and let us not permit the rhetoric of an election year to obscure this fundamental truth.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. ACKERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is extraordinary, not for what it says but for what it deliberately refuses to admit. The President took us to war. An immediate nuclear threat was the bait. This resolution is the switch.

In the aftermath of the war, we found no stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction, and with shifting justifications coming from the President and memorialized here in this Republican-crafted resolution, I cannot help but feel, as my constituents do, that we were sold a bill of goods. Not surprisingly, today's feel-good pep-rally resolution does not speak to these issues. What it does provide is the background music for justification revisionists.

But since we have not discovered the promised stockpiles of weapons, we have a big problem. Not that our failure to find the weapons is not a big problem or that al Qaeda forces sneaking into Iraq is not a big problem or that nation building a place the size of California is not a big problem. The real problem is an utter lack of White House credibility. It is gone. Having not just cried wolf, but rabid wolf, this administration has lost its credibility with the Congress, with the American people, with the people of Europe, even with the people of "New Europe," and with the international community.

And the credibility gap extends to the plans for what we would do after the war. We won the war. The Secretary of War makes good war. And for the peace we were assured, the American people were assured that there was a plan. In fact, there was. It was crafted by the State Department. It spoke to all of the issues and problems that we have come up with until today, and it was scrapped by the Secretary of Defense. So how are the American people supposed to believe that the current plan to hand over power to the Iraqis on June 30, ready or not, come hell or high water, will actually work when all the expertise the United States Government could muster in advance has been summarily dismissed? I have concluded that the administration's plans to get us into the war was bait and switch, and the plan to get us out looks like cut and run.

Finally, I am deeply concerned that the war against Iraq has undermined our stated Bush national security doctrine on preemption. Surely we face a new and different world in the wake of September 11 and we must think differently about how to win the war on terror, but preemption as a valid and legal doctrine for self-defense depends on imminence, an imminent threat to our national security. What we have discovered in Iraq is that there was no imminent threat and that our intelligence about Saddam's weapons was far from the mark. The administration has destroyed its credibility with the world community, and if by our actions we have transformed preemptive war into preventative war, then despite what today's resolution says, we have not made the world a safe place but a more dangerous place in the long run.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would just like to comment on the use of the word "imminent." I wonder when the aircraft smashed into the

World Trade Center, what was imminent. That morning? The day before? See, when we are dealing with suicide bombers, "imminence" is a rather difficult term to apply to circumstances. Sometimes by the time one finds out it is imminent, they are dead.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS).

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of this important resolution. It has been almost a year now since our brave men and women in uniform liberated the Iraqi people from the oppressive regime of Saddam Hussein. In doing so, our Armed Forces brought individual freedom to a people who have for decades only known persecution. Now they are proving just as impressive at rebuilding the country.

Mr. Speaker, several of the previous speakers have said that the Bush administration falsely claimed that the threat posed by Iraq was imminent. The threat was not imminent. The administration made no such claim. The threat was it needed to be dealt with before the issue became imminent. Saddam's regime continued to try to kill our American and British air crews patrolling the no fly zone, people like the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), who flew those missions as a naval reservist. The United States could not keep a potential invasion force on station near Iraq indefinitely, nor would we want our soldiers to have to fight at the height of the summer.

With the ousting of Hussein from power, we have discovered the true horror and atrocities of this regime. As we look at the unearthed mass graves and reflect on the countless human rights abuses, how can we possibly question the legitimacy of this decision? The world is a safer place with the liberation of Iraq, particularly for the 25 million Iraqis who no longer have to live in fear of a brutal tyrant.

We entered Iraq to free its people and plant the seeds of a democratic government, and that is precisely what we are doing. If a few years ago, one would have told someone, anyone, that in the year 2004 the Iraqi people would be creating a constitution founded on democratic principles, I daresay that no one, no one, would have objected. Consequently, that is just what our decision has done.

I commend the diligence of our Armed Forces in the reconstruction effort, and I am pleased with the rapid progress that is being made. The road is certainly not an easy one, but I remain confident in the ability of the Iraqi people, with the cooperation of the coalition, to rebuild their country and to create a secure and stable sovereign nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for yielding me this time.

We all in this institution support our troops. We marvel at and applaud their bravery and their courage. It is not, Mr. Speaker, what is in this resolution. It is what is not in it. I suggest to my Republican colleagues that they meet with families of the men and women who are serving in Iraq, something many of us in this institution have done. They will learn how badly this administration has supplied our troops.

There is no mention of the lack of body armor in this resolution and how the Bush administration has failed to outfit our troops. There is no mention in this resolution about the lack of safe drinking water for our troops, something that this administration has failed to supply. There is no mention in this resolution of cuts in prescription drug benefits to veterans that this administration has forced on those who have lived up to their obligation for our country. There is no mention in this resolution of the \$1.2 billion underfunded for the Veterans Administration in the President's budget. There is no mention in this resolution of 558 courageous young men and women who have died in Iraq. There is no mention of the 2,788 soldiers and sailors who were wounded since President Bush dressed in his flight suit and declared, "mission accomplished." There is no mention in this resolution of weapons of mass destruction. There is no mention in this resolution of the Bush administration's deceit in leading us to this war.

Mr. Speaker, the best way to honor our troops is to supply the troops adequately, to protect the troops and make sure they are safe, and to fulfill the promises to our veterans. Something the Bush administration has failed to do. Something my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle have failed to address.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I was fascinated by the remarks of the last gentleman. We have been checking records of people who have strong views on this subject, and I find the gentleman has voted 11 times to cut the intelligence budget. That is pretty consistent, and I give him an A for consistency. He also voted against the supplemental to provide the wherewithal for the troops to be fully equipped. And so, as I say, the gentleman talks a very robust military, but he does not quite follow up with supporting funding for our intelligence.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the \$87 billion, first of all, I voted to equip the troops in Iraq in the first vote. When the Bush administration failed with enough money in that budget to provide safe drinking water, to provide body armor, when the adminis-

tration failed to do it, they had plenty of money to do it; yet it took them months and months and months to make our troops safe. That is why so many in this body said do not give the Pentagon more money, do not give Halliburton more money, do not give more money to the company that is paying Vice President CHENEY \$3,000 a week while he is Vice President of the United States.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said what is not in our resolution. I will tell the Members what is not in. The 11 votes he voted to cut funds for intelligence, his vote against the supplemental. And so to talk out of one side of his mouth for a vigorous military and that they should be supplied, and then to deny them the wherewithal to do it, it seems to me is standing on two stools. It is a great way to get a political hernia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution, first to praise the efforts of our men and women in the military who have worked so hard and sacrificed so much on behalf of this country. I also want to take a minute to recognize the courage and resilience of the Iraqi women.

Under Saddam Hussein, Iraqi women lived in fear. They endured years of great beatings, torture, under a farce of a legal system under which they had no rights. Does no one remember the pictures of the Kurdish people, dead, holding their babies in their arms, trying to shield them from the horror of a weapon of mass destruction in Iraq? Only Baathists were awarded the right to have medical care. Families were torn apart on trumped-up charges. Divorce was grounds for having their children taken away. Imagine a mother watching her child die because of her political beliefs. Imagine watching a husband leave for work one day, never to come back. Imagine walking down the street and having their children ripped from their hands.

The persecution of women under Saddam Hussein was brutal and systematic and left deep and damaging psychological wounds. Women were afraid to walk down the streets. Girls were afraid to go to school. With the source of that oppression now removed great challenges lie ahead. Some estimate, for example, that over 70 percent of the Iraqi women are illiterate. They could not go to school.

Somehow this battered and oppressed nation has to educate a new generation of Iraqi children. And in the face of that tough task, there is optimism in Iraq. For the first time in generations, they see an opportunity where only once they had terror. Where once there was depravity, there is excitement and hope in these women for the future. I have met with these women. I have talked with these women.

The optimism is due to the United States' intervention and the selfless

service of our men and women in uniform. In our Armed Forces stationed in Iraq, women stand alongside with men there and they serve as a model for the Iraqi women who aspire to that kind of equality on their own in their own country.

The new Constitution of Iraq calls for almost a 25 percent representation of women. The Iraqi women themselves have asked for 40 percent. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us commends the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of unspeakable oppression. I commend the women of Iraq for overcoming that unspeakable adversity. I hope that everyone will back this bill.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on International Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Human Rights.

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we send troops into battle without body armor. Shame. Those troops come back deprived of the veterans benefits we promised. Shame. And now we deliberately divide the homefront for political advantage. Shame.

Make no mistake about it. This resolution was designed by political consultants to generate the largest possible Democratic "no" vote which can then be the subject of political ads saying one of our Nation's great political parties does not support our troops. Shame.

The world is better because Saddam is gone. But a fair resolution would acknowledge that we are worse off because 566 of our troops are now deceased and 3,254 were wounded. And we are less safe because our military is exhausted and overextended. Our international credibility has been mangled beyond belief. So the real threats to our security, North Korea and Iran, are able to make progress on their nuclear weapons programs. We are not safer now than we were a year ago because those who would develop nuclear weapons and smuggle them into our cities have had a year further to progress.

□ 1500

And one party devotes a day of floor time to dividing our Nation during our war on terrorism. Shame. Just as that political party brought forward money for our troops in a supplemental and linked it to a giant welfare program for Halliburton and forced us to vote on it as a package. Now it attacks our patriotism when we said "no" to Halliburton, because they would not let us say "yes" to our troops and "no" to Halliburton at the same time. Shame.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the learned gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

After listening to some of this debate, and I am sure it will get worse during the day as we deal with this politically, from a policy point of view, I would just like to take a minute and review what really we are talking about here. We are talking about a resolution that I cannot imagine any American, frankly, could not support. I mean we are simply saying that we affirm that the United States has made the world safer by the removal of Saddam Hussein. Well, I believe that pretzle strongly.

We are commending the Iraqi people for their courage and going through all they have gone through. We are commending the Iraqi people because they actually have an interim Constitution and a Bill of Rights. That ought to have been on the front page of some paper somewhere. And we are commending our troops. What is there to be against, against that? All of it is true.

Do we want something else added to it? Well, I do too. And my colleagues will vote no because they did not get it exactly like they wanted it. I would like for this resolution to have commended the Commander in Chief of the United States. I would like for us to say to President Bush, thank God we have a man who has come along with enough backbone to stand up to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction around the world and is willing to stand up to the terrorists. Thank goodness we do that.

My colleagues spend all of their time talking about weapons of mass destruction. What this President has said to us about weapons of mass destruction is precisely what the previous administration said to us also. The difference is, we have a 9/11. And the difference is, we had a President that was willing and ready to act as we should have acted.

Just think about it a minute. We knew he had weapons of mass destruction. We knew he had the ability to make weapons of mass destruction, did we not? We knew he used weapons of mass destruction. When I voted yes for the President, I thought he had weapons of mass destruction, but I was not by myself. Israeli Intelligence thought so; British Intelligence, German Intelligence, French Intelligence, the U.N., even Saddam Hussein thought he had weapons of mass destruction. Get off of that.

We are doing the right thing to protect this world, and we are doing the right thing to protect our security here at home.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing but praise for our warriors in Iraq, but I oppose the President's Iraq war.

If this was a resolution praising our warriors instead of using them as a

pretext for applauding the President's after-the-fact arguments for going to war, I would vote for it. If this was a resolution proposing ways in which Congress and the President will raise our soldiers' pay, improve their housing at home and abroad, ensure quality health care for their families and survivors, I would vote for it. If this was a resolution guaranteeing the greater benefits, job training, educational and employment opportunities for returning veterans, I would vote for it. If this was a resolution demanding that the President develop a real foreign policy agenda instead of a doctrine of preemption and preventative war, I would vote for it. If this was a resolution calling on the President and the Intelligence Community to come clean on why no weapons of mass destruction have been found, I would vote for it. If this was a resolution condemning the no-bid contracts by which private military companies like Halliburton have enriched themselves and whose contributions have fattened the President's campaign war chest, I would vote for it.

But since this resolution is none of the above, I am compelled to vote against it. Since this resolution is steeped in hypocrisy and self-congratulatory bravado while refusing to address the false pretenses upon which the Iraqi war was launched, I am compelled to vote against it.

Again, this is poli-tricks, again, as this resolution was crafted to divide this Nation, not bring this Nation together. No, none of us had an opportunity on this side to contribute anything to this resolution, if, in fact, they want to have any kind of unity.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for authoring this very important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, much of the dark and unseemly world of Saddam Hussein is only now coming to light, and it is significantly worse than many of us had thought. The fact that as many as 400,000 victims were systematically brutalized and raped and tortured to death ranks the Hussein dictatorship as one of the worst in modern history. Had the United States and coalition forces not gone in to liberate Iraq, there is no doubt whatsoever that the killing fields would have continued unabated and that tens of thousands Iraqis or more would have met a terrible fate.

Mr. Speaker, on the issue of chemical weapons, we know that chemical weapons used by the Iraqis are not mere conjecture. Hussein used weapons of mass destruction and used them with impunity both in the Iran-Iraq war and he used them against the Kurds. We know for a fact, according to Human Rights Watch and many other organizations and the U.S. Department of State, that upwards of 5,000 Kurdish

people died a horrific death from those chemical attacks. There have also been, as my colleagues know, a staggering number of disappearances, believed to range between 250,000 to 290,000.

Mr. Speaker, the Armed Forces of the United States and our coalition partners have conducted themselves in Iraq with incredible valor, professionalism, and commitment. Our forces and those of our allies are peacemakers. We often talk about peacekeepers, soldiers who go in when the situation, while volatile, presents the opportunity to ensure that the combatants can be separated. Our men and women went into Iraq and they "made" the peace. They are peacemakers in a place in the world where peace was an oxymoron.

The recently adopted interim Iraqi constitution, Mr. Speaker, will more likely get further worked once the new assembly is up and running next year, is historic; a constitution which articulates basic fundamental human rights and the rule of law in the Middle East. After Israel, which has an excellent constitution, we now have Iraq. And I think there is a great opportunity for democracy to break out and the rule to be respected and that also mitigates the danger of Iraq which now is a peacemaker itself to its friends and allies in the region.

Finally, just let me say, a previous speaker talked about shame when it comes to our veterans and our men and women who are returning home. I chair the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. We have seen, since the Bush Presidency began, and it continues the trend line of the late 1990s, more than a 30 percent increase in health care funding and we will increase it again this year, and we will do so significantly.

President Bush has signed no less than 16 separate bills to enhance, to expand veterans benefits. The Veterans Benefits Act of 2003 was signed on December 16. There were seven titles to it, filled with very important provisions to enhance veterans benefits. The Veterans Education and Benefits Act contains a 46 percent increase in the GI Bill, 46 percent increase in college funding. I know, because I authored it. I was the prime sponsor of the bill. With no fanfare whatsoever, this President signed that legislation and 15 other bills into law.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that these trying to use veterans issues as a political football would cease on this floor today. We are trying, in a bipartisan way, to meet the obligations and the needs of our veterans. I stand committed to that. This party, and I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, to do so as well, we should all be pro-veteran, and we are matching our words and our rhetoric with funding and with responsive and responsible laws.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), a

distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this resolution, but I am going to do it with a heavy heart. I am going to do it with a heavy heart because this is obviously a politicized resolution. It is a resolution that was designed to make Democrats look bad. It is a resolution which Democrats had no input in whatsoever. It is a resolution that really smacks, I think, of hypocrisy, because when we look at the self-righteousness on the other side, when we had a resolution on the House floor several years ago when Bill Clinton was President to support our troops in Kosovo, almost everyone on the other side voted no.

I am going to vote for this because I support our troops. I am glad that Saddam Hussein is no longer in power, and I am glad that there is an Iraqi Constitution, and that is essentially what this resolution says. I believe that whether one believed that the war in Iraq was justified or unjustified, the fact that we are there now and we cannot cut and run because if we did, Iraq would surely be a terrorist state now if it was not one before, we really cannot cut and run.

But I think my friends on the other side of the aisle really ought to build a consensus. Democrats should have had input into this resolution. Democrats should have been allowed to amend this resolution. If we truly want bipartisanship, then we really need to stand together.

I am troubled that no weapons of mass destruction were found in Iraq. I am troubled that it seems that our intelligence was not exactly up to snuff. I am troubled that the American people were not told the entire truth. But I think we have to come together to support our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say again to my friends on the other side of the aisle, we support our troops whether they are in Iraq, Kosovo, or anywhere around the world, and we have to stand together and say it, not play partisan political games.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 557. Americans should be proud that we are again confronting an evil threat to the Western world. We have done that before and we will do it again. We should be proud of our soldiers and we should be proud of our President.

The last administration did nothing. What we are doing now is making up for what was not done 10 years ago. Ten years ago, we let Afghanistan be turned into a terrorist base. Ten years ago, we let Saddam Hussein continue his dictatorship and yes, the administration before the last, George Bush's father, deserves some of the blame for

this; but for the 8 years of the Clinton administration, Saddam Hussein was murdering his people and aligning himself with the terrorists of the world. Yet we did nothing.

Now, I remember voting for the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998. It passed this House by 360 to 38. Now, today, we hear oh, the President of the United States did not justify going into Iraq. Well, many of the people making that point voted for the Iraq Liberation Act in which section 3 of the Iraq Liberation Act authorizes the President of the United States to remove Saddam Hussein by force. Yet this President is taking care of business, while the last administration did nothing. Finally, we have a President who is taking care of business, protecting our national security. And what do we get? What do we hear? Nitpicking and back-biting from day one.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to support this resolution because it indicates that America is standing proud again. We have a President that is providing leadership. We are courageous and we are going to change the course of history. By getting rid of Saddam Hussein, we are going to create a democratic Iraq and we are going to stick it out there. Nobody is going to force us to cut and run; no amount of nitpicking or back-biting will hurt our resolve. We are going to create an alternative for moderate Muslims throughout the world, and that will change history. It will take the power away from the radical Islam. We are taking care of business now. Let us support our troops and our President.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, and 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for purposes of control.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE), a valued member of our committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first let me just say I rise in total opposition to this resolution. This is another resolution to deceive the American people. This resolution completely distorts and ignores the basis for this war and its costs.

□ 1515

This resolution never even mentions the more than, now, unfortunately, 560 Americans and countless others who have died in this war. This is really insulting, and it is insensitive.

It also leaves out any mention of weapons of mass destruction, which was the rationale for this war. And it claims the war made the world a safer place. That ignores reality.

We had choices. We had options. We did not have to go to war. In the last year, for example, 72 Members of this House voted for my amendment to the

Bush administration's war resolution that would have rejected the unnecessary rush to war and instead strengthened our commitment to the United Nations inspections process.

Now we have a resolution today that celebrates this war but ignores its cost, its cost to our soldiers, to our credibility, to our children's future. This pattern of deception and distortion must end.

I tried to offer an amendment to this misleading resolution yesterday. It just expressed our deep sorrow for all those who have been killed in this war and pointed out the terrible toll this war has taken on our own security. The Committee on Rules did not even allow my amendment honoring the sacrifice of our troops or offering the truth about the war. Once, again, the debate is being stifled.

What has happened to democracy in this body? Once again, this administration and the Republican leadership are attempting to trick the American people. And they are neglecting the very soldiers they claim to honor, the men and women who need health care, proper equipment, and veterans benefits, whose families need economic security. We must call them out on this and vote against this resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the opportunity for Members of the Committee on Armed Services to talk about our piece of this important resolution, and that is, I think, the most gratifying part of this resolution, which I think we can all join together on and that is commending our great troops who have been carrying out this effort in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, from the time when they spearheaded this drive up from Kuwait up through the choke points in Nasarea with the Marines out to the east and the Army, the 101st Airborne and the 3rd Infantry Division further to the west and worked up to those choke points at some places where RPGs were coming like volleys of high-tech arrows at those convoys of Humvees and trucks and tanks, to where they got up and went past the bridges before they could be blown, took the positions in the dams before the electronics could be executed to blow those places, and launched one of the most rapid-moving attacks in the history of warfare, with great heroism and great accomplishment, from those days to today when our troops are in this AO, this area of operation, not as much as attackers but in this case defenders of the new freedom of the Iraqi people, and hooking up pipelines and sanitary systems and getting children to school and opening up medical clinics, our people in uniform have performed heroically.

The most important message we can send from the United States House of Representatives is, you did a great job, America's people in uniform. You did a wonderful job for our country. And what you are doing has great value and

will enure to our freedom over the coming decades as well as the freedom of the world.

So, Mr. Speaker, we stand together and even united in commending our troops. I am glad that my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), is here as my partner on this committee to also commend the troops for the great job that they have done.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a valued member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, if the Republican leadership wanted to work on a bipartisan expression of support, we would have been able to get some place today. They could at least have had an opportunity for Congress to step back and examine what we have learned.

We were prepared to win the war in Iraq. It was never an issue. A major concern is that we were not adequately prepared to win the peace, either in terms of equipping or staffing the occupation of Iraq nor preparing the American public for the full scope of the cost and consequences.

Giving too much money to the wrong people to do the wrong things in Iraq is a legitimate object of debate, and I hope that we will some day have it. But, in the meantime, the most important unanswered question is whether the massive investment of the troops, the money, and the attention was best spent rushing to Iraq rather than concentrating on continuing the global struggle against al Qaeda and the other forces of terror.

By delaying for over a year and a half the concerted efforts in searching out bin Laden, it has allowed al Qaeda and other terrorists to gain strength, to metastasize, making bin Laden almost irrelevant other than as a symbol of our policy failure. Our unwillingness or inability to launch a concentrated effort to mobilize global support when we had the entire world united on our side is a sad by-product of this administration's policies.

We are long on celebration; we are short on analysis. We are long on talking; we are short on accomplishment. Congress's job is to know what is going on, define the policy, to fund the right things, and provide oversight. That is our job, and we are falling far short of the mark.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), my colleague and a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this Friday, the President ordered the men and women of our Armed Forces into Iraq. They performed magnificently and have continued to do so despite an ongoing guerilla campaign, difficult conditions, and a shortage of protective gear such as Kevlar vests and armored Humvees.

As we celebrate their courage and skill, we must also reflect on their sac-

rifices. As of today, 565 American troops have been killed in this war including United States Army Specialist Rel Allen Ravago, IV, one of my constituents.

I will support this resolution because it includes language honoring our troops, but I am very concerned over what the resolution excludes and deeply disappointed that it was not crafted in a bipartisan manner.

Our troops in Iraq are not representatives of one political party or the other, and those who seek to exploit their daring and sacrifice for partisan gain would do well to remember that.

This resolution fails to address a number of serious issues that have arisen as a result of the war. Although the resolution before us makes no mention of it, this Nation went to war over intelligence that Saddam Hussein had both an existing arsenal of biological and chemical weapons and an ongoing nuclear weapons program. A year has passed, and we have yet to find evidence that this was correct.

Clearly, we must look at the totality of the circumstances that led to such a colossal intelligence failure. This failure cannot be minimized or, in the case of this resolution, ignored all together. To do so does no honor to our troops who have been lost and further imperils our future.

The planning for the post-war period of this operation was also deficient and based on a number of unsupported assumptions. Over the past decade and a half, our forces have been engaged more and more in post-conflict operations. Clearly we need to organize ourselves better to meet the challenges posed by post-conflict reconstruction.

In the coming days, I will offer a House companion to a bill introduced in the Senate by Senators LUGAR and BIDEN that does just that, and I hope my colleagues will support it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON), my good friend and distinguished colleague.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, for more than 200 years the men and women of the United States military have, through their valiant actions, earned a well-deserved reputation for courage, honor, and sacrifice in defense of liberty. The brave Americans now fighting and dying in Iraq are heirs to a legacy that flows from Lexington and Concord through Normandy, straight up to the present day. They should be very proud of what they have accomplished in Iraq, and they deserve our firm support as they continue to face danger there.

I am sure that my colleagues who support H. Res. 557 are sincere in their desire to salute our troops. However, I feel they have committed a grave error by confusing the valor and the sacrifice of our troops with the misguided and misleading policy that sent them to Iraq in the first place.

Members of Congress voted in good faith for a resolution on the use of

force believing that Iraq was capable of unleashing deadly weapons of mass destruction. We were told that the threat was imminent and could directly impact our Nation's security. Certainly the people of Iraq had suffered from the brutal regime of Saddam Hussein, but this was not the primary reason given for the preemptive strike by the United States.

It is good that Congress is on record listing the many atrocities of Saddam Hussein's regime. Saddam was a brutal dictator. That is not debatable. What is debatable is whether our actions in Iraq have improved the security of the United States and our allies. I therefore question the resolution's assertion that "the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq." In fact, our laser beam focus on Iraq, with no proven connections to 9/11, has allowed al Qaeda to regroup and again unleash its destructive capabilities on one of our closest allies. Moreover, I believe our involvement in Iraq is a major contributing factor to America's declining image around the world, which Margaret Tutwiler, the administration's head official in charge of public diplomacy, admitted "will take us many years of hard, focused work" to restore.

When the President announced on May 1 of last year that major combat operations in Iraq had ceased, I expected a quick draw-down of American troops and a significant increase of United Nations peacekeepers. Tragically, our Nation has lost more American men and women in Iraq after the President's declaration that major hostilities had ended. The total now stands in excess of 565 and is climbing.

This resolution is disingenuous. In its place should be a straightforward resolution of commendation for those who fought valiantly and risked their lives to overthrow Saddam Hussein's regime. And condolences to those whose lives were snatched from them in this most unjustified conflict.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), our last speaker.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today we are asked to commemorate a preemptive war. President Bush told the world there was no doubt Iraq was concealing weapons of mass destruction, but this Republican resolution instead reinterprets history.

It would have the American people believe that President Bush took our Nation to war because in 1988 Saddam gassed the Kurds while President Reagan appeased the Iraqi regime or because Saddam punished the Marsh Arabs by draining the marshlands while the first Bush administration watched.

This resolution memorializes the horrors of a dictator to justify the flawed premise for preemptive war, but it fails to acknowledge the 565 American patriots who sacrificed their lives. This resolution exploits the sacrifices of our troops, the suffering of the Iraqi people, all for partisan gamesmanship.

Our Nation is at war. Our troops, their families, and the American people deserve honesty from this House and from the White House.

We all support our troops. We all want a safer world. And the American people deserve the truth.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I designate each of the following three Members to control ½ hour of time allotted to me under the rule: ½ hour for the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ½ hour for the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), and ½ hour for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the greatest asset our Nation has known, those heroes, and they are heroes, that we call on every time when we need courage and effectiveness on the battlefield, the incredible American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines that reflect the best attributes of those who have served before them; and they are a wonderful reflection of America across our country. So we thank them and we honor them.

Like many Members, I have had the privilege of traveling to Iraq twice, this last time with our minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) from the Committee on Armed Services.

And what was clear is that our men and women are doing an extraordinary job in the most trying of circumstances. They are superbly trained, superbly led, and are just the finest force in the world. We owe them a great debt of gratitude.

We also owe the same to more than 550 families of those who have given the ultimate sacrifice to our Nation in Iraq. But what was also clear in my trips, there was no effective or realistic planning done for the aftermath of the military invasion of Iraq. We did a superb job on the battlefield; but since that time, sadly, as I warned the President in two letters, September 4, 2002, and then one a couple of days before the actual invasion, I feared the outcome and I warned the administration in these letters about what the potential consequences might be of getting the post-war wrong.

□ 1530

Sadly now, we are seeing those consequences come home to roost, and some of the issues that I raised in those letters are sadly coming to pass today.

While the Iraqis now have an interim constitution and we should congratulate them for that, it is no clearer now than it was back in November, when the timetable for transformation was laid out, who will take over on June 30. Now it looks like there will be no status of forces agreement negotiated before that time. Let me tell my colleagues, a status of forces agreement is very important because it can establish limitations. It could establish rules of engagement that make it more difficult for our forces to protect themselves.

Perhaps most dangerously we see more signs of ethnic and religious strife, raising the possibility of a civil war in Iraq. I truly hope that does not happen, but the tensions are growing, and there are insurgents and foreign fighters who have fanned those flames. Today's most deadly and tragic bombing of the hotel in Baghdad seems to be the only recent sign of this. We need to do a better job in planning. Everything we have worked to achieve in Iraq will be undermined if we do not figure out who we are turning sovereignty over to on June 30 and how to manage the transition in a way that avoids civil war.

These are dangerous times. This is not an easy day for our troops or for the leadership in our country, and that is why I raise these issues, Mr. Speaker. The security of the Iraqi people, the security of our troops, the stability in the region, and even our own national security depends on doing this right.

I will support this resolution because I support the men and women who are sacrificing daily, and I support those families who are fighting the insurgency in making Iraq secure, but I urge the administration to do the hard planning, to figure out quickly what will happen after June 30 to hold off a potential civil war, and we cannot have that.

We must not let last year's military victory become a long-term defeat because of more failures due to the tough planning ahead. June 30 is a date that must be taken very seriously by our country. We must make sure there is a stable Iraqi transition, and that it works; because if it does not work, if there is civil war, all of the sacrifices of those young men and women in uniform, whether wounded or killed, and the families that have grieved and shared their burdens with them, will have been in vain. We really, really cannot afford to have that.

So let us praise the troops. And every American should be proud of them as I am.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his thoughtful statement, and I yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

(Mr. SHAW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, and I rise in support of this resolution, support of our troops and particularly pay my great admiration to the 124th Infantry, Bravo Company, that just returned safely to Palm Beach County, Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 557 and to offer my gratitude to all the men and women who have worked, and who continue to work, so hard to serve their country in Iraq. In particular, I'd like to extend my respect and admiration to Captain Joseph Lyon and the reservists of the 1st Battalion, 124th Infantry, Bravo Company, who have re-

turned home safely to West Palm Beach from service in Iraq.

The contributions of these brave soldiers can be seen every day in the numerous improvements in the Iraqi economy and society. With the aid of the Coalition forces, the transfer of power to the people of Iraq is progressing smoothly. Iraqi forces are gradually relieving and will completely replace coalition forces in all aspects of the reconstruction.

I am thankful to all who have helped the Iraqi people establish a stable and peaceful country. By doing so, we defend our people from the danger of Iraq returning to being a haven for terrorists. Today, Iraq is a safer place and is on the road to establishing their own democracy to serve as an example in the heart of the Middle East.

I urge all my colleagues to support H. Res. 557.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities, who spends more time with the troops than he does with us.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of traveling to Iraq twice in the last few months to visit our troops and to thank them for the job they are doing, as well as to see firsthand the progress that is being made by both the Iraqis and the international coalition in providing security and growing stability to the Nation.

I was amazed to see and hear some of the very real and significant success stories that our forces are accomplishing. When one travels by air, for example, over Iraq, it is easy to realize that 65 percent of the Iraqi people live off the land. Many are accomplished farmers, but others are being aided by the efforts of the American soldiers and by American generosity.

In Iraq, the Iraqi Ministry of Agriculture once ran a 400-acre farm not far from where Saddam Hussein was captured. It was called Saddam Farm, and it produced a harvest that benefited only Saddam Hussein and his family. Today, the Army is helping Iraqis establish the nation's very first cooperative farm on that 400 acres. Iraqi farming families are also being helped by the generosity of the American citizens who have donated some \$20,000 worth of seeds, and the Army has distributed them.

Throughout my travels in Iraq, I have found Iraqi children with smiles on their faces. It is remarkable to think that they are living in freedom for the first time. They know it and they like it. Like many children throughout the world, Iraqis enjoy the sport of soccer, and I have seen Iraqi children kicking soccer balls on the playing fields and vacant lots and empty streets. American troops have undertaken projects to give soccer balls to some of the poorer Iraqi children who may not be able to obtain for themselves. For example, the 501st Forward Support Battalion undertook one

project and gave away 150 soccer balls to kids in Baghdad. The 101st Airborne also distributed soccer balls in the north.

Perhaps the greatest and most noteworthy accomplishment that I have seen in Iraq, however, is the increase in the level of security and stability for the Iraqi people. Unfortunately, there are still those that want to see a free Iraq fail, but for our troops, many changes in the Iraqi lifestyle have been evident. In many other areas, security and stability are succeeding because of the efforts of the international coalition forces and the Iraqis themselves.

Iraq's security forces have grown tremendously in the last year since they were first created. The Iraqi Department of Border Enforcement now employs 80,000 Iraqis and 9,000 border enforcement agents, as well as to monitor the nation's 3600-kilometer border. More than 11,000 experienced policemen now patrol Iraq, and another several thousand Iraqi policemen will join their ranks by the end of this year.

There is still much to be done in Iraq, but the fact of the matter is that there are many success stories, many more than one reads in the morning newspaper or sees on daily television reports, and certainly many more than I have time to outline here.

The successes I spoke of and the countless others not only are helping Iraq to become more stable, but they are helping Iraqis to provide for that security and stability. Ultimately, the sooner Iraq is run and secured by Iraqis, the sooner our great troops will come home.

I am proud to stand here today and commend the Iraqi people for their courage and to say again thank you to our troops for a great job well done.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman, formerly from Missouri, now from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Missouri for recognizing that Missouri, too, is the State of my birth, and I am delighted to be on the floor today with him because he has provided wonderful leadership for our caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I came today to the floor to shame the Republicans and the President for politicizing this tragic war in Iraq. God bless our soldiers. They do not deserve to be made pawns in political gamesmanship. There are many Members who love and support our soldiers but refuse to be blackmailed into supporting this preemptive strike doctrine of this administration and to be used by this President. Just as President Bush is attempting to use the New York 9/11 scene as a backdrop in his political advertisement, this resolution is being used to paint the picture that this President is a tough leader, fighting terrorism and winning.

Mr. Speaker, this President is not winning. Our country and the world is not more secure. Tragically, over 564

soldiers have died since the war began last year, and thousands more have been injured. The administration has spent \$157 billion so far in this war, and even the allies who have supported him are being retaliated against.

If my friends on the opposite side of the aisle were sincere about gathering us all together in a resolution to say to our soldiers thank you for your sacrifices, they would have done what was asked of them by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) today: Pull this one-sided resolution off the floor, get Democrats involved, let us join hands and support our soldiers.

This is the most divisive administration that this country has ever had, polarizing us, putting us at each others' throats. It is a shame, and I do not mind saying it on this floor today. You need to withdraw it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank our great chairman for yielding me the time. And, Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues in this Chamber have any doubt about the necessity of our war against the sadistic and despotic regime of Saddam Hussein, I urge them to look at this photo that I took with Iraqi girls during a congressional trip that some of my colleagues and I went on last December.

If my colleagues take a close look at this picture, they will see bright, sunny faces of happy girls who look like they could live in my district or any of their districts around this country, but the sad reality is that a little over a year ago, these young girls were living under the ugly regime of a murderous dictator who would not hesitate to take their lives or the lives of their friends and family. In fact, from 1983 to 1988 Saddam Hussein wiped out 60 villages and murdered more than 30,000 Iraqi citizens with weapons of mass destruction. Human rights organizations continually received reports from women who said that rape was routinely used by Iraqi officials as weapons of torture, intimidation, and blackmail.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what would have happened to these girls if the United States had not acted against Saddam Hussein's ruthless Baathist regime, but I do know this much. Since the liberation of Iraq, more than 5.5 million children went back to school this year; 2,300 schools which fell into disarray under Saddam's regime have been rehabilitated. School children have books, shoulder bags, notebooks, pencils, papers and desks to use for their studies; but, most importantly, they are now living free from Saddam's repressive regime, and they never have to worry again about being harmed by their tyrannical government, thanks to the strong leadership of President Bush and the heroic efforts of our men and women of the armed services.

I cannot say enough about our troops who risk life and limb every day to

bring freedom to these girls and to the other people of Iraq. I urge strong support of this resolution endorsing our troops.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and it is unfortunate that this resolution has become so political because I think clearly all of us should have been able to sit down and come up with a resolution that would be united and that would send a clear voice to all of the world how much we support our troops.

We are going to have 4 hours of debate, and there are so many important things we should be discussing, like the fact that we failed to provide our troops with critical protection and equipment that they need, from interceptive body armor to anti-jamming devices, to armored humvees.

Yesterday, I met with Brian Hart, the father of Private First Class John Hart who was killed in Iraq last October when the unarmored humvee that he was patrolling in was ambushed and sprayed with bullets. Just days before his death, Pfc. Hart called his father and told him how unsafe he felt riding around in humvees that lacked bullet-proof shielding or reinforced doors.

The story of John Hart is all too familiar. A couple of months ago, the Defense Department stated that 29 American troops had been killed and 290 wounded on attacks on humvees. Now I hear they are not even tracking those numbers anymore, but I do know that of the 18 soldiers killed in Iraq from Massachusetts, 6 died in unarmored humvees or trucks.

Look at this chart. Almost 80 percent of the 12,500 humvees deployed in Operation Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom lack reinforced windows and doors. The evidence here is overwhelming that we have not gotten what our troops need fast enough.

□ 1545

And what bothers me is that the Army did not even begin to address this shortage until August 2003, 3 months after President Bush announced the end of the war in Iraq. The Secretary of the Army says that they will get this done by August; but as of today no new orders have been placed, leaving our troops, many of them, in this vulnerable position, in unarmed vehicles. August just is not good enough.

For too long, the Army has dragged its feet because it failed to consider quick, effective alternatives to uparmoring Humvees like installing add-on armor kits.

If we purchased more add-on kits and reached out to other vendors, we can get these Humvees armored now.

Recently, 25,000 Marines deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan and took with them 3,000

trucks and Humvees, all of which have been armored with protective plating. The Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Hagee, understood that installing temporary add-on kits provides a quick, easy alternative to uparmoring Humvees in depots at home. So Gen. Hagee purchased \$9 million worth of add-on armor kits to outfit Humvees before he sent his Marines back into the battlefield.

I have introduced a resolution urging the Defense Department to use whatever means possible to armor these Humvees as quickly as they can.

If we truly want to support our Armed Forces, this would provide them with the critical protection and equipment they deserve!

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to let my colleagues know that all Humvees are manufactured unarmored. They are basically big Jeeps, and this Congress has been rushing to armor Humvees in the wake of the new threat known as the IED, the remotely detonated device. We put some \$400 million in the last supplemental to pay for that armor.

I just would say to my colleagues, it would have been great if they could have voted with us on that one because that is the funding supplemental that paid for the arming of the Humvees.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, that is precisely why I could not vote for it. We were supposed to have this money appropriated. We have troops over there in unarmed vehicles. It is inexcusable.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the idea that you do not armor vehicles because it is not done already at the factory makes no logic to me.

I would urge the gentleman to work with me to continue to armor them, because we are shipping steel in there now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, just as an introduction, it seems to me that, to a certain degree, the other party doeth protest too much.

The first thing I have been hearing about is complaints about intelligence information. Yet it was the other party, the Democrat Party, that under the Church Commission dismantled our human intelligence and has consistently done that. Over the 8 years Clinton was in office, they voted to cut the human intelligence budget 30 percent and now want to complain about the fact that our intelligence information is not that good.

This is also a party that cut the defense budget close to half and wonders why there is not some equipment sometimes. They cannot have it both ways.

But I would like to focus, rather, about what was and what is now. What was, we saw. We saw the late-night knock of the secret police. We saw the torture chambers when I was in Iraq

that used to exist. We saw the women that had been raped as a form of political coercion. We saw women that were not educated.

Those things have changed. Because what is now is a society that is moving into a new century, a place where women can be educated, where no longer torture and murder and amputation are used as a tool to intimidate, and where we saw on the streets of Iraq people starting to emerge into a free civilization. There are all kinds of new businesses being formed.

These are words from a brave Iraqi Parliamentarian, probably risking his life, talking about the new constitution. Some, he says, may say that the Bill of Rights is copied from the West. My answer: these rights and values are not exclusively the property of the West. They are universal and should be respected and implemented everywhere. We have put up a high standard so that the people of the future may always try to reach.

I think that is a statement of our success. Americans have always succeeded when we invest in those tremendously important principles of our own founding, the belief that people are valuable. And we continue to attest to that by our presence in Iraq, by our brave soldiers there. They believe people are important, as opposed to the terrorists that say they are mere pawns.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution claims to honor our troops, but it is nothing but a thinly veiled attempt to run a political campaign on taxpayers' time.

We have the best military in the world. I am honored to represent the men and women of Travis Air Force Base in Congress, and I will always be grateful to all of our men and women in uniform for their patriotism, courage, sacrifice, and devotion to our great Nation. As Members of Congress, we must support them in word and deed.

I have been to Iraq and the Persian Gulf twice in the past year to talk to our troops serving there and learned firsthand what they need to get the job done and return home safely. Forty thousand American troops were sent to Iraq without bulletproof vests, and many more still do not have reinforced Humvees to protect them from daily roadside bombs. But this resolution does nothing to get this critical life-saving equipment to our troops.

I am very disappointed this resolution does not offer condolences to the families of the 564 Americans killed in Iraq thus far, nor mention the 2,500 wounded in action.

It is also hard to believe that these congressional leaders would consider a resolution that categorically reaffirms that the United States and the world

are made safe by the removal of Saddam Hussein and the Ba'ath Party from power just days after the Spanish people buried more than 200 of their citizens in the worst act of terror in European history, and on a day, today, when a bomb blast killed dozens in Iraq.

Instead of patting ourselves on the back, it is time to ask whether this administration's approach to the war on terror and the war on Iraq have made us safer. Two and one-half years after the September 11 attacks, al Qaeda is more dangerous than ever. The war in Iraq removed a dictator, but has created a new front on the war on terror that did not exist before and has pinned down a large amount of our troops in the Middle East for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote "no" on this resolution. I urge my colleagues to support our troops with action, not shameless political ploys, and do the same.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, all too often the voices whining about what they find wrong with our planning, our troops, or our military tend to drown out their great successes. But when I went to Iraq, I found our troops were proud that they had liberated 24 million Iraqi people in just 3 weeks.

The untold story of Operation Iraqi Freedom were the stories describing the logistics warriors who not only accomplished extraordinary things but who were often also put in harm's way to support the phenomenal contributions of our combat troops. Sometimes we just assume that food is going to get there and our ammunition is going to get there, but let me tell you some of the truly amazing logistics work that occurred during this conflict.

The main supply line stretched 350 miles; and on any given time, there were 2,500 logistics and support vehicles on the road. There were 2.5 million gallons of gas per day delivered effectively to fly our aircraft. We built the longest pipeline the Army has ever built, 220 miles long. There were 66,000 pipe sections hand laid to construct that critical system, and it is still in service today serving the Iraqi people. We delivered 1.5 million liters of water a day successfully and effectively. A third of a million meals were served per day. Two million tons of spare parts and equipment were moved effectively every day.

In particular, the tremendous effort of the Army's Quartermaster Corps, the home of which is in Fort Lee, Virginia, are reflected by these totals from the war: 186 million gallons of fuel, enough to fill the tanks of 40,000 cars; they served 53 million meals, enough to feed the entire population of New York State with three meals a day; provided 330 million gallons of water, enough for a daily shower for the half million residents of Las Vegas; and delivered nearly 8 million pieces of mail.

With so much success and such an enormous effort, it should not be hard to find additional improvements to be made. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fitting today that we stand up and pass this resolution to honor their great work.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Guam (Mr. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding me this time, and I rise today in support of our service men and women who need much more than the words we speak here today to help them in Iraq.

As the fires from the most recent terrorist attack today in Baghdad burn against the night sky, I am moved to remember Army Specialist Christopher Jude Rivera Wesley, who died in Iraq, the first Chamorro casualty of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

I also want to take time to pay tribute to Army Specialist Hilario Bermanis of the 82nd Airborne Division. He joined the Army from the Federated States of Micronesia, and after losing both legs and his left hand fighting in Iraq, he has now become an American citizen. I visited him at Walter Reed Medical Hospital. One day he might even become a Senator, like Max Cleland, who also sacrificed for his country a generation before him.

In my mind, this resolution affirms that we are yet to do everything that we can for our troops. We need the best technology to defend our troops and care for the wounded, the best diplomacy to make sure they do not stay a day longer than they have to, and the courage of our convictions to finish the job.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the leadership of President George W. Bush, the valor of the American military and the courage of our coalition partners, 1 year ago this week the liberation of Iraq started marking the beginning of the end of Saddam Hussein's brutal regime.

My gratitude for this historic success is as a Member of Congress. I had the opportunity to go with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and visit our troops in Iraq. Additionally, I am grateful as a veteran myself. I retired last July after 31 years of service with the Army National Guard, and I am so proud of what our active Guard and Reserve forces have done. But additionally, I am proud and grateful as a parent. I have three sons who are in the military of the United States, and one of my sons began his deployment in Iraq this week. We are very proud in the Wilson family of our contribution and the success of the American military.

Some today have incorrectly accused the administration of saying Iraq was in imminent threat. In reality, the case for the war with Iraq was made precisely because Iraq was not yet an imminent threat. After the hard lesson of September 11, we can no longer wait until our enemies grow stronger and more deadly before we take decisive action to prevent future tragedies.

Saddam Hussein posed a unique danger to the people of the United States and the world. He ignored 17 United Nations resolutions for over a decade, harbored and supported terrorists, and had used biological and chemical weapons on his own people, had a history of violent aggression against his neighboring countries, and attempted to assassinate a President of the United States.

Today, Saddam Hussein's regime of terror has ended and the world is a safer place for it; yet we know the war of terrorism is not over. We need to remain vigilant to protect America's families by promoting this resolution today, and I urge its support. In conclusion, God bless our troops. We will never forget September 11.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, never opened for committee discussion and now closed to amendments, is perhaps a consistent way to mark the anniversary of an unnecessary war that was built on misleading statements, dangerous disregard for the facts, and dangerous policies.

To a person, we believe that our military men and women have done a remarkable job in very difficult conditions, conditions like traveling in tactical vehicles that do not have steel armor, leaving them dangerously vulnerable to grenades, small arms, and roadside bombs. Soldiers in Iraq are hanging flack vests and even plywood on their Humvees in desperate attempts at protection, army officials are quoted as saying, and the casualties mount week by week.

Republicans who choose to slime the records of opponents of this resolution would be better to turn the mirror on themselves. Many of us will be supporting a Democratic budget resolution that will back up our rhetoric with the resources needed to provide equipment, compensation, military housing, child tax credits for military families, and other necessities that are missing in the Republican budget proposal. Let us put our money where our mouth is.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), who provides all those quality-of-life issues to our uniformed services.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today to support House Resolution 557.

Under the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein, the Iraqi people lived in poverty and fear. During his 30-year reign of tyranny, he massacred tens of thousands of his own people, some murdered for their religion and some for their ethnicity.

On March 19, 2003, the United States and its coalition partners launched the first air strikes of Operation Iraqi Freedom. In 3 weeks, Iraqis in Baghdad danced and waved their country's flag as U.S. forces toppled a statue of Saddam Hussein, signaling the end of Saddam's brutal tyranny.

□ 1600

Operation Iraqi Freedom was a military success, courageously executed by American men and women in uniform. It was an operation of unparalleled precision and speed, and was carried out in a way that prevented widespread destruction of Iraq's infrastructure, lengthy street-by-street fighting or a humanitarian crisis. Food and medical aid flowed into Iraq immediately after the troops and there was no "adventurism" by Iraq's neighbors or other destabilizing action in the region.

One year later, Iraqis are engaged in the enormous challenge of rebuilding their country after decades of neglect, and are working with the coalition toward the creation of a secure, stable, sovereign and peaceful Iraq. To date, in nearly all major cities and most towns and villages, Iraqi municipal councils have been formed, and for the first time in more than a generation the Iraqi judiciary is fully independent. More than 600 Iraqi judges preside over more than 500 courts that operate independently from the Iraqi Governing Council and the Coalition Provisional Authority.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. forces are handing the torch to the Iraqi people as they take control, form an army, build an effective police force, and develop a fair justice system.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution. I have a lot of other good stuff to say, but my time has expired.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise first and foremost to thank the men and women of the Armed Forces serving bravely in Iraq, Afghanistan and literally all over the world. I supported the resolution to authorize the war, and in the supplemental request I continue to support those troops and their work, but I must express my continued concerns about the safety of the troops and the haphazard way the administration has proceeded in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we have no end game in sight. Our exit strategy is murky, and our efforts to help this fledgling democracy seem to be going nowhere. When this war began last year, it became clear our troops do not have the

life-saving body armor and vehicle armor they needed. Even with the passage of the Iraq supplemental last November, there are still too many soldiers at risk, and we are experiencing increasing reports of street fire, mines and ambushes aimed at our troops. It is unconscionable that they continue to lack the protective gear they need.

On yesterday's evening news, Houston's CBS affiliate KHOU reported there are still a number of Humvees in Iraq without bulletproof armor, and I will include for the RECORD the news report. In fact, there are Humvees on the streets of Houston that have more safety features than the ones being used by our troops, according to the report. These vehicles are intended to transport soldiers and defend them in the war zone, and the last thing we should hear is soldiers' complaints that their family's sedans are safer than the military's soft-sided Humvees.

A year ago today, we started a war to remove an evil man from power; but in doing so, the lives of our troops are unnecessarily jeopardized by sending them into harm's way without proper armor and under-equipped vehicles. Our troops are doing a dangerous job, and I hope the administration will correct these problems.

[From KHOU.com, Mar. 17, 2004]

UP CLOSE: MILITARY LEADERSHIP LITTLE
SOFT ON VEHICLE PROTECTION

(By Dave Fehling)

As we approach the 1-year anniversary of the war in Iraq, we're learning more about an additional risk to our troops overseas. Thin-skinned vehicles not designed for combat are currently being driven by hundreds of soldiers in Iraq right now. And several service men have been killed, including one from League City. 11 News looks at the shortage of armor and the rush to fix what some call a deadly miscalculation.

Last October, 20-year-old paratrooper John Hart phoned his parents from Iraq and whispered words that shook them. He felt exposed in his soft-sided humvee, the same kind in which friends already had been killed or wounded in ambushes. The vehicle offered less protection than the family sedan.

"We were thinking about how best to address it," says John's father, Brian Hart, "when we got news the following week that John had been killed in an ambush."

John Hart was shot to death in his unarmored humvee, along with Lieutenant David Bernstein, fifth in his class at West Point.

Diane Elliott lives in fear that her husband is also an easy target in his unarmored humvee. "A bullet came through the humvee and through the back of his seat," she says. "He said there was a bullet hole, just barely missed his head."

That was the second time Army reserve Captain Roger Elliott escaped death in a canvas covered humvee in Baghdad.

The first time he got hit by a homemade bomb. "They said it hit the humvee, rolled off and hit the ground, and it blew a big hole in the ground," says Elliot. "Here's the humvee, and screws and nails and everything flying, just goes right through it."

Captain Elliott's Purple Heart arrived in an ammo box, along with his wife's wedding anniversary gifts.

Bullets, nails and shrapnel go right through the vast majority of humvees in

Iraq because they were designed to transport soldiers, not to protect them.

A factory near Cincinnati is the only plant in the world that produces armored humvees. "This is what we end up with. Fully armored doors, armored perimeter, turret," says a factory worker. "Underbody capable of defeating a landmine."

And windows that stop bullets. It's the kind of protection soldiers are asking for, and dying for.

"It's maddening," says Brian Hart. "It's absolutely maddening."

Maddening for John Hart's father, for Roger Elliott's wife. "How could you not know you need armored humvees when you're going into a war?" asks Diane Elliott.

And maddening for the parents of Texas National Guardsman Nathan Feenstra who says their son was sent to Iraq with old soft-sided humvees, and without new bullet proof vests that have saved an untold number of lives since the war began. "Basically, they're saying they've done all they can for now. It's too late for your unit, but we are preparing for the next group going into Iraq," says John Feenstra. "I said that's not good enough."

The Feenstras write letters to military leadership, and pray their son comes home alive.

Brian Hart is pressing congress to press the Army to speed up production. The plan in Ohio is boosting output. But some lawmakers are outraged. And the republican chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee called the shortage of armored humvees "unacceptable."

The Army Vice Chief of Staff told Congress in September more armored humvees weren't sent to Iraq because "To be honest, we just didn't expect this level of violence."

Back in May there were only about 235 armored humvees in Iraq. The army now wants more than 3,000. But it's expected to take until summer of 2005 before the Army gets all the beefed up humvees it wants.

To Brian Hart who made a promise to his son and to the soldiers who brought home his son's body, that's not good enough.

The army says it's rushed all available armored humvees to Iraq, and is sending 6,000 kits to toughen up standard humvees. It's also speeding up production of new armored vehicles.

Meanwhile many soldiers are improvising, using steel plates, rubber mats and sandbags to harden their humvees against attacks.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH).

(Mr. LEACH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, the measure before us contains many consentaneous American thoughts: Recognition that Saddam was a despot of tyrannical proportions; support for a process of democratic self-governance in Iraq; and, profoundly, appreciation for the sacrifice and commitment of Americans serving in our armed forces in these very troubling, indeed dangerous, times.

But as widely accepted as these notions are, care must be taken in this debate to underscore what this resolution is not. It cannot be read either as a Gulf of Tonkin-like resolution giving the Executive a blank check for future actions or considered an indication of Congressional approval of executive action to date.

Many in Congress, perhaps a majority, would be willing to vote for a more expansive

resolution, but such is not before us today. Nonetheless, the subject matter of this resolution necessitates a review of what has transpired since the Congress, without my support, authorized military intervention in Iraq a year and a half ago.

All of us recognize that Iraq is a judgmental quagmire. Thoughtful Americans are conflicted. The President has a case for the actions he has taken. But I feel obliged to make clear why I continue not to find it compelling and indicate, in as constructive a way as I am able, the problems that a lengthy occupation may yield and present a theoretical framework and the case for timely disengagement.

Perspective is difficult to apply to current events or for that matter life itself. But it is important to attempt to frame the discussion of the war in which we are engaged in relation to our history, to the development of knowledge (particularly science), and to our relations with other countries.

First our history. In the broadest sense the political history of America has encompassed four great debates. The first was the question of whether a country could be established based on the rights of man. The second was about definitions: whether the concept of "man" included individuals who were neither male nor pale. It took over a century, a civil war and suffrage and civil rights movements to bring full meaning to the universal language of the Declaration of Independence. With courage and sacrifice Americans finally came together to embrace the democratic notion that consent of the governed lacked legitimacy unless all individuals of all backgrounds had rights of citizenship.

The third debate is about opportunity, whether individual rights can be protected if every citizen doesn't have a fair crack at the American dream. There are many on-going elements of the opportunity debate, which in the 20th century was symbolized by the New Deal initiatives of Franklin Roosevelt and the counter-weight of the Reagan revolution. But I would like to emphasize an aspect of this debate which gets little attention because it is taken for granted, and that is the role of public education. All young Americans not only have access to public education, they are required by law to attend public schools or comparable alternatives. As society becomes more complicated, educational opportunity becomes increasingly central to advancing social opportunity. And as we look at the narrow schooling provided by madrasses abroad it becomes apparent that how and what others teach has relevance to the security of Americans at home.

The fourth debate is symbolized by Hiroshima and Nagasaki and revolves around the question of whether any right can be valid if it is not underpinned by a right to peace.

In these debates the role of foreign policy is critical, and even when we've looked inward it has been with an eye to establishing a shining city-state on a hill, a beacon for all.

The greatest legislated act in American and perhaps human history is the Declaration of Independence. The universality of its principles constitutes the cornerstone of historic American idealism in foreign as well as domestic policy.

As architect of the Declaration, Jefferson—while never a member of Congress—was our greatest legislator. And as the architect of the Louisiana Purchase, he stands as our greatest

diplomat-president. The precept implicit in the Declaration and the Louisiana Purchase is the notion of individual rights and collective decision-making by a people entrusted with the capacity to make sovereign decisions.

Jefferson was the philosophical godson of John Locke, who borrowed from Thomas Hobbes the 17th century paradigm of a state of Nature where, according to Hobbes, life was nasty, brutish and short.

Hobbes had a pessimistic view of human nature. Self-centered man could not escape from the jungle of human relations. Locke, on the other hand, was an optimist. He also assumed that man was self-centered, but, unlike Hobbes, he believed that individuals were rational enough to recognize the necessity of accommodating the self-interest of others. Civil society—the condition where rules would govern disputes and third-party arbitration would exist—was thus possible as well as necessary.

Whether or not the theoretical constructs that political philosophers relied on three centuries ago have relevance to real life on the planet, then or now, the progress of science has made man's efforts to protect the rights of individuals and society more difficult today. In one of the most profound social observations of the 20th century, Einstein noted that splitting the atom changed everything save our mode of thinking.

Physics has brought us nuclear energy and perhaps a way to help live a modern life without reliance on fossil fuels. Biology has brought us the capacity to extend the life of man by several and perhaps many decades. But just as splitting the atom has a dark side—nuclear weapons—splitting genes has ominous implications, too—the ability to manufacture diseases for which there may be no antidote. Hence the obvious: at no time in human history is there a greater obligation for people in public life to appeal to the higher rather than lower angels of our nature.

This is particularly the case as the world has smallened and friction between peoples has increased in economics, politics and, most profoundly, religion.

Perhaps the most thoughtful speech ever given in Iowa was delivered four decades ago by the Oxford historian, Arnold Toynbee. A decade earlier, Winston Churchill chose a small Midwestern college in Fulton, Missouri, to warn of the dangers of Soviet expansionism; an "Iron Curtain," he said, had descended on Eastern Europe. Toynbee picked Grinnell College to chastise Marxists for shallowly looking at history through the lens of economic determinism and Americans for assuming, in part because of the civil rights movement then underway, that the most contentious issues in the world related to race. Toynbee argued that at this stage in history conflict would more likely erupt because of religious differentiations than economic or racial ones. As we look at the Middle East, at Northern Ireland, at the Balkans, at the divisions between Pakistan and India, Toynbee's observation appears to be vindicated.

Expanding on Toynbee, Samuel Huntington of Harvard has propounded a theory of international relations over the past several decades that suggests that the next great wars are less likely to represent battles between countries than clashes between various civilizations.

Given Toynbee's predictions and Huntington's civilization-clash paradigm, it is appro-

priate to return to Jefferson, who at the public level strove assiduously to protect individual freedom of religion and at the private level believed that what mattered most was not nuanced differences between religions or denominations, but the moral threads common to all creeds. In terms of guides to individual behavior, it is impressive, for instance, that the Ten Commandments underpin Islam as well as Judaism and Christianity. And the Confucian doctrine of "shu," which asserts that moral behavior should be premised on not doing unto others what one would not have done to oneself, is an inverted kind of Golden Rule.

Despite the fact that history is rife with examples where religious differentiations have caused and intensified conflicts, there is no credible substitute for the constructive role of faith-based convictions. Conflict may be envisioned, but it can be constrained if individuals are taught the most esoteric of precepts: loving, or at least not hating, one's neighbor.

Ironically, genocide, which is disproportionately a 20th century phenomenon, is about weapons of lesser lethality: machetes, bullets, poisonous gas.

But if mankind can't prevent killing up close, the question must be pondered whether there can be any optimism that the world can avoid a cataclysmic exchange from afar of weapons of mass destruction, which would make the greatest crime of mankind to date, genocide, the second-to-last crime in human history. It is simply a short stop from genocide—the killing one at a time of millions—to "global-cide"—the end in a single stroke of all life on the planet.

In recognition of the 20th century's experience with Holocaust and other brutal genocides, from Cambodia to Rwanda, we have no choice except to change our mode of thinking. Man's instinct to hate must be curbed and social wisdom applied to the new challenges science has thrown at man.

In this context, I want to stress a second challenge of science that has nothing to do with war and arms making but is clearly the largest foreign policy issue of our day. It is the problem of disease. In Iraq more than 500 Americans and perhaps as many as 20,000 Iraqis have been killed in the past year. But over the last two decades 20 million people have died of AIDS and 40 million are infected with HIV. In Africa, Southeast Asia, and Southern Russia, AIDS has hurdled well beyond the groups considered most vulnerable in the U.S. In many countries children are infected through mothers at birth and in several countries a 15-year-old girl is far more likely to have the disease than a 15-year-old boy. We simply must expand resources to stop this disease abroad before it stops our families at home.

Not that everything in the world is dark or unraveling. Promising political breakthroughs are occurring between India and Pakistan; in the civil war in Sri Lanka; in Libya, where Muammar Khaddafi may be giving up a quest for nuclear weapons; and even with North Korea, as six-party talks unfold. Several of these bits of good international news are developing without a central U.S. role; several will require our leadership. My only advice to the Executive is to meet every positive step of others with at least two steps of our own. Progressive change from suspect leaders cannot be sustained if peoples of various societies

are not convinced that America prefers extending carrots to applying bullying tactics. We simply can't wait for tomorrow to respond to good omens today. This is especially true of a country like Libya where backsliding is so easy. It may be more difficult with the hermit country—North Korea—simply because paranoia and anti-Americanism run so irrationally deep in the people as well as the government. But constructive steps, especially of a humanitarian dimension, can be taken.

Iowa also has brought some good news to the world. In January I attended the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, and a Conference on the Prevention of Genocide in Stockholm, Sweden. In conversations with Europeans the depth of anti-American sentiment becomes quickly evident. But when asked what state I represent, I was impressed with the sincerity of the positive responses when I indicated I was from Iowa. Everyone knew of Iowa because of the caucuses. In Iowa the caucus process seems a bit mysterious. In other states it is very mysterious, and in Europe it is a full blown mystery. But people in Europe were deeply impressed that individuals seeking the most important political position in the world had to come to the homes and schools and offices of private citizens who, with real care, reviewed their credentials and platforms.

For many years I have had reservations about the caucus system because the ballot is not secret and because participation is not as large as in a traditional primary. But I feel obligated to reconsider and, as a Republican, must tip my hat to the Iowa Democrats for the thoughtfulness with which they advanced American democracy and spotlighted our values for the world. Abroad, people followed but did not necessarily identify with the individual candidates, but everyone was impressed with the process and the care with which citizens carried out their duties.

It is instructive to put the current tension in transatlantic relations in historical perspective. With regard to the profoundest issue—war and peace—attitudes on each side of the ocean have come full circle over the five centuries of interaction.

The U.S. was founded by immigrants seeking refuge from religious persecution and a spate of seemingly senseless wars among European countries and principalities. The new Americans sought to distance themselves from the violence and religious intolerance of the Continent. It was with the greatest reluctance that in 1917 a pioneer country, which had been convulsed with the magnitude of a westward moving Manifest Destiny, determined that blocking a Kaiser's ambitions called for intervention in European affairs.

In the wake of a war trumpeted to end all wars, America retreated into political isolation in the 1920's. After inspiring its creation, we refused to join the League of Nations; and after expanding trade in industrial and agricultural products, we succumbed to economic protectionism in the 1930's. Only a direct attack on our territory caused us to enter World War II.

Today, it is Europe which is looking inward, pre-occupied with its manifest destiny, political integration made feasible by a growing economic union. Increasingly secular Europeans desire to separate themselves from an America that appears to them to be too unilateralist and quick to go to war, too fundamentalist and

thus blind to tolerance, and too simplistic to realize that conflicts with religious overtones are the most traumatic to manage.

When speaking to constituents of the rationale for and against the Iraq War, I have over the past couple of years referenced a set of books that held particular currency in the 1960's: the Alexandria Quartet by Lawrence Durrell. Each of the four books describes the same set of events in inter-war Egypt from the perspective of a different character. While the events are the same, the stories that unfold are profoundly different, causing the reader to recognize that one person's perspective is at best a snapshot of reality. A clear picture cannot be pieced together without looking through the lens of a multiplicity of eyes and experiences.

The Moslem experience gives substantially less weight than the Western experience to the two cataclysmic wars of the 20th century. Despite Lawrence's involvement in Arabia and the battles between Allied forces and Rommel's tanks, the engagements in the Middle East and North Africa were skirmishes compared with the struggles in Europe and the Far East. Not only do Moslems see the 20th century differently from Westerners, but Europeans and Americans have drawn different strategic parallels in the application of common experience to current challenges in the Middle East.

In the immediate aftermath of the First World War, historians and political strategists in Europe rightly concluded that the European alliance system had been too rigid and the assassination of a relatively minor figure, an archduke, should not have precipitated a war of such devastating consequences. Hence European leaders in the 1930's falsely concluded that historical wisdom necessitated initial accommodation with Hitler's adventurism. Too little flexibility caused one war; too little spine led to Munich. In the current context, President Bush sees himself as Churchill rather than Chamberlain, but Europeans see 9/11 as more analogous to the shots fired at Archduke Ferdinand than as a cause for a doctrine of preemption or war with Iraq, a war that could too easily spring into a clash of civilizations. Second guessing is always conjectural because history gives few second chances. Unlike football, downs aren't repeated.

Accordingly, the challenge today on both sides of the Atlantic is to put debate about going to war behind and work together to figure out how we proceed from here. A lot of polite observations have been made that European leaders seem less angry about American decisions related to Iraq this year compared to the differences expressed during the pre-war buildup. This may appear that way on the surface, but my sense is that European judgment, if anything, is more solidified and definitive today. Europeans may have become resigned that events have unfolded without their concurrence. By the same token, frustration that their advice has been discounted has caused anti-American anger to metastasize into anti-American smugness. Europeans believe that their skepticism has been vindicated by events. The stark good-versus-evil clarity that Washington policy makers seek appears to Europeans to be un-nuanced, unsophisticated, and unappreciative of differing judgments.

Americans countenance criticism of our President and his policies by fellow Ameri-

cans, but we are not so tolerant of foreign dissent. The assumption in Washington is that Continental leaders deliberately sought to undercut U.S. leadership in the world community and that, in particular, the refusal of the French and Germans to support the President's position in the Security Council and NATO has made matters more dangerous for our troops and reconciliation more difficult in the current post-war setting.

On our side of the Atlantic, the sense exists that French and German political judgment has not only been at variance with American ideas but that a concerted effort was made on the Continent to triangulate the terrorist challenge and take advantage of America's dilemma. By distancing themselves from Washington, Paris and Bonn are seen to be encouraging the re-direction of Moslem discord. Whereas the rhetoric of Osama Bin Laden and other extremists was initially anti-Western, it is now more exclusively anti-U.S. The opportunity to transplant America's commercial as well as political position in parts of the world consumed with anti-Americanism appears not to have been lost on the European political-industrial elite.

With all of the attention given to the new transatlantic tensions, the implications of the Iraq war on Russia have received short shrift. But the new European antagonism to America has not gone unnoticed in Moscow. The cleavage between Washington and Europe and the preoccupation of America with the Middle East clearly give Putin a freer hand to advance a less democratic and more nationalistic set of policies at home. This is one reason why it is so important that America and NATO demonstrate then can work together in such areas as Afghanistan, where strategic common ground exists.

Likewise, the priority we have given to Iraq as well as North Korea, two charter members of the so-called "Axis of Evil," means that we have been implicitly forced to subordinate trade and human rights issues with China. China's support, or at least no opposition, in international strategic affairs, has become so central to Administration policy makers that Beijing has been able to downgrade U.S. concerns about the historic shifts taking place in trade terms. A Chinese trade surplus with the U.S. that now exceeds \$10 billion a month and an undervalued currency pegged to the dollar that makes flexible trade adjustments impossible are simply not being given the attention they deserve.

Economics and politics have seldom been more intertwined. Yet underappreciated is the prospect that a protectionist backlash of 1930's dimensions could develop if our political policies fail and our government loses respect in the world. Analogously, a political backlash could sweep the country if Washington doesn't develop institutional reforms to protect the political system from vulnerabilities to single-issue and special-interest constituencies. At a time when our foreign policy appears too attentive to ideological forces and too prone to rely on proxy empowered corporations to advance the national interest, Congress has an obligation to aggressively provide oversight of the contracting as well as intelligence judgments advanced by the Executive. Just as committees to review a new intelligence inadequacies are in order, so is a new committee to oversee government contracting related to operations in Iraq and Af-

ghanistan. The professionalism and integrity of government decision-making about issues of war and peace must be above reproach. The country can afford neither ideological posturing nor war profiteering.

As for the dilemma of the moment, policy makers have been caught philosophically short. As mistaken as the overestimation of Saddam's WMD capacities was, the greater judgmental error may relate to the political pressure applied to the intelligence community on the issue of Iraqi complicity in the plane strikes on 9/11. Initially, the CIA straightforwardly noted that there was no credible evidence of Iraqi involvement. Then, under obvious pressure, it changed its stance and in presentation after presentation to Congress ominously suggested they had an "evolving" view of the role of Iraq, despite, to date, producing nothing of a definitive nature to show why the community changed its initial representation. Hence, the decision to go to war was against the backdrop of public opinion polls showing 60 percent of the American people believed significant Iraqi involvement existed in the 9/11 attack.

Compounding this lack of forthrightness, where the intelligence community knew the situation but refused publicly to differ with the political decision makers, was a judgment showing doubtful understanding of Moslem attitudes. The notion that American forces would be welcomed in Iraq as a liberating force with the well-intentioned option to reshape over time Iraqi political institutions was a mistake of profound proportions. Now, given the anarchy that has mushroomed in the country, Washington is swept by occupation analogies of World War II. Japan and Germany, it is noted, were occupied for more than five years after hostilities ceased. Hence, many are suggesting, we must be prepared to stay at least this long in Iraq.

I have seldom been more apprehensive about an historical analogy. Japan and Germany were the instigators of war; their citizens understood this. Iraqis don't see it this way. They see the U.S. as the aggressor. Images from Al-Jazeera portray a country under siege. In the Moslem world Iraq looks more like a police-cordoned West Bank than a great and ancient society on the move to a better life. Outsiders are viewed as unwanted intruders acting out of great power self-interest, disrespectful of the culture and values of the country being occupied. The irony that it is Shi'a clerics, not American statesmen, who are pushing for democratic elections at this time is not lost on the Iraqis or the Moslem world.

More profoundly, I am amazed that pundits haven't caught on to the possibility that the only thing worse than being wrong in our intelligence assessments of Iraqi WMD would have been if we had been right and thereby taken the risk of precipitating a retaliatory BW attack against Israel or possibly an American city. Biological weapons in the control of petty potentates is mad science in the hands of mad men. To go to war against a country with BW weapons, especially if the initiator has no knowledge where they are, is to hazard more than a clash of civilizations; it is to instigate a potential challenge to the maintenance of civilization itself.

In any regard, if a WMD rationale for intervention can't be established, we must not allow the democracy case to founder. To authorize an additional \$80 billion for Iraq and

not be able to find the means to conduct timely elections is preposterous.

Legitimacy is critical for all countries. There may be times and circumstances in which the U.S. national interest requires action without a U.N. sanction. But the U.N. is ignored at great risk, especially when the international community is at odds with a nation state's policies. The U.N.'s help, for instance, could be significant at this point in facilitating elections and helping legitimize new governing structures. If a commitment to a time frame for democratic elections isn't soon forthcoming, the Administration may see an escalation of violence in Iraq led by the Shi'a in the South, thus adding to the traumas precipitated by Saddam's old henchmen and foreign trouble makers in the Sunni triangle to the north, where disorder is so prevalent today.

The judgment call Washington must make is whether to employ something closer to a "get in/get out" strategy or one of prolonged occupation. Each approach carries risk, with the likelihood of a certain amount of disorder developing whenever the American presence is reduced. Whether that disorder becomes less deep with time or whether time allows anarchist forces to organize more vigorously and lay claim to a legitimizing nationalist mantle is conjectural.

In the realm of policy timing can often be as important as substance. Just as Senator Dirksen once noted that a billion dollars here and a billion dollars there and pretty soon you're talking about real money, in foreign affairs a week here and a week there can soon add up to a policy dilemma.

The difficulty of timing was underscored this week when some in Washington charged the newly elected Spanish Government with "appeasement" for its announced intention to withdraw its forces from Iraq in the wake of last week's bombings in Madrid unless the U.N. role in Iraq is broadened. The language of appeasement may appropriately describe the lack of resolve of Western leaders when they refused to stand up to Hitler's growing power in the 1930s, but it may not be as fair to apply such a term to Spanish policy today. Indeed, doing so may carry irresponsible implications because fear of its connotations may make disengagement more difficult if the country or forces of an occupying power are ever under attack. For instance, if "appeasement" is considered the dominant potential issue, U.S. policy makers relinquish their sovereign discretion and instead could give terrorists the determinative say when we will disengage from Iraq. A few radicals could with relative ease launch a steady dose of terrorist attacks on our civilian and armed services personnel and "force" us to stay or then be in a position to argue when we eventually leave that they forced us out. That is why it is so critical that we lay out a basis for withdrawal that has nothing to do with the terrorist behavior of Iraqi radicals and everything to do with the establishment of a freely elected leadership.

On the issue of the timing of the hand-over of civil authority I give less judgmental weight in the Iraqi circumstance to historical analogies to the post-war occupation of Japan and Germany and more to a personal anecdote about the manner the Vietnam war came to be concluded. Early in my career in Congress, I was invited to the Library of Congress to join a small group of historians to listen to a lec-

ture by Henry Kissinger about the negotiations that led to the end of that war. The night before the lecture, I perused one of Secretary Kissinger's autobiographic tomes and came across a paragraph that so startled me that I asked him about it in the seminar that followed the lecture. Kissinger wrote that in December 1968, shortly after Richard Nixon had asked him to be his National Security Council director, he met with the President-elect to discuss the direction of the new administration's foreign policy. They determined together, he noted, that their policy would be to get out of Vietnam. So I asked him why they didn't just proceed to do that. Kissinger looked at me for a moment and then uttered words I will never forget. "Young man," he said, "we meant with honor." I then asked him if "honor" required escalation. "Absolutely," he responded.

In governance, judgment to be good must be timely. The course of history and attitudes toward America would be very different today if the Nixon administration had acted forthrightly on its own judgment. In Iraq, where we are fast becoming a magnet of instability rather than a force of stability, we must not hesitate. If the issue is democracy, let's hold elections with dispatch and use the democratic transition as the rationalization for deep troop reductions.

If we maintain a heavy presence much longer our president could find himself in a dilemma of the kind Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon came to know too well. There are circumstances in life where the small can humble the powerful. This has the makings of one. Despite the overwhelming nature of our military victory and the courageous commitment and sacrifice of our armed forces, policies can fail if the timing of disengagement is wrong.

This is why clarity of purpose and flexibility of response are so crucial. And why the neo-con mantra—"we must see this through"—deserves review. Hasty withdrawal is problematic; orderly, philosophically cogent decisions to wind down the military dimension of our presence in Iraq should, however, be our highest national interest priority. Democratic elections are the key. They can be held in relatively short order (at least by year's end; preferably earlier) if there is a will and commitment to do so. But the longer we heed the advice of those who want to hold onto power in Iraq, the harder it will be to avert increased terrorism here and abroad.

Here I would like to return to what in most contexts must be considered a rather esoteric paradigm: the Hobbesian notion of a state of nature. Terrorism is a military or, more precisely, militant tool of anarchy. It is the desire of terrorists to make Iraqi society a social jungle, a state of nature where anarchy rather than law rules. Legitimacy of government in this setting can perhaps be precipitated but it cannot be imposed from the outside. Outside pressure is less convincing when it appears to be presented by a singular authority—i.e., the United States. One of the reasons so many countries prefer a strong U.N. role is that such a role not only provides greater legitimization of intervention but greater legitimization of processes leading to a new government. U.S. slighting of the U.N. undercuts governmental legitimizing efforts and causes the entirety of the Moslem world to become more antagonistic to our country.

For our part, we have gotten caught in a web of events we can influence but not con-

trol. In the end, legitimacy of any new government in Iraq will depend on consent of the governed. The only wise U.S. policy is to steamroll ahead with a constitutional framework of democratic elections with a pre-announced strategy of large-scale troop withdrawals commencing somewhat before or just after elections are held.

In conclusion, let me suggest a corollary to Lord Acton's maxim that power corrupts and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely. The Leach corollary is that military power tempts and excessive power tends to tempt excessively. America's enormous military strength is critical at this stage in history. But while we are obligated to recognize that its maintenance is imperative, we must also realize that its utilization may not fit, and may indeed be counter-productive, in certain strategic settings. We have to use more than just our own eyes and rely on more than just our own expertise if in turbulent times we are to manage prudently the affairs of state.

Analogies between all wars exist, but comparisons between Iraq and Vietnam are frail. What must be understood is not that Iraq could be as bad as Vietnam; rather, that it could be far worse. Vietnam, after all, involved no WMD issues; and while the North was predominantly Buddhist and the South Catholic, there were no implications of a world-wide religious struggle; nor of a conflict that might last many decades, if not centuries. The issue at the time was Communism and fear that if Vietnam fell, neighboring governments would topple like dominoes. In retrospect, the real domino lesson of Vietnam was about political decision-making. Once the patriotic flag was raised, stands taken, words uttered, one doubtful decision precipitated another, and the pride of politicians did not allow a change of course until the people demanded common sense reconsideration.

In this context, there is an aspect of this resolution that deserves reflective review. It is true, as the resolution asserts, that Iraq and the world are better off without Saddam Hussein ensconced in power. But it is not necessarily true that our country and the world are safer if the overthrow of one thug leads to the creation of millions of rebels with a cause.

It would be a mistake of historical proportions if respectful relations not only between America and the Moslem world but between America and its traditional allies were to rupture. We are obligated to see that they don't.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a very distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 557 expressing the views of the House on the liberation of Iraq. Frankly, I find myself amazed that this resolution is the topic of such an extended and spirited debate.

Who can seriously dispute H.R. 557's main points? The world is safer with Saddam Hussein in prison as opposed to being in power. If anyone questions that, let them ask the citizens of the two Muslim countries he invaded, the Kurds whom he gassed or the Shiites whom he butchered by the thousands. The Iraqi people should be commended for their courage in overcoming 35 years of oppression and they should be

recognized for adopting an interim constitution and moving forward toward a democracy, similar to the same situation faced in our own Civil War.

Certainly the United States military and our allies in the coalition deserve to be recognized for their heroic service and their valor on the battlefield and their continuing struggle in Iraq.

The American people and our allies ought to also take pride in what we have done to improve the lives of the average Iraqi. Since the end of the war, 4.2 million children and 700,000 pregnant mothers have been vaccinated. Over 30 million vaccine doses have been procured and 22 million actually delivered to Iraq. By the end of 2004, 90 percent of Iraqi children will have been vaccinated against polio, tuberculosis, and measles; 600 primary health clinics have been reequipped to provide health care, dozens of schools opened, colleges kept operational and the sanitation extended.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of what America and Americans have done in Iraq. I hope and trust that pride is shared by Members of this House and every American.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members have said this resolution is simply about commending the troops and the people of Iraq. If that were truly the case, this measure would enjoy unanimous support. On the contrary, in what it says and what it fails to say, it attempts to speak to the handling of the war. It glosses over the serious intelligence failures and serious misstatements by the Bush administration concerning Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.

It papers over the lack of preparation for the aftermath of the war as well as the initial failure to actively seek international support and continued lack of it. It ignores the equipment shortages that need to be addressed to protect our troops. It fails to make any mention of the 565 U.S. soldiers who have died in Iraq, or the thousands who have been wounded, or the sacrifices of their families.

The resolution before the House today does not bring credit to this institution. It tries a well-used tactic to divide and conquer. Instead, it is a case of dividing and losing: dividing this House when it is a subject that needs unity and losing further credibility for the Republican House that does not even try to act on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just remind my colleagues if I am reading the same resolution they are, this resolution and I quote, commends the Members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces for liberating Iraq and expresses its gratitude for their valiant

service to our country. That is not a political statement, that is a commendation, and it should be from all of us, Democrats and Republicans.

I do not read politics into that, and nobody else should.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I represent Fort Benning, the home of the Infantry in Columbus, Georgia, and I rise in support of the resolution to pay tribute to those Americans serving in uniform who have brought liberty to 24 million Iraqi citizens. It is their courage, commitment, and endurance that made possible the unprecedented success that we have witnessed halfway across the world.

While soldiers are hunting down leaders of Saddam's regime, Americans and Iraqis are working together to construct hospitals and schools and establish a new Iraqi government. As a physician, I know what it takes to provide health care for a large number of patients. That is why it amazes me to learn 52 clinics have been renovated and over 600 have been reequipped to provide primary health care.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to this chart which shows that more than 22 million doses of vaccines have been delivered to 4.2 million Iraqi children and 700,000 pregnant women. In fact, by the end of 2004, over 90 percent of Iraqi children under the age of 5 will be immunized against diseases such as polio, tuberculosis, and measles.

In February alone, 800 tons of high-protein meals were delivered to malnourished children. Sadly, those who oppose us are not idle. I do not know how long the war on terrorism will last, but I know America is right and our military and humanitarian efforts must continue until this evil is eradicated not only in the Middle East but in the entire world.

While we hope our allies will not abandon us when we face inevitable hardships, if necessary, we have the courage and the commitment to stand alone.

Mr. Speaker, my prayers remain with the soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines deployed around the world, and with their families who wait for them at home with love and patience. I wholeheartedly support this timely resolution.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, in October 2002, I voted to authorize the use of force to remove Saddam Hussein, and I would again. I think it was the right decision for this country.

I agree with the resolution statement that the world is safer with the removal of this leader from Baghdad; I believe it is. And the succession of changes that we have seen in Syria, Libya, and Iran are evidence of that.

I went to Iraq in January and saw young people serving this country in uniform and the leadership that they showed us, and I was so proud of them. They have never let us down.

I think today with this resolution we are letting them down. Leadership is about unifying people; it is about healing wounds; it is about bringing people together. There are many patriotic Members of this body who in good faith believe the world is not safer because Saddam Hussein is gone. I respectfully disagree with them, but we should have been able to come together today on the first anniversary of the initiation of hostilities and focus on the soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines and the guardsmen, and we should have been able to focus on what we agree on; and what we agree on is we respect their service, we mourn the loss of our dead, we are ready to heal those who have come home wounded, and then we are ready to debate the foreign policy of this country as to how we should go forward. We have let our troops down by this resolution, and it is a shame.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, no one can ever forget the horrific attacks on our Nation of 9/11. Our lives changed that day; the world changed that day; and America looked for answers and we looked for justice. And we looked, most importantly, for leadership.

I think the terrorists, recognizing the very limp response that America had made to terrorist activities during the 1990s, probably thought we would make a lot of noise, we would be out here rattling our sabers, and then go back to our comfortable lifestyles and that we would not respond in any meaningful way.

Well, these cowards, these terrorists who prey on the weak and innocent, seriously underestimated the will of the American people, and they certainly did not understand the political resolve of our great President George W. Bush, our President who understands that his constitutional responsibilities are to protect the homeland, to protect Americans.

And so we went to Afghanistan and toppled the Taliban. We went into Iraq where we liberated the Iraqi people from the oppression of Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity to travel to Libya where we met with Moammar Qaddafi, and as we all know, he has opened up the borders to Libya to let the Atomic Energy Commission come in and voluntarily dismantle his nuclear program. Apparently he watched Saddam Hussein get drug out of a rat hole and thought this regime change is not all it is cracked up to be. Clearly the Bush doctrine is working.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize the brave Americans who have lost their lives fighting for freedom, fighting the war

on terror. We recognize that battle is not over yet. Every one of them is a hero, every American who puts on the uniform is a hero, and we thank our partners in the coalition as well. God bless them all, God bless our Commander in Chief, and God bless America.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I support commending our troops, but I believe the war with Iraq did not make the United States safer. We know that Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11 and no connection to al Qaeda which poses the real threat to the safety of the American people.

We know that the war in Iraq diverted resources from the war against al Qaeda and the Taliban, which is staging a resurgence in Afghanistan today. We know that the war in Iraq alienated our allies whose help and intelligence we need to fight the real threat, the Islamic terrorists. We know that the war against Iraq makes it much harder to take action, perhaps military action, if necessary, to deal with the very real potential threat of a nuclear-armed Iran.

After the administration misled this House, misled the American people, and misled the world about the non-existent Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, who will believe us if we need to act against the real nuclear threat from Iran?

□ 1615

I believe this war made us less safe because it dealt with a phantom threat, not the real threat. It diverted resources from the real threat. This resolution is good in commending our troops, but untruthful in saying the war against Iraq made us safer. Therefore, I cannot vote for it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I proudly yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), a member of our committee.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on behalf of House Resolution 557. The U.S. investments in the war on terror and in Iraq are proving worthwhile and are making the world safer. As of February 2004, 44 of the 55 most wanted former Iraqi leaders are dead or in custody. The Iraqi people have created and signed an interim constitution guaranteeing basic freedoms, rights and protections to all Iraqis previously unrealized in Iraq.

I visited Iraq in October and saw firsthand that Iraqis are much better off than they were under the oppressive regime of Saddam Hussein. Children are able to go to school without being taught government propaganda. Small businesses are able to open. Iraqi citizens have access to health care formerly denied to them, and once neglected infrastructure is being rebuilt.

No one who argues against this resolution can deny that Saddam Hussein was an enemy of the United States and an enemy of the Iraqi people. The war on terror has encouraged nations to protect their national security, track down and arrest known and suspected terrorists, and to make ovations to the international community in order to create a more peaceful and stable environment.

Last fall, the United States stopped a ship carrying nuclear components bound for Libya. Recently, Libya voluntarily turned over equipment from its nuclear weapons program to the United States. Had Libya kept these materials, they had the ingredients to create nuclear weapon capabilities. The 50,000 pounds of machine parts to enrich uranium is just a small portion of the material and information that they have turned over. Qaddafi himself has cited the fall of Saddam Hussein as a reason for Libya abandoning its nuclear weapons of mass destruction program. Can anyone have imagined a nuclear power as Libya?

Libya's decision is an example of the administration's tough line against states that sponsor terrorism and have unconventional weapons programs. United States investments in Iraq are proving themselves effective. Iraq is a safer nation, as is the United States. I commend our Armed Forces of the United States and the coalition forces.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. First and foremost, let us all begin by thanking and saluting each and every American soldier, more than 500 of whom have died, thousands who have been injured, and several hundred thousand who are on active duty today, for their service and continued service doing what they are commanded to do every day. But under the shield of commending our troops, the sponsors of this measure are trying to run through what I believe is a resolution that does really nothing to, one, equip our soldiers with the body armor they still need and the extra protection for the armored vehicles that they use in Iraq, does nothing to restore veterans benefits that President Bush's budget proposes to cut for health care for our veterans, does nothing to bring in meaningful assistance from our so-called coalition partners or the international community to help patrol the streets of Iraq and rebuild the nation and the billions of dollars it will cost. And this resolution does nothing to lay out the exit strategy this Nation will need to tell our troops when they will be able to come home and when we will be able to stop spending the billions of dollars every day abroad.

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution which can commend our troops, and should; but it does nothing to move the ball forward.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would just take a minute to remind my col-

league that every single soldier in Iraq has body armor as does every single civilian worker in Iraq and that the gentleman who just spoke voted against the very supplemental that sent that body armor to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), who has spent so much time with the troops and is home to the 82nd Airborne, the All-American Division.

Mr. HAYES. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do represent Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, the epicenter of the universe. I rise with great pride and admiration to support this resolution because of those troops.

The tragic events in Spain last week and in Iraq today remind us that terrorism is an ongoing threat to people around the world. However, today we live in a world that was different just 1 year ago. The Iraqi people were living under a tyrant, a brutal dictator who gassed his own people. The U.S. military victory in Iraq was unprecedented in military history. Our brave men and women in uniform liberated 24 million Iraqi people in just 3 weeks. Because of the actions and sacrifices of our troops, the regime of Saddam Hussein has been deposed and Iraq is on the path to becoming a free and prosperous nation.

The U.S. military victory in Iraq was truly unprecedented. On March 19, 2003, offensive operations began with air strikes against Iraqi leadership positions. Operation Iraqi Freedom was executed with a combination of precision, speed, and force that stunned our enemy. Soldiers and Marines, many from my home State of North Carolina, charged to Baghdad across 350 miles of hostile territory in one of the fastest military advances in the history of warfare. I am proud of those soldiers at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base and other posts around this wonderful country. The Hussein regime fell on April 9. By April 15 after only 27 days of offensive operations, coalition forces were in relative control of all major Iraqi cities.

I would like to highlight some of those military victories. Coalition forces carried out hundreds of raids and thousands of patrols seizing caches of enemy weapons and massive amounts of ammunition that can no longer be used against our troops or innocent civilians. As of February, 44 of the 55 most wanted Iraqi leaders are dead or in custody.

In addition to bringing down Saddam's regime with great skill, courage and speed, we can also be proud that our military conducted operations with minimal collateral damage to the country's infrastructure. No neighboring countries were hit with Scud missiles, as was the case in the first Gulf War.

Mr. Speaker, when I was in Iraq, Command Sergeant Major Gainey gave me the following quote: "You have never lived until you have almost died. For those of us that have been deployed or fought for it, freedom has a

special flavor the protected will never know.”

God bless our troops and protect them.

Mr. Speaker, I represent Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base and I rise in strong support of this resolution. The tragic events in Spain last week and in Iraq today remind us that terrorism is an ongoing threat to people around the world. However, today we live in a world that was different just one year ago. The Iraqi people were living under a tyrant, a brutal dictator who gassed his own people. The U.S. military victory in Iraq was unprecedented in military history. Our brave men and women in uniform liberated 24 million Iraqi people in just three weeks. Because of the actions and sacrifices of our troops, the regime of Saddam Hussein has been deposed and Iraq is on the path to becoming a free and prosperous nation.

The U.S. military victory in Iraq was truly unprecedented. On March 19, 2003, offensive operations began with air strikes against Iraq leadership positions. Operation Iraqi Freedom was executed with a combination of precision, speed and force that stunned our enemy.

Soldiers and Marines, many from my home State of North Carolina, charged to Baghdad across 350 miles of hostile territory in one of the fastest military advances in the history of warfare. I am particularly proud of the soldiers, airmen, special operations forces and others from Ft. Bragg and Pope Air Force base in my district in North Carolina. The Hussein regime fell on April 9, 2003 and by April 15 after only 27 days of offensive operations, coalition forces were in relative control of all major Iraqi cities, including Baghdad, Basra, Mosul, Kirkuk and Tikrit. Iraqi political and military leadership had collapsed.

I would like to highlight some of our military victories. Coalition forces carried out hundreds of raids and thousands of patrols, seizing caches of enemy weapons and massive amounts of ammunition that can no longer be used against our troops or innocent civilians. As of February 2004, 44 of the 55 most wanted former Iraqi leaders are dead or in custody, as well as thousands of other Baath Party loyalists and terrorists.

In addition to bringing down Saddam's regime with great skill, courage and speed, we can also be proud that our military conducted operations with minimal collateral damage to the country's infrastructure. No neighboring countries were hit with Scud missiles as was the case in the first Gulf War. There were virtually no instances of civilian casualties, nor were there large masses of fleeing refugees. Bridges were captured intact and rail lines protected. Dams were taken whole and villages were not flooded. Oil fields were protected and we denied Saddam's regime the opportunity to ignite widespread oil field fires. Of 250 wells in the key sections of the Rumaila oil field, only nine were dewatered, causing just seven fires.

Operation Iraqi Freedom will go down in military annals as a truly unprecedented offensive. The Saddam Hussein regime was not a government of benevolence; it was a reign of terror. The U.S. men and women in uniform have deposed of that terror with their remarkable achievements.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to Iraq twice: the first time right after major combat operations ceased and we witnessed a country just beginning to consider life in the post Saddam

era. The second time I visited was just this past month. Along with Leader PELOSI and Ranking Member SKELTON, we saw incredible progress being made. Command Sergeant Major Joe Gainey, one of the outstanding soldiers with whom we met, shared with me his favorite quote. I would like to share it with you:

You have never lived . . .

Until you have almost died.

For those of us that have been deployed or fought for it,

Freedom has a special flavor . . .

The protected will never know.

Our military success is about that freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my heartfelt thanks and admiration to our men and women in uniform for their service and success. May God protect and bless them as they secure freedom for Iraq and protect freedom for America.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. I would like to thank the ranking member for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues on the House Committee on Armed Services, I have been pleased to provide our troops with the support and the equipment that they need to succeed in their mission, and I have had the privilege of traveling to Iraq to meet with some of them personally. I am so proud of the job that they are doing. God bless them. Iraq's transition to democracy and the ongoing war on terrorism will pose new challenges for our men and women in uniform, but they may take comfort in the knowledge that this Congress stands behind them.

Yet despite the fact that every Member of this Chamber supports our troops, this resolution was prepared with no input from Democrats. Just as the administration has adopted a “go it alone” strategy on numerous foreign policy initiatives, the House leadership has done the exact same thing when drafting legislation. This resolution could have and should have been prepared with bipartisan input. I am disappointed that inappropriate tactics have overshadowed the unanimity we share in support of our Armed Forces.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a most distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, as we speak here today, progress is being made in Iraq. As chairman of the Water and Power Subcommittee, I have visited Iraq and witnessed firsthand their accomplishments. With our help, they have surpassed prewar electrical generation levels and are on track to be generating at almost 140 percent over their prewar level by June. Water facilities are currently operating at 65 percent of prewar levels and are improving. Current projects include the rehabilitation of 15 water treatment facilities and a canal to Basra. These projects will benefit millions of Iraqis and provide for a future of water reliability.

But make no mistake, we did not go into Iraq to improve water infrastructure or increase electrical power capabilities. One year ago, this country, along with our allies, made the decision to topple a tyrannical regime, liberate a people, and help build a democracy in the heart of a terrorist breeding ground. However, the gift of freedom and democracy is being built on the basic level of services and quality of life which they are building today. We must stand by the Iraqi people in their long and challenging journey toward democracy because their freedom contributes to our security and the security of the world.

God bless America and God bless our troops.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member on the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

As we near the 1-year anniversary of the commencement of hostilities in Iraq, now is an appropriate time to examine how we got into the war in Iraq in the first place. The resolution before us contains many “whereas” clauses about how brutally Saddam Hussein treated his own people. I agree with those clauses. But let us not fool ourselves about the reason the American people were told that we needed to launch a preemptive war against Iraq. Over and over again, President Bush and his senior advisers told us that we needed to go to war to protect America from weapons of mass destruction.

Several months ago I asked my staff to prepare a comprehensive analysis of the statements made by the top administration officials most responsible for making the case for war. Yesterday, I released the results of this work in a report entitled “Iraq on the Record.” Members can find the report, and a searchable database of administration statements, at www.reform.house.gov/min. What we found was that the President, the Vice President, and other top administration officials repeatedly and systematically misled the public about the threats posed by Iraq. They made claims that Iraq posed an urgent threat; they exaggerated Iraq's nuclear capabilities; statements that overstated Iraq's chemical and biological weapons; and statements that misrepresented Iraq's relationship with al Qaeda. We judge whether a statement was misleading based on what intelligence officials knew at the time the statement was made, not what we know now.

If Congress really wanted to show respect for the troops, it would enact legislation calling for an independent commission, a real independent commission to examine how the President and his top advisers made hundreds of misleading statements to the American public.

The resolution before us is reminiscent of these statements. Vice President CHENEY said: “We do know with

absolute certainty that he, Saddam Hussein, is using his procurement system to acquire the weapons he needs to build a nuclear weapon," when this resolution says the same thing so unequivocally, quote, "the world has been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein." I hope that is true, but we do not know it yet. Ask the hundreds who have died since Saddam Hussein was captured.

The purpose of this resolution is an attempt by the Republican leadership to divide us, not to unite us behind our troops. They are using the sacrifice of the lives of our young men and women for their own political gain. I will not vote for this resolution or against it. I will vote "present" as an act of disdain for those who want to play politics with the lives of Americans and the credibility of this great Nation as the world's leader.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just make a point to the gentleman who just spoke, that every Member in this House received a personal invitation from me for classified briefings dealing directly with our intelligence agencies with the opportunity to ask any question they wanted to ask so that when they made the vote on whether or not we should go into Iraq, they could make an informed vote. I presume that the gentleman accepted that opportunity and made an informed vote based on his own understanding of what the situation was. Let me just reiterate that every person in uniform in Iraq has full body armor, as does every civil servant.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the point of difference today appears to me to be the question of are we safer. I could not disagree more with my colleague from California on this issue.

□ 1630

It is not a question of truth or falsity or even of credibility. It is a question of judgment, a judgment that we collectively exercised as a body when we undertook our responsibility under the Constitution to authorize the use of force in Iraq. There were some things that were very important to me when I made that decision, which are reinforced here today. We knew that Saddam Hussein had used weapons of mass destruction against his own people and against his neighbors. We knew that he had tested unarmed aerial vehicles with sprayers. We knew that he had another unarmed aerial vehicle program with smaller drones that they were building and testing at long ranges. And we knew that that unarmed aerial vehicle program sought to purchase route mapping software over the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, September 11 we watched 3,000 people die in a morning. That would be a footnote in American

history compared to someone determined to use disease to kill Americans. This is a question of judgment, and we did the right thing to remove Saddam Hussein from power.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

National security is not only a bipartisan effort, it is truly a nonpartisan effort. On the Committee on Armed Services, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), we do our very best to be bipartisan in nature. And, frankly, it concerns me a great deal that no Democrat was even asked to make a recommendation on what might or might not be in this resolution. I would have included several items including reference to the families. I would have included reference to those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice. I would have included a wish that the transition on June 30 be done correctly. And I would include that there should be increased international participation.

But I was not given that opportunity. Young men and young women from Democratic homes and from Republican homes and from Independent homes have paid the ultimate sacrifice. And I think it is incumbent upon everyone that offers such a serious resolution as this to give everybody an opportunity to make recommendations and to help write it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I would relinquish to the next group that has jurisdiction for the next hour.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This is a picture that Mr. Stavenas of our staff took of a reenlistment ceremony at Saddam Hussein's spider hole in Iraq. It symbolizes the willingness of our military, our soldiers, our people in uniform, to come back under very difficult circumstances and reenlist and continue to fight this wonderful fight for the United States and for freedom. And our soldiers have done a great job for us, and this resolution is commending those soldiers. All those people who wore the uniform of the United States supported our country at a time of need and are continuing to undertake the biggest deployment right now, redeployment, since World War II.

Let us all stand behind them, Republicans and Democrats, cast off the partisan positions that have been taken today on the House floor, and let them know that we support them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 557 and claim the time set aside for us under the rule, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, our President, having exhausted all other options, made the decision to take action against Saddam

Hussein and the threat posed by his evil tyranny. During that course, the debate about that, this House was presented with an overwhelming body of evidence detailing the brutal inhumanity of Saddam Hussein and his regime, the suffering of the Iraqi people under his repressive dictatorship, the threat that Saddam presented to his neighbors and to the world, and indeed the piles of bodies in neighboring countries he left behind. Today, now that Saddam has been removed from power and the mass graves, the secret laboratories, the vast military stockpiles, missile capacities that he had, have all been exposed to the world, the world is a safer place. Certainly the Iraqi people, all Iraqi people, have a new hope for a better future today than they did just a year ago. Just a year ago. What a remarkable accomplishment by our troops and the coalition.

Yet we continue to hear claims from some that the liberation of Iraq, no matter how worthy the result, no matter how necessary to improving U.S. national security, was somehow a flawed endeavor. Yes, it was hard, but they claim it was a flawed endeavor because the intelligence that the United States had prior to the war was not perfect.

Some apparently feel that either the Intelligence Community was pressured by the administration into stating that Iraq was a threat or the Intelligence Community did not really believe Iraq was a threat but the administration misused the intelligence provided to it. The truth is neither of those are correct. But that has not deterred some conspiratorially critics from contorting themselves, trying to make both arguments simultaneously.

Looking back about a year and a half ago, while the Intelligence Community was focused heavily on Iraq, the President stated that Saddam was "a grave and growing threat." And he was right. Today we have the benefit of hindsight, of a presence on the ground in Iraq, and of the thousands of hours of studying all there is to study on the prewar intelligence picture of Iraq, and we have barely begun to get that job finished.

Taking advantage of all these benefits, I would like to share my assessment so far, and I would note that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House, and I know of the Senate also, is underway in coming forward with a formal review of all this, which I hope we will be able to share with our colleagues before too long. That is our plan.

The intelligence picture of Iraq, of the threat Iraq posed to its neighbors and to the United States, including the assessment of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, was entirely consistent over a period of almost a decade. The assessment is consistent in the finished intelligence and the daily current intelligence pieces from the mid-1990s onward. It is consistent in the classified records that have been provided to the House Permanent Select Committee on

Intelligence over the past year. So I have to conclude on that basis alone, if the intelligence adjustments regarding Iraq were the result of political pressure or manipulation, any such machinations must have occurred in the middle of the 1990s. But I do not believe that that is the case. Therefore, if the intelligence picture is unchanging, was there a change in the substance or tone used by this administration to describe that threat? We do not need to go to the Intelligence Community or to any classified records to answer that question. We just need to compare public statements that have been made, and they are available to the world.

In 2003 President Bush said this: "Today, the gravest danger in the war on terror, the gravest danger facing America and the world, is outlaw regimes that seek and possess nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. These regimes could use such weapons for blackmail, terror, and mass murder. They could give or sell those weapons to terrorist allies who would use them without the least hesitation."

In 1998 then President Bill Clinton said: "In the next century," which is now, "the community of nations may see more and more the very kind of threat Iraq poses now, a rogue state with weapons of mass destruction, ready to use them or provide them to terrorists . . . who traveled the world . . . if we fail to respond today, Saddam . . . will be emboldened tomorrow by the knowledge that they can act with impunity."

And again in 1998, then President Bill Clinton said: "There should be no doubt, Saddam's ability to produce and deliver weapons of mass destruction poses a grave threat to the peace of that region and the security of the world . . . His regime threatens the safety of his people, the stability of his region and the security of all the rest of us." President Clinton, 1998.

Fast forward, 2003, President Bush: "Some have said we must not act until the threat is imminent. Since when have terrorists and tyrants announced their intentions, politely putting us on notice before they strike . . . Trusting in the sanity and restraint of Saddam Hussein is not a strategy, and it is not an option."

Actually, there is not a lot of difference in the leadership that was taking place in this country on the question of the threat that Saddam Hussein and his regime and weapons of mass destruction that might be at his disposal were to the rest of us. It is pretty clear that that was a consistent view.

So, were the intelligence assessments perfect? No. In fact, comparing the intelligence assessment to what has been found in Iraq today, it is clear there were insufficiencies in our intelligence capabilities and they are of concern to us, and on a bipartisan basis we are looking into that. What was the cause of these insufficiencies? Perhaps Iraq, under Saddam, was a difficult target. It was sort of a denied area. There was a

ruthless security apparatus there that made information gathering inside the country extremely difficult, very dangerous. We also know that Iraq instituted a truly massive denial and deception program designed to mislead anyone attempting to learn about Saddam's weapons of mass destruction and related programs. Virtually everybody who tried found out that he was involved in denial and deception. So these factors made intelligence collection a little difficult, but it is the tough job that intelligence is there for.

So, what else? I found that cuts in intelligence resources, personnel, and political support in the mid-1990s made many aspects of the intelligence mission in Iraq even more impossible than what we are up against.

Where were these cuts most severe? In the case of Iraq, it turns out it was the decline in our intelligence capabilities that hurt the most. Human intelligence is where we get more than pictures, more than fragments. We get insight into the plans and intentions of our target. What is going on in the minds of the troublemakers? And without good human intelligence, HUMINT, as we call it, it is very difficult indeed to get an accurate picture of what an adversary is up to.

Yet from 1991 to 1998, a time of cutbacks for military and intelligence resources across the board, our human intelligence capabilities suffered dramatically. The number of officers collecting information shrank by about a quarter; the number of operating locations overseas dropped by about a third; reporting sources declined by almost 40 percent; and the number of intelligence reports produced were cut in half or thereabouts.

So we add on top of that the politically correct "nice spies" guidelines that were posed in 1995, the risk aversion problem, and we begin to see why information in Iraq was so hard to come by. Good information about plans and intentions, the eyes and ears, just were not sufficient.

So despite these severe limitations, I think the scorecard shows that the United States Intelligence Community provided the best assessment it could. And referring Members to the Director of Central Intelligence's recent speech at Georgetown, the assessments were not as far wrong as some critics of the war would have us believe.

In the final analysis, I think it is important that we get it right. Saddam was a threat. The United Nations believed he was a threat. The vast majority of the Western nations, even those outside of the U.S.-led coalition, believed he was a threat. The U.S. Intelligence Community assessed consistently that Saddam was a threat. The previous administration told the American people that Saddam was a threat. And it has been the official policy of the United States to seek regime change in Iraq since 1998 across two administrations. The difference between 1998 and 2003 is that President Bush

took the bold action necessary to address a grave threat where others before him did not. The world is a safer place for it.

□ 1645

Freedom is not free. The purpose of this resolution is to recognize the hardships that the men and women who are doing the dangerous, risky work of protecting our freedoms, the people in our military services, the people in the coalition, the people who are taking risks. After a year, we are here to say, you are doing great work, keep it up, we are so grateful.

We are also including some applause for the people of Iraq who have gone through miserable times and now have some hope, and they have completed the remarkable achievement of a temporary constitution already. This is the sign of a spirited people who are looking for a better life.

This resolution simply says that and commends that. I believe we can all agree that these are the times that we can get together and say, well done, more to do, let us get on with it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I came here to talk about how we can improve this resolution, but I would like to say to the able gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS), the chairman of our committee, that some of the things he just said in his opening remarks might deserve amplification. It is true that during the 1990s, overwhelming bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress approved cuts in funding for intelligence. So strong was this bipartisan position that often no one called for a recorded vote; Intelligence budgets were approved on a simple voice vote. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is correct that overseas intelligence operations were canceled and that the core of our overseas intelligence operations declined by about 25 percent. But what he failed to mention is that those cuts were ordered by the 41st President, President Bush. They were supported by more than 95 percent of Republicans in Congress, including the gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS).

What I am here to say today, however, is that this resolution could be improved if it called for steps now on a bipartisan basis to fix what are obvious intelligence problems. In addition to commending our troops, we should be calling for action to make them safer.

Had I been consulted on this resolution, I would have suggested adding a clause calling on the President to acknowledge the obvious problems with our intelligence and to take steps to fix those problems now. Had I been consulted, I would have insisted on adding language applauding the brave and

dedicated cadre of people serving in Iraq and around the world as intelligence officers. They work in the shadows with little thanks and recognition.

Mr. Speaker, the terrorists are clearly not waiting for us to fix our intelligence, witness today's tragic bombing in Iraq and last week's bigger tragedy in Madrid. The insurgents in Iraq are not waiting for us to fix our intelligence. Ask the young men and women at Walter Reed Hospital.

The North Koreans and Iranians are not waiting for us to fix our intelligence. Their nuclear weapons programs are far more advanced than Iraq's ever were. As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the chairman of our committee, acknowledged this morning, the world is not safe just because we removed a brutal dictator. We all know this. It will not be safer until we fix our intelligence.

After deep study on the Select Committee on Intelligence, it is clear to me that our senior leaders remain in a deep state of denial. There are no discernible signs from the President or the Vice President acknowledging the obvious flaws in our intelligence systems and committing our country to fix the problems now. Force protection in Iraq depends on accurate, timely, and actionable intelligence to counter terrorism and insurgency. We must do better.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), and chairman of one of our critical subcommittees.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 557, recognizing the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant services of American and coalition forces.

In the years since the United States led a coalition of willing States to disarm Saddam Hussein, we have arrested a dictator that killed hundreds of thousands, possibly as many as 1 million people, during his reign. We have returned children to school and given the Iraqi people a new destiny.

I have been to Iraq several times. It continues to be a dangerous place. Iraq is also a complicated place. There has been a considerable amount of debate and attention to what we knew before we went to war and how well our intelligence is measuring up with the realities on the ground in Iraq.

I would like to take this time to clarify the record on a number of charges that have been levied against both the administration and our intelligence community.

A number of Members who voted for the Iraq war resolution claim they did so because they were fooled by the President who overstated the threat from Iraq. In fact, some suggest that the administration knew Iraq did not have weapons of mass destruction and went to war regardless of the facts. These critics do not understand the dif-

ference between intelligence and policy formation.

The President considered the intelligence in Iraq and calculated the risk of engaging in a conflict with Iraq and decided war was just. He took action, and we are all safer as a result. Some argue that the President portrayed Iraq as an "imminent threat," that the administration misled the American public by overstating the threat posed by Iraq. This is what he said in January 2003, 2 months before the war: "Some have said we must not act until the threat is imminent. Since when have terrorists and tyrants announced their intentions, politely putting us on notice before they strike? If this threat is permitted to fully and suddenly emerge, all actions, all words, and all recriminations would come too late. Trusting in the sanity and restraint of Saddam Hussein is not a strategy and it is not an option."

In fact, this President's statements on Iraq are not all that different from the previous President and his administration's remarks when they discussed the threat posed by Iraq: "If we fail to respond today, Hussein and all those who would follow in his footsteps will be emboldened tomorrow by the knowledge that they can act with impunity." And: "What if he fails to comply and we fail to act? Some day, some way, I guarantee you, he will use the arsenal."

These were President Clinton's words in August of 1998.

Another quote: "And, indeed, we have information that Iraq has assisted in the chemical weapons activity in Sudan. We had information linking bin Laden to the Sudanese regime and the Al Shifa plant." These words were written by former National Security Adviser Sandy Berger.

Another quote: "Sometimes the United States has to act alone or at least has to act first. Sometimes we cannot let other countries have a veto on our foreign policy." That was a quote from President Clinton during his election campaign.

President Bush used the best intelligence available, as it had been suggested by the former administration, that Iraq was a threat, a growing threat. The removal of Saddam Hussein and his evil regime from power was a policy endorsed by both sides of the aisle for more than a decade. This menace became even more of a concern when examined through the lens of September 11. Saddam is gone. The world is better because of it.

Mr. Speaker, we can argue the morality of war all day, but terrorists do not possess the same concern, as we saw again today. They act, and they act brutally. Iraq represents another front on the global war on terrorism. Iraq also represented a dangerous threat to the region and the world. This country witnessed the consequence of failing to act strongly against terrorism on September 11, 2001.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the bipartisan comments of the

last speaker, and I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before us correctly points out the atrocities that Saddam Hussein perpetuated against his own people and the importance to Iraq's future to be free from the oppression of Saddam Hussein. The Resolution properly commends the members of the U.S. Armed Forces for their valiant service. They have made tremendous sacrifices on behalf of their country and have served longer deployments than expected. I extend my condolences to the family members of U.S. soldiers and civilian personnel who have lost their lives in Iraq, as well as to the many thousands of soldiers that were wounded in Iraq. I also express my sorrow and regret for the deaths in Iraq of Coalition forces and United Nations personnel, as well as for the unknown number of Iraqi civilians and other noncombatants that perished in the war. Congress and the Administration have an obligation to provide our troops with all the resources necessary to carry out their ongoing mission.

I am pleased that Iraqi Governing Council has adopted an interim constitution, and that the Council, in cooperation with the international community, is establishing war crimes tribunals in Iraq to create a historical record of the war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by Saddam Hussein and his regime. We must establish an accurate and complete factual record of these crimes, so that we can punish the offenders and deter future war crimes by government officials against their own population.

My support for this resolution in no way signifies my views on other issues beyond the scope of this resolution. This resolution does not offer a complete and balanced chronology of events that led to the U.S. invasion of Iraq. I am most disappointed that both before and after the war in Iraq the United States consistently failed to broadly engage the international community. The Administration is only belatedly seeking international support for our reconstruction efforts in Iraq.

Because of these failures, Americans have paid a heavy price. It is primarily American troops stationed in Iraq that face continuing attacks. It is our taxpayers that are being asked to almost exclusively pay the cost to rebuild Iraq, and these costs are mounting every day. Iraq is already facing a difficult transition in establishing a democracy that operates under the rule of law and protects minority rights. The U.S. must show enough flexibility in working with our allies to effectively help Iraq during this critical transition period, so that other countries will pledge both troops and funds to alleviate the burden on our American soldiers and taxpayers. Ultimately, the best way that we can support our troops is to reach out more aggressively to the international community, establish order and security in Iraq, and transfer authority to the Iraqis in a responsible manner.

Although I support the Resolution, I regret that it was not in order to consider a Motion to Recommit with instructions. The Motion to Recommit would have allowed us to strengthen the resolution by urging the President to give our troops in Iraq all of the equipment

needed to keep them safe; provide the health care and benefits our wounded servicemen and women earned when they come home as veterans; recognize the key contributions made by our Reserve and Guard components, many of which came from my Congressional district in Maryland.

This Motion would have also asked the President to acknowledge that there were serious deficiencies in United States pre-war intelligence on Iraq, particularly in light of the failure to find any evidence of WMD programs, and to take action to improve our intelligence community so that United States troops are better protected and informed for future conflicts.

Finally, the Motion would have asked the President to seek broader international support for the reconstruction of Iraq, and to take steps to correct the deficiencies of the U.S. Government to plan adequately for the post-war occupation of Iraq.

We should have improved this Resolution to more accurately reflect our ongoing objectives in our involvement in Iraq.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), a member of the Committee on Intelligence and ranking member on the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution asks that the House affirm that the United States and the world is a safer place today with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq. Who can argue with that? Saddam Hussein, a tyrant that is responsible for so many thousands of deaths, a tyrant that has used weapons of mass destruction in the past.

There was a famous frontiersman who said, Be sure you are right, then go ahead. That was reported to be Davy Crockett. I think that is what we are about a year later, after going to war against Saddam Hussein and Iraq.

A colleague of ours mentioned earlier, this whole thing was about judgment. Well, I would submit that it is also about responsibility, it is also about accountability, and it is also about credibility. Why do I say that? Because when we talk about the world being a safer place today, I want us to remember that 55-some-odd families are without their loved ones today that have been killed in Iraq carrying out this war.

I saw into the eyes of Sergeant Rico's widow who asked me why. And I told her that we were very proud of the sacrifice that had been made by her husband and by her family. But she continued to ask me why. And that is why I think it is about responsibility. Did we do the responsible thing by attacking Iraq and Saddam Hussein when we knew that he had nothing to do with 9-11? It is also about accountability. A year later, we are finding out that he did not have weapons of mass destruction. And, obviously, it is about credibility, because if we as the last super-

power are going to benefit from credibility, we have to be patient, we have to understand what the threat is, and we have to act responsibly. That is what I think this is about.

I am going to support this resolution, as I support the men and women in uniform. But this whole issue is about those three words: responsibility, accountability, and credibility.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), a member of our committee and the chairman of a subcommittee as well.

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 557, and I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, our military and coalition forces, as well as our intelligence community, are all working tirelessly to protect this Nation 7 days a week, 24 hours a day.

A year ago, the United States led a military coalition to disarm Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein's regime committed horrible atrocities; and Saddam was a threat, a grave and increasing threat to his country, his region, and to the world. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, marked the 16th anniversary of Saddam's use of chemical weapons on the Kurdish citizens of Iraq. Sixteen years ago, Mr. Speaker, as a result of this atrocity, 5,000 Kurdish Iraqis died. Saddam was indeed a terrorist in his own nation. Thanks to our efforts, Saddam Hussein will never commit such atrocities again.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, we are all safer without this tyrant in power. Our decision to go to war in Iraq was based on our intelligence about Saddam's threat to world security.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence, I know the substantial investment now being made in our intelligence community to meet the demands of the global war on terrorism. Our intelligence community is aggressively rebuilding its capabilities that withered during the mid-1990s. Our clandestine service dropped by 25 percent, and nearly one-third of our overseas offices were closed. Our overall intelligence reporting fell by almost 50 percent during that period of time. Language skills were slow to develop, limiting our ability to infiltrate rogue organizations or intercept messages encrypted in tribal dialect and regional tongues. We effectively lost our ability to see and hear in many of the world's most dangerous places. Our intelligence community provided the best information and analysis on Iraq that it could, given the reduced collection, language shortfalls, and Iraq's active denial and deception programs.

Every one from David Kay to the Director of Central Intelligence, George Tenet, has stated that analysts did not

and would not change their judgment to meet policy objectives.

Some argue that judgments in the October 2002 National Intelligence Estimate on Iraq's Continuing Programs of Weapons of Mass Destruction Programs were flawed. They point to the report's statement that "Iraq has chemical and biological weapons." However, this is only the first six words of the second sentence in the declassified portion of the report. The rest of the sentence reads, "as well as missiles with range in excess of U.N. restrictions and, if left unchecked, Iraq probably will have a nuclear weapon during this decade."

Critics also fail to mention judgments made by Dr. Kay and the Iraqi Survey Group regarding their findings in Iraq: "We judge that Iraq has continued its weapons of mass destruction programs in defiance of U.N. resolutions and restrictions." Quote: "Although we assess that Saddam does not yet have nuclear weapons or sufficient material to make any, he remains intent on acquiring them."

□ 1700

Yes, chemical or biological weapons stockpiling have not been found, but secret laboratories have. And, yes, Iraq appears not to have reconstructed its nuclear program, but the Iraq survey group uncovered documents that revealed Saddam's intent to make nuclear weapons.

Intelligence analysts seldom, if ever, are 100 percent perfect. This is the nature of the business. Intelligence officers collect the dots and analysts attempt to connect them. Given the reduced resources and inadequate insight into Iraq, I say the picture we drew from a limited amount of dots was pretty good.

And we were right to take action. Every day intelligence officers make tough judgment calls and dangerous operations are conducted. We must support them. We must support our troops in the ongoing efforts to protect our Nation.

I support House Resolution 557 and strongly urge its adoption.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, once again, the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives has taken an issue of bipartisan concern and turned it into an occasion for partisan division.

On the 1-year anniversary of the beginning of Operation Iraqi Freedom, the leadership introduced a bill that claims to honor our troops—at the same time that our Armed Forces and veterans are being shortchanged in the budget that is under consideration in this body.

I strongly oppose this resolution for two important reasons.

First, it fails to properly acknowledge and honor the American troops who are serving, have died, or have been injured in this war.

And secondly, it is a blatant attempt to cover-up the fact that American soldiers went to war in Iraq because Iraq allegedly had weapons of mass destruction that threatened America. And yet no such weapons have since been found in Iraq.

Our troops—National Guard and Reserve and regular forces alike—deserve more than one line in a resolution on the first anniversary of a war. Their service and their sacrifice deserve to be honored, and more importantly they deserve the resources to help them succeed with the greatest degree of safety possible.

Had Democrats been afforded the opportunity to modify this resolution, we would have offered our sincere condolences to the families of the more than 500 soldiers killed and thousands wounded in Iraq, given our troops in Iraq the body armor and armored vehicles they need to keep them safe, and continued to press for a true international coalition to relieve the United States of its nearly unilateral burden in Iraq.

I am a proud cosponsor of the Democratic Salute to Veterans and the Armed Forces Act, a comprehensive package of benefits designed to honor the contributions of those who have served America in the Armed Forces. The legislation ensures that those who are serving today have incentives to continue serving, those who served in previous conflicts are properly honored, and those who choose to serve in the future are coming into a system that is the best in the world.

As I said at the outset, I also oppose this resolution because it is a blatant attempt by the Bush administration to distort the public's understanding of why America went to war.

Americans did not die in Iraq to punish Saddam Hussein for his reprehensible and vile actions, such as gassing the Kurds in 1988 or flooding the Arab marshlands. Those actions clearly did not pose an imminent threat to the security of the United States, especially not in the year 2003. And yet those are the actions that this partisan House resolution today speaks to. Americans would not have believed that those actions warranted a military attack in Iraq last year.

President Bush warned Americans that Iraq posed an imminent threat to the security of the United States that could only be deflected by a unilateral military strike against Iraq. Today, the House seeks to bury this crucial piece of history.

The President provided intelligence that has not been discredited to justify the attack on Iraq. It must never be forgotten that American soldiers attacked Iraq because the President said that it had weapons of mass destruction that endangered our security.

The Republican leadership sponsored this resolution today hoping to later attack Democrats who vote against it. But I for one will not join them in their partisan charade that brings shame on the People's House. My Democratic colleagues and I will continue to articulate our concerns for America's armed forces, for America's veterans, and for America's security.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), the ranking member on the House Permanent Select Com-

mittee on Intelligence Subcommittee on Human Intelligence.

(Mr. BOSWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN). I appreciate it.

And I want to say at the outset I rise to support the resolution. When I look over there, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), and a whole bunch of others, they are my heroes. But we have some on this side of the aisle too. I think of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), I think of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), a lot of us as well as a lot of my colleagues.

This is not a partisan thing. We support the troops. No question about it. I was a little appalled this morning as I heard my dear friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), and his comments. But I still support the troops.

Our troops in Iraq are to be commended for their courage and their valor. I do say the same about the dedicated men and women of the intelligence community. I visited with them in Iraq. It is truly inspiring to see what they have accomplished. And the Iraqi people are to be commended for their courage in the face of Saddam's cruelty.

But I agree with the remarks of my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the proposed resolution ought to do more. It is time the President set about fixing the problems in intelligence that are already known to exist. This will do much more to secure the peace in Iraq than just commending the troops and the Iraqi people which, of course, is very important.

For example, the DCI has acknowledged that we did not have enough human intelligence. In addition, the sources we did have too often gave us bad information. There are also some indications that we may have dismissed potential sources of information because they were not telling us or we did not believe or did not want to believe that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction.

Closed societies of Iraq are among the most difficult of intelligence targets. No question about it. Terrorist groups are equally difficult to penetrate. However, there are steps we can take to improve our ability to recruit sources of information on these hard targets.

The intelligence community is developing new ways of deploying human intelligence collectors. In urging the President to take steps now to fix intelligence, we can encourage these efforts which will yield benefits in Iraq today. The proposed resolution ought to do this. Why not? We can. We should.

I do support the resolution.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the last speaker for his wonderful remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), the ranking member on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Subcommittee on Intelligence Policy and National Security.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank our very distinguished ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), for the time.

Mr. Speaker, we are just about a year to the day that America with our very brave forces invaded Iraq. So it is coming up to the moment where we commemorate those that serve, those that did serve and lost their lives, through a resolution that is on the floor.

This resolution has good parts to it. Of course, we commend our troops who are second to none. They are the best led, the best equipped, and the best performing troops in the world, the best military. But this resolution is not necessarily a celebration, nor should it be. Because what it does not include are the sacrifices that have been made: 558 American troops, 101 allied troops, and some 10,000 Iraqi citizens have died since this war began. They are not mentioned in this resolution.

Where is our commitment in this resolution? It should be stated and restated in more than one "whereas" about the 115,000 troops in Iraq with all the protective gear that they should have. Nowhere in this resolution do we affirm or reaffirm our commitment to our troops and veterans.

Today the House Committee on the Budget cut over \$1 billion. So there is a bit of double speak to this. Nowhere in this resolution are the people that serve in our intelligence community, some of the most dangerous jobs that anyone could ever have, are they set apart and thanked in this resolution relative to Iraq.

Turn on the TV sets. Iraq is not safe. There are more people that have lost their lives today. There are more fires; there are more blow-ups. So this is a very sobering resolution. And I think the good parts of it should be underscored. But we have not been allowed to add to it the things that I just stated that I think should be very much a part of it.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER), our able rookie.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I will support this resolution as an expression of our Nation's gratitude and pride of our men and women in uniform who were ordered to war in Iraq by their Commander in Chief. Whether you are for or against the war, the fact is we are there now and we need to support our troops.

These military servicemembers are working around the clock to make Iraq a better place for the Iraqi people. Many of them have left their young families behind to serve their country,

and they deserve our thanks here on the floor of Congress.

I recently returned from Iraq as part of a bipartisan group of Members from the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I truly believe that good intelligence is the best way to prevent terrorist attacks in our country, as well as Iraq. The members of our intelligence community who are also working on the dangerous front lines of this war deserve our gratitude. They serve in silence with little thanks.

I was proud to join with my Republican colleagues and visit the Iraqi police training academy and honor 23 Iraqi police officers killed in a recent bombing. Even in the face of tragedy, the resolve of the Iraqi people to take back their country and start governing themselves was strong.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution should have simply expressed our support for our Armed Forces working and living in harm's way. Regrettably, however, the majority has handled this resolution in a manner intended to divide us, not unite us.

Mr. Speaker, I share the view that the Middle East and the world are better off without Saddam Hussein and his brutal regime; but success must be our only exit strategy. When those goals are accomplished, we can say with certainty that the world is a safer place. We owe our military men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice for their country in Iraq nothing less.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I join the authors of this resolution in commending the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of oppression and in praising the valiant service of the United States and coalition forces in Iraq. We are as proud as we could possibly be of our troops, their sacrifice and their service.

But to put forth this partisan resolution in this way is both an affront to our troops and a disservice to our country, sowing division where there should be unity.

This resolution is not necessarily objectionable because of what it says, but because of what it omits. There is no reference, for example, to the mid-course correction that is called for in terms of financial accountability, contracting practices, securing international cooperation, and repairing our relationship with long-standing allies whose support is integral to our ultimate success.

The minority has been denied the opportunity to improve this bill, to give

our troops the body armor they need, for example, to achieve pay equity for National Guard and Reserve personnel, to provide much needed health care and benefits for our wounded servicemen and -women, and to offer condolences to the families of those killed in Iraq.

This resolution rightly affirms our support for the Iraqi people as they adopt an interim constitution that upholds the values of open debate and democracy. How ironic that this very bill is structured to shut down discussion and debate.

The rule rammed through by the majority is not only a closed rule, making it impossible to offer a Democratic substitute, but it also eliminates the right to offer a motion to recommit with instructions. That takes to a new level the procedural abuses that have become almost routine in this House.

At stake is the manner in which we, as members of the House, are permitted to express our encouragement. We can support our troops serving in Iraq, yet still debate how to extend support to them and their families and to hasten the day when they can return. We can support the Iraqi people, yet still debate how best to ensure the development of a stable, democratic form of governance. To debate such issues does not reflect a lack of patriotism. To the contrary, it's a celebration of it.

We should be proud, Mr. Speaker, of the progress we have made in Iraq. At the same time we should address the deficiencies in our prewar intelligence and our post-war occupation plan.

No one disputes that the world is better off with Saddam Hussein gone, but we are doing our troops and the American people a grave disservice if we perpetuate the illusion that they are somehow "safe" or that our mission in Iraq is accomplished. Many difficult tasks still lie ahead, and glossing over the serious questions that remain unaddressed by this administration jeopardizes our mission to secure and stabilize Iraq.

I urge the Republican leadership to honor the collaborative and unifying approach that we are urging on the people of Iraq. This body should support our troops and lead by example, and this resolution falls short on both counts.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), my classmate and colleague.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 year ago the first bombs blasted in Baghdad and the United States christened a shameful new military doctrine, the preemptive war, against a regime that for all its vicious cruelty had not provoked the United States or our allies.

We were told by the President that Iraq posed an imminent threat to our national security with a link to al Qaeda, which is fiction. And our own weapons inspector concluded that weapons of mass destruction did not exist. Where was our intelligence? What were we working on?

After September 11, countries throughout the world clamored to give the United States support in the global fight against terrorism. But after bombing Iraq without multinational support, the United States lost the moral authority we once enjoyed around the rest of the world.

Today, 1 year later, Iraq remains mired in chaos. It is becoming a breeding ground for terrorists, nowhere near ready to assume the responsibility of a democracy.

For this we have sacrificed nearly 600 American lives with thousands more wounded; 27 today have already been killed in Baghdad with hundreds injured. If this Congress wants to support the troops, we should work to equip every soldier in Iraq and Afghanistan with the best equipment and supplies available, including hydration water systems. We would ensure them the benefits they have been promised and they deserve when they return home. But we do not talk about that in this resolution.

Tomorrow I will introduce a resolution called Smart Security. Smart Security is about prevention, not preemption. It sees war as a last resort to be considered only after every diplomatic solution has been exhausted.

□ 1715

It calls for more robust multilateral institutions to prevent terrorism, manages international conflicts and promotes global stability, since smart security is tough, pragmatic, and patriotic. It is smart and it would keep America safe and it supports our troops.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my extreme pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, if all we were doing here on the floor today on the House was commending our troops for their valor, there would be no debate. There would be no disagreement and there would be no opposition. This resolution, however, says something more than that we honor our troops.

What this resolution says is that we, the House of Representatives, affirm that "the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq." There is not a Member of this body that mourns the fact that Saddam Hussein and his regime have been removed from power. We all agree that Saddam was a brutal thug. The problem is that America was told before the war that we would be made safer by fighting to find and destroy Saddam's weapons of mass destruction. We now know that those weapons either did not exist, in which case we fought a war based on flawed intelligence, or that there really were weapons of mass destruction, in which case they are now in the hands of Saddam's

Baathist henchmen or al Qaeda terrorists or some other party, and that would put us in greater peril than we were before the war started.

Moreover, if we switch our TV from C-SPAN to CNN, we will see that another bomb has gone off in Baghdad today, killing more than 25 and wounding nearly 50 innocent people. We will see that two American missionaries have been assassinated in Iraq. We will see reports of more and more targeted assassinations of civilian employees of the Coalition Authority, as well as continued attacks on our military forces in Iraq.

Meanwhile, the real terrorist threat to America, al Qaeda, continues to organize and plan future terrorist attacks against our country. Osama bin Laden and some of his top lieutenants remain at large. Mullah Omar, the head of the Taliban, remains at large.

What is happening on the House floor today is symptomatic of everything that is wrong with the Bush administration and Republican leaders in Washington. Instead of working together in a bipartisan fashion to congratulate the troops for the wonderful job which they did, they seek to divide this House by forcing us to vote on something which, in fact, is not an accurate representation of what has happened across this world.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), another able member of our committee.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution commends the men and women of the United States Armed Forces and the Coalition forces for their valiant service. It is appropriate to do that. They have made huge sacrifices, their families have. In many cases, the soldiers have made the ultimate sacrifice in their response to the call of their country.

As a member of the committee that oversees the Intelligence Community, let me also add my gratitude to the incredibly hardworking men and women of the Intelligence Community whose role in Iraq is less public but no less vital and in many cases is every bit as dangerous. These dedicated public servants should have all the tools they need to accomplish their mission. So rather than simply commending the Iraqi people for their courage and their accomplishments, rather than simply thanking these brave men and women in the U.S. armed services and Intelligence Community with words, we should see that they have what they need to do their jobs.

This resolution today, I believe, has different motivation than simply to honor our troops. It really is more about the House of Representatives patting themselves on the back than it is to honor our troops.

It perpetuates a simplistic thinking that took us into the war with

unexamined intelligence, and clearly there were deficiencies in the intelligence that took us up to and into that war. It perpetuates the simplistic thinking that left our troops unprepared for the postwar occupation, and it perpetuates a kind of divisive thinking. I mean, what can be more divisive than a closed rule that allows no amendments, no substitutes, really nothing to make this a better resolution?

It is not enough to say thanks in words to 550 families who have lost someone in Iraq. They want more than thanks and words. Same for the more than 3,000 families of the wounded. If we only give them what they need, this resolution would be more meaningful: more armored Humvees, more language speakers, more support.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), who is also a subcommittee chairman of the committee.

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 557, recognizing American and coalition forces in Iraq and the liberation of the Iraqi people.

The American people should know and believe that the President brought the U.S. into this war to oust Saddam Hussein and bring freedom in that part of the world with 34 coalition partners, and that was a good decision. Many of us supported the President and voted to provide emergency supplemental funding for military operations in Iraq. These were the resources that financed the capture of additional Saddam regime loyalists and Saddam himself and provided funding to protect our troops.

As a matter of fact, the lion's share of the money went to the troops and the other went to rebuilding the country, opening schools, opening hospitals, putting electricity on line, opening businesses. The people of Iraq love America because of their newfound freedom, their newfound hope, and their newfound opportunities.

Many of us voted for the war resolution because we believed it was the right thing to do, and many of us voted for the supplemental funding because we believed it was the right thing to do.

We have heard all the claims that the intelligence community's analysis was politicized and analytical judgments were made to advance the administration's policy. The same judgment and analysis was given to President Clinton who used that analysis to take limited action against Saddam. The point is that both Presidents received the same intelligence. The only difference is that President Bush took serious and meaningful action against Saddam Hussein.

In my opinion, critics have not given the intelligence community a fair shake, and it is obvious from some of

those who do not even serve on the committee come down here and criticize when they have not had the benefit that many of us have had of serving on the committee. That is unfortunate. They have failed to highlight those judgments on UAVs, ballistic missiles, illicit procurement networks that have been found and confirmed in Iraq. They have failed to highlight those judgments about the presence in Iraq of terrorist elements associated with al Qaeda.

It is fine to highlight real problems and propose real solutions to fix them, but we have yet to hear that from the critics. Telling analysts not to make tough judgments is not a viable solution. Rebuilding our intelligence community and providing them with the resources needed to fight the global war on terrorism seems more appropriate.

I support our troops and our intelligence community, people who work in dark places in the world but never get any credit for the work that they do. The credit goes in some cases to politicians and government officials, but those people in dark places who are doing the hard work deserve the credit. No politician can take credit for capturing Saddam. That credit goes to the intelligence community and the military, and those of us that have supported them with our votes on this floor to give them the money to do it. Also I think they deserve the credit, and the critics need to really, I think, examine what they are saying.

Congratulations to those in the intelligence community and the military community for liberating Iraq, freeing the people and giving them hope and opportunity, and for that reason, I support I think a very well-worded and -constructed resolution.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the last speaker that I think this resolution should include words of praise for the members of the intelligence community who take risks on our behalf in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do not find myself critical of the intelligence community. The criticism I and many others have is of the political leadership which I think misused the intelligence and made faulty decisions.

The gentleman talked about people who work in dark places. I did not talk about the Vice President. I do not know how he got into this debate.

The point about what we are saying is this. We now, without weapons of mass destruction, without a tie to al Qaeda, have been told that the rationale for this was essentially to extend democracy. I am in favor of extending democracy; although extending it by military invasion is a difficult policy. There are plenty of undemocratic, tyrannical governments in the world, and I want to oppose them, but I am not

generally for invading them. But what troubles me is that in the name of advancing democracy internationally, the majority is debasing it at home.

No one can think, who understands the tenets of democracy, that this procedure today comes close to it. There is no justification whatsoever for this legislation to have been drawn up and then brought to us without amendment. Will someone explain to me why this could not be amendable? Were we too busy? That would not pass the laugh test. The reason is that the majority is afraid that if amendments were available, it would bring into discussion things they do not want to talk about.

Of course, we support the troops. Voting for or against this resolution is wholly uncorrelated to supporting the troops. A resolution that simply congratulated the troops would have been passed unanimously. What we have here, frankly, is an effort to use the troops for political purposes. It is an effort to say that because Americans are proud of our fighting people, we will put into a resolution some phrase for them which contains a number of other politically more controversial items; we will bring it forward in a way that does not allow the democratic process to go forward.

I hope the Iraqis will not be watching this and think that this is the way a democracy should work, that it should be up or down, that the Constitution should not be amendable, resolutions should not be amendable. We do not advance democracy by debasing it as we do in this procedure.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today seeks to rewrite history. It recognizes that on March 16, 1988, Iraq used mustard gas and other nerve agents against the Kurds in Halabjah, Iraq, killing an estimated 5,000 people. This is an atrocity that is used by many, including members of the President's war cabinet, as justification for invading Iraq.

Yet, if the gassing of the Kurds was a reason for war, why did these same people in both the Reagan and the first Bush administrations work to increase aid, cooperation, trade and intelligence-sharing with Iraq after the gassing occurred? Before history is rewritten, it is important to set the record straight about what did happen in this tragic event.

Secretary of State Colin Powell was Ronald Reagan's National Security Adviser from December 1987 to January 1989 and was the chairman of the Joint Chiefs from 1989 to 1993.

Under Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz was Under Secretary of Defense for Policy from 1989 to 1993.

National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice was a director on the National Security Council from 1989 to 1993.

Vice President DICK CHENEY was the Republican whip in the House in 1988 and the Secretary of Defense from 1989 until 1993.

Why then, when they were in positions of tremendous influence, did they not cry foul when this atrocious gassing happened? Briefly, here is what they did after the Halabjah gassing happened.

In 1988, the Reagan Administration sent \$1.1 billion in loan guarantees to Iraq.

According to declassified State Department documents, the United States shared intelligence data with Iraq before and after this mass murder.

In early October 1989, President Bush signed a national security directive to expand political and economic ties with Iraq, including \$1 billion in new aid to Iraq.

On October 31, 1989, Secretary of State Baker personally intervened with the Agriculture Department to get more money to go to Iraq.

On April 19, 1990, the National Security Council did the same thing.

□ 1730

Following the end of the Gulf War, U.N. inspectors discovered that front companies for every known site at which Iraq developed biological and chemical weapons bought American computers with licenses approved by the Reagan and Bush administrations.

Weapons of mass destruction did exist in Iraq, but that was 15 years ago. We missed our chance to do something about it, and we cannot allow history to be rewritten here today. This war was not about Halabja or other human rights abuses. It was a preordained preemptive war of choice based upon twisted intelligence and driven by an equally twisted ideological agenda.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), for yielding me this time and giving me the opportunity to be heard this afternoon.

I stand here representing the 11th Congressional District of Ohio. In the Iraqi war, I lost two of my constituents. I read to my colleagues now the statements of the father of one of those constituents, and this is from an article in the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

"The soldier's father feels betrayed. On March 17, the President told the country intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised. A week later, Private Brandon Sloan, 19, was killed in Iraq. On Sunday, February 8, Brandon's father heard the President hedge about Saddam Hussein: 'We thought he had weapons. He had the capacity to make a weapon.'

"The Reverend Tandy Sloan believes there is a key difference between hav-

ing no doubt a country possesses weapons of mass destruction and having the ability to make them. A minister, he calls that difference the eighth commandment: 'Thou shalt not bear false witness.' It bothers him deeply that the President apparently has no regrets for overstating the danger for weapons of mass destruction that do not appear to exist. Sloan says, 'At least we admit we were wrong. I want the President to say that mistakes were made that cost lives.'

"It has been almost a year since that Sunday night knock on the door when military uniforms brought news that Brandon was missing. Days later, Sloan learned that his son was dead. Months later a brigadier general told him what happened to the 507th Company, made famous by Jessica Lynch. 'He basically told us the military goofed,' Sloan said. 'The President wanted a hard, fast hit,' the general said. Brandon's unit, hauling trucks, water, tools and gear, couldn't move fast enough to keep up with the other units, so they left it behind.

"Sloan said, 'You let my son down. My son did not sign on to be left behind.'"

I stand here on behalf of the parents of private Brandon Sloan and other young people killed across this country. Let us not politicize whether or not we are safer without Saddam Hussein or not safer. Let us celebrate the young people who lost their lives in this war and let us move forward to make the United States a safer Nation.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the vice chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I do rise as a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on International Relations, and I want to commend the authors of the resolution. I think it is straightforward and an accurate statement of the facts regarding Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address just a few aspects of the resolution, particularly those relating to the WMD. As H. Res. 557 notes, the brutal regime of Saddam Hussein not only trampled on the rights of the Iraqi people but he repeatedly defied the U.N. Security Council and ignored its obligations to the U.N. weapons inspectors. The resolution correctly notes that in November 2002, the Security Council unanimously agreed that Iraq "remains in material breach of its obligations under the relevant resolutions."

Let me repeat that, because it is important. The U.N. Security Council unanimously found that Iraq was unquestionably in material breach of its international obligations. The Iraqi regime had unquestionably interfered

with the IAEA inspectors and prevented the U.N. from effectively doing its job.

Contrary to our greatest fear, and fortunately for our forces, Iraq did not use weapons of mass destruction in the conflict with the U.S. and allied forces. Members of this body are acutely aware of the fact that no large WMD stockpiles have been found. This, of course, raises a number of questions. We certainly should examine the quality of our intelligence, and the appropriate oversight committees are doing just that. It is important, however, to remind the body of exactly what we have found that Saddam Hussein did possess.

We know, for example, that Saddam had, A, a concealed ballistic missile production line that dramatically breached U.N. range and payload restrictions; B, had covert programs to develop both new and more effective liquid and solid rocket fuels, which would further enhance the range and accuracy of Saddam's illegal missiles; C, had a secret pipeline to purchase advanced missile components and technology from North Korea; and had, D, two separate undeclared, unmanned aerial vehicle production lines that senior Iraqi officials now admit were to have been used for carrying biological weapons.

These items are critically important because missiles and UAVs are the means to deliver any weapons of mass destruction. That is why the U.N. prohibited Iraq from having these systems. There is no doubt that these missiles and UAV programs existed, in clear violation of Iraq's international obligations; and there is no doubt that they had WMD application.

What else do we know that Saddam Hussein had? One, the Iraqi Survey Group has found a network of labs and safe houses that contained everything needed for chemical/biological weapons production. These were undeclared facilities under the direct control of the Iraqi intelligence and security services.

Two, at an Iraqi prison they found evidence of an undeclared chemical/biological laboratory complex that seems to have been for human testing.

Three, we have learned that Iraq maintained a WMD scientific community and infrastructure that was organized in such a way that WMD production could be quickly resumed.

Four, we learned from David Kay, the former head of the Iraqi Survey Group, that Saddam and his son Uday were demanding to know from their subordinates how long it would take Iraq to produce chemical weapons.

And, five, while the evidence on nuclear activity is less clear, David Kay has testified that "the testimony we have obtained from Iraqi scientists should clear up any doubts about whether Saddam still wanted to obtain nuclear weapons." He did.

Mr. Speaker, none of this should be in the least bit surprising. Throughout the 1990s, we knew Saddam Hussein was

seeking to maintain an arsenal of prohibited weapons. Over the years, he became a master of deception, hiding many elements of his extensive WMD program. For example, after the 1991 Persian Gulf War, we found that Iraq was much further along on a nuclear weapons development program than anyone had suspected, only months from a serious capability.

We do know in the 1990s Saddam himself admitted he possessed 30,000 liters of anthrax. Now, remember, just a teaspoon of anthrax paralyzed the other body, the Senate, for months.

Saddam acknowledged a stockpile of 5,000 gallons of botulinum toxin and 25 biologically filled Scud missiles. He admitted to these lethal weapons after years of denying he had such weapons because his son-in-law defected and provided incontrovertible evidence of their existence.

All intelligence services—U.S., British, French, Italian, German, and others, agreed that Iraq had WMD. The U.N. concluded Iraq possessed a hidden WMD arsenal. The IAEA warned that Saddam was not cooperating. The WMD threat in the late 1990s was considered so compelling that, in December 1998, President Clinton felt he had no choice but to launch retaliatory airstrikes. The case for action was compelling in 1998, and the case was every bit as compelling in 2003.

Certainly our intelligence could have been better; it should have been better. It will never be as good as the consumers—the policy-makers—want it to be.

As we prepared for Operation Iraqi Freedom, there were gaps in our knowledge. There were things that we just did not know. It would seem that we just didn't have good access to Saddam Hussein's inner circle. There is a reason we didn't have that access and the intelligence information we would have wanted. Frankly, in the decade following the collapse of the former Soviet Union, we didn't invest adequately in human intelligence (HUMINT). The Intelligence Community sharply reduced the number of case officers, and the number of recruited intelligence assets is reported to have significantly declined.

This lack of HUMINT resources was compounded by self-imposed limits on whom our intelligence officers could recruit. In the 1990s the CIA established guidelines that made it extremely difficult to recruit the unsavory characters—individuals who are exactly the sort who could have provided useful intelligence. Any excuses aside, the "Deutsch Guidelines", as they were known, discouraged the recruitment of spies with criminal or human rights issues in their background. Yet these were precisely the sort of people who could get close to Saddam Hussein. In practical effect, our intelligence services were not allowed to recruit them.

With the active and tenacious involvement of the Intelligence Committee the Deutsch Guidelines were rescinded in the FY 2002 Intelligence Authorization Act, but there is little doubt that the damage to our human collection capability has been substantial. Under the guidance of the distinguished gentleman from Florida, the Chairman of the HPSCI, this body has been supporting the rebuilding of our HUMINT capability so that we aren't as likely to face future intelligence gaps. It is, however,

a matter that will require continued priority, resources, and the close attention from the relevant oversight committees.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 557 is a good resolution that reflects the basic truth that the world is much better without Saddam Hussein governing Iraq. This Member commends the authors of the resolution and urges its support.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I, on this side of the aisle, I am also saddened. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and the people I work with on the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and I think that we should have worked this together. But I tell my colleagues on the other side, I have been here 14 years, and this is the worst partisan bickering I have seen from the Democrat leadership since I have been here. And when my colleagues ask us to be bipartisan, I think you need to look inward at what has happened on this House floor recently.

They say the President overstated. But look at what Dr. Kay said. Liberal Democrats will not tell you what Dr. Kay actually said that Saddam Hussein and Iraq was even more dangerous from what we have found out since we went in there than we thought prior to the war. More dangerous. He said that any reasonable person, including any country, would know that Saddam Hussein was working on weapons of mass destruction; that he had them, used them against his own people, and would feel that he still had weapons of mass destruction.

So when I hear from the left that the President overstated, it's not so; and it makes me mad to point fingers like that. Evidence of weapons of mass destruction going to Syria. Dr. Kay. Any reasonable person would believe WMD.

Saddam Hussein ethically cleansed four times the number of people, four times, than when my liberal friends supported President Clinton going into Bosnia and Kosovo because of ethnic cleansing. Was there chemical or biological or nuclear weapons there? No, but ethnic cleansing.

And the liberal left, the most extreme case of bantering a secretary that I watched in the Haiti discussion was miserable. Tell me there is weapons of mass destruction in Haiti.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The Chair would remind all Members when addressing other colleagues that it is appropriate to use the term gentleman and gentlewoman, and not refer to the Member by a first name.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to say first off that I am sure that is what the last speaker intended. He is a good friend, a member

of our Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and I am certain he did not have me in mind when he was suggesting that there is excessive partisanship about our intelligence budget.

I call myself a passionate bipartisan on intelligence and security matters, and I take a back seat to no one for my efforts to try to work out agreements on a bipartisan basis to fix our intelligence.

As I said earlier, in my view, the proposed resolution does some good things, but it also should be calling for action to keep our troops and other personnel serving in Iraq safe.

Just a few hours ago, Mr. Speaker, a devastating car bomb destroyed a hotel in Baghdad. The casualty reports are still coming in, but at least two dozen people have died. Better intelligence is essential to protecting our troops in Iraq and ensuring that we ultimately succeed there. It is the first line of defense in the war on terrorism.

There are good ideas from both sides of the aisle that should be discussed and debated this year. What should we be doing? In my view, let us try six things:

First, the President should direct intelligence agencies to scrub weapons of mass destruction intelligence on all major targets and release updates on areas of concern. Now.

Second, the President should direct intelligence agencies to improve collection and vetting of information. Now.

Third, the President should require intelligence agencies to improve the way they analyze intelligence and convey information to policymakers. Now.

Fourth, the President should direct a review of the activities of various DOD offices, particularly the Office of Special Plans, to see whether they fed unreliable and unvetted intelligence to him, the Vice President, or his senior national security team.

Fifth, the President should take immediate steps to strengthen and rein-vigorate international inspections.

And, finally, the President should consider longer term changes to the leadership organization and business methods of the intelligence community.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution should have been a call to action in support of our troops, in addition to an expression of our heartfelt gratitude.

We could have done much, much better.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1745

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), a former member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard plenty of questionable statements today from Members about misrepresentation of intelligence and al-

leged use of military force, without enough information to back up that action. As a former member of the Committee on Intelligence, I would remind Members about one particular incident and the, quote, "depth of intelligence" supporting that action.

Not long ago the United States, on the order of the Commander in Chief launched a cruise missile attack against a pharmaceutical plant in Sudan, destroying the facility and taking human life. At the time, the action was justified by the President and his administration on the grounds that the al-Shifa plant was involved in the production of chemical weapons and had ties to Iraq and possibly al Qaeda which had just bombed two U.S. embassies in Africa.

What was the administration's basis for making these claims? What was the entire intelligence record that backed up this military action? This represents the entire intelligence on the al-Shifa plant. Yes, the entirety of the intelligence record connecting the al-Shifa plant to chemical weapons production was this, a single soil sample collected by a friend of a friend of a source. That is it.

The Intelligence Community did not know who actually owned the plant or have any other clear and convincing evidence to connect al-Shifa to weapons of mass destruction production; all it had was a bit of dirt and many unanswered question.

Yes, the information gaps were emphatically stated in the intelligence record of the day. None of these caveats were expressed by the President or his administration, and I believe the President picked this target himself. Now, I could name the President and the precise day in August 1998 and the attacks, and what else was happening that day; but rather than dwell on that, I would like to ask my colleagues on the other side: Where was their outrage in 1998? The information that this President used to inform his policy decision and act militarily against Hussein was voluminous, consistent, and as sound as it could be.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining 45 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) working as the ranking member on our committee to improve our Intelligence Community and to build support for the Intelligence Community in this House. It is important that we deal with a subject like this on a bipartisan basis. I know the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) is anxious and sincere in her call for action. I am too.

I believe we did have a call for action after 9/11, and I think that call for action has led us to go forth as the United States of America and to try to do the right thing on the war on terror. And I think from time to time as we go through that war, it is fine for us to say to the troops, well done, God bless you, and it is time to say to people in-

involved in places like Iraq, we know it is tough, thanks for hanging in there, you have a better future ahead.

That is what this is about. I thank all Members for having that kind of understanding and looking ahead. We have a lot to do; we have got to get along and get it done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentleman's time has expired.

The Chair would advise the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) he has 31 minutes remaining, including 1 minute from the gentleman's previous time rolled forward, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) controls 35 minutes because the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) reserved the remaining 5 minutes of his time for this debate.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I was fortunate to go to Iraq with a couple of my colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVIS) just a few weeks ago, and was able to see firsthand what is going on.

I think there is consensus that Saddam Hussein was a brutal dictator and he committed horrific crimes. But the question is whether we are right in ending this regime. I say emphatically I think the Iraqi people back this up, and we did the right thing there. There is still a very difficult security situation there, and the bombings which happened today underlie that.

But what are we to expect? When Saddam Hussein and his followers fled, coalition forces and ordinary Iraqis had to start from scratch to defend the place.

We had a taste of what went on over the past decade in particular. We went to several palaces built during the Oil-For-Food Program. We were told over 70 palaces were built during the 1990s when Saddam Hussein was supposed to use all of the revenue from oil to pay for food and medicines. Seventy palaces, with an estimated cost of over \$2 billion, were built while Saddam Hussein's people starved.

We also went into the basement of one of these palaces and saw Uday Hussein's stash of personal belongings: booze, cigars, swords, guns, paintings, all kinds of things, while the people went without medicine. Saddam Hussein and his shallow circle of loyalists were able in part to control Iraqis by depriving them.

We were the first CODEL able to go to the south in Basra, and we were able to see what those people had during that time, particularly the last decade. A lot of them simply were killed by neglect. No money was put into the south. The buildings are falling down, the infrastructure is horrible, and the

people were literally killed. We discovered remains of about 400,000 Iraqis. Over a million are believed to have been killed during that time.

Mr. Speaker, the question here is did we do the right thing. I can tell Members the Iraqi people know we did the right thing. Are we safer today because Saddam Hussein is gone? Yes, emphatically. People all over the world are safer because that madman is gone. I urge support of the resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to lay some groundwork for some comments I will make later. I am concerned in the first place, as I said before, that no one on this side was consulted about this resolution. I am embarrassed, I am indignant that they did not consult me.

This looks like an innocuous resolution, but when it says it is safer today than before Saddam Hussein was captured, I believe we are putting on paper something that is not true. It is like some of the things that were said, and I said, before this war started. I said there were weapons of mass destruction. I said that Saddam Hussein was a danger to the world. We do not go to war unless there is a core national security interest, and now we are trying to justify why we went to war by some of the things that are in this resolution.

There is no question that a number of people were killed. Thousands of people were killed. There is no question that Saddam Hussein was a despot. There is no question about a brutal regime. But in this one list, they say that in 1988, 5,000 people were killed, Kurdish citizens were killed. Well, we went to war in 1991. President Bush once said, and he was one of the best foreign policy Presidents we have ever had, he said, I am not going into Iraq because I do not want to occupy Iraq because that would be a problem. He said that in his book, and he said, I do not want to reconstruct Iraq.

We have spent \$150 billion in Iraq today. We had testimony before our committee right before the war started by the Under Secretary of Defense who said it will not cost us a penny, the oil revenues from Iraq will pay for this war. Well, \$150 billion later we are still paying for it. When Members say it is safer, it makes me nervous because we are exaggerating, as we have during this whole thing. And I blame myself as much as anyone else.

A constituent of mine said to me, he said, never in history have so many been misled by so few, and he was talking to me. He was saying I misled him. I believed there were weapons of mass destruction. I believed there was an imminent danger, but it turns out that I was wrong.

What we have to look at now is we need bipartisanship now to win long term. This is a long-term problem. I have voted for every appropriation, I have supported every President when it comes to foreign policy, but this reso-

lution, just because it says on paper it is safer, does not mean it is safer throughout the world.

Today we had an incident where there was a bombing in Baghdad where the bomb took out as wide as a street, 30 or 40 feet wide and 30 or 40 feet deep. We had the Spanish problem where they killed a couple hundred people and wounded 2,000. So worldwide, and it says here the world is safer. The world is not safer today than it was before they captured Saddam Hussein.

I have a list of countries where they do not think it is safer. Those countries, Canada, France, Italy, Germany, Spain, all of them believe there is an increased terrorism threat in the world. The reason I am saying this is we have to depend on those countries. We have to be honest and upfront, and when we say it is safer today, we are not being upfront. It is not safer. It may be down the road. This is not the time, in my estimation, for us to make statements like that. There will come a time if we persist, and I am going to be there the whole way, but I am just concerned that we are making a statement which just exacerbates the very problem that we have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, really in one sense, it does not matter how people vote on this resolution because it has no effect, but some things need to be said about it.

Every Member here supports the troops. Every Member here applauds the sacrifices the men and women of our Armed Forces have made. Every Member here understands that America needs no one's permission to defend this country from attack.

But when American leaders choose to wage a preemptive war against a country that did not attack the United States, when those leaders attempt to rally the American people to their support on the basis of faulty information and bad intelligence, when that unilateral decision costs more than 500 American lives, when it costs thousands of American wounded, when it costs the lives of uncounted thousands of innocent civilians, that decision does not, despite the claims of this resolution, it does not leave us in a stronger and safer position, as this resolution falsely suggests. In fact, it could be argued it does just the opposite.

Are we really in a safer and stronger position when the world and our allies know that we went to war unilaterally on the basis of wrong intelligence? Are we really going to be in a stronger position to persuade the world to follow us the next time we tell them it is necessary to act; for example, in the case of an American conclusion that North Korea has nuclear weapons?

Are we really in a safer and stronger position in persuading more Americans to serve in the military when they see that we rushed to war before 45,000 U.S. troops were supplied with the ceramic inserts that they needed for their body

armor, when they see their government did not provide the shields that protect Humvees and their occupants from roadbed explosions, or when they see that their government did not supply our troops with the electronic jammers needed to protect those troops against remotely detonated bombs and mines?

Are we really in a safer and stronger position when we are forced to police Iraq largely on our own, with little help from our allies? Have we really created a safer world when, by our actions, we have told the Indians and Pakistanis, who have been close to nuclear war with each other, that a doctrine of preemptive war is acceptable? Are we really as safe and strong as we would be if we had not diverted to Iraq key personnel and taken intelligence resources away from the crucial task of finding Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan?

Last night, many of us sang the praises of John Hume, the great Irish peacemaker. Hume said last night that there has been no war in history that has not killed more innocent civilians than it has combatants.

Are we really safer and stronger in a world where thousands of young Muslims now are being told to hate the United States because we waged a war against a Muslim country that had not attacked the U.S., rather than focusing like a laser on destroying the al Qaeda network which is the justifiable target of our rage?

Many Members who vote for this resolution today will do so despite the misstatements it contains, because it contains an expression of support for our troops. Many who vote against it will also do so because of the unwarranted assertions in this resolution that needlessly detract from our focus on the sacrifices those troops have made.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, shame on the House leadership for drafting this resolution in a way that needlessly divides us rather than unites us. By not allowing meaningful alternatives to be debated and voted on, they do not promote democracy; they mock it.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD after my statement a copy of the resolution on which we should have been allowed to vote.

RESOLUTION

Relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces.

Whereas Saddam Hussein and his regime committed crimes against humanity, systematically violating the human rights of Iraqis and citizens of other countries;

Whereas Saddam Hussein's terror regime subjected the Iraqi people to murder, torture, rape, and amputation;

Whereas on March 16, 1988, Saddam Hussein's regime had and unleashed weapons of mass destruction against Kurdish citizens, killing nearly 5,000 of them;

Whereas as many as 270 mass grave sites, containing the remains of as many as 400,000 victims of Saddam Hussein's regime, have been found in Iraq;

Whereas rape was used to intimidate the Iraqi population, with victims often raped in front of their families;

Whereas the regime punished the Marsh Arabs by draining the marshlands, which created hundreds of thousands of refugees and caused an ecological catastrophe;

Whereas the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-338), passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 360 to 38, made it United States policy to support efforts to remove from power the regime headed by Saddam Hussein;

Whereas with the Iraqi regime failing to comply with 16 previously adopted United Nations Security Council resolutions, the Security Council unanimously approved Resolution 1441 on November 8, 2002, declaring that Iraq "has been and remains in material breach of its obligations under relevant resolutions, including resolution 687 (1991), in particular through Iraq's failure to cooperate with United Nations inspectors"; and

Whereas on October 10, 2002, the House of Representatives passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243) and on March 19, 2003, the United States initiated military operations in Iraq; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) acknowledges the belief on the part of some that the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq and the belief that a final judgment on the value of activities in Iraq cannot be made until Iraq is stable and secure;

(2) commends the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of unspeakable oppression and brutality inflicted on them by Saddam Hussein's regime;

(3) commends the Iraqi people on the adoption of Iraq's interim constitution;

(4) commends the members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces for liberating Iraq and expresses its gratitude for their valiant service; and

(5) urges the President—

(A) to take all steps necessary to ensure that all members of the United States Armed Forces serving in Iraq receive the best force protection equipment available, including protective body armor and extra-armored wheeled vehicles capable of providing better protection against explosive devices;

(B) to ensure that all members of the Armed Forces who suffer wounds or other injuries, or who incur illness, while serving in Iraq receive complete, timely, and high-quality health care to treat the short-term and long-term consequences of such wounds, injuries, and illnesses;

(C) to recognize the key contributions made by members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and their families, in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and, in consultation with Congress, to address immediately the disparity that exists for many Reserve and Guard personnel between the pay they receive in civilian life and the military compensation they receive when ordered to active duty;

(D) to acknowledge that there were serious deficiencies in United States pre-war intelligence on Iraq, particularly in light of the failure to find any evidence of significant weapons of mass destruction programs, and to take steps now to improve intelligence so that United States troops are better protected and future United States national security strategies are better informed;

(E) to request sufficient funding immediately to fully support United States military operations in Iraq and the surrounding region in order to ensure the safety and well-being of United States troops deployed to Iraq and the surrounding region;

(F) to obtain far-reaching international participation in the securing, reconstruction, and political development of Iraq so that the United States can reduce the number of its troops in Iraq, and reduce the size of its financial commitment to Iraq operations; and

(G) to take steps to correct the failure of the United States Government to plan adequately for the post-war occupation of Iraq, including the failure to integrate internal United States Government studies and outside expert opinions that predicted the onset of guerrilla activity and described how to promote effective reconstruction, democratization, and civil society development activities, and the failure to apply those studies and opinions today in order to improve current United States reconstruction efforts in Iraq;

(6) expresses deep sorrow and regret for the deaths of more than 550 and the wounding of more than 3,500 members of the United States Armed Forces in Iraq and extends support to their families; and

(7) expresses sorrow and regret for the deaths in Iraq of United States civilians, United Nations personnel, unknown numbers of Iraqi civilians, and other noncombatants.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. I think there is a little semantic difficulty on the words "safe" and "safer." I would not say that Iraq is safe. I would not say crossing Pennsylvania Avenue in rush hour is safe. The question is, Is it safer with Mr. Saddam Hussein in a cell? Or is it less safe with him in one of his palaces plotting to amputate limbs from some of his people or to bury Kurds alive like he has done?

The world is a safer place with him in a cell because Mohmmar Qaddafi watched that and went to school on that. He decided to put his cards down and give up his nuclear pretensions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in commending the brave men and women who have liberated the Iraqi people. And I want to express my heartfelt sympathies to those families who have lost loved ones in battle. Did we do the right thing? I would say we did. Hundreds of mass graves containing the remains of as many as 400,000 victims of Saddam Hussein have been found in Iraq. For those of my colleagues who have not seen it, I would urge them to get a copy of "Iraq's Legacy of Terror: Mass Graves," published by USAID. Let me quote from it:

"Rows of white bundles containing bones filled room after room. Families filed by searching for signs of those who had disappeared, some stolen during the night, others taken in daylight. Even small children were not spared the butchery. Some graves hold a few dozen bodies, their arms lashed together and the bullet holes in the backs of skulls testimony to their execution. Other graves go on for hundreds of meters, densely packed with thousands of bodies."

We have learned from survivors about Iraqi citizens being indiscriminately detained, men, women, children, the elderly, the blind, the aged, led to

the edge of a swamp and executed one by one. Why? Just to let everybody know who was in charge. We know that Saddam's psychopath sons were as evil as their father. His eldest son Uday boasted that when it was his time to rule Iraq he would be even more brutal than Saddam. It was Uday who routinely had his thugs deliver women to him so he could rape them. It was he who was said to have fed a young woman to his attack dogs. It is he who reportedly abducted and violently raped a newlywed. After she committed suicide, he had her husband arrested and executed.

Now, because of the bravery and sacrifice of the men and women of our Armed Forces, Saddam is behind bars, Uday and Qusay are roasting in hell, and 25 million Iraqis are free.

Did we do the right thing? I think we did.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the learned gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in my office listening to the rhetoric. It has been very interesting. People have been talking about how this resolution divides us. I do not think it is the resolution. I think it is the rhetoric. We are all in support of our troops, but those who have been over there, as we were just a couple of weeks ago, know that our troops know they are doing the right thing. They know that the Iraqi people are happy that Saddam Hussein is gone. We talked to people when I was over there that said they did not have 400,000 people in mass graves, people that were tortured in the prison; but they believe it was more like between 1 million and 1.3 million. Over 1 million people were thrown into mass graves. That alone is reason enough to get that guy out of there.

But let us talk about weapons of mass destruction. In the 1980s, the Israelis attacked a nuclear reactor in Iraq because they knew he was going to build a nuclear weapon, and a nuclear weapon is a weapon of mass destruction. He used, as we all know, chemical weapons to kill thousands and thousands of Kurds, women and children, and he used those same things in the Iran-Iraq war that went on for 7 years. So this guy used weapons of mass destruction. He violated every single U.N. resolution that came out of the United Nations. So why should we believe that he would not have weapons of mass destruction, that he would disarm himself when he violated every agreement that he made? And he used weapons of mass destruction.

The President had every right to do what he did. Saddam Hussein was a threat not only to the region but to the whole world. As far as working with al Qaeda, you will never convince me that he was not working with the international terrorist network, including al Qaeda. That guy wanted to destroy our way of life and everything we believe in.

Some of my colleagues today have been down here on the floor haranguing about how they feel about this. I want to quote some of my Democratic colleagues and what they have said in the past. On December 17, 1998, regarding Iraqi women and children and how they should be protected, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) said:

"I also say that we in this body, along with the Commander in Chief, must have a definitive policy to protect the suffering women and children and to make sure that democracy comes to the region." That is a little different than the tone we are hearing today. My distinguished colleague for whom I have high regard, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), said:

"Had the President not ordered the attack, many would have bitterly criticized him for not having followed through with the tough words he uttered just 1 month ago." And also my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) came to the floor to decry criticism of President Clinton's motives for ordering air strikes on Iraq. He said:

"To my colleagues who have questioned the President's motives in the midst of this crisis, shame on them. Shame on them for breaking the long-standing tradition that leaves party politics at our Nation's shores." What are we hearing today? Party politics. This is a resolution congratulating our troops and talking about doing the right thing in Iraq, and we ought to be working together instead of criticizing each other for this. Then the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) echoed those sentiments at the same time when he said, "For one day we should have been patriots, not partisans. Politics should have stopped at the water's edge." How about today? That is what the Democrat colleagues of mine were saying just a few years ago.

And, of course, the distinguished minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), said on National Public Radio's "Talk of the Nation" program, "There is no question that everyone wants regime change in Iraq. The question is change to what?" And then on the "O'Reilly Factor" she said in 2002, "I think Americans and those in Congress are unified in wanting and joining the President in wanting a regime change in Iraq."

Then let me quote the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), who said in 2002, "We cannot simply hope that Saddam Hussein will be deterred. He has shown himself to be an inveterate and dangerous gambler." The gentleman from New York was not wrong. This is a good resolution. We ought to all join together to pass it.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The President of the United States has said there is no connection between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein. The director of intelligence has said there is

no connection. Secretary of State Colin Powell has said there is no connection. You may think there is a connection. We are revisiting history when we start to talk about all the things the gentleman is talking about. We went to war because there were weapons of mass destruction. We went to war because there was connection with al Qaeda. We did not go to war because of this. Many of these incidents happened when George Bush I was President and he said, "I'm not going to go into Iraq because I don't want to rebuild Iraq." The cost to this Nation, the Under Secretary of Defense said, will be nothing. He said, "We'll pay for it with their oil." \$150 billion later we are still paying, and we will pay for a long time.

I am in this for the long haul, but when I see a partisan resolution which was brought up without any input from me or any other Democrat, and you call us partisan? This does not make any sense. Why did anybody not come to us and say, change a few words, change some in the preamble and we will have a resolution we can support.

I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. There is nobody that has supported Presidents more than I have, but I just get upset when something comes across this way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), a Korean War veteran.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most difficult periods of time that I have had, because I do not get angry when the majority drafts bills in order to embarrass Democrats. I think that goes with the job. But I think it is really insulting and embarrassing when they use the troops as a vehicle to embarrass us.

There is nobody on either side of the aisle that will challenge the deep respect that we have for the men and women in our Armed Forces. But when the majority drafts a bill and says this is a Republican bill, you know that there is something crummy about it. You just have to look and find out what it is.

So they start saying all of these things that we agree to; but then they say, and it is a safer world as a result of Saddam Hussein being captured. It would seem to me that the lives of Americans that are on the line, their safety, that if there is anything that we as Democrats and politicians could find as sacred, if we just wanted to commend them and their families and their loved ones, that we would go out of our way to make certain that we do not put anything in there that could be described by political pundits as a poison pill. We should run it by Democrats and Republicans and say, Is there anything at all offensive in this because we do not want this to be controversial?

I am so glad I was not a fly on the wall when the Republican leadership put this together because in my heart

I do not truly believe that they wanted to find some way to laud the troops, but they wanted some way to try to find to embarrass Democrats. To use our military is one of the cheapest things that I think you can do.

Let us talk about who these military people are that we are lauding. This is one of those things I learned on Lennox Avenue when I was a hoodlum. There are always some people talking about, Let's go to fight. Let's settle this. Bring them on and we're not going to tolerate anything except total victory. But when it comes time to get involved in that fight, they are the same ones saying, "You go ahead in the fight, I'll hold your coat."

There is a lot of talk about shared sacrifice, but I hope we take a look and see who are the people who are volunteers, that is, volunteering putting their lives on the line each and every day. I remember in June of 1950 I was in Fort Lewis, Washington, and we were alerted that the Second Infantry Division was going to go to Korea to fight the North Koreans. Not one of us ever said, "What is the fight about? What is the war about?" We only knew that we were warriors, we were military people; and when that flag went up, we saluted it.

I go off and see the Reservists. I go off and see the National Guard going to Iraq. Not one of them has asked the political question as to why are we going over there. Yet I think that we have the political responsibility when we endorse the wars to find out not only why are we doing it but we have a political responsibility to be satisfied that it is the right thing. If we differ about that, that is what America is all about. That is what the Congress is all about. But you do not put that controversy in a bill when these military people do not have the options to discuss whether the war is right or wrong. They have the responsibility to obey the Commander in Chief.

I have taken a little survey along with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) about who is fighting this war and these people that we are commending. Believe me, they did not sign up to get rid of Saddam Hussein. As evil as this guy may be, one day some of us may be asked the question, Was it worth 550 American lives or 3,000 people that are in our heart, some with and some without Purple Hearts? One day someone would ask, where did they come from? Did they enlist to fight terrorism, or did they enlist because there were no jobs available? Are these minorities from the inner cities that are looking for a better way of life but accept their responsibility as to why they enlisted? Do they come from districts such as the gentleman from Missouri's district, the rural areas where unemployment is rampant? And why do we find there are more blacks, almost twice as many as the population, in the Army and how does that compare where in my city 50 percent of the African American men are unemployed?

□ 1815

Do the Members not think that had something to do with the enlistments? Do the Members not think they wanted to send a check home to their mom because they could not get a job? Do the Members not think they want the educational benefits to improve themselves, as I did as a high school dropout?

And why do we have to commend them when we find out just today that 12 percent of the Nation's population is black but they represent 20 percent of those that were killed. Black deaths in the Iraq war exceeds the rate of Vietnam. Go to Hispanics, we see the same thing. Go to white Americans and we see the same thing.

So we do not need a political resolution to try to polarize this Congress. We know we love and respect those people who salute that flag. And to put in a political controversial clause to attempt to embarrass us is just not going to work.

How low can you get when you use the military as a way to attempt to embarrass your colleagues?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I enjoyed listening to the last speaker tell us of his war exploits. I never tire of hearing them, and I find them quite fascinating. But I am bewildered. I do not quite understand why someone who wants to praise the military does not understand that getting rid of Saddam Hussein and trying to secure Iraq is a conquest by our military, an achievement, and that is why they are first in the four things this resolution does. And why he would want to detract from that accomplishment, that military achievement, is something that I am bewildered by.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for edification since he is bewildered?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the last time I yielded, I did not get my time back.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentleman from Illinois yields back his time, the gentleman from Pennsylvania may recognize the gentleman from New York, and then we have got our time in order.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HYDE. Very well, Mr. Speaker. I yield back my time and I will listen again.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the chairman may be fascinated by my war experiences. I did not talk about it. When he has time, I will give him more time than he will ever want to hear about it.

What I am saying is this: We have an opportunity to laud our service people. You know there is one issue on this floor, and that is whether or not we

were misled in getting involved in this. I do not care which side one is on. We want to laud the servicemen. Why would you put Saddam Hussein in this resolution? Why did you not leave him out so that we could have unanimous consent that we laud the military? You deliberately put Saddam Hussein in there to divide us and not to bring us together.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of this resolution. One year ago this week, freedom came to the good people of Iraq and the tyrant Saddam Hussein fell. And it is impossible to speak of the one without the other. And the contents of this resolution are therefore fitting and appropriate.

I rise to support this resolution, Mr. Speaker, with my feet still dusty from a trip to Iraq just 2 weeks ago. And while I was deeply moved and overwhelmed by the valor of our troops during that journey, I was equally moved by the gratitude and the affection that I experienced from the people of Iraq. I really fell in love with the Iraqi people, and I learned that the Iraqis that I met love the American people.

We traveled through a ravaged city of Basra, one-story sandstone homes, and met at Coalition Provisional Headquarters. During our meeting with top civil and religious leaders, I thought when it came to my turn I would just ask them, What did they think of our decision to remove Saddam Hussein? And what had been a cool if not distant atmosphere in our discussion suddenly erupted in a flourish of passion and candor. A local Muslim leader, whose dress and appearance gave him an ancient air, said icily to me "Saddam Hussein was a nightmare, and the day that your people removed him from power was a day when a dark curtain was lifted from the people of Iraq and the daylight was able to shine in."

Later we met with a large group of ordinary Iraqis eager to speak to American officials. As we sat around the lunch table, there were pointed opinions. These English-speaking Iraqis were so strong in their views and sometimes criticisms of our reconstruction policies, I thought for all the world I was back on the floor of Congress. But then they began to speak of their gratitude toward the American people, of the horror of living under Saddam Hussein, of 400,000 bodies of men and women and boys and girls that had been found, and another 800,000 that were missing. I saw them many times, Mr. Speaker, with tears in their eyes say to me as an American official "When you go home, tell the people that you serve that we are grateful to the American people and your allies

for what you have done for us." And they were breathlessly excited about democracy.

I will never forget the moment at a USAID class where I spoke to a group of Iraqi women. They shared with me poems in English that they had written about democracy, and almost with the enthusiasm of grade-school children, their hands almost quivered as they spoke of the future in which they believe.

I rise to honor in this resolution our Armed Forces, our allies, and the good people of Iraq, all of whom deserve the resolution and support of this Congress.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for yielding me this time.

This resolution rightly highlights the vast crimes against humanity committed by Saddam Hussein's regime. And as we have heard today, as many as 270 mass graves have been found so far, containing the bodies of 400,000 Iraqis. Four hundred thousand.

I remember photos my father, a U.S. serviceman, took when U.S. forces overran the death camp in Dachau, Germany in the closing days of World War II. People executed in pits, by the thousands. I never thought I would see photos like those photos again.

In the days and weeks following Saddam's overthrow, we learned more about another dictator's evil, and here is one account from the L.A. Times: "The executions took place two or three times on most days. Each time between 100 and 150 blindfolded people, their hands and sometimes feet bound, were led into pits about 10 feet deep. Gunmen then fired into the pit, often for several minutes . . . A bulldozer then pushed dirt over the bodies, sometimes burying or crushing people who had survived the volley and were trying to climb out." Four hundred thousand people.

In two trips to Iraq, I have had the chance to talk to tortured Iraqis. Some ask, Why act in Iraq and not the other countries suffering through human rights nightmares? I would respond that just because we do not act in all cases of gross human rights abuses does not mean we should not act in any cases. Moreover, in Iraq's case, our ability to act effectively is greater because our vital national security interests are on the line. Our interest in seeing a reformed Middle East will keep us committed to building a free Iraq. So let us forget that argument. It obscures the nightmare that was Saddam's Iraq and it belittles our closing of his torture chambers.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We did not go to war in World War II because of Dachau. We went to war because they attacked us, because our national security was in danger. And we went to war in Iraq because there

were weapons of mass destruction, I thought. There were al Qaeda connections, I thought. We did not go to war because these people were killed.

George Bush one, the first George Bush, knew there were mass graves. And he did not go into Iraq and he said, I do not want to rebuild Iraq; I do not want to occupy Iraq. And one Under Secretary of Defense said to our subcommittee it will not cost us a cent. It has cost us \$150 billion to fight in Iraq and to rebuild Iraq.

So we are trying to revisit history. I mean, we cannot change it. We went to war because we thought we were threatened. These things were terrible things. We are glad to get rid of Saddam Hussein. That is not the point. We cannot revisit and change history. So I feel very strongly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, like many senior Democrats, I supported George Herbert Walker Bush in going into Iraq the first time. I also served my country in World War II, and I know a little about the military.

But I want to talk about this curious process that we are going through today. I want to talk about this resolution. If we look, the Committee on Rules has given us a closed rule. No Democratic amendments are allowed. No real discussion is permitted. And it says so in the report. If my colleagues do not believe me, they should get a copy of it. No Democratic sponsors. Very little Democratic support or consultation on this side with the Members.

If we want to have bipartisan support for what we are doing over there, there is a way to do it. It may well be my Republican colleagues do not know it. But a little consultation over here could be useful. I think my colleagues on the Republican side should know what the problem is. It is where we make an affirmation that the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime. Have we really been made safer? Let us look at it. We have committed the entirety of our military to serve over there. We have nothing to meet a problem which might exist in Korea or somewhere else where there are atom bombs and weapons of mass destruction now readily available. No weapons of mass destruction have been found. Mr. Kay and Mr. Blix both said none. The President said they are there. Now the President has admitted they are not. And, of course, my Republican colleagues now want to purge themselves of responsibility for what is evidence of some kind of either disingenuous behavior or outright dishonesty in committing us to a war on the theory that there were weapons of mass destruction there.

Now we also have our Republican colleagues in the curious position where

they say that al Qaeda is operating there, and al Qaeda probably is operating there, and we must ask again if we are safer because al Qaeda operates there. The fact of the matter is there is no evidence at any time previously, and the administration has to admit it, that al Qaeda or any terrorist group was functioning out of Iraq. That is something that has now been manufactured in the teeth of admissions by the administration that that kind of situation does not obtain.

I do not want to say whether the administration has deceived the American people intentionally or otherwise. That will be decided by history, and we are going to have to let the Republicans and their administration decide whether it was an exercise of supreme incompetence or whether there was dishonesty or some curious mixture of the above. I do not want to pollute this debate with that kind of discussion.

But I do want to point out some things. We are not safer now with the troops that we have all committed over there and the inability to address problems that exist in Korea or elsewhere in the world where people might stir up trouble, or in Iran, immediately next door, or, for that matter, in Pakistan, or in other places where there are dictators who are anxious and willing and able to make trouble. We are not stronger in this country because we have committed, as my good friend from Pennsylvania says, 150-some billion dollars. The number is actually more like \$186 billion over there.

□ 1830

That is money that will not be available for schools and education and health. It is money that is not going to be able to assist us to deal with threats to the security of this Nation from other causes, from the risks that exist in the other countries that do make trouble.

This is the defect of this process. If we want to deal with this thing of our commitment in Iraq, I say to my Republican colleagues, address it in a real bipartisan way. Let us consult. Let us work together. Let us consult together so that we can pull together in the interests of the United States. Because every man and woman in this Chamber wants to bring those young people home safe, with dignity and honor. Every person in this Chamber wants to see to it that we win over there. And every American in this Chamber is committed to seeing to it that we not only bring our people home safe, but to see to it that we win, and that we now do correct the problems of having committed ourselves to what was essentially a very unwise war on the basis of unwise statements which had little or no basis in fact.

That is the way we should be addressing this issue. We should not be bringing forward to the House something that looks like a pronouncement from the Republican National Committee that has all of the bipartisanship that

one can find in such an undertaking. We should be talking and working together about how we bring Americans together now to address this question. Patriotic Americans are still entitled to speak their thoughts. Patriotic Americans are still entitled to have answers to why we are in this mess. And sensible, intelligent men and women are entitled to ask why we are in this mess.

Mr. Speaker, history tells us what we are looking at. The British went in in 1920 to Iraq. They left Iraq after a dozen years of warfare over there. They had lost thousands of British troops' lives, hundreds of millions of pounds, each one of those pounds was worth somewhere between \$50 and \$100 U.S. dollars today, and they still were not able to win, to get the peace that they wanted, to establish a world in that area where things would go the way honest and decent human beings wanted it.

Iraq is a country which is driven by racial and religious differences. We have the Sunnis, the Shi'ias, we have the Kurds, the Turkmens, the Catholics, the Christians, and the Chaldeans over there. None of them like each other and all of them distrust each other intensely.

We are losing today about one American every day, one American, dead; but thousands of them maimed and killed in the most gruesome of ways. We need to understand that we have to pull together. This is not the mechanism for that.

These people over there and the United States are not more safe because of this. We are not focusing on international problems which threaten us. We are not able to spend the resources which we need because we are spending them over there and cannot now spend them over here on schools and education and health and other things that are important to our people.

This is the wrong way to proceed. I say shame.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

What are our goals and how do we best achieve them? I would think our goal in this war on terror is to have a safer and better place in America and the rest of the world. I would suggest that we are moving ahead in that direction.

Let me just read the resolution:

"Commends the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of unspeakable oppression and brutality inflicted on them by Saddam Hussein's regime." I do not think we should disagree with that.

"Commends the Iraqi people on the adoption of Iraq's interim constitution." I do not think anyone should disagree with that.

“Commends the members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces for liberating Iraq and expresses its gratitude for their valiant service.” Certainly nobody would disagree with their valiant service.

Is it a question that we are liberating Iraq? I thought the poll that came out was very interesting, where 2,500 Iraqis were polled on their opinion now, a year later, and I will read a couple. Some 57 percent said that life was better now than under Saddam, against 19 percent who said it was worse. Fifty-seven said it was better now and 19 percent said it was worse. Overall, 70 percent said that life was good now. Seventy percent said that life was good now, compared with 29 percent who said it was bad.

Asked what political system they believed was needed in their country, 86 percent said they wanted democracy. I met a little over a month ago with 60 nations at the Pacific Interparliamentary meeting. Those people are happy, in my mind, as I judge their conversations, that the United States and Great Britain and the coalition forces are doing something. They are sort of happy they are not paying for it, but they are happy that somebody is aggressive in this war on terrorism.

I met a couple of weeks ago in Libya, and Qaddafi, there is no question that Qaddafi did not want to end up the way that Saddam did. I was one of eight Members in Libya, and now we have countries like Libya saying, We are going to give up our nuclear weapons. We are going to give up our weapons of mass destruction.

Did Saddam have those weapons? We know he had them. This summer we found all of those airplanes buried under the sand. I think, I suspect, that some place under the sand or someplace, there are still those weapons. We know he had them; we do not know what he did with them. I think the world is safer.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, like so many here in the House, I continue to pray for all of the courageous men and women in the uniforms of our Armed Forces, and especially the families who have lost a loved one and have paid the ultimate price in Afghanistan and Iraq. But I wish, as the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) referenced, that all of the Members could have been with me in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, this past Monday, along with the Secretary of Energy, to see the centrifuges and the nuclear arsenal that was voluntarily given up by Moammar Qaddafi from Libya, because there is no doubt, while we can all draw our own conclusions, there is no doubt in my heart that that is a result of our consistent and decisive offensive since September 11 around the world against terror; because terrorism, as we see in Spain and in Baghdad and the fear in London, is alive and well, and terrorism con-

tinues, and we must pursue the terrorists and keep them on the defensive.

I believe our consistency and our resoluteness has paid off in effective ways, such as Libya giving up their nuclear deterrent; the Bush doctrine: You are either with us or you are against us. They have to declare. Libya declared. We do not want to be against you; they are voluntarily giving it up.

Now, we need to listen to some of the neutral parties. I know a lot of the concern today is about process. I do not know, I was not here when the Democrats were in the majority. Frankly, both parties are guilty of shutting out the other side. But I know that I am concerned about the signals that are being sent today out of this Chamber and in this town about our commitment to Iraq. This is a bold, long-term commitment.

Neutral observers like Thomas Friedman expressed concern in the last 48 hours about Spain, what is happening in Iraq, and whether the terrorists are intimidating free people around the world. We need to stand our ground in this war on terror. There is no doubt we had to do what we did in Iraq and that good has come out of it.

Mr. Speaker, terrorism cannot be allowed to win the day. Peace through strength works. Appeasement has never worked. And we are tested again today, whether or not we will stick to our guns and finish what we have started, even if it takes years and more money.

I want to secure our investments in the region. The people were poor there, but the country was wealthy. I believe we have done the right thing, and we have to be strong and tough and dig our heels in.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I believe that when the political smoke of this great debate today clears, that this bill is going to pass with a very substantial vote. I think it is going to be passed with a substantial vote because every one of us in this Chamber wants to keep the commitment that we made several years ago after September 11, that we are going to support our troops when they are in the field, when they are at risk, when they are in harm's way.

This is just another statement, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has repeatedly said today, we have spent a lot of money of American taxpayer dollars to fund the operation, and we want to make sure that our troops understand that we believe they are doing a good job, and they are. We want to let them know that they are not in harm's way in vain.

So I think the bill is going to pass with a nice vote. But do my colleagues know something? I had a chance to be the sponsor of the bill that appropriated \$40 billion on September 14 of 2001. I had the privilege of being the

sponsor of the supplemental that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) talked about, that was sizable, to pay for our troops in the field and what they needed by way of equipment. But do my colleagues know something? Besides being a player to that extent, I am not offended that I was not asked to write this bill. I am very satisfied that the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) and his committee wrote a very good bill. I am not offended that I was not asked to be the sponsor. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is the ideal sponsor, and those who did sponsor this bill.

So I think once the political smoke clears, this House is going to stand up and is going to be counted and to tell our troops in the field and to tell our troops who are recuperating in hospitals that we support what they are doing, we believe in what they are doing, and that we are here to do whatever has to be done to protect our country and our countrymen from terrorist attacks and to provide support for those who provide that kind of security for us.

I have a lot of other things I would like to say, but time is limited. So, Mr. Speaker, I will insert the balance of my statement into the RECORD at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 557, which honors the valor, courage, and professionalism with which our American forces, and those of our coalition partners, have served in liberating the people of Iraq.

We consider this resolution today on the first anniversary of the initiation of military operations in Iraq. However, the difficult decisions by Congress to authorize the use of force in Iraq and the President's ultimate directive to send troops into Iraq were the culmination of more than 13 years of violence and terrorism directed at the United States and our allies throughout the world.

Saddam Hussein's movement of troops into Kuwait in 1990 threatened the freedom and security of the people of that nation who remain one of our country's staunchest allies. We responded as a Nation and in partnership with the free nations of the world in Operation Desert Storm to throw Saddam's forces out of Kuwait. Subsequently, through a series of United Nation's resolutions, we sought to monitor Saddam's activities to prevent him from again threatening the sovereignty of another ally.

Since then, as this resolution points out, Saddam Hussein and his regime have committed repeated heinous crimes against humanity, including the murder, torture, rape, and amputation of his own people. This is the regime that unleashed weapons of mass destruction against the Kurdish people, killing nearly 5,000. We have found more than 270 mass graves sites in Iraq, with the remains of more than 400,000 people. Saddam Hussein poisoned the water supply of his enemies, he even punished the Marsh Arabs by draining their marshlands, which created hundreds of thousands of refugees and created an ecological catastrophe.

This Congress responded in 1998 by adopting the Iraq Liberation Act, which made it U.S.

policy to support efforts to remove Saddam Hussein and his regime from power. President Clinton, however, after signing this act into law never followed through.

Four years later, after little or no U.S. action to rid Iraq of Saddam Hussein, the United Nations Security Council approved Resolution 1441 declaring that Iraq "has been and remains in material breach of its obligations" under previously adopted Security Council resolutions.

Clearly, the United States and President Bush did not start this war, just as we did not start the global war on terrorism. We responded to a series of attacks against the American people and our allies throughout the world.

Recall that on February 26, 1993, six lives were lost in the first bombing of the World Trade Center. Our response at the time was a series of harsh words and empty rhetoric.

Three years later, on June 25, 1996, 19 U.S. service members lost their lives in the bombing of Khobar Towers, outside a U.S. air base in Saudi Arabia. The response again was harsh words, empty rhetoric, and promises of a thorough investigation.

Two years after that, 259 died, including 11 Americans, in the bombing of U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. The response again was more harsh words and a cruise missile attack on a pharmaceutical factory in Sudan.

Finally, feeling empowered by the continuing lack of a credible U.S. response to past attacks, terrorists bombed the USS *Cole* while anchored off Yemen, killing 17 U.S. sailors, and injuring countless others. The U.S. response again was harsh words of outrage and the promise of a full investigation.

The year 2001 arrived with a new President and a new set of world challenges. However, just nine months into the Bush Administration, the world changed forever on September 11, 2001. A hijacked airliner crashes into the Pentagon killing 189. Two hijacked planes crash into the World Trade Center, killing 2,801. And a hijacked plane crashes in rural Pennsylvania, killing 44.

This time it was a different President with a different response. President Bush announced that in response to these terrorist attacks on our nation and our people we will respond by seeking out those who were responsible and hold them accountable. We will respond by identifying terrorist organizations and eliminate them at their roots.

Mr. Speaker, the terrorist attacks of September 11th were a direct assault on our nation's freedom, and a test of our will to defend it. The nations of the free world wondered if we would meet the challenge, if this time our promises to strike back against the terrorists would be followed by decisive action.

Just three days after September 11th, my Committee on Appropriations and this Congress stepped forward to approve a \$40 billion emergency supplemental appropriations bill to fund recovery efforts in New York City and at the Pentagon, and to take military action against the perpetrators of those despicable attacks. That was the first concrete signal to the world that this time, we as a nation were serious in backing up the words of our President. Since that day Congress and the American people have shown time and again that no matter how long it takes or where it may lead, our commitment to win this war on terrorism is unshakeable.

President Bush sent U.S. troops to Afghanistan to destroy and disrupt al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden's operations. Our forces routed the Taliban, killed many terrorists, and eliminated al-Qaeda main base of operations. They also liberated millions of men, women, and children from a cruel regime, and gave them a chance to choose their own government and enjoy the benefits of freedom. But our victory against the Taliban was not the end of the war on terrorism.

When the United Nations determined that Saddam Hussein was not living up to the Security Council resolutions, President Bush acted decisively in sending troops to Iraq.

This resolution recognizes the remarkable swiftness and precision with which our troops advanced across Iraq to remove from power the Hussein regime. The effectiveness of our Armed Forces caught the enemy by surprise. Even after the end of major combat operations in Iraq our troops have continued their mission to stabilize and rebuild that country. They have captured 45 of the 55 most wanted Iraqis, including Saddam himself, ensuring that he will never return to power. With the co-operation of Iraqi security forces, our troops have captured and killed hundreds of terrorists who sought to restore the dictator to power. The world has also seen the humanity and generosity of America, as our troops, using funds appropriated by this Congress, help restore water and electricity, provide basic health services, and bring children back to school, free from intimidation and indoctrination.

There are those in this debate today who have said that we started the war against terrorists in Afghanistan and Iraq. The truth of the matter is that the war started in 1993 with the first bombing of the World Trade Center, which was greeted with such a tepid response. Thank God that on September 11, 2001 George Bush was President and he decided that there was enough of this one-sided war against Americans and our allies. There was enough of us being on the receiving end of cowardly acts of terrorism, with the bad guys getting away with it. So yes, we did engage in combat finally to fulfill our obligation to protect our country and our people whether in their workplace, in their homes, or in their schools.

Having spent considerable time with our troops here at home and abroad, including those who have been injured in the line of duty, I can tell you that they support President Bush and their mission. These kids; and I say kids because many who are on the front lines are 18, 19, and 20 years old; are true patriots. Those who are injured are determined to get well so they can get back to the fight to finish the job they have begun. They all share a strong belief that what we are doing is right, not just for the people of Iraq, but it is right for the freedom loving people of the world.

The battle of Iraq was another critical advance in the War on Terrorism. Today we are establishing a Muslim democracy at the heart of the Middle East. Representatives from all three of Iraq's major ethnic groups came together on March 8 to sign an interim constitution. Iraq now has an independent judiciary and will have free elections later this year. Because of the leadership of our President, the courage and determination of our troops, and the strong commitment the members of this body made to the rebuilding of Iraq, that na-

tion is making strong progress towards freedom and prosperity.

As many of you know, my wife Beverly and I spend many hours visiting wounded soldiers and Marines at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center and the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, Maryland. In addition to comforting them and helping give them strength for their recovery, I always take the time to remind them that the American people are grateful for their service and their sacrifice, and proud of their achievements. Mr. Speaker, this resolution gives Members of this body the opportunity to remind all of our men and women in uniform that we are thankful for their service, and proud of their victory in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, it was President Franklin Delano Roosevelt who in this very Chamber talked about the "four essential human freedoms." He said that they are, "The freedom of speech—everywhere in the world. The freedom of every person to worship God in his or her own way—everywhere in the world. The freedom from want—everywhere in the world. The freedom from fear—anywhere in the world."

President Bush has led the world-wide effort to ensure the freedom from fear, anywhere in the world, whether it be the United States, Iraq, Afghanistan, or Spain. And he has called upon the world's most powerful and best trained soldiers of peace to carry out that mission, which they have done with valor, with courage, with pride, with devotion, and with unmatched professionalism.

Mr. Speaker, with the adoption of this resolution today, we can reiterate our support for their mission which is to ensure a world where people can truly live free from fear.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN).

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, for more than 20 years, Saddam Hussein used tactics of torture, brutality, and fear to terrorize the citizens of Iraq and neighboring countries. Exactly 16 years ago this week, Saddam Hussein unleashed weapons of mass destruction that killed 5,000 of his own Kurdish citizens. He encouraged Iraqi officials to rape and torture women. Men and women of Iraq were repressed, and they were isolated from the rest of the world.

One year after the United States and coalition forces liberated Iraqi citizens, the people of Iraq are embracing this opportunity to build a new and free Iraq for their children.

Last October, I saw firsthand the remarkable activities that are taking place on the ground in Iraq. There are now over 3,800 programs that offer immediate assistance to improve the quality of life for all Iraqi people. As reconstruction efforts continue to move forward, many essential services like water, sanitation, electricity, and telecommunication have been restored and even surpass prewar levels. In fact, public health spending is now 26 times as great as it was under Saddam's regime.

Today I met with a delegation of Iraqi leaders to talk about the continuing advances in Iraq. This was a diverse delegation. It was men and women, Shi'as, Sunnis, tribal leaders, doctors, members of the free press. They are dedicated to promoting and to teaching democracy throughout south central Iraq. They shared their personal stories. They talked about the Democracy Regional Center where a democracy discussion was held for more than 1,500 Iraq people from different backgrounds, and they are launching a radio station, and they are promoting democracy to 10 million people through that part of the country. The Iraqi people are embracing democracy with open arms.

Mr. Speaker, last week I held a roundtable discussion with a group of remarkable women leaders from Iraq. One of the women in the group gave me her wedding ring to keep as a reminder that we should not waiver from our commitment to women.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, support the Iraqi men and women who have done so much for us in that Nation. We should help them.

□ 1845

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, as I sit here and I listen to the debate, I am almost in disbelief when I hear Members on the other side claiming perhaps that the world is not as safe a place since Saddam Hussein was removed.

But I do not hear anyone on the other side disputing the facts in the resolution that Saddam Hussein committed crimes against humanity, that he subjected the Iraqi people to murder and torture, and that he unleashed weapons of mass destruction against his own people.

So I can only arrive at the conclusion that perhaps someone is insinuating that the horrific terrorist bombings that have occurred in Bali, in Riyadh, Madrid, Jerusalem since Saddam Hussein's ouster would not have occurred if he were still in office. Now, that is just preposterous. I know that no one would suggest such a thing.

President Bush was right when he said that we cannot distinguish between the terrorists and the states that sponsor those terrorists. Regimes like Saddam Hussein's still exist. Those brutal outlaw regimes around the world who are there supporting the terrorist organizations are our enemies just as the terrorists themselves.

Clearly, without Saddam Hussein, America is safer. The Middle East is safer. Just ask the Israelis. Ask them if they feel that they are not safer without the threat of Saddam and his Scuds aiming at Tel Aviv. Of course they are safer. Of course the world is safer.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by thanking God that we have our troops and our young men and women who are volunteering their lives, risking their

lives to go and take the battle to the front lines, to take the battle to the terrorists so that perhaps we can avoid another terrorist attack on our homeland.

Mr. Speaker, some people may flinch when they look in the eyes of the terrorists, but with this President in this House with the American people, that will never happen.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the distinguished whip.

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, today as we debate this resolution, I am more convinced than ever that our country's leadership in removing Saddam Hussein from power was both morally and strategically right. Saddam Hussein left no choice but for us to act. He systematically violated 17 separate U.N. Security Council resolutions. The U.N. chose not to act. He tried to conceal from the international community his desire to produce weapons of mass destruction.

In November of 1999, our Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, said that Saddam Hussein has chosen to spend his money on weapons of mass destruction and palaces for his cronies. No doubt David Kay was correct when he called Saddam a gathering threat during a recent congressional hearing. If you do not believe Mr. Kay, maybe we should ask the families of the thousands of Kurds Saddam gassed in 1988 or ask the first U.N. weapons inspectors who prior to 1998 revealed the presence of anthrax, mustard gas, VX nerve gas, chemical weapons casings, and bombs filled with germ agents. These weapons remain unaccounted for today.

Saddam Hussein's regime's support of numerous other terror organizations is well documented. Iraq stoked terrorism and instigated violence in Palestinian territories by paying the families of suicide bombers \$25,000 for attacking innocent civilians.

Iraq harbored the notorious Abu Nidal, whose terror organization carried out more dozens of terrorist attacks in 20 countries that killed and injured nearly 900 people including many Americans.

Iraq harbored Abu Abbas who was responsible for the Achille Lauro.

Iraq also incorporated the MEK terrorist organization into its own military and security forces.

Since Saddam's fall, Libya voluntarily opened its weapons program to inspectors. Pakistan is now taking overdue action to reign in its nuclear proliferators. And very importantly, the emergence of a pluralist and democratic Iraq is forcing the region to undertake democratic and social reforms which will enhance stability throughout the Middle East.

Iraq has a bright future. Not every day is a bright day, but every day

moves closer to constitutional government and democracy. On March 8, the governing council approved an interim constitution. Took us a lot longer to do that in our country. A sovereign government will assume authority for Iraq, we hope, later this year, later this summer even.

There is plenty of work left to be done. But I think as we move this resolution today, we appropriately commend those who led this fight, the Iraqi people, for their incredible courage and optimism in the face of unspeakable horrors, and the proud men and women who serve us in the United States Armed Forces.

For the reasons I just mentioned, along with many other reasons, I voted with the vast majority of my colleagues in 1998 in favor of the Iraq Liberation Act, which made it the policy of the United States that Saddam Hussein should be removed from power. And I commend the President for his leadership in taking action on this policy.

And, Mr. Speaker, as a result of this action, there is no question that the United States and the world are safer. Decisive coalition action against this brutal dictator and his WMD programs has demonstrated our resolve. To name a few specific examples: First, in the weeks and months after the war, Colonel Gadhafi's regime in Libya voluntarily opened up its weapons program to inspectors after considering the cost of defying the United States and its partners in the war on terrorism; second, Pakistan is now taking overdue action to rein in its nuclear proliferators and, as a result, the network of illicit WMD suppliers is becoming more clear; last, Mr. Speaker, and this is very important, the emergence of a pluralist and democratic Iraq is forcing regional autocrats to undertake much-needed democratic and social reforms, which will lead to greater stability in a tumultuous region.

For the first time in their lives, Iraqis will be guaranteed a free and fair election process, a Bill of Rights, and an independent judiciary; ideals which we here in America take for granted. All Iraqis, most notably Iraqi women, now have freedoms and rights they could have only dreamed of after a generation spent under Saddam's reign of terror. And more than 200,000 Iraqis have been trained and equipped by coalition forces to provide for the security, not the repression, of the Iraqi people.

To be sure, there is plenty of work left to be done in Iraq. A society of terror and repression does not transform into a free and stable democracy overnight. But we must have faith in the Iraqi people. Early in our own Nation's history, regional and racial schisms threatened to tear the United States apart. Although the parallel is not perfect, many of Iraq's challenges today resemble those of early America as Iraq struggles to secure peaceful borders, build institutions, and draft a working democratic constitution in the face of great odds.

The United States and the new Iraqi government must be strong allies in the war against terror, the effort to halt the proliferation of WMDs, and the ongoing struggles to bring fundamental human rights to all people. No other modern nation's people understand the need for these efforts like the people of Iraq. The normalization of relations with Iraq will provide us with opportunities to work closely

with our Iraqi friends. I urge my colleagues to meet and work with Rend Rahim, the Representative to the United States from the Iraqi Governing Council, and who under the new sovereign government will become Iraqi Ambassador to the United States. Representative Rahim left Baghdad as a young woman in the 1970s. In 1991 she founded the Iraq Foundation and has become well-known as a passionate advocate for democracy in her homeland. In her new role she will work tirelessly toward fostering and maintaining the relationship between the United States and a free and democratic Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we must be prepared to stay the course in Iraq, to overcome the terrorists and Ba'athists who fear democratic principles, and to put forth the necessary resources to demonstrate to the Iraqis and to the world that the United States will always remain committed to a free and secure Iraq. I commend the President and our coalition allies for their leadership in deposing Saddam Hussein, a brutal dictator who procured and employed weapons of mass destruction, repressed and tortured his people, and actively encouraged global terrorists with financial rewards. I commend the Iraqi people for their incredible courage and prevailing optimism in the face of horrors you and I cannot imagine. And I commend the proud men and women of the United States armed forces, who have proven once again that when called upon in defense of freedom, their effectiveness is unmatched anywhere in the world.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I associate my remarks with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

I rise with concern and dismay on the Resolution before us.

First of all it resolves a sense of the House of Representatives. How can you have a sense of the entire House when it only has Republican authors?

How can it be a sense of the House with not a single Democrat as a co-sponsor?

This Resolution seems to provide political cover for the President for failing to secure support from our major Western allies in the War on Terrorism in Iraq.

This Resolution ignores the fact that we had no post-conflict reconstruction plan, before the first bombs dropped.

The Resolution glosses over the fact that our investigators, along with the United Nations inspectors, have found no weapons of mass destruction and were denied more time to complete their inspections, which could have obviated the need to go to war.

This Resolution is brought up at a time when the President's poll ratings are slipping. The world is not safer and adoption of this politicized resolution won't make it so.

Baghdad is suffering new deaths as we debate, our own home turf suffers from its own brand of terrorism. Inner city communities are losing lives in drive by shootings and Americans don't feel safer.

No, the world is not safer and to get Congress to say that it is, is hypocrisy at its worst.

In an election year, Congress should work to bring us together—not to play political gotcha.

I urge this body to reject this Resolution. We can do better. We can truly support our troops without political excuses. We can commend the Iraqi people for their courage without taking credit for their courage.

Write a Resolution without partisan politics and it will get a unanimous vote, which is after all, what is needed to show support for our troops—not a house divided for partisan purposes.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. TIERNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in salute to America's troops and veterans, and urge my colleagues to honor their sacrifices not with lofty political rhetoric but with concrete budgetary reality.

Sadly, we are denied that opportunity today. Instead, after waiting weeks for a budget and voting primarily on uncontested matters, receiving only this week a proposed budget that:

Fails to appropriately address the sad state of our economy;

Fails to propose policies that will create an environment for the maintenance and creation of jobs;

Fails to clearly fund ongoing expenses related to the continuing military efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq and fails to adequately fund force protective measures as well as first responder needs for homeland security;

Fails to fund the President's own promises with respect to education mandates on local communities;

Fails to even begin to deal with the nation's health care crisis;

Proposes pilfering the Social Security surplus; and

Forces enormous further debt burden on every one of our children.

This Republican House leadership—I believe in cooperation with the White House—now proposes to politicize foreign policy for their own domestic political purposes.

It's a disgrace!

The self-promoted "uniter not divider" in the White House has at every opportunity slammed any effort at bi-partnership—this resolution is one more example. The White House has been complicit as House Republicans manipulate and distort rules and customs to wring every ounce of the democratic process out of the exercise of government here, while professing to support democracy worldwide.

After shamelessly exploiting in TV advertisements the 9/11 tragedies and depicting victims (whose families the President would not honor by cooperating with the investigation into circumstances surrounding the incident as well as intelligence and government action and inaction leading up to and following 9/11) and first responders (who must continue to labor on the front lines without adequate communications, equipment, training, standards and support), this group of Republicans now allows four hours to debate a resolution the sole purpose of which is to create a dilemma for those who know the Administration's effort with respect to Iraq and with respect to fighting terror to be woefully inadequate.

The resolution is structured with the appearance of supporting our troops, but is worded

so that it could be argued—however wrong such an argument would be—that Congress endorsed the way this Administration has conducted itself with respect to Iraq.

In essence, yet another false choice for Members: Vote for it, so disingenuous political operatives can claim the President is supported even in his misleading acts and his diversion of efforts from the fight against terrorists and his Administration's abject failures of planning for post-Saddam Iraq, or Subject oneself to even more disingenuous assertion by political hacks—for that is what they would be—who might assert a vote against the resolution was a vote against support and recognition for our troops.

It is politics at its most base and vile level, yet this White House and this Republican majority promote it without hesitation.

Well, it will not work! The American people—even with an all-too-slowly awakening media—is learning more each day that this President and this Republican majority have very little in the way of meaningful policy for America—and far too much politics aimed at benefiting their careers and ideological extremists.

Whichever way people vote on this resolution, it will be clear to America that the President's and the Republican majority's hypocritical resolutions will not work any better than their tasteless advertisements.

The American people deserve far better, and the Democrats stand ready with a vision and a plan to deliver it: Democrats are working to protect and defend America from those who plan attacks against our families and communities. Democrats are prepared to use military force to protect our security, our people, and our vital interests, and have an unswerving commitment to ensure that America's armed forces remain the best trained, best led, best equipped force for peace the world has ever known.

Democrats applaud the troops who ousted Saddam in 20 days. We want to support them on their still dangerous mission, and believe we should be debating giving our troops the armor—body and vehicle—rifles, jammers and other equipment they need.

It now appears that the President's rationale for war was flawed. CIA Director George Tenet admitted that the intelligence agencies never told the White House that Iraq posed an imminent threat. [Washington Post 3/10/04] Former Chief UN Weapons Inspector Hans Blix stated that the Bush Administration made up its mind that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction—and wasn't interested in evidence to the contrary. [AP, 3/12/04] But the President and the rest of the Administration said Iraq posed an "urgent and unique threat," an "immediate threat," a "mortal threat," and an "imminent threat" to the people of the United States. [President Bush, 11/20/02; Secretary Rumsfeld, 11/14/02; Financial Times, 8/27/02; Press gaggle with Scott McClellan, 2/10/03] Democrats want a full accounting of the events leading up to the war in Iraq. Americans should be able to trust that what the President tells them is true—especially when it comes to the life and death decisions of war and peace.

Our troops were sent to Iraq without enough of the equipment they depend on to do their jobs safely. Un-armored Humvees are falling victim to road-side bombs and rocket propelled grenades. Thousands of soldiers are

forced to fight without body armor—and the President still failed to include enough funds in his budget to pay for operations in Iraq.

Americans shouldn't have to continue to bear most of the burden of rebuilding Iraq alone. President Bush's dismissive treatment of our allies has left the United States primarily responsible for the heavy burden of stabilizing and rebuilding Iraq. A year after invading Iraq, we are seeing the price of the President's distorted priorities. American taxpayers are paying almost all the bills—a colossal \$120 billion and rising. Most importantly, American soldiers are enduring almost all the casualties: over 550 Americans killed and thousands more wounded.

Democrats want to work with our international allies. Democrats want to strengthen the capacity of America's intelligence gathering operation, and forge stronger international coalitions, to increase our ability to target and capture terrorists even before they act. Instead of alienating our allies, Democrats want to work with them and with international institutions so that we can prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and keep them out of the hands of terrorists.

Democrats support a foreign policy that reflects American priorities. Democrats want to make America safer with a foreign policy that reflects American priorities—promoting political and economic freedom and human rights; cooperating with allies and friends; and respecting international law and institutions.

Democrats want an honest accounting of the continued cost of the Iraq war. Top defense officials, including Army Chief of Staff General Peter Schoomaker, testified to Congress that the U.S. war efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan will run out of money in September, leaving the military scrambling to cover as much as \$19 billion in costs. [St. Petersburg Times, 2/11/04] Democrats want a detailed plan for future spending, so our troops are guaranteed to get the resources they need.

Homeland security must be a priority. Democrats want to make sure that our firefighters and police officers get the tools they need to keep us safe here at home. But the Bush Administration and the Republicans' budgets fail to provide the funding we need to address our security concerns. Democrats want to connect local, state, and federal terrorist information systems to make sure that every cop on the beat has the information they need to keep our families safe. We want to provide firefighters, police officers, and emergency medical personnel with the equipment they need to communicate in a crisis. We want to protect the long stretches of our border that are currently unwatched and unprotected. And we want to help make sure states are prepared to respond to a bioterrorist attack.

Part of winning the war on terror is taking care of those who helped us fight it. On the battlefield, our troops pledge to leave no soldier behind. Here at home, Democrats know that we must leave no veteran behind. We must ensure their health care, their pensions, and their survivor's benefits. But the Bush Administration wants to raise health care costs for over 1 million veterans, increasing co-payments and imposing new enrollment fees that will cost veterans \$2 billion over five years.

Unfortunately, in a disgraceful rebuke to democracy, the Republican majority has stubbornly refused to offer Democrats any oppor-

tunity to share our vision and plan with the American people—refusing an up-or-down vote on the Democrats' plan to salute our troops not just with lofty political rhetoric, but with concrete budgetary reality. What are they afraid of? Why are the Republicans cowed by the prospect of a fair debate?

My colleagues, just because the Republican majority refuses us a democratic debate, you need not subject yourselves to the political antics of this most demeaning political ploy. Vote no, yes or present . . . whichever best allows you to share these comments and facts with the American people.

What is important is that the American people know our troops are supported, and that their sacrifices and those of their families are appreciated and honored.

They will know (quickly if the press is alert and perceptive; over time if left to their own diligent inquiries and pursuit of truth) that at a time of great national challenge and need for unity, this White House and their Republican majority once again sought to divide the nation, not unite it, and did so for crass, shortsighted, selfish benefit.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Democratic leader.

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense for yielding. I thank him and commend him for his extraordinary leadership and support of our troops. When the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) speaks, we listen. And that is why I will be joining him in opposition to this resolution this evening.

Mr. Speaker, before I enter into my reasons why, I want to call to the attention of our colleagues a section of the San Francisco Chronicle that was published this Sunday: "Portraits of Sacrifice." It has the face, the name, and the date of sacrifice of the 556 members of the U.S. Armed Forces as of last Thursday who had lost their lives in Iraq since the war began almost a year ago. Of course, sadly, since last Thursday, indeed, since last Sunday, that number has grown.

Mr. Speaker, I will include for the RECORD these names and dates of sacrifice and home towns.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in a moment of silence to honor the memory, the sacrifice, and the patriotism of these brave American troops.

Mr. Speaker, every one of us who serves in this body supports our troops. There is no question about that. We appreciate their valor, their patriotism, again, the sacrifice that they are willing to make for our country. When I have had the privilege of visiting them before the initiation of hostilities with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) last year in Qatar, Turkey, and Kuwait, we promised those troops

that they would have whatever they needed, that regardless of what we were on the resolution of going into the war, once we went into the war, once the President made that decision, we were one team, one fight.

And that is why it is so sad that today with this resolution to support the troops that we cannot be one team, one fight. Why was it so difficult for the Republicans to reach across the aisle, say to our troops that we could have come together as one team, one fight, in support of our troops?

Mr. Speaker, it is sad to say that more than 415 of our troops have died, over 415 of the 560-some have died since the President declared in early May the end of major combat with a sign saying "Mission Accomplished" behind him.

Perhaps some of those deaths could have been avoided if our troops had the equipment and the actionable intelligence to protect them, the force protection that they needed. But they did not.

I visited Iraq with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the senior Democrat on the Committee on Armed Services, and, similar to the visit with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the troops greeted him with great appreciation for his service to our country.

Again, we promised them the equipment that they needed. And it is only recently, maybe just this week, that the troops have the Kevlar in their lining, in their flak jackets that they need. It has taken that long. And it would not have happened without the gentleman from Pennsylvania's (Mr. MURTHA) insistence when the \$87 billion request came to the floor, the second request for Iraq, that did not have the request for that equipment in it.

We all agree that our military conducted itself with great excellence. It performed its duties in a way that is worthy of commendation. However, the civilian preparation was not so good. Do not take my word for it. Take the word of General Zinni, who said the level of sacrifice of our troops was not met with the level of preparation for post-war Iraq.

Over 400 of our troops have died in the post-war phase.

This resolution that we have before us today is interesting in what it lacks. It lacks the recognition of the challenge that we face in Iraq. It is clearly an indication that the Republicans are in severe denial about Iraq. They are in denial as to why we went into Iraq, they are in denial as to what the conditions are that exist in Iraq right now, and they are denying in this resolution what our troops and those who have served in Iraq need.

There is such inconsistency this day that I must spend my time on this floor to point it out. There is so much I want to say about this resolution and about statements that have been made in this debate. But what I want to focus on are some of the inconsistencies of the Republicans. Because

while we have been debating here what would be the best resolution, bringing us together, of course, we do not have that opportunity, while the Republicans are proposing this resolution on the floor, they are dishonoring the troops in the Committee on the Budget. They are dishonoring the troops in the Committee on the Budget.

The Bush budget shortchanges American veterans. When he tells our brave troops serving in Iraq and Afghanistan in the State of the Union address that he will, quote, "give you the resources you need," but then does not budget for them, his credibility gap grows and so does my colleagues'.

This budget refuses to end the disabled veterans tax. It does not end the survivors' benefit tax. It proposes new increases in the cost of veterans health care. This is what is going on on Capitol Hill today while we have this meager resolution to support the troops on the floor. It fails to provide meaningful investments in veterans' health care. The list goes on and on.

And the severe blow was that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Military Construction, offered a resolution to add \$1.3 billion for veterans' health. And that was defeated along party lines. That would have been a way to honor our troops. Yes, indeed, it would have.

□ 1900

When I say that this resolution is in denial about why we went into the war, of course it mentions nothing about weapons of mass destruction, but it does mention that Saddam Hussein drained the Arab marsh, causing an ecological disaster. Did my colleagues realize that that was the reason that we went to war, the same folks who have rolled back 30 years of bipartisan environmental progress are declaring a cause of war, the draining of the marsh in Iraq? It was a terrible environmental disaster.

Nobody spoke about it at the time, but there is another swamp that must be drained and that is right here in Washington, DC, the swamp of special interest money, the swamp that says special interest money calls for giving tax cuts to people making over \$1 million, not having \$1 million, making over \$1 million a year, give them that tax cut but do not provide for our troops and do not provide for our veterans. At the same time, we are giving money to Halliburton, who is ripping off the taxpayer while feeding the troops with overcharges.

Yes, there is a swamp that needs to be drained. It is right here in Washington, DC, and that would not be an environmental disaster.

Mr. Speaker, we did have an opportunity and we requested of the Committee on Rules that we be able to present a Democratic resolution. In fact, we had hoped it would be a bipartisan resolution, and it drew upon the expertise of so many; the leadership,

the patriotism, the intellect, the integrity of so many of our Members.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), of course, called for us immediately to offer our condolences to the families of those who were killed in Iraq. That would have been a valuable addition to this resolution. It insisted that we give the troops the body armor, all of them, and the armored vehicles they need to keep them safe. Some of that has come to fruition because of the gentleman from Pennsylvania's (Mr. MURTHA) work. Much of it is still not accomplished.

Under the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. HARMAN) leadership, we had in our resolution to immediately remedy the deficiencies in the intelligence on which our troops rely. Force protection saves lives. As a 10-year member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I value that. It should be part of what we are advancing.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) insisted that we honestly account for the cost of ongoing military operations in Iraq.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) insisted that we assemble a true international coalition to accomplish our mission.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) demanded that we eliminate disparities in pay between our active duty military and the National Guard and reservists. We had that opportunity today, but you rejected it.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) again insisted that we provide for the health care and benefits our wounded servicemen and -women earned for when they come home.

Why could we not have come to the floor with a bipartisan resolution? Why could we not have been one team, one fight? I do not understand it. We all take our responsibility to provide for the common defense very, very seriously. The clear and present danger facing our country is terrorism. Our military and our Intelligence Community serve our country well. They protect us with their lives. We must support them with our actions, as well as our words.

Our military, we pledged to leave no soldier behind on the battlefield. We must leave no soldier or any veteran behind in our budget. Only then will we honor them in a manner worthy of their sacrifice.

The material I referred to previously I will insert in the RECORD at this point.

Name, Age, Branch, Hometown, State

Jay Thomas Aubin, 36, Marine Corps, Waterville, ME.

Ryan Anthony Beaupre, 30, Marine Corps, Bloomington, IL.

Therrel S. Childers, 30, Marine Corps, Harrison, MS.

Jose Gutierrez, 22, Marine Corps, Los Angeles, CA.

Brian Matthew Kennedy, 25, Marine Corps, Houston, TX.

Kendall Damon Waters-Bey, 29, Marine Corps, Baltimore, MD.

Thomas Mullen Adams, 27, Navy, La Mesa, CA.

Nicholas M. Hodson, 22, Marine Corps, Smithville, MO.

Eric James Orłowski, 25, Marine Corps, Buffalo, NY.

Christopher Scott Seifert, 27, Army, Morrisville, PA.

Brandon S. Tobler, 19, Army, Portland, OR.

Jamaal R. Addison, 22, Army, Roswell, GA.

Edward J. Anguiano, 24, Army, Brownsville, TX.

Michael E. Bitz, 31, Marine Corps, Oxnard, CA.

Brian Rory Buesing, 20, Marine Corps, Cedar Key, FL.

George E. Buggs, 31, Army, Barnwell, SC.

Tamario D. Burkett, 21, Marine Corps, Buffalo, NY.

Kemaphoom A. Chanawongse, 22, Marine Corps, Waterford, CT.

Donald J. Cline Jr., 21, Marine Corps, Sparks, NV.

Robert J. Dowdy, 38, Army, Cleveland, OH.

Ruben Estrella-Soto, 18, Army, El Paso, TX.

David K. Fribley, 26, Marine Corps, Cape Coral, FL.

Jose A. Garibay, 21, Marine Corps, Costa Mesa, CA.

Jonathan L. Gifford, 30, Marine Corps, Macon, IL.

Jorge A. Gonzalez, 20, Marine Corps, El Monte, CA.

Nolen R. Hutchings, 19, Marine Corps, Boiling Springs, SC.

Howard Johnson II, 21, Army, Mobile, AL.

Phillip A. Jordan, 42, Marine Corps, Brazoria, TX.

James M. Kiehl, 22, Army, Comfort, TX.

Johnny V. Mata, 35, Army, Amarillo, TX.

Patrick R. Nixon, 21, Marine Corps, Nashville, TN.

Lori Ann Piestewa, 23, Army, Tuba, AZ.

Frederick E. Pokorney Jr., 31, Marine Corps, Tonopah, NV.

Brendon C. Reiss, 23, Marine Corps, Casper, WY.

Randal Kent Rosacker, 21, Marine Corps, San Diego, CA.

Brandon U. Sloan, 19, Army, Warrensville Heights, OH.

Thomas J. Slocum, 22, Marine Corps, Thornton, CO.

Donald R. Walters, 33, Army, Kansas City, MO.

Michael J. Williams, 31, Marine Corps, Yuma, AZ.

Thomas A. Blair, 24, Marine Corps, Broken Arrow, OK.

Evan T. James, 20, Marine Corps, LaHarpe, IL.

Braedley S. Korthaus, 28, Marine Corps, Scott, IA.

Gregory P. Sanders, 19, Army, Hobart, IN.

Francisco A. Martinez Flores, 21, Marine Corps, Los Angeles, CA.

Donald C. May Jr., 31, Marine Corps, Richmond, VA.

Patrick T. O'Day, 20, Marine Corps, Santa Rosa, CA.

Gregory Stone, 40, Air Force, Boise, ID.

Michael Vann Johnson Jr., 25, Navy, Little Rock, AR.

Kevin G. Nave, 36, Marine Corps, Union Lake, MI.

Joseph Menusa, 33, Marine Corps, San Jose, CA.

Jesus A. Suarez Del Solar, 20, Marine Corps, Escondido, CA.

Fernando Padilla-Ramirez, 26, Marine Corps, San Luis, AZ.

Robert M. Rodriguez, 21, Marine Corps, Queens, NY.

- Roderic A. Solomon, 32, Army, Fayetteville, NC.
 James W. Cawley, 41, Marine Corps, Roy, UT.
 Michael E. Curtin, 23, Army, Howell, NJ.
 Diego F. Rincon, 19, Army, Conyers, GA.
 Michael Russell Creighton Weldon, 20, Army, Palm Bay, FL.
 William W. White, 24, Marine Corps, Brooklyn, NY.
 Eugene Williams, 24, Army, Highland, NY.
 Aaron J. Contreras, 31, Marine Corps, Sherwood, OR.
 Michael V. Lalush, 23, Marine Corps, Troutville, VA.
 Brian D. McGinnis, 23, Marine Corps, St. George, DE.
 William A. Jeffries, 39, Army, Evansville, IN.
 Brandon J. Rowe, 20, Army, Roscoe, IL.
 Jacob L. Butler, 24, Army, Wellsville, KS.
 Joseph B. Maglione, 22, Marine Corps, Landsdale, PA.
 James F. Adamouski, 29, Army, Springfield, VA.
 Brian E. Anderson, 26, Marine Corps, Durham, NC.
 Mathew G. Boule, 22, Army, Dracut, MS.
 George A. Fernandez, 36, Army, El Paso, TX.
 Christian D. Gurtner, 19, Marine Corps, Ohio City, OH.
 Erik A. Halvorsen, 40, Army, Bennington, VT.
 Scott Jamar, 32, Army, Granbury, TX.
 Michael F. Pedersen, 26, Army, Flint, MI.
 Eric A. Smith, 41, Army, n/a, CA.
 Nathan D. White, 30, Navy, Mesa, AZ.
 Chad E. Bales, 21, Marine Corps, Coahoma, TX.
 Wilbert Davis, 40, Army, Hinesville, GA.
 Mark A. Evnin, 21, Marine Corps, Burlington, VT.
 Edward J. Korn, 31, Army, Savannah, GA.
 Nino D. Livaudais, 23, Army, Ogden, UT.
 Ryan P. Long, 21, Army, Seaford, DE.
 Donald S. Oaks Jr., 20, Army, Erie, PA.
 Randall S. Rehn, 36, Army, Longmont, CO.
 Russell B. Rippetoe, 27, Army, Arvada, CO.
 Todd J. Robbins, 33, Army, Pentwater, MI.
 Tristan N. Aitken, 31, Army, State College, PA.
 Wilfred D. Bellard, 20, Army, Lake Charles, LA.
 Daniel Francis J. Cunningham, 33, Army, Lewiston, ME.
 Travis A. Ford, 30, Marine Corps, Ogallala, NE.
 Bernard G. Gooden, 22, Marine Corps, Mt. Vernon, NY.
 Devon D. Jones, 19, Army, San Diego, CA.
 Brian M. McPhillips, 25, Marine Corps, Pembroke, MA.
 Duane R. Rios, 25, Marine Corps, Hammond, IN.
 Benjamin W. Sammis, 29, Marine Corps, Rehobeth, MA.
 Erik H. Silva, 22, Marine Corps, Chula Vista, CA.
 Paul R. Smith, 33, Army, Tampa, FL.
 Stevon A. Booker, 34, Army, Apollo, PA.
 Larry K. Brown, 22, Army, Jackson, MS.
 Edward Smith, 38, Marine Corps, Chicago, IL.
 Gregory P. Huxley, Jr., 19, Army, Forestport, NY.
 Kelley S. Prewitt, 24, Army, Birmingham, AL.
 Andrew Julian Aviles, 18, Marine Corps, Palm Beach, FL.
 Eric B. Das, 30, Air Force, Amarillo, TX.
 Lincoln D. Hollinsaid, 27, Army, Malden, IL.
 Jeffery J. Kaylor, 24, Army, Clifton, VA.
 Jesus Martin Antonio Medellin, 21, Marine Corps, Fort Worth, TX.
 Anthony S. Miller, 19, Army, San Antonio, TX.
 George A. Mitchell, 35, Army, Rawlings, MD.
 William R. Watkins III, 37, Air Force, Danville, VA.
 Henry L. Brown, 22, Army, Natchez, MS.
 Juan Guadalupe Garza Jr., 20, Marine Corps, Temperance, MI.
 John W. Marshall, 50, Army, Los Angeles, CA.
 Jason M. Meyer, 23, Army, Swartz Creek, MI.
 Scott D. Sather, 29, Air Force, Clio, MI.
 Robert A. Stever, 36, Army, Pendleton, OR.
 Jeffrey E. Bohr Jr., 39, Marine Corps, Ossian, IA.
 Terry W. Hemingway, 39, Army, Willingboro, NJ.
 Riayan A. Tejada, 26, Marine Corps, New York, NY.
 Jesus A. Gonzalez, 22, Marine Corps, Indio, CA.
 David E. Owens Jr., 20, Marine Corps, Winchester, VA.
 Gil Mercado, 25, Army, Paterson, NJ.
 John E. Brown, 21, Army, Troy, AL.
 Thomas A. Foley III, 23, Army, Dresden, TN.
 Armando A. Gonzalez, 25, Marine Corps, Hialeah, FL.
 Richard A. Goward, 32, Army, Midland, MI.
 Joseph P. Mayek, 20, Army, Rock Springs, WY.
 Jason David Mileo, 20, Marine Corps, Centerville, MD.
 John T. Rivero, 23, Army, Tampa, FL.
 Andrew T. Arnold, 30, Marine Corps, Spring, TX.
 Roy R. Buckley, 24, Army, Merrillville, IN.
 Robert W. Channell Jr., 36, Marine Corps, Tuscaloosa, AL.
 Alan D. Lam, 19, Marine Corps, Snow Camp, NC.
 Troy D. Jenkins, 25, Army, Ridgecrest, CA.
 Osbaldo Orozco, 26, Army, Delano, CA.
 Narson B. Sullivan, 21, Army, North Brunswick, NJ.
 Joe J. Garza, 43, Army, Robtown, TX.
 Jesse A. Givens, 34, Army, Springfiel, MO.
 Sean C. Reynolds, 25, Army, East Lansing, MI.
 Jason L. Deibler, 20, Army, Coeburn, VA.
 Marlin T. Rockhold, 23, Army, Hamilton, OH.
 Cedric E. Bruns, 22, Marine Corps, Vancouver, WA.
 Richard P. Carl, 26, Army, King Hill, ID.
 Hans N. Gukeisen, 31, Army, Lead, SD.
 Brian K. Van Dusen, 39, Army, Columbus, OH.
 Matthew R. Smith, 20, Marine Corps, Anderson, IN.
 Jakub Henryk Kowalik, 21, Marine Corps, Schaumburg, IL.
 Jose Franci Gonzalez Rodriguez, 19, Marine Corps, Norwalk, CA.
 Patrick Lee Griffin Jr., 31, Air Force, Elgin, SC.
 Nicholas Brian Kleiboeker, 19, Marine Corps, Irvington, IL.
 David T. Nutt, 22, Army, Blackshear, GA.
 William L. Payne, 46, Army, Otsego, MI.
 Douglas J. Marencoreyes, 28, Marine Corps, Chino, CA.
 Rasheed Sahib, 22, Army, Brooklyn, NY.
 Dominic R. Baragona, 42, Army, Niles, OH.
 Andrew D. LaMont, 31, Marine Corps, Eureka, CA.
 Jason W. Moore, 21, Marine Corps, San Marcos, CA.
 Timothy L. Ryan, 30, Marine Corps, Aurora, IL.
 Kirk A. Straseskie, 23, Marine Corps, Beaver Dam, WI.
 Aaron D. White, 27, Marine Corps, Shawnee, OK.
 Nathaniel A. Caldwell, 27, Army, Omaha, NE.
 David Evans Jr., 18, Army, Buffalo, NY.
 Keman L. Mitchell, 24, Army, Hillard, FL.
 Kenneth A. Nalley, 19, Army, Hamburg, IA.
 Brett J. Petriken, 30, Army, Flint, MI.
 Mathew E. Schram, 36, Army, Sister Bay, WI.
 Jeremiah D. Smith, 25, Army, Odessa, MO.
 Thomas F. Broomhead, 34, Army, Cannon City, CO.
 Michael B. Quinn, 37, Army, Tampa, FL.
 Kenneth R. Bradley, 39, Army, Utica, MS.
 Jose A. Perez III, 22, Army, San Diego, TX.
 Michael T. Gleason, 25, Army, Warren, PA.
 Kyle A. Griffin, 20, Army, Emerson, NJ.
 Zachariah W. Long, 20, Army, Milton, PA.
 Jonathan W. Lambert, 28, Marine Corps, Newsite, MS.
 Atanacio Haromarin, 27, Army, Baldwin Park, CA.
 Branden F. Oberleitner, 20, Army, Worthington, OH.
 Doyle W. Bollinger, 21, Navy, Poteau, OK.
 Travis L. Burkhardt, 26, Army, Edina, MO.
 David Sisung, 21, Navy, Phoenix, AZ.
 Jesse M. Halling, 19, Army, Indianapolis, IN.
 Michael E. Dooley, 23, Army, Pulaski, VA.
 Gavin L. Neighbor, 20, Army, Somerset, OH.
 John K. Klinesmith Jr., 25, Army, Stockbridge, GA.
 Andrew R. Pokorny, 30, Army, Naperville, IL.
 Ryan R. Cox, 19, Marine Corps, Derby, KS.
 Shawn D. Pahnke, 25, Army, Shelbyville, IN.
 Joseph D. Suell, 24, Army, Lufkin, TX.
 Robert L. Frantz, 19, Army, San Antonio, TX.
 Michael L. Tosto, 24, Army, Apex, NC.
 Michael R. Deuel, 21, Army, Nemo, SD.
 William T. Latham, 29, Army, Kingman, AZ.
 John T. Nakamura, 21, Army, Santa Fe Springs, CA.
 Orenthial J. Smith, 21, Army, Allendale, SC.
 Cedric L. Lennon, 32, Army, West Blocton, AL.
 Andrew F. Chris, 25, Army, San Diego, CA.
 Gregory E. MacDonald, 29, Marine Corps, Washington, DC.
 Kevin C. Ott, 27, Army, Columbus, OH.
 Gladimir Philippe, 37, Army, Linden, NJ.
 Corey A. Hubbell, 20, Army, Urbana, IL.
 Joshua McIntosh, 22, Navy, Kingman, AZ.
 Richard P. Orengo, 32, Army, Toa Alta, PR.
 Tomas Sotelo Jr., 20, Army, Houston, TX.
 Timothy M. Conneway, 22, Army, Enterprise, AL.
 Christopher D. Coffin, 51, Army, Bethlehem, PA.
 Travis J. Bradachnall, 21, Marine Corps, Multnomah County, OR.
 Edward J. Herrgott, 20, Army, Shakopee, MN.
 Corey L. Small, 20, Army, East Berlin, PA.
 David B. Parson, 30, Army, Kannapolis, NC.
 Jeffrey M. Wershow, 22, Army, Gainesville, FL.
 Chad L. Keith, 21, Army, Batesville, IN.
 Barry Sanford Sr., 46, Army, Aurora, CO.
 Craig A. Boling, 38, Army, Elkhart, IN.
 Robert L. McKinley, 23, Army, Kokomo, IN.
 Dan H. Gabrielson, 39, Army, Spooner, WI.
 Roger D. Rowe, 54, Army, Bon Aqua, TN.
 Jason A. Tetrault, 20, Marine Corps, Moreno Valley, CA.
 Melissa Valles, 26, Army, Eagle Pass, TX.
 Christian C. Schulz, 20, Army, Colleyville, TX.
 Joshua M. Neusche, 20, Army, Montreal, MO.

- Paul J. Cassidy, 36, Army, Laingsburg, MI.
 Michael T. Crockett, 27, Army, Soperton, GA.
 Cory R. Geurin, 18, Marine Corps, Santee, CA.
 Jaror C. Puello-Coronado, 36, Army, Pocomo Summit, PA.
 Ramon Reyes Torres, 29, Army, Caguas, PR.
 David J. Moreno, 26, Navy, Gering, NV.
 Mason Douglas Whetstone, 30, Army, Jacksonville, FL.
 Joel L. Bertoldie, 20, Army, Independence, MO.
 Jonathan D. Rozier, 25, Army, Katy, TX.
 Justin W. Garvey, 23, Army, Townsend, MA.
 Jason D. Jordan, 24, Army, Elba, AL.
 David A. Scott, 51, Air Force, Union, OH.
 Christopher R. Willoughby, 29, Army, Phenix, AL.
 Mark A. Bibby, 25, Army, Watha, NC.
 Jon P. Fettig, 30, Army, Dickinson, ND.
 Joshua T. Byers, 29, Army, Sparks, NV.
 Brett T. Christian, 27, Army, North Royalton, OH.
 Evan Asa Ashcraft, 24, Army, West Hills, CA.
 Raheen Tyson Heighter, 22, Army, Bay Shore, NY.
 Hector R. Perez, 40, Army, Corpus Christi, TX.
 Juan M. Serrano, 31, Army, Manati, PR.
 Jonathan P. Barnes, 21, Army, Anderson, MO.
 Jonathan M. Cheatham, 19, Army, Camden, AR.
 Daniel K. Methvin, 22, Army, Belton, TX.
 Wilfredo Perez Jr., 24, Army, Norwalk, CT.
 Heath A. McMillin, 29, Army, Canandaigua, NY.
 Nathaniel Hart Jr., 29, Army, Valdosta, GA.
 William J. Maher, 35, Army, Yardley, PA.
 Leif E. Nott, 24, Army, Cheyenne, WY.
 Michael J. Deutsch, 21, Army, Dubuque, IA.
 James I. Lambert III, 22, Army, Raleigh, NC.
 Justin W. Hebert, 20, Army, Arlington, WA.
 Farao K. Letufuga, 20, Army, Pago Pago, AS.
 David L. Loyd, 44, Army, Jackson, TN.
 Zeferino E. Colunga, 20, Army, Bellville, TX.
 Kyle C. Gilbert, 20, Army, Brattleboro, VT.
 Brian R. Hellerman, 35, Army, Freeport, MN.
 Leonard D. Simmons, 33, Army, New Bern, NC.
 Duane E. Longstreth, 19, Army, Tacoma, WA.
 Matthew D. Bush, 20, Army, East Alton, IL.
 Brandon Ramsey, 21, Army, Calumet City, IL.
 Levi B. Kinchen, 21, Army, Tickfaw, LA.
 Floyd G. Knighten Jr., 55, Army, Olla, LA.
 David S. Perry, 36, Army, Bakersfield, CA.
 Timothy R. Brown, 21, Army, Conway, PA.
 Richard S. Eaton Jr., 37, Army, Guilford, CT.
 Daniel R. Parker, 18, Army, Lake Elsinore, CA.
 Taft V. Williams, 29, Army, New Orleans, LA.
 Steven W. White, 29, Army, Lawton, OK.
 Eric R. Hull, 23, Army, Uniontown, PA.
 David M. Kirchhoff, 31, Army, Cedar Rapids, IA.
 Craig S. Ivory, 26, Army, Port Matilda, PA.
 Bobby C. Franklin, 38, Army, Mineral Bluff, GA.
 Kenneth W. Harris Jr., 23, Army, Charlotte, TN.
 Michael S. Adams, 20, Army, Spartanburg, SC.
 Kylan A. Jones-Huffman, 31, Navy, Aptos, CA.
 Vorn J. Mack, 19, Army, Orangeburg, SC.
 Stephen M. Scott, 21, Army, Lawton, OK.
 Ronald D. Allen Jr., 22, Army, Mitchell, IN.
 Pablo Manzano, 19, Army, Heber, CA.
 Darryl T. Dent, 21, Army, Washington, DC.
 Gregory A. Belanger, 24, Army, Narragansett, RI.
 Rafael L. Navea, 34, Army, Pittsburgh, PA.
 Anthony L. Sherman, 43, Army, Pottstown, PA.
 Mark A. Lawton, 41, Army, Hayden, CO.
 Sean K. Cataudella, 28, Army, Tucson, AZ.
 Charles T. Caldwell, 38, Army, North Providence, RI.
 Joseph Camara, 40, Army, New Bedford, MA.
 Cameron B. Sarno, 43, Army, Waipahu, HI.
 Christopher A. Sisson, 20, Army, Oak Park, IL.
 Bruce E. Brown, 32, Air Force, Coatopa, AL.
 Jarrett B. Thompson, 27, Army, Dover, DE.
 Ryan G. Carlock, 25, Army, Macomb, IL.
 Joseph E. Robsky Jr., 31, Army, Elizaville, NY.
 Henry Ybarra III, 32, Army, Austin, TX.
 William M. Bennett, 35, Army, Seymour, TN.
 Kevin N. Morehead, 33, Army, Little Rock, AR.
 Trevor A. Blumberg, 22, Army, Canton, MI.
 Kevin C. Kimmerly, 31, Army, North Creek, NY.
 Alyssa R. Peterson, 27, Army, Flagstaff, AZ.
 Richard Arraiga, 20, Army, Ganado, Tx.
 Brian R. Faunce, 28, Army, Philadelphia, PA.
 Anthony O. Thompson, 26, Army, Orangeburg, SC.
 James C. Wright, 27, Army, Morgan, TX.
 Lunsford B. Brown II, 27, Army, Creedmore, NC.
 David T. Friedrich, 26, Army, Hammond, NY.
 Frederick L. Miller, Jr., 27, Army, Hagerstown, In.
 Paul J. Sturino, 21, Army, Rice Lake, WI.
 Michael Andrade, 28, Army, Bristol, RI.
 Robert L. Lucero, 34, Army, Casper, WY.
 Robert E. Rooney, 43, Army, Nashua, NH.
 Kyle G. Thomas, 23, Army, Topeka, KS.
 Andrew Joseph Baddick, 26, Army, Jim Thorpe, PA.
 Christopher E. Cutchall, 30, Army, McConnellsburg, PA.
 Darrin K. Potter, 24, Army, Louisville, KY.
 Dustin K. McGaugh, 20, Army, Derby, KS.
 James D. Blankenbecler, 40, Army, Alexandria, VA.
 Analaura Esparza Gutierrez, 21, Army, Houston, TX.
 Simeon Hunte, 23, Army, Essex, NJ.
 Tamarra J. Ramos, 24, Army, Quakertown, PA.
 Charles M. Sims, 18, Army, Miami, FL.
 James H. Pirtle, 27, Army, La Mesa, NM.
 Spencer T. Karol, 20, Army, Woodruff, AZ.
 Kerry D. Scott, 21, Army, Mount Vernon, WA.
 Richard Torres, 25, Army, Clarksville, TN.
 Joseph C. Norquist, 26, Army, Oakland, CA.
 Sean A. Silva, 23, Army, Roseville, CA.
 Christopher W. Swisher, 26, Army, Lincoln, NE.
 James E. Powell, 26, Army, Radcliff, KY.
 Jose Casanova, 23, Army, El Monte, CA.
 Benjamin L. Freeman, 19, Army, Valdosta, GA.
 Douglas J. Weismantle, 28, Army, Pittsburgh, PA.
 Donald L. Wheeler, 22, Army, Concord, MI.
 Stephen E. Wyatt, 19, Army, Kilgore, TX.
 Kim S. Orlando, 43, Army, Nashville, TN.
 Joseph P. Bellavia, 28, Army, Wakefield, MA.
 Michael L. Williams, 46, Army, Buffalo, NY.
 David R. Bernstein, 24, Army, Phoenixville, PA.
 Sean R. Grilley, 24, Army, San Bernardino, CA.
 John D. Hart, 20, Army, Bedford, MA.
 Paul J. Johnson, 29, Army, Calumet, MI.
 Paul J. Bueche, 19, Army, Daphne, AL.
 John P. Johnson, 24, Army, Houston, TX.
 Jason M. Ward, 25, Army, Tulsa, OK.
 John R. Teal, 31, Army, Mechanicsville, VA.
 Artimus D. Brassfield, 22, Army, Flint, MI.
 Michael S. Hancock, 29, Army, Yreka, CA.
 Jose L. Mora, 26, Army, Bell Gardens, CA.
 Steven Acosta, 19, Army, Calexico, CA.
 Rachel K. Bosveld, 19, Army, Waupun, WI.
 Joseph R. Guerrero, 20, Army, Dunn, NC.
 Jamie L. Huggins, 26, Army, Hume, MO.
 Aubrey D. Bell, 33, Army, Tuskegee, AL.
 Charles H. Buehring, 40, Army, Fayetteville, NC.
 Jonathan I. Falaniko, 20, Army, Pago Pago, AS.
 Algernon Adams, 36, Army, Aiken, SC.
 Michael Paul Barrera, 26, Army, Von Ormy, TX.
 Isaac Campoy, 21, Army, Douglas, AZ.
 Todd J. Bryant, 23, Army, Riverside, CA.
 Linda C. Jimenez, 39, Army, Brooklyn, NY.
 Benjamin J. Colgan, 30, Army, Kent, WA.
 Joshua C. Hurley, 24, Army, Clifton Forge, VA.
 Maurice J. Johnson, 21, Army, Levittown, PA.
 Daniel A. Bader, 28, Army, Colorado Springs, CO.
 Ernest G. Bucklew, 33, Army, Enon Valley, PA.
 Steven D. Conover, 21, Army, Wilmington, OH.
 Anthony D. Dagostino, 20, Army, Waterbury, CT.
 Darius T. Jennings, 22, Army, Cordova, SC.
 Karina S. Lau, 20, Army, Livingston, CA.
 Keelan L. Moss, 23, Army, Houston, TX.
 Brian H. Penisten, 28, Army, Fort Wayne, IN.
 Ross A. Pennanen, 36, Army, Shawnee, OK.
 Joel Perez, 25, Army, Rio Grande, PR.
 Brian D. Slavenas, 30, Army, Genoa, IL.
 Bruce A. Smith, 41, Army, West Liberty, IA.
 Frances M. Vega, 20, Army, Fort Buchanan, PR.
 Paul A. Velazquez, 29, Army, San Diego, CA.
 Joe N. Wilson, 30, Army, Crystal Springs, MS.
 Rayshawn S. Johnson, 20, Army, Brooklyn, NY.
 Robert T. Benson, 20, Army, Spokane, WA.
 Francisco Martinez, 28, Army, Humacao, PR.
 Jose A. Rivera, 34, Army, Bayamon, PR.
 James A. Chance III, 25, Army, Kokomo, MO.
 Paul F. Fisher, 39, Army, Cedar Rapids, IA.
 James R. Wolf, 21, Army, Scottsbluff, NE.
 Cornell W. Gilmore I, 45, Army, Baltimore, MD.
 Kyran E. Kennedy, 43, Army, Boston, MA.
 Morgan D. Kennon, 23, Army, Memphis, TN.
 Paul M. Neff II, 30, Army, Fort Mill, SC.
 Scott C. Rose, 30, Army, Fayetteville, NC.
 Benedict J. Smith, 29, Army, Monroe City, MO.
 Sharon T. Swartworth, 43, Army, n/a, VA.
 Gary L. Collins, 32, Army, Hardin, TX.
 Kurt R. Froshaiser, 22, Army, Des Moines, IA.
 Mark D. Vasquez, 35, Army, Port Huron, MI.

- Nicholas A. Tomko, 24, Army, Pittsburgh, PA.
 Genaro Acosta, 26, Army, Fair Oaks, CA.
 Marlon P. Jackson, 25, Army, Jersey City, NJ.
 Nathan J. Bailey, 46, Army, Nashville, TN.
 Robert A. Wise, 21, Army, Tallahassee, FL.
 Joseph Minucci II, 23, Army, Richeyville, PA.
 Irving Medina, 22, Army, Middletown, NY.
 Michael D. Acklin II, 25, Army, Louisville, KY.
 Ryan T. Baker, 24, Army, Brown Mills, NJ.
 Kelly Bolor, 37, Army, Whittier, CA.
 Jeremiah J. Digiovanni, 21, Army, Tyler town, MS.
 William D. Dusenbery, 30, Army, Fairview Heights, IL.
 Sheldon R. Hawk Eagle, 21, Army, Grand Forks, ND.
 Jacob S. Fletcher, 28, Army, Bay Shore, NY.
 Richard W. Hafer, 21, Army, Cross Lanes, WV.
 Warren S. Hansen, 36, Army, Clintonville, WI.
 Timothy L. Hayslett, 26, Army, Newville, PA.
 Damian L. Heidelberg, 21, Army, Batesville, MS.
 Erik C. Kesterson, 29, Army, Independence, OR.
 Pierre E. Piche, 29, Army, Starksboro, VT.
 John W. Russell, 26, Army, Portland, TX.
 Scott A. Saboe, 33, Army, Willow Lake, SD.
 John R. Sullivan, 26, Army, Countryside, IL.
 Eugene A. Uhl III, 21, Army, Amherst, WI.
 Joey D. Whitener, 19, Army, Nebo, NC.
 Jeremy L. Wolfe, 27, Army, Menomenie, WI.
 Alexander S. Coulter, 35, Army, Bristol, TN.
 Nathan S. Dalley, 27, Army, Kaysville, UT.
 Dale A. Panchot, 26, Army, Northome, MN.
 James A. Shull, 32, Army, Kamiah, ID.
 Joseph L. Lister, 22, Army, Pleasanton, KS.
 Scott M. Tyrrell, 21, Army, Sterling, IL.
 George A. Wood, 33, Army, New York, NY.
 Gary B. Coleman, 24, Army, Pikeville, KY.
 Damian S. Bushart, 22, Army, Waterford, MI.
 Robert D. Roberts, 21, Army, Winter Park, FL.
 Eddie E. Menyweather, 35, Army, Los Angeles, CA.
 Christopher G. Nason, 39, Army, Los Angeles, CA.
 Rel A. Ravago IV, 21, Army, Glendale, CA.
 Darrell L. Smith, 28, Army, Otwell, IN.
 Jerry L. Wilson, 45, Army, Thomson, GA.
 David J. Goldberg, 20, Army, Layton, UT.
 Thomas J. Sweet II, 23, Army, Bismarck, ND.
 Ariel Rico, 25, Army, El Paso, TX.
 Stephen A. Bertolino, 40, Army, Orange, CA.
 Aaron J. Sissel, 22, Army, Tipton, IA.
 Uday Singh, 21, Army, Lake Forest, IL.
 Clarence E. Boone, 50, Army, Fort Worth, TX.
 Raphael S. Davis, 24, Army, Tutwiler, MS.
 Ryan C. Young, 21, Army, Corona, CA.
 Arron R. Clark, 20, Army, Chico, CA.
 Ray J. Hutchinson, 20, Army, League City, TX.
 Joseph M. Blickenstaff, 23, Army, Corvallis, OR.
 Steven H. Bridges, 33, Army, Tracy, CA.
 Christopher J. Rivera Wesley, 26, Army, Portland, OR.
 Jason G. Wright, 19, Army, Luzerne, MI.
 Todd M. Bates, 20, Army, Bellaire, OH.
 Richard A. Burdick, 24, Army, National City, CA.
 Jerrick M. Petty, 25, Army, Idaho Falls, ID.
 Aaron T. Reese, 31, Army, Reynoldsburg, OH.
 Marshall L. Edgerton, 27, Army, Rocky Face, GA.
 Jarrod W. Black, 26, Army, Peru, IN.
 Jeffrey F. Braun, 19, Army, Stafford, CT.
 Rian C. Ferguson, 22, Army, Taylors, SC.
 Kimberly A. Voelz, 27, Army, Carlisle, PA.
 Kenneth C. Souslin, 21, Army, Mansfield, OH.
 Nathan W. Nakis, 19, Army, Corvallis, OR.
 Christopher J. Holland, 26, Army, Brunswick, GA.
 Glenn R. Allison, 24, Army, Pittsfield, MA.
 Charles E. Bush, Jr., 43, Army, Buffalo, NY.
 Stuart W. Moore, 21, Army, Livingston, TX.
 Edward M. Saltz, 27, Army, Bigfork, MO.
 Benjamin W. Biskie, 27, Army, Vermilion, OH.
 Eric F. Cooke, 43, Army, Scottsdale, AZ.
 Christopher F. Soelzer, 26, Army, Sturgis, SD.
 Christopher J. Splinter, 43, Army, Platteville, WI.
 Michael E. Yashinski, 24, Army, Monument, CO.
 Thomas W. Christensen, 42, Army, Atlantic Mine, MI.
 Stephen C. Hattamer, 43, Army, Gwinn, MI.
 Charles G. Haight, 23, Army, Jacksonville, AL.
 Michael G. Mihalakis, 18, Army, San Jose, CA.
 Michael J. Sutter, 26, Army, Tinley Park, IL.
 Ernesto M. Blanco, 28, Army, San Antonio, TX.
 Rey D. Cuervo, 24, Army, Laguna Vista, TX.
 Curt E. Jordan Jr., 25, Army, Green Acres, WA.
 Justin W. Pollard, 21, Army, Foothill Ranch, CA.
 Dennis A. Corral, 33, Army, Kearney, NE.
 Solomon C. Bangayan, 24, Army, Jay, VT.
 Kimberly N. Hampton, 27, Army, Easley, SC.
 Eric T. Paliwoda, 28, Army, Goodyear, AZ.
 Marc S. Seiden, 26, Army, Brigantine, NJ.
 Luke P. Frist, 20, Army, West Lafayette, IN.
 Jesse D. Mizener, 24, Army, Auburn, CA.
 Craig Davis, 37, Army, Opelousas, LA.
 Michael A. Diraimondo, 22, Army, Simi Valley, CA.
 Christopher A. Golby, 26, Army, Johnstown, PA.
 Gregory B. Hicks, Army, Duff, TN.
 Nathaniel H. Johnson, 22, Army, Augusta, GA.
 Philip A. Johnson, Jr., 31, Army, Mobile, AL.
 Ian D. Manuel, 23, Army, Jacksonville, FL.
 Jeffery C. Walker, 33, Army, Havre de Grace, MD.
 Aaron A. Weaver, 32, Army, Inverness, FL.
 Ricky L. Crockett, 37, Army, Broxton, GA.
 Keicia M. Hines, 27, Army, Citrus Heights, CA.
 Roland L. Castro, 26, Army, San Antonio, TX.
 Cody J. Orr, 21, Army, Ruskin, FL.
 Larry E. Polley Jr., 20, Army, Center, TX.
 Edmond L. Randle, 26, Army, Miami, FL.
 Kelly Hornbeck, 36, Army, Fort Worth, TX.
 Gabriel T. Palacios, 22, Army, Lynn, MA.
 James D. Parker, 20, Army, Bryan, TX.
 Michael T. Blaise, 29, Army, Macon, MO.
 Brian D. Hazelgrove, 29, Army, Fort Rucker, AL.
 Jason K. Chappell, 22, Army, Hemet, CA.
 Ervin Dervishi, 21, Army, Fort Worth, TX.
 Kenneth W. Hendrickson, 41, Army, Bismarck, ND.
 Randy S. Rosenberg, 23, Army, Berlin, NH.
 Keith L. Smette, 25, Army, Fargo, ND.
 William R. Sturges Jr., 24, Army, Spring Church, PA.
 Adam G. Mooney, 28, Army, Cambridge, MD.
 Matthew J. August, 28, Army, North Kingstown, RI.
 James T. Hoffman, 41, Army, Whitesburg, KY.
 Luke S. James, 24, Army, Hooker, OK.
 Lester O. Kinney, 27, Army, Zanesville, OH.
 Travis A. Moothart, 23, Army, Brownsville, OR.
 Cory R. Mracek, 26, Army, Hay Springs, NE.
 Patrick Dorff, 32, Army, Buffalo, MN.
 Sean G. Landrus, 31, Army, Thompson, OH.
 Luis A. Moreno, 19, Army, New York, NY.
 Juan C. Cabralbanuelos, 25, Army, Emporia, KS.
 Holly J. McGeogh, 19, Army, Taylor, MI.
 Eliu A. Miersandoval, 27, Army, San Clemente, CA.
 Armando Soriano, 20, Army, Houston, TX.
 Roger C. Turner Jr., 37, Army, Parkersburg, WV.
 Seth J. Dvorin, 24, Army, East Brunswick, NJ.
 Joshua L. Knowles, 23, Army, Sheffield, IA.
 Richard P. Ramey, 27, Army, Canton, OH.
 Thomas D. Robbins, 27, Army, Schenectady, NY.
 Elijah Tai Wah Wong, 42, Army, Mesa, AZ.
 Christopher Bunda, 29, Army, Bremerton, WA.
 Jude C. Mariano, 39, Air Force, Vallejo, CA.
 William C. Ramirez, 19, Army, Portland, OR.
 Patrick S. Tainsh, 33, Army, Oceanside, CA.
 Eric U. Ramirez, 31, Army, San Diego, CA.
 Bryan N. Spry, 19, Army, Chestertown, MD.
 Nichole M. Frye, 19, Army, Lena, WI.
 Michael M. Merila, 23, Army, Sierra Vista, AZ.
 Christopher M. Taylor, 25, Army, Daphne, AL.
 Jeffrey C. Graham, 24, Army, Elizabethtown, KY.
 Roger G. Ling, 20, Army, Douglaston, NY.
 Henry A. Bacon, 45, Army, Wagram, NC.
 Matthew C. Laskowski, 32, Army, Phoenix, AZ.
 Stephen M. Wells, 29, Army, Egremont, MA.
 Michael R. Woodliff, 22, Army, Port Charlotte, FL.
 Michael J. Gray, 24, Navy, Richmond, VA.
 Gussie M. Jones, 41, Army, El Paso, TX.
 Matthew G. Milczark, 18, Marine Corps, Kettle River, MN.
 Edward W. Brabazon, 20, Philadelphia, PA.
 Richard S. Gottfried, 42, Lake Ozark, MO.
 Bert Edward Hoyer, 23, Ellsworth, WI.
 Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).
 Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.
 I just have to remind the distinguished minority leader that, in fact, every troop who is in country now and every civil servant has body armor in the fight, in the fight. Every frontline troop moving up to Baghdad had body armor, and I would say further to the gentlewoman that the Humvees, the jeeps that we have, have never been manufactured with body armor until very recently to meet the new challenge of the IEDs, and we are armoring them in rapid fashion, and many Members on her side voted against the supplemental appropriation that provided both body armor and armor for the Humvees.
 Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).
 Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman, Chairman of the

Committee on Armed Services, is respected by all of us here. I thank him for his service to our country.

Would the gentleman inform the Members of this body when all of the troops had the body armor? As of when?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, it was a frontline troop that moved into the major assault, going up through, leaving Kuwait, last year starting on this anniversary, moving up through Iraq.

Ms. PELOSI. Starting this anniversary?

Mr. HUNTER. Every frontline troop. That meant every troop that was in the front line had both types of body armor; that is, the old type of body armor and the new.

Ms. PELOSI. As of when? As of when?

Mr. HUNTER. Every one. When they moved across the line, every frontline troop had it. Then what we did was we gave body armor over the last several months not only to the troops that were the frontline troops but every single troop.

Ms. PELOSI. As of when? As of when?

Mr. HUNTER. Every frontline troop had it when they moved across the line.

Ms. PELOSI. But when did every troop have it? As of when?

Mr. HUNTER. When they moved across the line from Kuwait.

Ms. PELOSI. The gentleman knows that they only had it as a matter of weeks, and they would not have had it without the gentleman from Pennsylvania's (Mr. MURTHA) help.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The Chair would observe the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, after this partisan debate, I want to open my remarks by saying I agree with Bill Clinton who in December of 1988 said, "There should be no doubt, Saddam's ability to produce and deliver weapons of mass destruction poses a grave threat to the peace of that region and the security of the world." I could not have put it better myself.

Unfortunately, too many in the minority, faced with the harsh realities of the war on terror, have not even tried to say it at all. Too many seem to be in denial. Too many seem to prefer to ignore the war on terror or choose to see it as "far less of a military operation and far more of a law enforcement operation."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a fundamental debate before us today. Are we at war or are we not? Should the United States appease international terrorists and pretend that they are a

law enforcement problem or fight them as the military threat that they are? Let us consider the records of these competing positions.

First, the appeasement approach. Through the 1990s, the United States and our allies were victimized by progressively deadlier and more audacious terrorist attacks, and in accordance with the international law enforcement strategies, our leaders did nothing. They passed U.N. resolutions and they issued subpoenas and indictments. They wrung their hands about root causes, and they tried to reduce the problem of international terror to a dorm-room dialectic.

Meanwhile, as we listened to double-talk about constructive engagement and cross-culture dialogues, they gutted the national security and intelligence infrastructure of this Nation. They slashed our military budget and surrendered national interests to the higher authority of international institutions. And on September 11, 2001, on September 11, 2001, we witnessed the tragic and the inevitable consequences of the international law enforcement approach.

By contrast, America's foreign policy since 9/11 has been to wage war on the terrorists before they wage war on us. In Afghanistan, in Iraq, in the Philippines, in southeast Asia, everywhere in the world a terrorist sticks his head out of a cave, there will we fight, fight the terrorists, their networks, their allies, their financiers and, most importantly, their state sponsors.

Enter Saddam. One year ago, Iraq was still enslaved, still ruled by an unstable psychopath who started two regional wars, two regional wars in just a decade, who possessed and used weapons of mass destruction against his own people when he gassed the Kurds in 1988, who funded international terrorism and provided terrorists a safe haven; a mass murderer, sitting atop a nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons program, a ticking bomb, a ticking time bomb, a nuclear 9/11 waiting to happen.

So we violated the principle tenet of the international law enforcement approach. We acted, and in less than a year, since Iraq's liberation, a preliminary constitution, the most progressive of its kind in the region, has been signed by its leaders. Elections will soon be scheduled and the human right, the human right of self-determination will be exercised by the Iraqi people.

Had we not acted, as our opponents wished, Iraq would still be enslaved. Terrorists would still enjoy a strategic ally and a safe haven and a financier in Baghdad, and we would still be fighting the war on terror with U.N. resolutions and losing; but instead, Iraq is free, America is safer, and the world has changed for the better.

Now, terrorists have no safe harbors in Afghanistan and Iraq nor potential partners in Saddam Hussein or Moammar Qaddafi's weapons of mass destruction programs. States once con-

flicted about terrorism, like Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and others are now vital allies in the war, providing us with invaluable intelligence and assistance. And for all these reasons, Operation Iraqi Freedom and the courageous policies that set it in motion have won the most significant battle yet in the war on terror, and yet appeasers who endorsed the law enforcement approach, who did nothing to deter terrorism in the 1990s, had the audacity to call the Bush doctrine and Operation Iraqi Freedom reckless.

Well, what would you have us do? Wait until Saddam proved that he had nuclear weapons by detonating one in New York City? Wait like we waited for al Qaeda to prove that they really meant business on September 11, 2001? A war raged and many people did not know it. A war raged for 8 years and our national policy on Iraq was regime change, which had overwhelming bipartisan support and yet nothing was done. Six dead in the World Trade Center bombing, 19 dead at Khobar Towers, 224 dead in the African Embassy bombings, 17 sailors dead on the USS *Cole*, 3,000 dead on 9/11. And you speak to us about recklessness?

People are dying and the course of human history hangs by a thread, and that thread, Mr. Speaker, is the moral courage of this Nation.

In the name of justice, vote yes on this resolution to affirm the liberation of Iraq as a victory for all humanity over barbarism. In the name of decency, vote yes to salute our brave and compassionate troops, and in the name of freedom, vote yes to reaffirm that the citizens of these United States of America will never abandon the cause of human liberty, no matter how terrifying its enemies or tempting the platitudes of appeasement.

Support the resolution and make our voices heard. No retreat, no surrender, and no apologies. Victory, Mr. Speaker, only victory.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the words of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and salute the troops and emphasize that the world is not yet safe.

Mr. Speaker, every one of us in the House of Representatives supports our troops. We are proud of their services for this Nation. However, this is a complex issue. The War in Iraq has become costly and contentious. The American people are concerned for the future of Iraq, and for our own future. They deserve to hear that the House of Representatives is engaging in a thoughtful discussion of the progress and challenges before us in Iraq.

Unfortunately, on the one-year anniversary of the invasion of Iraq, instead of looking objectively at the situation in Iraq and discussing how we got there and how we could have

done things better, we are spending hours on the Floor just discussing a partisan resolution that is just an opportunity for the leadership to wave the flag and pat each other on the back. The American people and our troops deserve a more thoughtful process.

The Republicans put out a resolution, with no input from the many Members on our side with decades of experience on issues of diplomacy and foreign policy. The resolution is deeply-flawed in its incompleteness. It jumps out at me that there is no mention of the words “democracy” or “women” or even “freedom”. What are we fighting for? What do we want out of this struggle? It used to be about Weapons of Mass Destruction, but now we are hearing that there probably have not been any banned weapons in Iraq in over a decade. It used to be about 9/11; now even the President has admitted that there is no connection between Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden. Now it is about “liberating” the people of Iraq. That is what we lost almost 600 of our sons and daughters for, and almost \$200 billion—while thousands of Iraqis and losing the respect and admiration of the world community. But if liberation was the goal, why does the Republican resolution not mention the principles we are fighting for, and the tremendous costs we have incurred fighting for them?

Obviously, I feel the discussion this week should be taking a much different course.

In a time when we are trying to encourage democracy in Iraq and Afghanistan, we should not be hindering democracy in our own Congress. I had three amendments that would have enhanced the underlying resolution, drawing attention to some of the successes that have come from the toils of our troops and the Iraqi Governing Council, and pointed to directions where progress is needed.

The first amendment simply would have encouraged the Iraqi Governing Council to enhance the role of women in the governing process. During the transition from a brutal dictatorship to a true representative democracy, it is critical that women are not left out of the mix. Great strides are being made to provide opportunities for Iraqi women to take leadership positions. That should be encouraged and reinforced. Instead the subject is not mentioned in H. Res. 557. I believe the omission was probably just an oversight that could have been easily corrected with a quick amendment. Instead we are missing an opportunity because the Republican leadership is not allowing amendments to their resolution.

Similarly, I was surprised to notice that the word “democracy” is nowhere to be found in the underlying resolution. Isn't it the principles of freedom and democracy that our soldiers are fighting for? My second amendment would have added a sense of Congress that the Iraqi Governing Council should continue on the path toward making Iraq a free and just democracy.

My third amendment may have been more controversial, but I believe it would have made the most important contribution. Our soldiers are now risking their lives fighting for a cause that has been called into question by our own experts and those from around the world. I didn't vote to send our troops to War, but I understand that many who did thought they were doing it to prevent a chemical, biological, or nuclear weapon from being launched at the U.S. from one of Saddam Hussein's alleged

stockpiles of such WMDs. Now we are learning from Dr. David Kay and others, that such stockpiles were probably not there when War broke out. Other Members and some people in the American public supported the War because they were told Iraq somehow helped cause 9/11. Now, the President had told us that there is no reason to think there was such a connection.

I agree that Saddam Hussein was a horrible man. A decade ago, he was also dangerous to our allies in the region. But a decade of sanctions, precision strikes by our brave pilots, and patrols of the no fly zone—left him basically impotent. We need to find out why this administration was telling us otherwise. It is the duty of Congress to exercise our oversight of the executive branch, to immediately launch full Congressional hearings to determine how our intelligence failed, or how intelligence might have been misused or abused in the run-up to war. We owe it to our soldiers and our future soldiers to prevent future lapses.

Some may argue that “Intelligence is never perfect.” Misjudging the size of a stockpile is, or thinking the missiles with anthrax are in Baghdad when actually they are in Tikrit—that is an “imperfection” in intelligence. However, when our President, Secretary of Defense, Director of the NSC, and Secretary of State are warning us of imminent threats and mushroom clouds—when the U.N. weapons inspectors are on the ground getting unprecedented access and can even bring senior Iraqi scientists to the U.S. for questioning—When we go to war and kill tens of thousands of Iraqis, and lose almost 600 of our own sons and daughters, and billions of dollars of taxpayer dollars, and lose the respect of the world community—that is not “imperfection” that is just a fundamental breakdown of our system.

We cannot base our foreign policy on such flawed intelligence in the future. It is up to Congress to find out what went wrong and start to fix the problem. My amendment would have started the process by calling for immediate hearings and a report to be produced by the end of the year.

But, we could not even debate that possibility on the Floor. It does not make sense. It is undemocratic. I would have liked to support the underlying resolution, but its failure to be forthright, to admit the need for more progress on the war on terrorism and the need for further investigation of our nation's representation that Iraq had at the time of the war, Weapons of Mass Destruction leaves me little choice but to vote no on partisanship.

I did not think we needed to go to War last year, while U.N. inspectors were making unprecedented progress in demonstrating that Saddam Hussein had no WMDs. We could have waited, and focused on terrorists like Al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden instead of broadening our scope and getting distracted by Iraq. Now we have compromised our military, compromised our budget, compromised our world standing, and embarked on a mission that could leave us in more danger than we were before.

As we look at the tragedy last week in Madrid, and then today with the bombing of the Palestine Hotel in Baghdad, we see that there is much work left to be done to make the world safer. It does not make sense to embark on that mission only drawing on half of our government's expertise. We need to work in a bipartisan fashion and in support of our troops

and for real peace in Iraq and around the world.

It would have been a symbolic first step to work together on today's resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I went to Austin with the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) after the President was elected but before he was inaugurated, and I sat at his table, and I said to him, Mr. President, you do not have to worry about missile defense, you have got to worry about terrorism and you have got to worry about nuclear proliferation.

Then I came back, we went to committee, and under the leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) we moved \$1.4 billion out of missile defense and put it into counterterrorism on September 11, 2001. We could not finish our markup that day because of what happened. One of the planes went down in my district. That was the start of the war against terrorism because those passengers in that plane took a stand. They got up and fought that plane to the ground. The plane was probably coming towards the Capitol of the United States.

The reason that I am so upset about this resolution, not only because they did not consult any of us, but because the terrorists worked with a calendar and we work with a clock. This is going to be a long war. We have been discredited worldwide with our intelligence.

I told the story before. When Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State at the time, went to meet with President de Gaulle to show him the evidence of the Cuban missiles in Cuba, and he offered to show him photographs, he said, I do not need to see the photographs, I will take the word of the President of the United States.

We have been discredited because our intelligence was faulty. I believed there was weapons of mass destruction. I believed that there was an al Qaeda connection. None of this has turned out to be true.

A constituent of mine said in pointing to me, he said, Never in history have so many been misled by so few. I said, You mean me? He said, I mean you, Mr. MURTHA. He said to me, Before I voted on the resolution and before we went to war, he told me, I have confidence in your vote; I have confidence we should go to war and put our soldiers in harm's way because I know you have the inside and you know the truth.

Well, let me tell my colleagues, the preamble to this paper is what makes me so upset. We are trying to justify what we did. Look, no question about Saddam Hussein being a bad guy, but that is not why we went to war. If we

took the preamble and we put that as a resolution, there would not have been a resolution. When they ask me if you would have voted for this resolution if you know what you know, I said there would not have been a resolution because the resolution would not have come up because there was no threat to our national course, national security.

□ 1915

This is going to be a long war, and I am going to be right there. I am going to be voting for something that means something. I am going to be voting for the money, for the troops, for all the things they need. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and I stand shoulder to shoulder. Only 16 people voted against our defense bill. I do not think that many voted against the authorization bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

So we are for the defense of this country, but we should not mislead the people. I have said over and over again, do not be overly optimistic. This is going to be a long haul. And if we are overly optimistic and we tell the American public and the international community and they lose faith in us, we cannot win this war on terrorism. We have to have the support of the American public, which has dropped dramatically. And if you tell them the cost, it drops below 50 percent. Internationally they do not support us because they do not believe many of the things that we say now, and we have to have them if we are going to win this war on terrorism.

So I would ask the Members to be careful with the charges that they are making in this resolution. And I would hope the Members understand that all of us support the troops. All of us want to do everything we can; and when it comes to the money, we will be there. So I would ask all the Members to vote for the recommittal motion and let us make a slight change in this resolution so that we can pass it overwhelmingly.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

First of all, I want to say that I have the utmost respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He has been a leader in this Congress for a long, long time; and I have seen him in action in the Middle East and other places. He has the utmost concern for our men in uniform and respect for them and compassion for them.

However, I have to take some difference in his conclusion; and I just want to say that when we made that decision to move into, first of all, Iraq, we all made decisions based on the information we had before us, information that a previous President had, information that we had in the Senate, information that we all looked at. It

was the best information that we could bring before us. I do not think anybody in this Chamber or in this town tried to deceive anybody on that information. I would stand shoulder to shoulder with him and say we tried to make the best decisions for our men and women in this country with the information that we had.

We still do not know where weapons of mass destruction are: if they are buried, if they are in a lab someplace, or where they are. But we know that the enemy at that time had the potential to make those weapons; and for all we knew, they had those weapons.

So I rise today in support of this resolution, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it. This resolution is quite straightforward. My constituents back home would call it plain talk. It is common sense. It commends the Iraqi people for adopting an interim constitution. It commends our military for their brave efforts in liberating Iraq. And it affirms to the world that the world is a better place without Saddam Hussein in power. That is what it does.

It is hard to imagine that anyone in this Chamber could be against it; yet some are. Politicians sometimes behave in strange ways in election years. We all know that. And there are those who have vowed to change our national leadership no matter what it takes. But the "no matter what it takes" approach causes folks to do some foolish things, to cast some foolish votes.

How can anyone vote against a resolution that commends our troops as they fight a just war overseas? How can anyone defend a dictator who used rape rooms as a matter of state policy? How can anyone forget the 400,000 victims in mass graves that had already been found in Iraq, brutally murdered by the Hussein regime?

There has been a lot said in the press and even on this floor about the victory of the Spanish Socialists in last Sunday's election in Spain. Clearly, the Spanish people have a right to elect their own government. But I hope that the terrorists do not draw the wrong conclusion about that election. Europe should have learned a painful lesson in the 1930s and should never return to a peace-through-appeasement strategy. Our country, the United States of America, must never adopt a policy of appeasement. We must never let terrorists take encouragement from anything that we do on the battlefield or in this Chamber.

We all must say with one voice that we were right to rid the world of the murdering thug Saddam Hussein; that our troops did the right thing to bring Uday and Qusay and all of Saddam's brutal henchmen to justice; and that the long march to democracy that has started finally both in Baghdad and Kabul is both inexorable and inevitable.

Today, with this resolution, we start the public trial of Saddam Hussein. Let us never forget the pain that he caused

countless Iraqis, his neighbors, and even his so-called friends. Let us never forget the threats that he posed to America and America's allies or his willful disregard of the 17 United Nations Security Council resolutions. And let us never say that this war was in any way unjust or illegitimate.

Every brave man and woman who sacrificed their lives, their limbs, or their blood and sweat and tears to fight the Hussein regime did so for a righteous and just cause. This is not like Vietnam. Vietnam is over. This war we fight now is a war against terrorists. It is a war against those who have attacked and killed Americans abroad and on our own soil. Saddam Hussein was a terrorist of the worst kind.

Some of my colleagues might be looking for the shades of gray in this debate, but I simply do not see the gray. Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden are cut from the same cloth. They are both brutal killers. They both hate America with every ounce of their being. And because we are free, we want all people on Earth to be free. And they both must be brought to justice. We have Hussein, and we will get bin Laden.

Take a stand against terrorism. Take a stand for our troops. And vote for this important resolution.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, Halabja is alluded to in the resolution before us. Because Halabja is where Saddam slaughtered some 5,000 Iraqi Kurds with chemical weapons. The resolution appears to suggest that this despicable act—this crime against humanity—provides some justification for the invasion of Iraq in 2003.

But the tragedy of Halabja occurred in March of 1988. And we did nothing then. Because Saddam was our ally. And many of those currently serving in the Bush Administration were key figures in that alliance. They were fully aware of what happened in Halabja.

Our Secretary of Defense, Mr. Rumsfeld, was a special envoy to Saddam. The Vice President, DICK CHENEY, was Secretary of Defense for the first President Bush. The Secretary of State, Colin Powell, served as both National Security Advisor and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs.

The history of our relationship with Saddam is important so that we do not repeat the errors of the 80s and 90s in today's war on terror.

Under Presidents Reagan and Bush, Iraq was removed from the terrorist list. Full diplomatic relations were restored. Billions of dollars in loan guarantees were provided to Saddam. The sale of dual-use technology for weapons of mass destruction was approved—no wonder, after the first Gulf War, that we found that Iraq had an advanced nuclear weapons program. We gave them the tools to build it. We let other countries supply U.S. military equipment. We even shared highly sensitive satellite intelligence with Saddam's army. And even though we knew Saddam was using chemical weapons against Iran, the U.S. prevented the United Nations from condemning Iraq.

According to a Congressional Research Service report, which I will insert into the RECORD, not only did we support Saddam, but

when the Congress tried to impose sanctions on Iraq for the use of chemical weapons, the Reagan and Bush Administrations blocked those efforts.

I fear now we are forging similar unholy alliances in our war on terror. In Uzbekistan we are supporting a tyrant who, according to our own State Department, heads an oppressive regime that has more than 5,000 political prisoners. In Turkmenistan, we are allied with another Stalinist thug, by the name of Turkmenbashi, who has created a personality cult that rivals Saddam's. He's renamed January after himself, and the month of April after his mother.

So let us remember the lessons of Halabja. If we are going to speak of democracy and liberty, let us practice it. If we are going to talk about human rights, let us defend them. If we are sincere about the war on terror, let us not ally ourselves with those illegitimate heads of state who terrorize their own people. Let us keep what credibility we have left.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my support for H. Res. 557.

As I have done since the beginning of this war, I continue to focus my attention on the fine men and women of the Armed Forces that have fought so valiantly in Iraq. In particular I am pleased to recognize the contributions of the National Guard and Reserve.

The citizen soldiers of the Guard and Reserve left behind their families and careers to serve their country. We must continue to recognize those family members and employers who have also sacrificed over the last year while their loved ones served in harm's way thousands of miles away.

Today, three units from the Connecticut National Guard continue to serve in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, while one unit has returned and yet another prepares to deploy. I had the unique opportunity to meet with many of these fine soldiers in theater during my October trip to Iraq last year. Their morale and conviction for the mission remain as strong today as it was when they deployed.

We must remember that work here in Congress remains to insure that both active duty soldiers and our Guard and Reserve units continue to get the support they need. We must continue to see an increase in the flow of up-armored HMMWVs and up-armor kits and body armor to theater. We must also make sure the troops know that the American people support their efforts in securing a world free from the threat of terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I was not able to make the roll call vote for H. Res. 557, but had I been in attendance I ask that the RECORD reflect that I would have voted "yea," joining with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in commending the members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces for liberating Iraq. I am grateful for their valiant service.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I believe the resolution before us only tells part of the story about our efforts in Iraq. I will vote for this resolution because of my thanks to our brave service personnel for their efforts and my hope for the creation of a free and democratic Iraq, but I am deeply disappointed in the partisan way that such an important resolution is being used to further divide our country.

This resolution portrays the case that we went to Iraq solely based on the brutality of

Saddam Hussein's regime. Americans were told that Saddam Hussein presented a clear and immediate danger to the safety of the United States, and our soldiers were told they were going to Iraq to protect our country from a direct attack on our soil. We now know that justification to be false, and I believe it is a disservice to our soldiers who are risking their lives and our citizens if we do not honestly address the failures in the use of intelligence.

Saddam Hussein was a brutal tyrant who oppressed and murdered his people. It is good that he is gone. The Iraqi people now have the opportunity to create something they have never had: a free and stable country. That is a goal that I fully support.

I am proud of our military personnel for performing above and beyond the call of duty. They have demonstrated that they are the best fighting force in the world, and we should show our gratitude for the professionalism and skill with which they have carried out their mission.

But that is not the whole story. This resolution fails to recognize the great sacrifices made by our military personnel and their families, or offer condolences to the over 540 families who have made the ultimate sacrifice. This resolution offers no recognition of the dedication shown by our citizen soldiers who have been asked to serve in far greater and more dangerous capacity than many of them ever imagined. We cannot afford to forget these sacrifices.

If we truly wish to honor our soldiers. I ask my colleagues to work together in a bipartisan way to provide not just words, but actions. We need to provide the proper support so that they may safely carry out their mission, and we need to recognize that our responsibility to our soldiers does not end when they take off the uniform. We need to recognize that caring for the veterans of this country and the veterans of this war is part of the cost of defending our Nation.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I support our courageous men and women in uniform who are bearing the burden of this military action in Iraq. I am deeply grateful for their patriotism, and their sacrifice.

Unfortunately, this resolution does not simply support our troops—it is an endorsement of this President's policy of unilateral, preemptive military action, and it makes the dubious assertion that the world today is safer than it was before the Iraq war began.

Considering that the President's budget does not request a single dollar for the ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan or provide the health care and benefits that our wounded servicemen and women deserve when they come home, I find it deeply ironic that the leadership of this House is so eager to offer a resolution praising our troops but empty of material support.

I would have happily supported an honest and fair resolution expressing support for our troops, but that is not what we are being asked to vote on today. The fact is President Bush and the Republican majority have not provided our troops in Iraq the body armor and armored vehicles they need to be as safe as they can be. The Administration has not explained its faulty "intelligence" to justify the decision to go to war or its failure to plan adequately for the post-war occupation of Iraq. The President clearly has not provided the Congress with an accurate accounting for the

costs of the ongoing military operations in Iraq.

This resolution makes no mention of the more than 550 American service men and women who have been killed, another 2,500 Americans wounded, many grievously, or the thousands of Iraqis who have died during this conflict. Nor does this resolution mention the more than 200 people killed just last week in Madrid, and those who have been killed in numerous other terrorist attacks since the war began. It is hypocritical and disingenuous for the sponsors of this resolution to claim that the world is a safer place while ignoring the fact that terrorist operations in response to our occupation of Iraq are occurring with alarming frequency.

Mr. Speaker, like all of my colleagues, I am happy that Saddam Hussein no longer has the power to abuse and slaughter his own people—but unlike the claim made in this resolution, I do not believe that the world is a safer, less dangerous place than it was twelve months ago. Nor do I believe that we have provided our troops everything that they need to do their job properly.

The resolution that we are voting on today is really just a reminder of what the Bush Administration would like us to forget from the past year—the hidden costs, the faulty intelligence, the failure to find weapons of mass destruction, the false claims of links between al-Qaeda and Saddam Hussein, and the rising number of dead and wounded—and I cannot support it.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as it should be, military service is being held in high esteem. What strikes me when I visit our military bases and Walter Reed Army Medical Center, is the age of those who have answered the call to duty throughout America's history. In this war, as in those of our past, we send our young. They are the best of the best. Their motto might well be, in the words of Alexander Pope, "Act well your part, therein all honor lies."

Spc. Jeffrey Wershow, a National Guardsman from Gainesville, Florida, is a shining example of Pope's words. He was a patriotic young man with passion and heart who left this world too early. His dreams included law school and public service. Spc. Wershow wanted to change the world, and he did.

I stand 100 percent behind our troops. All those who deserve our appreciation, our respect, and our compassion. The brave men and women in uniform who have volunteered to defend our country are in my thoughts, and in my prayers. I pledge to work to ensure that they have all the resources necessary to help them accomplish their mission quickly and safely so that they can return home to their families.

I want to salute the 566 U.S. troops killed in the year that troops have been in Iraq. Our Nation is humbled by their allegiance, service and sacrifice. I pray that their families will find comfort and peace. To date, 3,254 U.S. troops have been physically wounded. I wish them a speedy recovery and happiness as they return to their family and friends. An untold number of troops will not bear physical scars from this war, but will struggle with their time in Iraq when they return home. I pledge that I will not forget their service and will stand with them when they come home to America. Thousands of Iraqi civilian casualties have been reported. I want the Iraqi people to know that my heart goes out to them during this difficult period.

May God bless our troops and may God continue to bless America.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 557, "relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces." First and foremost, I believe that it is important to take this time to honor the men and women of our armed forces who have sacrificed under difficult and dangerous conditions to make our military efforts successful in Iraq. It is also important to recognize the sacrifices of the families of our troops, friends, and those who employ the members of our Guard and Reserve forces deployed overseas. Our appreciation goes out to these individuals for their support during these challenging times.

Last October I had the opportunity to visit with our military men and women in Iraq and survey the operations of the U.S. reconstruction mission to Iraq. I have never been more proud to be an American than when I witnessed our troops fulfilling their mission in difficult and dangerous circumstances. While we still have a long way to go in Iraq, I saw many signs of progress in helping meet the basic needs of the Iraqi people.

From Wisconsin alone there are over 1,460 members of the Air and Army National Guard who are serving on active duty. This includes military units activated from the Third Congressional District, which I represent. Wisconsin's 229th Army National Guard Engineer Company from Prairie Du Chien and Platteville, and 652nd Army Reserves Engineer Company from Ellsworth are currently serving in Iraq.

We welcomed the members of Wisconsin's 829th Army National Guard Engineer Detachment from Richland Center back home recently. We also welcomed back members of Wisconsin's 1158th Army National Guard Transportation Detachment from Black River Falls and Tomah, serving in Fort Irwin, CA. In addition, the 128th Infantry Battalion headquartered in Eau Claire was recently alerted for possible mobilization. The people of western Wisconsin are proud of their service and the service of all men and women of our armed forces during this important time in our Nation's history. I also want to recognize the incredible work of the people at Fort McCoy and Volk Field in western Wisconsin. They are working countless hours to get our troops ready.

As the day pass, we must not forget those who have died in the mission to liberate the people of Iraq. Over 540 American soldiers have died while serving in Iraq. 2LT Jeremy Wolfe, MAJ Christopher Splinter, and PFC Bert Hoyer from the Third District in Wisconsin, each paid the ultimate sacrifice to give the people of Iraq the greatest gift of all—their freedom. These young men exemplify all that is good and decent about America. Their loss is tragic; their sacrifices should not be forgotten.

I do, however, have reservations about certain language in this resolution, in particular, the references to the world being safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein. That subject is highly debatable. While I agree that the Iraqi people are better off free from the tyrannical rule of Saddam Hussein, the most critical threat to international security is still at large and still very active. To this day, it is al Qaeda, who remains the number one security

threat and we must combat that international threat with an international coalition.

It is al Qaeda that was directly responsible for the attacks on September 11 and it is al Qaeda that is reconstituting itself as a truly global terrorist threat. As we know now, Saddam Hussein's regime, as ruthless as it was, did not possess an imminent threat against its own neighbors, let alone against the United States. We still need a thorough investigation of our intelligence failures so future miscalculations, that change world opinion against us, are not repeated.

As our military effort continues, I, and other Members of Congress will work to ensure that our service men and women have all the resources necessary to fulfill this continuing mission. My thoughts and prayers are with those serving our country, as well as their families. America is firmly behind our troops and we are all hoping to see them home safe, secure and soon.

May God continue to bless these United States of America.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 577. Under the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein, the Iraqi people lived in poverty and fear. During his 30-year reign of tyranny, he massacred tens of thousands of his own people, some murdered for their religion, some for their ethnicity.

On March 19, 2003, the United States and its Coalition partners launched the first air strikes of Operation Iraqi Freedom. On the evening of April 9, 2003, Iraqis danced and waved their country's flag in central Baghdad as U.S. forces toppled a huge statue of Saddam Hussein. In a matter of weeks, Hussein's decades-old regime was dismantled and 25 million Iraqis were liberated from one of the world's most brutal tyrannies.

Operation Iraqi Freedom was a military success, courageously executed by American men and women in uniform. It was an operation of unparalleled precision and speed, and was carried out in a way that prevented widespread destruction of Iraq's infrastructure, lengthy street-by-street fighting or a humanitarian crises. Food and medical aid flowed into Iraq immediately after the troops, and there was no "adventurism" by Iraq's neighbors or other destabilizing action in the region.

Coalition successes include delivering some 3.3 million metric tons of food to Iraq; all 240 hospitals in Iraq and more than 1,200 clinics are open with more than 90 percent of Iraq's 4.3 million children under the age of 5 have been vaccinated against diseases including polio, tetanus, diphtheria, measles and tuberculosis; two-thirds of potable water production in Iraq has been restored, treating nearly 800 million liters a day, benefiting 3.5 million people; electric power generation has surpassed 4,400 megawatts of electricity in contrast to only 300 megawatts prior to the war; average crude oil production has reached 2.5 million barrels per day and since June 2003 oil sales have generated more than \$5 billion in revenue for Iraqi reconstruction.

One year later, Iraqis are engaged in the enormous challenge of rebuilding their country after decades of neglect, and are working with the Coalition toward the creation of a secure, stable, sovereign and peaceful Iraq. To date, in nearly all major cities and most towns and villages, Iraqi municipal councils have been forced, and for the first time in more than a generation the Iraqi judiciary is fully inde-

pendent. More than 600 Iraqi judges preside over more than 500 courts that operate independently from the Iraqi Governing Council and from the Coalition Provisional Authority.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. forces are handing the torch to the Iraqi people as they take control of their own resources, form an army, build an effective police force and develop a fair justice system. Thousands of Iraqis now provide security for their fellow citizens, and Iraqi security forces now account for more than half of all forces in Iraq. Every day more and more Iraqis who know that a free Iraq will change the world are stepping forward to ensure a more prosperous and free Iraq. And Iraqis who once fearfully followed a fluid and unwritten law now have the assurance of a fair and reliable bill of rights that ensures equality for all.

Some skeptics continue to suggest that military action in Iraq was wrong, that preemption is never the answer and that Iraqis would have been better off left to the will of Saddam Hussein. Today, however, Iraq has been freed from the grips of fear, a liberated people are cultivating their resources and exploring their free lands, and the world is also a safer place because of Saddam's removal.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 557.

A year ago this week a remarkably successful military campaign began against Saddam Hussein's brutal dictatorship. As we honor the brave men and women of our Armed Forces who waged this battle and the Iraqi people who strive to establish a free and open society, we reflect on the tremendous sacrifice they have made and on the hard work that remains to be done.

We knew ridding the world of Saddam Hussein and introducing democracy to Iraq was not going to be easy. During four trips to Iraq since April, I have seen the strength and courage of our forces as they worked alongside Iraqis rebuilding schools by day, and risking their lives patrolling those same streets by night.

At the 1-year anniversary of military action, we extend our heartfelt thanks to the men and women of our military who continue to sacrifice in Iraq. We also honor the Iraqi people who, by signing an interim constitution, have taken a bold step in the pursuit of freedom.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, while I am a staunch and unwavering supporter of our Nation's troops, I must rise in opposition to this resolution.

One year ago, the United States invaded Iraq, a unilateralist strike approved by Congress because President Bush told us that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction and was prepared to use them.

The Bush administration, in fact, assured the country that we faced imminent danger.

Today, we know that President Bush and his advisors made dozens—perhaps hundreds—of misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq. Yet H. Res. 557 makes no reference to weapons of mass destruction, the leading justification for our supposed "preventive" strike at Saddam Hussein, other than to mention the use of such weapons some 16 years ago.

This is an attempt by the Republican Party to rewrite history and avoid accountability for their false claims about the nature of the Iraqi threat. Nobody from the Democratic side of the aisle was allowed to provide input on the resolution.

Let us remember: CIA Director George Tenet has admitted that U.S. intelligence never told the White House that Iraq posed an imminent threat; former Chief U.N. Weapons Inspector Hans Blix has stated that President Bush disregarded any evidence suggesting that Iraq lacked weapons of mass destruction; even David Kay, the Bush administration's hand-picked head of the U.S. post-war weapons inspection effort, has stated that the Iraq war "was not worth it" and recognized that weapons of mass destruction "don't exist."

But instead of taking responsibility for its repeated deception, Republicans now want to avoid any accountability for this misguided war by claiming to honor our troops.

More than 550 Americans have been killed in the Iraq war and occupation, and thousands more wounded, yet the Bush administration and the Republican congressional leadership refuse to admit that they were wrong.

I call for a full accounting of the events leading up to the war in Iraq. Until then, the American people cannot fully trust what their President tells them—especially when it comes to life and death decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of our armed forces, but stand opposed to this resolution.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the United States forces in Iraq. I also salute the troops from 34 other nations who have also fought to liberate Iraq from the clutches of tyranny and despotism.

Our armed forces have performed with the utmost skill and bravery. They deserve our gratitude and support. They have not only been warriors in the heat of the battle and in the fog of war, they have also served as change agents, transforming upheaval into peace.

However, both time and the facts have proven that we were led into war with the weapons of mass distortion. We have since learned that our reasons for sending our troops to Iraq were based on faulty intelligence.

Assumptions about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction were incorrect. President Bush admits that the United States has no evidence linking Saddam Hussein to the 9/11 attacks, despite the Administration's timing conflating al-Qaeda-led terrorism and Saddam's regime.

Plans for rebuilding Iraq were woefully inadequate, and cost estimate absurdly low. Rather than catalyzing Mideast peace, the region is again awash in violence.

The Administration's arrogant dismissal of our allies' concerns has made it all the more difficult to win their financial and military support for post-war efforts.

One part of winning the war against terror is proving to the world that America stands with freedom, champions the weak and aids the righteous. We are failing in that effort.

The Administration has boasted that America, as well as the world, is now safer because of the toppling of Saddam Hussein. Twenty-five million Iraqis will attest to this. While the threat of Saddam Hussein may be gone, al-Qaeda is still a clear and present danger. As recent news headlines attest, the people of Spain are reeling from the dastardly acts of this hydra-headed monster.

The war in Iraq and the intensified conflict in the Middle East has increased anger at the United States, and people throughout the world have lost faith in America's foreign policies.

America's foreign policies should be driven by human rights, justice and equality—values that would decrease the threat to terrorism—and not by corporate interests.

I agree with this resolution on two points: the Iraqi people have been courageous and Saddam Hussein was a brutal and dangerous dictator.

A year ago, my constituents demanded answers to their many questions. How much would a war with Iraq and subsequent occupation cost taxpayers? How would this be paid for when the federal government is running large deficits? Will it be worth it? How long will we be there? All of these questions about Iraq remain unanswered.

I told them that there were no guarantees that we could replace the current regime with a viable alternative that would bring stability and peace to the region.

I hoped my grim predictions were wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I would never turn my back on our troops and our commitments. Our Nation is at war. We do know that the sons and daughters of all our many communities are engaged in the dangerous and unpredictable duties that are carried by the Armed Forces in a time of war. Our military, including overburdened national reservists, are stretched thin and remain vulnerable to deadly attacks.

Mr. Speaker, Iraq was neither an immediate or imminent threat to the security of the American people. Iraq's structural integrity did depend on fear, violence, illicit oil revenue and the illegitimate authority of one man and the party he led.

But was that enough to justify the more than 565 lost lives of American soldiers and more than 2000 wounded that will have to return to their communities where jobs are not available?

Post-war chaos and disorder in Iraq has proven to be just as destructive to human life as the actual war.

I believe this resolution fails to point out that following the devastation of World War II, the United States showed tremendous leadership in the world as we created international institutions and a framework of international law to prevent war and to sustain and maintain peace.

We were the leaders in promoting a world where conflicts could be resolved peacefully and cooperatively. While never perfect, this system of international institutions has been remarkably effective.

I and many others around the world are shocked and dismayed by the unilateral, confrontational approach that the Bush Administration has taken in the world arena.

We must recognize the consequences in the world community of our rejection of Kyoto, of the International Criminal Court, of the treaty to ban land mines, and our own withdrawal from the ABM treaty.

We must be mindful about how our criticism of the UN and NATO are heard throughout the world community.

We have to recognize that after 9-11, the world came together in solidarity with our loss, working with us to find the perpetrators, to break up Al Qaeda and to arrest its leaders.

It should have been abundantly clear that fighting terrorism and protecting American security would require friends and allies; cooperation, not confrontation.

Yet, the Administration instead engaged in a singled-minded drive to achieve its Iraqi objec-

tives at a deadly cost instead of developing a policy to deal with Iraq by working with our allies, by working with the world community.

Even if the Administration gets what they want this time, what is the long term damage to our international relationships? How will it impact our efforts to stop terrorism and protect the security of the American people?

I am worried. The people that I represent are very anxious. My colleague from Maine earlier circulated a dear colleague about this resolution. I would like to emphasize the points he highlighted in his Dear Colleague:

The Republican leadership has scheduled four hours of debate today on H. Res. 577, regarding this resolution.

This amount of debate time allocated to this non-binding resolution is equal to the amount the Republican leadership allowed on the 2003 tax bill (one hour) and the Medicare bill (three hours) combined.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all of Congress and all of America stand by our troops, but we think it is absolutely incumbent upon this Administration to answer our questions instead of debating a resolution with sound and fury while signifying nothing.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Res. 557. This resolution to mark the one year anniversary of the United States led military invasion of Iraq is a partisan measure. The brave men and women who continue to serve our Nation and fight for democracy in Iraq deserve bipartisan cooperation and an alternative resolution to the divisive proposal introduced today.

Back home in the fifth district of Missouri I have visited with families of service men and women to hear their concerns about the needs of our troops. Their message is clear: "We want them home. In the meantime, we want them safe." The Administration's budget proposes \$1.2 billion less than the amount requested by Veterans Affairs Secretary Anthony Principi while the Veterans of Foreign Wars terms a "disgraceful" level of funding for veterans' healthcare. We must also provide active service members with the equipment, training and resources they need to protect our freedom and fight the war on terrorism.

On the one year anniversary of our involvement in Iraq, we praise the efforts and sacrifices of those who put their lives on the line for us every day. Let our future actions on their behalf reflect that. This resolution does not.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Res. 577. This resolution claims to support our troops, yet it fails to even mention the over 550 American service men and women who have died in this conflict.

It also fails to even mention the weapons of mass destruction what were supposedly the justification for this war with its terrible cost in lives, dollars, and security.

And its claims that this war has made the world safer. In fact, the war in Iraq and the Doctrine of Preemption have made the world a more dangerous place. This is a terrible resolution. And it is a trap.

This resolution completely distorts and ignores the basis for this war.

In the fall of 2002, the Bush Administration told us that Iraqi weapons of mass destruction posed a grave and gathering danger to the United States and that we therefore supposedly had to go to war.

This resolution does not even mention this.

Now, the Administration's own chief weapons inspector, David Kay, has said that there are no large stockpiles of chemical, biological or nuclear weapons. He said, "We were almost all wrong." Why isn't this cited in the resolution before us? Leaving out the weapons of mass destruction argument represents yet another lie of omission.

In fact, the truth is, not everyone was wrong.

Mohammed El-Baradei and Dr. Hans Blix, the U.N. inspectors, raised real doubts about the Administration's rush to war.

And 72 members of Congress voted for my amendment to the use of force resolution that would have rejected the unnecessary rush to war and instead strengthened our commitment to the United Nations inspections process.

Last March, before the first shots in the war were fired, I introduced a resolution disavowing the Doctrine of Preemption because I believed that preemptive first strikes in the absence of a proven imminent threat go against both American values and American interests.

We had choices. We had options. We did not have to go to war.

Now we are on the verge of commemorating a year of war led by a President who is proud to claim his record as a war president. In that year over 550 American service men and women have died and over 3000 have been wounded, along with literally untold numbers of Iraqi civilians.

This Republican resolution blatantly and shamefully disregards this fact.

Some of us remember them today and their families. We also hope and pray for the safe and swift return of all our armed forces who are still in harm's way. As the daughter of a retired military officer, I know what we owe to these men and women.

We owe them and their families economic security. And we owe them our best efforts to create a safer world.

Now I tried to offer an amendment to this misleading resolution that said two things.

First of all, my amendment expressed our deep sorrow and regret for all those who have been killed in this war and extending our support to their families in this moment of terrible loss.

As I said, the resolution as written, never mentions the more than 550 Americans who have died. How insulting and insensitive.

Second, my amendment addressed the new world order—or disorder—that has been created by this war.

It stated: The war in Iraq and the Doctrine of Preemption on which it is based have undermined long-standing alliances; weakened the effectiveness of the United Nations; cost hundreds of American and unknown numbers of Iraqi lives and billions of dollars; and have made the world a more dangerous rather than a safer place.

We are not voting on this amendment today because the Rules Committee did not allow my amendment honoring the sacrifice of our troops or offering the truth about the war.

Once again, true debate is being stifled. What a shame and a disgrace!

Once again, this Administration and the Republican leadership are attempting to deceive the American people.

We must call them on it and vote against this resolution which does not mention those who have been killed.

It does not mention the weapons of mass destruction that supposedly were the justification for the war itself.

And it does not accurately portray the fact that this war and the Doctrine of Preemption on which it is based have made the world a more dangerous, rather than a safer place.

Is that the world that we want to turn over to our children?

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 557, commemorating the 1 year anniversary of the liberation of the Iraqi people.

In the past year, our soldiers, sailors, and airmen have performed magnificently, first liberating an oppressed country and now stabilizing peace and security. We could not be more proud of their efforts and dedication, and we thank them and their families for their commitment and sacrifices.

Solid progress has been made in the past year in reconstituting an Iraqi civil society and public infrastructure—after nearly 30 years of oppression under Saddam Hussein.

One sector I want to highlight is the work being done in improving the education system for Iraq's children. This is a critical step in giving them a viable, independent future, and it is necessary in order to secure Iraq's place in the world as a prosperous and peaceful country.

More children are attending school—currently 5.5 million are in school. All universities and technical schools have been re-opened. The curriculum now focuses on teaching reading, writing, and math—not instilling fear of the government.

As far as the Iraqi people have come in the last year, we know there is still more work to be done. Our troops and Iraqis still face threats from terrorists who have no future in a peaceful and prosperous Iraq.

Some during this debate have questioned the wisdom of our decision in liberating Iraq and removing Saddam Hussein as a threat to the international community. Some have focused on what has gone wrong, rather than on what has gone right. The recent terrorist attack in Spain should drive home the point of why we must take the fight to the terrorists—rather than waiting to fight with them here on our soil. This is not a clash of cultures, peoples of religions—this is about fanatic fundamentalists who despise their peaceful fellow countrymen and believers.

The new central front on the war on terror is Iraq. In order to defeat the fundamentalists, who love death and destruction more than they love life, we must stay the course in Iraq and in other parts of the globe where we and our allies work to defeat terrorism.

The war on terrorism is a global effort; it is a long-term effort. Terrorists have many agendas and capabilities. Their supporters hide in dark shadows and are elusive. But the one thing they have in common is the desire to change our way of life.

America is strong in its resolve in fighting terrorism. We will succeed, and we will continue to be patient, deliberate, and consistent in defending our citizens and interests.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, it has been one year since the brave men and women serving in the U.S. Armed Forces were ordered into Iraq. On a daily basis, these brave servicemembers are displaying tremendous patriotism and courage. They and their families have made enormous sacrifices, many even the ultimate sacrifice, to serve our Nation.

I continue to strongly support our troops serving us in Iraq, Afghanistan, and around

the world. My own district has seen the loss of four fallen heroes who gave their lives in defense of our Nation: Jorge Casanova, Atanacio Haro Marin, Francisco Martinez Flores, and Kelly Bolor. Many more from my district have been injured. One of my constituents, Eugene Serrano, was part of the unit that captured Saddam Hussein.

Last month, I hosted a ceremony in my district to honor these fallen heroes and all of our Nation's veterans—those who have lost their lives, those who have put their lives on the line, and those who continue to risk their lives in order to defend our Nation.

We should honor our troops and our veterans. However, I cannot support the particular resolution before us today.

I oppose this resolution not because of what it says, but because of what it does not say. It fails to express sorrow and condolences to the families of the more than 550 servicemembers that have died in Iraq, over 415 of whom were killed after President Bush declared an end to major combat in Iraq. It also lacks mention of the more than 3,500 who have been wounded in Iraq.

Honoring our troops should go beyond mere words commending their service. We should also eliminate disparities in pay between our active duty military and the National Guard and reservists. Some reservist families in my district are struggling to make ends meet while their loved ones are serving our Nation abroad.

We should also provide the health care and benefits our wounded service men and women earned when they come home. I've had the privilege of visiting Walter Reed Hospital in Washington, DC, where many of the wounded troops are receiving care upon returning from Iraq. Some of these soldiers, many of who have little financial resources, are facing substantial medical bills for injuries sustained during war.

We should also take steps to ensure that the families of fallen soldiers have access to resources to cope with the loss of their loved one. This includes adequate funds for bereavement costs and translators for military personnel who visit families of fallen heroes whose first language is not English. When military personnel arrived at the home of one of the fallen service members from my district, his parents, like all parents in the same situation, feared the worst. Unfortunately, the parents were unable to fully understand why the uniformed military members were visiting them because they did not speak English. They feared for their son's condition. Language and cultural differences should be acknowledged and addressed, especially when families are hearing news that they have lost a loved one.

Finally, this resolution ignores the important steps that must be taken to lay the foundation for a stable and secure Iraq. We should immediately remedy the deficiencies in the intelligence on which our troops rely and assemble a true international coalition so that the United States does not have to consume all of the costs and nearly all of the casualties. Doing so will help secure the region and bring our troops safely home.

Today, we had an opportunity to truly honor our troops with words and action. Unfortunately, this resolution accomplishes nothing more than dividing us at a time when we should be united.

I continue to support our troops. I want to extend sincere gratitude to them and their families for their extraordinary sacrifices.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concerns about the process by which H. Res. 557 has been considered in the House.

Once again, a small group in the House—the majority party on the Rules Committee—has prevented a full and fair debate. Last night, I submitted an amendment to the Committee for consideration. The first part of my amendment would have struck the language in the resolution claiming that the Iraq war has made the world safer, replacing it with language about the deplorable and brutal regime of Saddam Hussein. The second part would have added a fifth clause to the resolution, commending the members of the Reserve and National Guard and their families for their dedication and sacrifice, given the extraordinary number of such members called to active duty and their length of deployment in Iraq. Unfortunately, not only was my amendment not made in order, but no amendments at all were made in order. In fact, the minority does not even have the right to recommit this resolution with instructions.

Let me be clear that there is no doubt that the world is better off without Saddam Hussein and his horrible regime. But to put forth a resolution stating that the world is safer because of the U.S. invasion into Iraq, while claiming it “should be” bipartisan, is purely partisan politics. I am shocked at the audacity of the Republican leadership to force an up or down vote on a resolution with a clause justifying the war in Iraq, bundled with provisions that every member of this House supports—commending the Iraqis for their courage, commending the adoption of an interim constitution, and supporting U.S. and Coalition forces for their bravery. My amendment would have truly made this resolution something members on both sides of the aisle could support.

I also share the concerns of many of my colleagues that this resolution does not acknowledge many of the questions surrounding the justification that the Administration used for going to war in Iraq. First, no weapons of mass destruction have been found. Second, CIA Director Tenet has stated that he never said the threat coming from Iraq was imminent, a claim that President Bush repeatedly made to the American people. Third, the Administration’s alleged ties between Al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein’s regime have yet to be proven. In my view, these discrepancies are the reason why the Republican leadership has decided to take up this resolution. I think that they believe if they can get the House to agree that the world is safer because of the U.S. invasion into Iraq, the war is justified. But I disagree wholeheartedly with this flawed logic.

We should be spending our time talking about how to make our country and

world safer. We should be talking about the security of our borders, of cargo, of our critical infrastructure. We should be talking about truly supporting our troops by making sure they are taken care of when they return to the U.S.—ensuring that they don’t have to wait for six months to get an appointment at the VA; ensuring that the veterans who fought before them get the benefits they were promised; ensuring that their loved ones will be taken care of when they pass on. We should be talking about how to help the Reservists and members of the National Guard who have been called to serve longer than they ever envisioned, whose families need help paying the bills while the soldiers are gone.

I have been moved by the bravery of the troops that have been deployed from my district in New Mexico. They include the 52nd Engineer Combat Battalion’s Charlie Battery, the New Mexico National Guard’s 1115th Transportation Company, a group of soldiers from the New Mexico National Guard 3631st Maintenance Company, thousands of reservists, and countless active duty. I will continue working in Congress to help their families while they are gone and to help them with the transition when they return.

Let’s pass a resolution commending the bravery of our troops and coalition forces, thanking their families, commending the Iraqis for their courage in the face of a brutal regime and war, commending the adoption of an interim constitution in Iraq—but let’s allow for a full debate and do it in a way that does not divide us. A resolution on the one-year anniversary of the beginning of the war should not be used for political purposes. Our armed forces, including the Reservists and National Guard members I sought to commend, as well as the Iraqi people, deserve better.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 557. I do so obviously not because I oppose praising our armed forces, but because our policy in the Persian Gulf is seriously flawed and an effort to commend our forces should not be used to rubber-stamp a policy of folly. To do so is disingenuous. Though this resolution may yield political benefits to those who are offering it, it will prove to be historically inaccurate. Justifying preemption is not the answer to avoiding appeasement.

Very few wars are necessary. Very few wars are good and just, including this one. In reality, most wars are costly beyond measure in life and limb and economic hardship, including this one. There have been 566 deaths, 10,000 casualties, and hundreds of billions of dollars for a “victory” that remains elusive. Rather than bragging of victory we should recognize that the war that rages on has intensified and spread, leaving our allies and our own people less safe.

Denying that we are interested in oil and that occupying an Islamic country is not an affront to the sensitivities of most Arabs and Muslims is foolhardy. Reasserting U.N. Security Council resolutions as the justification for war further emphasizes our sacrifice of sov-

ereignty and Congress’s reneging on its Constitutional responsibility on war.

This resolution seems to forget that for too long we were staunch military and economic allies of Saddam Hussein. This in itself only demonstrates the folly of our policy of foreign meddling over many decades from the days of the U.S. installing the Shah of Iran to the current world-wide spread of hostilities and hatred, our unnecessary intervention abroad shows so clearly how unintended consequences come back to haunt generation after generation.

Someday our leaders ought to ask why Switzerland, Sweden, Canada, Mexico and many other nations are not potential targets of an attack by Islamic extremists.

Falsely claiming that al-Qaeda was aligned with Saddam Hussein and using this as a rallying cry to war has now resulted in al-Qaeda actually having a strong presence and influence in Iraq. Falsely claiming that Iraq had a supply of weapons of mass destruction has resulted in a dramatic loss of U.S. credibility, as anti-Americanism spreads around the world. As a result of this, al-Qaeda recruitment sadly has been dramatically boosted.

That Saddam Hussein was a brutal dictator was never in question, so reaffirming it here is unnecessary. What we must keep in mind, however, is that Saddam Hussein was attacking his own people and making war on Iran when he was essentially an ally of the United States—to the point where the U.S. Government assisted him in his war on Iran. This support is made all the more clear when viewing recently-declassified State Department cables in the days after Donald Rumsfeld traveled to Iraq as a U.S. envoy in 1983. Here are two such examples:

(1) United States Embassy in the United Kingdom Cable from Charles H. Price II to the Department of State. “Rumsfeld One-on-One Meeting with Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister,” December 21, 1983.

Presidential envoy Donald Rumsfeld and Tariq Aziz meet for two and one-half hours and agree that “the U.S. and Iraq shared many common interests,” including peace in the Persian Gulf, the desire to diminish the influence of Iran and Syria, and support for reintegrating Egypt, isolated since its unilateral peace with Israel, into the Arab world. Rumsfeld comments on Iraq’s oil exports, suggests alternative pipeline facilities, and discusses opposition to international terrorism and support for a fair Arab-Israeli peace. He and Aziz discuss the Iran-Iraq war “in detail.” Rumsfeld says that the administration wants an end to the war, and offers “our willingness to do more.” He mentions chemical weapons, possible escalation of fighting in the Gulf, and human rights as impediments to the U.S. government’s desire to do more to help Iraq, then shifts the conversation to U.S. opposition to Syria’s role in Lebanon.

(2) Department of State, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Action Memorandum from Richard W. Murphy to Lawrence S. Eagleburger. “EXIM [Export-Import] Bank Financing for Iraq” [Includes Letter From Lawrence S. Eagleburger to William Draper, Dated December 24, 1983], December 22, 1983.

Pursuant to the Reagan administration’s policy of increasing support for Iraq, the State Department advises Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Lawrence Eagleburger to urge the U.S. Export-Import

Bank to provide Iraq with financial credits. Eagleburger signs a letter to Eximbank saying that since Saddam Hussein had complied with U.S. requests, and announced the end of all aid to the principal terrorist group of concern to the U.S., and expelled its leader (Abu Nidal), "The terrorism issue, therefore, should no longer be an impediment to EXIM financing for U.S. sales to Iraq." The financing is to signal U.S. belief in Iraq's future economic viability, secure a foothold in the potentially large Iraqi market, and "go far to show our support for Iraq in a practical, neutral context."

This resolution praises the new constitution for Iraq, written by U.S. experts and appointees. No one stops to consider the folly of the U.S. and the West believing they can write a constitution for a country with a completely different political and social history than ours. The constitution that the occupying forces have come up with is unworkable and absurd. It also will saddle the Iraqi people with an enormous and socialist-oriented government. In this, we are doing the Iraqi people no favor.

Article 14 of the new constitution grants the Iraqi people the "right" to "security, education, health care, and social security," and affirms that "the Iraqi state . . . shall strive to provide prosperity and employment opportunities to the people." This sounds more like the constitution of the old USSR than that of a free and market-oriented society.

Further, this constitution declares that Iraqi citizens "shall not be permitted to possess, bear, buy, or sell arms" except by special license—denying the right of self defense to the Iraqi people just as their security situation continues to deteriorate. The Iraqi constitution also sets up a quota system for the Iraqi electoral system, stating that women should "constitute no less than one-quarter of the members of the National Assembly." Is this kind of social engineering in Iraq on very left-liberal lines really appropriate? Are we doing the Iraqi people any favors with this approach?

We all praise our troops and support them. Had this bill merely done that I would have been an enthusiastic supporter. But in politicizing the issue rather than simply praising the armed forces, I regret that I cannot support it. Challenging one's patriotism for not supporting this resolution and our policy in the Persian Gulf, however, is not appropriate.

We should all be cautious in endorsing and financing a policy that unfortunately expands the war rather than ending it. That, sadly, is what this legislation does.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our troops and the work of our armed forces in Iraq. About a year ago, our troops embarked on a mission to liberate the people of Iraq and end the threat posed by Saddam Hussein.

Looking back on the year, it is important that we remind ourselves of the nature of the threat against the United States, the Middle East, and the Iraqi people. Saddam Hussein was nothing short of evil. He threatened his neighbors through war and invasion. He threatened his people through rape, torture, and intimidation. He threatened the United States through years of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons development. Thanks to the brave efforts of the American armed forces and our Coalition allies, we are now safer. Terrorists still prowl the earth but one of their protectors and one who wanted to add WMD to terrorism is finished.

The mission has not been easy. These are attacks by terrorist and Baathist forces who remain determined to undermine the United States, the war on terror, and democracy in Iraq. Our troops, however, are equally determined to root out and destroy these forces. Despite news reports and a constant barrage of negative commentary on our mission's success, American military personnel have routed the main Iraqi forces, rounded up countless rebels, and restored much of Iraq's long neglected infrastructure.

I had the opportunity and honor to visit our troops in Iraq in January. I visited with a number of troops from my district and the State of Indiana. Among these troops and among troops in general, I saw no signs of the low spirits that some media reports say are plaguing troops. The troops I met complained about the food, sand fleas and weather conditions, but felt their service is worthwhile.

None of Iraq's rehabilitation and reconstruction would have been possible without the hard work of American and Allied troops, including the thousands of National Guardsmen and Reservists who put their civilian lives on hold to serve their country. Our military relies increasingly on National Guard and Reserve units to supplement regular army deployments, and the liberation of Iraq was no exception. During this war, members of the 1-293rd Army National Guard Infantry unit and the 122nd Air National Guard Fighter Wing from the Third District of Indiana served our nation and kept us secure.

I rise support of this resolution because I think the worst thing would be for our troops to think there isn't support for them or their mission in the United States. This resolution sends a message to our troops that we support them. The U.S. mission was and remains justified. Our troops were and remain the key to this mission's success. I will continue to support the American troops in the field and those who have returned from their duty.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution. We ought to be honoring those who gave their lives, their limbs and sacrificed their futures for our country. So far, 565 service members have lost their lives, more than 3,000 have been wounded—many losing limbs—and now we are seeing American civilians becoming targets.

Instead, we are here today making hollow political pronouncements that the war was right and just and that somehow our Nation and our world are more secure. Unfortunately, the opposite appears to be true. Americans are less safe and the world is more dangerous—precisely because of the Bush policy in Iraq.

On this anniversary of the war we ought to include in this resolution the names of the heroes who gave their lives. We ought to be honoring and commending these brave Americans for what they have given and sacrificed along with the troops who continue to serve valiantly. But, the Bush administration doesn't want to talk about—or expose—the 565 Americans who've been killed and the 3,254 wounded.

The omission of this remembrance demonstrates that President Bush and his Administration are good at taking credit, but terrible at accepting responsibility.

We've seen in the past few weeks the President cloaking himself in September 11th. He's put images of ground zero in his cam-

paign ads. I wouldn't be surprised if he didn't go so far as to give his acceptance speech for the Republican presidential nomination at that very site as the entire Republican Party politicizes September 11th at their upcoming convention.

Yet, President Bush won't attend any funerals or memorial services for soldiers killed in action in Iraq.

In fact, he's prohibited access to Dover Air Force Base to the media altogether. The Department of Defense has broken a long tradition by prohibiting arrival ceremonies because the images of these casualties are an embarrassment to President Bush.

The President knows that American troops were sent to Iraq ill prepared and without enough equipment to keep them safe. Soldiers face daily threats there. They don't have sufficient body armor or armored vehicles as rocket propelled grenades and roadside bombs take lives and limbs.

The President knows the troops wouldn't be there in the first place if he hadn't misled the American people. We now know—far too late—that the intelligence community never told the President or senior administration officials that Iraq posed an imminent threat or that it had weapons of mass destruction. Yet, President Bush continually referred to Iraq as an "urgent," "mortal" and "immediate" threat in making his case for war.

The President knows his mind was already made up to go to war. Today, he should know the world is not a safer place as a result, especially for our troops. I will not support a resolution that falsely makes any such claim.

While senior defense officials have told Congress that we will run out of money and need another \$19 billion in September, the President's Budget does not include a single penny of this spending. He simply refuses to give the American public the plain facts.

America and our security would benefit from a new approach to foreign policy. Imagine a President who embraces global cooperation, respects international law and institutions and promotes political and economic freedom and human rights around the globe. Imagine America exercising responsible leadership that reflects our priorities and capable of partnerships that make our world safer.

This would be a fitting tribute to those who gave their lives in Iraq. We should work for what these servicemen and women believed they could achieve: a more secure future for America and stronger, more peaceful world. That's the resolution I wish we were here considering today instead of this overblown rhetoric attempting to justify a failed Presidential agenda.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our men and women in uniform. I cannot however, in full confidence, rise in support of statements that the world is a safer place for the removal of Saddam Hussein from power. The human and financial costs of war are colossal. This action has been no exception. With the details of the tragic bombing of a hotel in Baghdad still developing as we debate this resolution, we are once again reminded of the horrors of war—and the long road ahead. Based on today's events, and the recent bombing in Spain, how can the authors of this resolution say that we are safer?

No one has borne the costs of this military action more than our soldiers and their families. No one understands these sacrifices

greater than the spouses and children of soldiers who spend month after month, deployment after deployment, in far away lands. No one understands sacrifices greater than the soldiers themselves who volunteer their time, but must sometimes pay with their health, their jobs, or even their lives.

All of us in this Congress want to honor these men and women in uniform. I am sure that we all want to minimize their hardships and that of their families. A bipartisan piece of legislation that I recently introduced, H.R. 3779, the Safeguarding Schoolchildren of Deployed Soldiers Act, would seek to bring us one step closer to this goal. At a time when Reservists and members of the National Guard are being used at unprecedented levels, many of them are experiencing new problems when they leave home.

According to the Department of Defense, there are currently 1.2 million children with military parents in the United States. This number is only slightly less than the total number of adults currently serving in the Armed Forces.

I learned firsthand how deployments can cause significant upheaval in a child's life when the brother of a deployed soldier recently contacted my office. He explained that his niece had moved to live with her mother while her father was away fighting in Iraq. As a result, she was prevented from attending her normal high school because she no longer resided within the school district.

The Safeguarding Schoolchildren of Deployed Soldiers Act would ensure some measure of continuity for children who change residence as a result of their parent's military service by allowing them to continue to receive an education at their schools, even if they are temporarily residing outside the school district.

While I will vote yes on today's resolution, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake that it is a vote of support for our troops and their families; troops such as Sgt. Christopher Kreiger from the 105th Military Police Company, who was informed this week that his unit's tour of duty has been extended indefinitely. It is my hope that he will come home quickly and safely to see his one-year-old daughter for the first time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on this very day 8 months ago, Prime Minister Tony Blair stood in this chamber and addressed a joint session of Congress. He said, "The spread of freedom is the best security for the free. It is our last line of defense and our first line of attack.

"And just as the terrorist seeks to divide humanity in hate, so we have to unify around an idea. And that idea is liberty.

"We must find the strength to fight for this idea and the compassion to make it universal. Abraham Lincoln said, 'Those that deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves.'"

Mr. Speaker, for over 2 decades Saddam Hussein denied freedom and liberty to the Iraqi people. He killed Kurds because of their ethnicity. He killed Shiites because of their religion. He killed Sunnis for their political views. And he even killed Egyptians, Kuwaitis, and Iranians because their lives meant nothing to him or his evil regime.

Today, Saddam's regime is no more. Overthrown in May and pulled from a spider hole in December, Saddam is now in jail.

America and its great military—made up of men and women from all branches of our

Armed Forces including our resilient National Guard and reserves—recognized that our security and freedom was under direct threat from Saddam Hussein.

With the strength of an international coalition, America took decisive action and set out on a clear mission: to defend America. Nearly one year later we are seeing the fruits of our work take hold. Operation Iraqi Freedom has delivered hope and optimism to the well-educated people of Iraq. Today, 25 million Iraqis are free from the grip of Saddam's oppressive regime.

Our operation and responsibility in Iraq, however, did not end with a quick and decisive military victory. Finishing the fight and removing Saddam did not mean we finished the job.

We pledged to see a new Iraq government grow into a model for democracy and freedom in the Middle East. We must stay until the job is done because America's security still depends upon it.

Terrorism cannot be defeated unless we bring civility to Iraq. With assistance from our coalition, the Iraqi people have taken the first steps toward controlling their own destiny. Schools, medical clinics and hospitals have been reopened. An army and more effective police force have been rebuilt. A fair judicial system has been constituted. And a foundation has been laid for democratic elections.

An interim constitution has been signed. Every Iraqi—no matter their gender, religion or ethnic origin—today has the guarantee of basic freedoms, rights and protections under law.

I wish every member of this House could have taken the trip I took to Iraq last year. Led by Chairman JERRY LEWIS, we traveled from Baghdad to Mosul to Al Hillah to witness the incredible work of our brave young men and women in uniform. We thanked them for their service to our country and let them know how grateful America was for job they were doing protecting our freedom and bringing democracy to Iraq.

To see our mission up-close and through the lens of our soldiers gave me great hope that one day Iraq will be a country of great promise and able to demonstrate strong leadership in the region.

On the first anniversary of Operation Iraqi Freedom let us honor every service man and woman who is making our country safer and more secure. And let us remember all those who have sacrificed and fallen while defending our freedom. We mourn the loss of very American soldier and pray for the early recovery of our wounded.

Today, America's courage remains firm and steadfast. Yet, we know that dangerous days still lie ahead. Terrorists who have previously sought weapons of mass destruction from Saddam "like ants to honey" continue to plot against America. The terrorists will not rest. When they're not attacking, terrorists are planning or strategizing about where and when to attack next. And remember, we were attacked without provocation on September 11, 2001.

For freedom and democracy to prevail over violence and terrorism, we must continue to take the fight to the terrorist before they again bring terrorism to our shores.

Mr. Speaker, let us commend the members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces for liberating Iraq by passing this resolution.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this resolution, although I do not approve of the manner in which it is being debated. The fact that the House is not permitted even to consider amendments means that our debate will be incomplete because the resolution covers only some of the issues that are relevant to understanding where we are one year after the beginning of military action by coalition troops in Iraq.

On this one-year anniversary, there is no question but that the House should commend the Iraqi people "for their courage in the face of unspeakable oppression and brutality inflicted on them by Saddam Hussein's regime."

The resolution also very appropriately commends the Iraqi people on the adoption of Iraq's interim constitution, a key step toward what all Americans hope will be the Iraqi people's creation of a new, free, and democratic Iraq.

And there is no question but that the members of the U.S. Armed Forces and the Coalition forces should be commended for serving in Iraq. For me, this is the most important clause in this resolution.

We may not all agree on whether going to war a year ago was the right course for the U.S. to take—indeed, I was not persuaded that it was, and so I voted against the war resolution in 2002. But we can all agree that our brave men and women in uniform deserve our support, our respect, our gratitude for their service—and in the cases of over 550 servicemen and women, their giving what Lincoln rightly called the last full measure of devotion by sacrificing their lives.

But I must qualify my support for one clause in this resolution—the clause that asserts "the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq."

I believe that Saddam out of power is infinitely better than Saddam in power. Saddam can no longer terrorize his people and his neighbors in the region. The Iraqi people are now able to move into an era of freedom—an incredible step forward for a country that has been brutalized for so long.

And it's true that the U.S. and the world are now living free of fear from Saddam's possible use of weapons of mass destruction or his possible assistance to terrorists.

But, while the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime has liberated the Iraqis and freed us from some worries, I think there are still some things to fear.

I still fear the consequences of the Bush Administration's "you're either with us or you're against us" approach. This approach rushed the diplomatic process at the United Nations and dismissed a strategy of "coercive inspections." This same approach caused Pentagon leaders to exaggerate intelligence claims and mangle the planning for the post-war occupation and rebuilding of Iraq. And by going in without broader support and without an adequate post-war plan, the Administration made long-term success in Iraq much more difficult to achieve.

So I'm afraid we're stuck with a heavy burden for years to come. I'm afraid that America won't be safer if it continues to have to focus so much of our attention and resources on our mission in Iraq. I'm afraid America won't be safer if we continue to spend so much in Iraq—\$120 billion and rising—because it will mean we have that much less money to

spend on ways to keep us safe from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, from terrorists in other areas of the world, or from potential threats right here at home. That would be troublesome enough if we were paying for it ourselves, through taxes—it is even more worrisome that the Administration is insisting on putting the burden on our children, who will have to repay with interest the massive amounts we are borrowing to cover the budget deficit.

I'm afraid that unless we return to a foreign policy that reflects American priorities—putting a priority on promoting political and economic freedom and human rights; more closely cooperating with allies and friends; and more truly respecting international law and institutions—we risk fueling the very terror that we ultimately hope to prevent.

I don't believe that the answer to these fears is to cut and run by prematurely pulling our troops out of Iraq. On the contrary, I believe we have to work that much harder to work with the international community to win the peace and to assist the Iraqi people to establish a new, free, and democratic Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important to take this moment to reflect on this one-year anniversary. We can look back at the last year with pride at the service and sacrifices of our troops and with admiration for the Iraqi people, who are working hard to find their way in this new post-Saddam world. And we can look back at this last year to learn lessons from what we did right. But we also need to understand our mistakes and what we did wrong in Iraq so that we can move forward with a better understanding and greater confidence in our mission in the months and perhaps years to come.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering H. Res. 557, which is intended to praise the efforts of the United States to liberate the people of Iraq, and to commend the efforts of our valiant soldiers who are serving in Iraq. Let me state at the outset, I support our troops and their families who cling to hopes and prayers that our soldiers will not succumb to harm's way and will be home soon.

I must offer some sobering words regarding this resolution. I believe that although well intended, the resolution is untimely. It does not contain any input from Democratic members; it does not honor the over 550 soldiers who have died; or the over 11,000 who have been wounded. There is no mention of the fact that no Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) were found. I have concluded that the world is not safer today.

There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein was a tyrant and dictator. A revisiting of the facts leads me to conclude once again though, that Americans and members of Congress were misled by the Administration. The administration acted on flawed CIA intelligence, alleged that Iraq had WMD, and was prepared to use them. The U.N. inspection teams did not uncover any weapons. Their search for WMD was prematurely aborted.

Over 550 soldiers have been killed. Over 11,000 soldiers have been wounded. Here at home, the families of our military serving in Iraq, including reservists, are suffering financially and emotionally. They know that this mission was ill-conceived. Another problem is that our troop deployment is thin. Some of them have committed suicide. The administra-

tion and the Defense Department have our troops mired in a military holding action. The situation is compounded by the fact that there is no clear exit strategy.

As we tout our efforts to promote democracy, it is still clear that we are attempting to export our version of democracy, as opposed to encouraging a form of democracy that will best suit the citizens of Iraq. Iraq has a long history of sectarian strife amongst Shiites, Sunnis and ethnic Kurds. As Americans, we are attempting to export our ideals of democracy. The fact of the matter is, we are still a young democracy. We still have not mastered the process. As Iraqis prepare for the adoption of new constitution, they will still be confronted with the realities of internal sectarian strife that could well undermine our vision and their hopes for democratic rule.

Regarding the premise that the world is safer now than when Saddam was in power, the rhetoric fails to square with reality. Al Qaeda, which was purported to be operating in Iraq pre-invasion, was not. Clearly, there is no connection between Saddam Hussein and Al Qaeda. The facts are clear, terrorist activity by Al Qaeda has escalated. We need only look at the bombings in Indonesia, Turkey and most recently in Spain. Does this mean we should cease our efforts against terrorism? Absolutely not! It does mean that we should be much more circumspect in the way we go about fighting terrorism. We must build coalitions to assist us.

Finally, let me say our allies around the world continue to chafe at the bully of the world persona that is attached to the United States. We are seeing an increasing erosion of confidence throughout Europe regarding the foreign policies being promoted by this administration. The best way we can honor our troops is to provide them with the equipment they need to be effective. We must provide a clear exit strategy.

It is indeed unfortunate that we are considering and debating this resolution which does not adequately honor our troops. I urge the leadership to withdraw this resolution. It is important for Republicans to include our Democratic leaders in the crafting of a new resolution. The new resolution should honor soldiers who have been killed and wounded. It should also contain language that addresses a plan to bring our troops home.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, 2003, we were debating a similar resolution—then to express support for the President and the U.S. military (H. Con. Res. 104). I said on that occasion: "I want to make it clear that our young men and women, who are putting their lives on the line in Iraq, have my unequivocal support. I will do everything in my power as a member of Congress to see to it that they have everything they need to win this war and return home safe and sound to their families. We can only hope and pray that this war will end quickly, and a minimum number of American, British, and Iraqi civilian and military lives are lost, destroyed or maimed for the rest of their lives."

Unfortunately, my worst fears have come true. Our troops, and the few other nations whose troops are involved, are not home. Families and many good Americans are volunteering to raise money to buy for our soldiers the kind of protective vests they need to be as safe as possible in the middle of a war. Many Americans and thousands of Iraqi fighters, but

mostly innocent Iraqi civilians, have died and been wounded. The wounded will spend a lifetime of disability and suffering. They will spend the rest of their lives knowing that they will never be able to accomplish the highest and best of what God had intended for their lives.

I said a year ago, "While the troops have 100 percent of my support, when appropriate, I will continue to articulate the grave concerns I have about the policies that sent them there." Today I am keeping the promise relative to the President's policies in Iraq.

This Congress did not vote to go to war in Iraq because Saddam Hussein was a bad guy. Everybody knew he was a bad guy. There are lots of bad guys in the world, and we are not even trying to remove them. Unfortunately, the fundamental lesson that President Bush has taught our children with his pre-emptive war strategy is that "the end justifies the means."

We were told we had to go to war because Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. Americans would not have supported going to war just because Saddam was a bad guy. One year later, we have found no weapons of mass destruction, and have little evidence that we will ever find them. Why? Because, mostly likely, U.N. inspections had contained his ability to make or use weapons of mass destruction.

President Bush has destroyed the unity, support and moral authority that the world gave to the United States after September 11. The latest evidence of that erosion of support was the Spanish election on March 14.

I said on March 20, 2003, "There is no convincing evidence that Iraq was involved or connected to Osama bin Laden, Al Qaeda or the events of September 11, 2001—despite President Bush's many failed attempts to morph the two, in order to convince the American people that there is such a connection." The attempt to weld 9/11, Iraq and the war on terror continues as we speak. The truth is we have virtually abandoned the real war on terrorism in Afghanistan. The truth is, Al Qaeda was not in Iraq a year ago, but they are today. As a result, the world has not been made safer, as the resolution suggests, but has become more unsafe and unstable.

I said on March 20, 2003, "Most Americans think that when our young men and women are risking their lives on the battlefield that Democrats, Republicans and Independents in this House would come together in a non-partisan manner to support our troops—because everyone does support them. . . . But the Republican extremists in the House have no shame and no limits. They will politicize the blood of our soldiers if they think they can gain a political advantage. They have never met an issue they were unwilling to 'wedge'." This resolution is a continuation of that same strategy in an election year.

I said one year ago, "Many Democrats, myself included, separate support for the troops from support for the President's policy. But the Republicans deliberately joined the two so they could make it a political wedge issue. Therefore, if you vote 'for' the resolution it appears that you support the President's policy. But if you vote 'against' the resolution, the Republicans intend to paint you as against our troops and unpatriotic in future elections. In other words, the Republicans have deliberately tried to set a 'Catch 22' trap."

Well, I support our troops, but I continue to oppose the President's policy in Iraq. I will

vote "no" on this resolution because the world has not been made safer because of the removal of Saddam Hussein. If you doubt me, ask the families of the over 200 people in Spain who lost loved ones in the recent explosions on the train there, and the hundreds who were wounded.

I filed a Federal lawsuit to try to stop the President from going to war in Iraq without a declaration of war from Congress. I believe the President's actions in Iraq were unconstitutional and in violation of international law.

The Bush policy of ignoring the United Nations and the lack of decent respect for the opinion of mankind; the U.S.-led preemptive policy has weakened the United Nations, weakened the structures of "collective security," weakened the rule of international law and has not made the world safer, but more dangerous and unstable.

Again I repeat what I said on March 20, 2003: As the wealthiest and only superpower in the world, the U.S. has the most economic and military interests in the world. The United Nations, collective security, and the rule of international law have well-served those U.S. interests. Weakening any of them increases the threat to U.S. interests at home and abroad.

So today, even as I give our young men and women in Iraq my unconditional support, I also renew my dedication to strengthening the United Nations, collective security, and the rule of international law. They help guarantee peace and security in the world and, when fully utilized, make it less likely that American service men and women may have to be sent to possibly make the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our country in the future.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make a few comments about the resolution we are considering today in recognition of the one-year anniversary of the U.S. invasion of Iraq. The resolution before us on the floor has significant shortcomings that I want to point out for the RECORD.

On March 19, 2003, offensive U.S. military actions were initiated against Iraq. Just two days later, on March 21, 2003, the House of Representatives approved a resolution which expressed "the unequivocal support and appreciation of the Nation for our troops and their families."

Only 8 minutes before passing this feel good resolution, however, the House of Representatives passed a budget, which I voted against, that included a \$28 billion cut over 10 years to veterans health care, disability compensation and pensions. While the Republican Party is able to eloquently express their support and admiration for our men and women in uniform via non-binding congratulatory resolutions, their follow through is non-existent.

Here we are a year later, and this "unequivocal support" has not been translated into substantive action. Congress must deliver on this promise of support by providing our troops with the equipment and training they need. And, Congress must deliver on this promise by providing our nation's veterans with the health care and services they've earned and deserve.

Words in a non-binding resolution will not provide a single soldier with the body armor necessary to protect his or her life nor will they ensure a single veteran can see a doctor in a timely manner or receive the disability compensation they've earned. Our soldiers and veterans need action, not words.

Unfortunately, the actions of the President and his allies in Congress have repeatedly short-changed our men and women in uniform and the veterans who have served our nation honorably.

Thousands of troops in Iraq remain in danger because the Pentagon leadership has failed to secure an adequate supply of body armor. Thousands of troops remain in danger because of inadequate supplies of armored Humvees and devices to disable roadside bombs.

According to a recent article in USA Today, U.S. military officers are having to dip into their own unit's funds in order to get this critical protective equipment because "bureaucratic delays" in Washington, DC, have short-changed troops.

I saw the dangers confronting U.S. troops first-hand during my recent trip to Iraq. I cannot understand why the President and the civilian leadership at the Pentagon would put our troops in harms' way without adequate protective equipment despite preparing for war with Iraq for 2 years prior to the actual invasion and despite \$400 billion in annual Pentagon spending.

Yet, the resolution on the floor today will do nothing to solve this problem.

Further, our citizen-soldiers in the National Guard and Reserve continue to be subject to second-class treatment. When I recently visited Fort Hood, Texas, I discovered that the 2nd Battalion, 162nd Infantry of the Oregon National Guard was sent to train without the basics: fuel, ammunition, toilet paper, field radios and other essentials, and they were housed in moldy, crumbling barracks.

Media reports have documented that over 1,000 wounded Army National Guard and Army Reserve soldiers, evacuated from Iraq to Fort Stewart, Georgia, and Fort Knox, Kentucky, were housed in sub-standard concrete barracks with no air conditioning, indoor toilets or running water, while they were forced to wait weeks and sometimes months for medical care.

Yet, the resolution on the floor today will do nothing to solve these problems.

Next week, the House Republicans will present their budget on the House floor. Like last year's budget, this year's budget will fail to fully meet the needs of our troops and veterans.

The budget resolution, as currently drafted, underfunds veterans programs by \$1.3 billion below the level requested by the Republican Chairman of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs.

The budget fails to repeal the age-62 penalty for military widows under the Survivor Benefit Plan. Yet, stand-alone legislation on this issue has 291 cosponsors, including 120 Republicans.

The budget fails to fully fund repeal of the disabled veterans tax immediately for all veterans despite the fact that stand-alone legislation to repeal the tax, H.R. 303, has 377 cosponsors, including 185 Republican cosponsors.

The budget fails to fund an expansion of the military health care program TRICARE to cover uninsured members of the National Guard and Reserve.

The budget fails to provide wage support for National Guard and Reserve members who are forced to leave civilian jobs with higher pay. These families are forced to do more with less.

The budget fails to provide additional compensation for soldiers who are forced to stay in the U.S. military through stop-loss orders despite having plans to retire or otherwise leave the service after fulfilling their time commitment under their enlistment contract. I have drafted legislation to provide a monthly bonus of \$500 for soldiers subject to stop-loss orders, orders that amount to an involuntary draft.

The budget fails to fund an extension of imminent danger pay and family separation pay for troops in Iraq past the end of this year when even Pentagon officials admit that U.S. troops will be in Iraq for the next several years.

And, the budget cuts funding for military construction and quality-of-life improvements for U.S. troops by \$1 billion from the levels approved before the Iraq war.

The resolution on the floor today will do nothing to address these challenges.

Finally, the resolution on the floor today fails to acknowledge the deaths of more than 550 American troops or the more than 3,000 wounded American soldiers.

The resolution fails to acknowledge the deaths and injuries suffered by American and Iraqi civilians, United Nations personnel, and soldiers from allied countries.

The resolution fails to adequately acknowledge the service and sacrifice of tens of thousands of National Guard and Reserve soldiers and their families.

However, I intend to support this resolution. There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein was a brutal dictator. He oppressed and killed his own people. He invaded his neighbors, and he used chemical weapons. The Iraqi people and the world are better off without him.

But, the fact that I am glad he's out of power and in U.S. custody does not mean I agree that the Iraq war was necessary. The war was not necessary. It was elective. I voted against the authorization for war. It was obvious even at the time of the vote, which occurred months before the war actually started, that the Administration had hyped, manipulated, and misrepresented the intelligence regarding the threat posed by Iraq and that the Administration had not planned adequately for post-war Iraq. The Administration's rosy scenario for post-war Iraq has not come to pass. Instead, the U.S. is bogged down in a costly—both in terms of dollars and lives—and lengthy occupation of Iraq.

I believe that America and the world would have been better served if the Administration had not become distracted by Iraq. Saddam was safely contained and defanged by sanctions supported by a broad international coalition. The sanctions prevented Iraq from redeveloping chemical or biological weapons, and made it impossible for Hussein to achieve his ultimate goal of developing nuclear weapons.

The Administration should have kept its focus on the single gravest threat to our society—al Qaeda. It was al Qaeda, after all, who attacked the U.S. on September 11, 2001, not Iraq. It was al Qaeda who bombed U.S. embassies in Africa. It was al Qaeda who bombed a U.S. warship in the Persian Gulf. And it is al Qaeda that continues to plan and carry out attacks against Americans and our allies around the world. The Administration should not have shifted intelligence and military resources away from the documented threat—al Qaeda—in order to invade and occupy Iraq.

However, I will support this resolution because it is merely hortatory. The resolution does not set national policy. It is not legally binding on anyone or anything. It commends the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of the brutal Hussein regime and commends their adoption of an interim constitution. It also commends the members of the U.S. military for their valiant service. I am voting for the resolution because I want to express my support for the nascent democracy in Iraq and for our soldiers.

I would urge the House Republican leadership to spend less time on resolutions like this, which offer merely words, and more time pushing through legislation that would actually provide our soldiers and veterans with the equipment, training and benefits they need and deserve.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the valiant service from our men and women in our Armed Services. That's why I am disappointed that the House leadership decided to present this toothless resolution rather than provide real assistance for our troops.

They say this resolution is meant to thank the American military men and women serving in Iraq. But if they truly wanted to honor these soldiers—this same leadership should have supported my amendment last year that would have given every American soldier serving in Iraq and Afghanistan a \$1,500 bonus. But it failed with 210 Republicans voting against it.

The President is traveling across the country to mark the war's anniversary and thank our troops. Yet his budget cuts Veterans health benefits—just like last year. Some thanks!

I support this resolution. But let's be clear: this resolution won't save any lives; it won't provide adequate body armor and armored humvees to our troops any quicker; it doesn't repair the damage done to our reputation in the international community, it won't bring our troops home any sooner and it won't heal a single wound or restore a single American life lost in Iraq.

The resolution also fails to answer some key questions:

Why did this Administration mislead the American people 237 times in their statements about the so-called immediate threat from Iraq? As Mr. MURTHA of Pennsylvania stated, "never have so few, misled so many."

Why did this Administration say that reconstruction would only cost Americans \$1.7 billion and that other countries and Iraqi oil would cover the rest? Instead American taxpayers have paid billions of dollars in rebuilding Iraq—and the tab is likely to increase in the next year.

To date, we have spent more than \$150 billion in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, more than 560 soldiers have died in Iraq and another 5,300 have been injured. We owe it to them, to their families and to all Americans to level with them and give them the straight answers on why we went into Iraq and how long it will take to get the job done.

Like all Americans, I am proud of our Americans soldiers in Iraq who are serving their country with dedication and courage. But I am not proud of those in the Administration that may have misled our great Nation into war.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Mr. HYDE and Mr. DELAY, the authors of House Resolution 557, for crafting

legislation that truly exemplifies naked political strategy.

This vapid proposal of phony patriotism does nothing to address the urgent concerns that are permeating the world stage.

Instead of seeking real solutions to the problems our troops are confronting; instead of taking the time to exercise judicious oversight to remedy the hardships that are being faced—we are instead spending a significant amount of our time indulging ourselves with legislation that ultimately does not help anyone.

And we are doing this today as Baghdad burns. How typical.

550 American service men and women have been killed in Iraq. No weapons of mass destruction have been found. Our Nation's reputation has been damaged to such an extent that former allies now have populations consumed with anti-American fervor.

Instead of affirming that Saddam Hussein is a bad guy—which we all know—shouldn't we be spending our time trying to decipher why the central arguments for a pre-emptive war appear to have been based on inaccurate intelligence?

Shouldn't we be examining reports regarding how Iraqi exile Ahmad Chalabi fed misinformation about Weapons of Mass Destruction to the United States government and investigate why the Pentagon is still paying him \$340,000 a month?

Instead of proclaiming that the world is safer shouldn't we be analyzing the terrorist attacks in Spain that occurred last week?

And while each and every single Member of Congress is awed and thankful for the bravery and valor of our men and women in the Armed Services, shouldn't we be discussing what we can do to help alleviate the daily deaths and bloodshed that they face?

And shouldn't we, at some stage, focus our attention on Afghanistan as well?

Wouldn't real action by Congress honor our military more than this? Wouldn't real action be more patriotic?

Surely the leadership in the House of Representatives can focus on more important work than a celebratory resolution?

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our troops and in support of those who lost loved ones in the violence in Baghdad that we all witnessed today.

On a day that should have shown the unity of our government, we have seen the parties divided. The Republican resolution has left out Democratic input.

It has left out our condolences to the families of those killed in Iraq.

It has left out feelings that our troops must be equipped with body armor and armored vehicles.

And it has left out steps to correct the intelligence failures in the run-up to the war.

Even though the Republican resolution leaves out so much, I'm supporting it to show my support for our troops.

After one year in Iraq our troops are still suffering.

Our soldiers were sent to Iraq without enough of the equipment they depend on to do their jobs safely and without a plan to bring them home.

564 Americans and 100 other coalition troops have been killed. Americans deserve to know what happened in the events leading up to the war in Iraq.

We demand accountability. We are tired of the President and the Administration obstructing the 9/11 commission.

We must be able to trust that what the President tells them is true and we shouldn't have to bear the burden of rebuilding Iraq alone.

American taxpayers are paying almost all the bills, \$120 billion and rising.

We deserve a detailed plan for future spending, so our troops are guaranteed to get the resources they need.

Part of winning the war on terror is taking care of those who helped us fight it.

We must ensure our veterans health care, their pensions, and their survivor's benefits.

But the Administration wants to raise health care costs for over 1 million veterans, increasing co-payments and imposing new enrollment fees that will cost veterans \$2 billion over 5 years.

Just this past month the VA said it will cut 540 positions from the Veterans Benefits Administration. How can the Administration reduce the veteran benefit backlog when it cuts the resources needed to help our veterans?

I keep thinking about the young men in my district that we recently lost.

There was Corporal Jorge Gonzales. His parents, Mario and Rosa are from Rialto and they still grieve.

And then there was Corporal Sean Grilley of San Bernardino who was killed while he was enforcing a curfew.

These brave men and their families deserve truthful accountability so our soldiers are protected, our veterans are taken care of and our troops can come home as soon as possible.

Mrs. CAPP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this resolution. Our troops should not be a pawn in a political power play. This resolution is not a simple statement of support for the incredibly valiant work of our men and women in Iraq. It is a cynical, political tool to further the agenda of the Bush Administration during this election year.

This resolution was pushed through the House of Representatives without input from a single Democrat. I wanted to vote for a resolution that truly recognizes the sacrifice of our troops and the importance of living up to our commitments to them, but the Republican leadership would not allow a vote on any other measure but their own. I refuse to bow to the politization of the grave matter of our young people at war, and for this reason I voted against the resolution.

Let me be clear: our troops deserve our qualified support as they serve our Nation in such dangerous circumstances. But that support must be more than empty words, it must be in promises kept.

I would have voted today for a resolution that reiterated our commitment to providing our troops with the body armor and armored vehicles they need to keep them safe, to immediately address the intelligence deficiencies that continue to put our troops in further danger, and to insist on a clearly articulated strategy for post-war occupation and exit of Iraq.

This alternative resolution I supported included provisions to eliminate the disparities in pay between our active duty military and the National Guard and reservists, and provide the health care and benefits our wounded veterans need when they come home. But the Republican majority never allowed for a vote on this fair-minded alternative.

Last week I sat in the Budget Committee and watched in shock as the Republican members of the Committee voted on party lines to reject a "Support Our Troops" amendment that would have raised funding levels for the military by \$2.5 billion. This money would have been spent on family separation pay, imminent danger pay, education funding for military school children, and TRICARE military health coverage for reservists, and military housing programs. How can we look our troops in the eye and tell them Congress rejected actual funding that would help them and their families through this difficult time, but instead passed a relatively meaningless resolution of our support? This is unconscionable.

I also strongly object to the clause in today's resolution claiming that the "world is safer" as a result of the Iraq war. Mr. Speaker, I disagree. Iraq is still in chaos. American soldiers, international diplomats, and Iraqi civilians are being killed every day. And the Administration is still a long way from pacifying Iraq or setting up a stable government. The Administration made claims that Iraq was a base of International terrorism and that turned out to be false.

Our troops deserve better than more empty words from Congress. On the one-year anniversary of the start to this misguided war, they deserve to be supported with sound policy, real dollars, and the commitment to bring them home safely.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, this is a deceitful resolution not for what it says, but for what it does not say. It is unfortunate that our Republican colleagues would once again use an issue that unites all Americans—support for our troops—into a naked political stunt that attempts to rewrite history in a divisive manner. The American people should understand that the Republican leadership in this House has prevented any Member of Congress from offering any change to this resolution.

The main defect of this resolution is that it tells only a small part of the story about Iraq. In an obvious attempt to change the subject, the resolution contains absolutely no mention of the primary justification President Bush gave for going to war in Iraq—the alleged existence of stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction. Instead, the resolution attempts to justify the decision for war on humanitarian grounds alone. It cites, among other things, Saddam Hussein's use of chemical weapons against Iraq's Kurdish citizens in 1988.

No one needs to tell me about Saddam Hussein's human rights abuses against the Kurds. In 1988, at the end of the Iran-Iraq war, I traveled to the Iraq-Turkish border as a staffer on the U.S. Senate Foreign relations Committee with my colleague Peter Galbraith. At that time, thousands of Kurds were fleeing across the border to seek refuge in Turkey. We interviewed hundreds of those refugees and documented Iraq's use of chemical weapons against the Kurdish people. Our report formed the basis for legislation to impose economic sanctions against Iraq for its use of chemical weapons against the Kurds. The bill passed the United States Senate; but the Reagan Administration, which included many of the key officials now in the Bush administration, opposed and helped block that sanctions legislation from passing. I challenge anyone to explain to me how you can oppose economic sanctions in 1988 in response to Iraq's use of chemical weapons against civilians and then

today turn around and say that those same actions are the reason the United States went to war in 2003.

Moreover, if Saddam Hussein's use of chemical weapons against his own people was the reason for military action, we should have finished the job during the Persian Gulf War in 1991. Iraq has not used chemical weapons since 1988, since the time my colleague Peter Galbraith and I went to the Iraq-Turkish border at the end of the Iran-Iraq war. But 3 years later in 1991, not only did we not remove Hussein in Baghdad, but at the end of the war the United States looked the other way for many days while Saddam Hussein turned his guns on the Shias in the south and the Kurds in the north. This history exposes the hypocrisy of this attempt to rewrite history in order to change the argument for going to war in Iraq in 2003.

The fact is that the Bush Administration told the American people that we had to go to war because Saddam Hussein currently possessed stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction and posed an imminent threat to the United States. When the U.N. inspectors asked for additional time to determine whether Iraq possessed stockpiles of such weapons, the Administration rejected the request and went to war. We now know that—based on the report of Chief U.S. weapons inspector, David Kay, that to date no stockpiles of chemical, biological or nuclear weapons have been found in Iraq. This resolution says nothing about the serious blow to U.S. credibility and security around the world caused by the Administration's misuse and abuse of intelligence information.

The Republican leadership would like to equate support for our troops in Iraq with support for the President's decision to go to war in Iraq. But my constituents and the American people deserve better than the false choice presented by this resolution. I will not play the game of having to support the President's views on Iraq in order to express support for our troops. I continue to stand behind our troops and am grateful for their valiant service. I recently returned from a trip to Iraq where I had the honor of meeting with many of the men and women in our Armed Forces. I expressed to them the gratitude of the American people for their sacrifice and for their service to our country. It is a disservice to our troops that the Republican leadership here would exploit them to attempt to gain partisan political advantage.

I have crafted an alternative resolution that presents the part of the story that the Republican leadership would like the American people to forget. This substitute resolution does not change a single word of the underlying resolution. However, it presents a fuller picture of the real story behind the decision to go to war in Iraq. Every one of the "Whereas" clauses in this alternative resolution is factually accurate and incontrovertible. Why does the Republican leadership want to hide from these facts? Why does it want to prevent the American people from knowing the full story? Why will it not allow this substitute to be voted on? Mr. Speaker, I submit this alternative resolution for the RECORD.

SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION PROPOSED BY
REPRESENTATIVE CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

Relating to the liberation of the Iraqi people, and the valiant service of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces and the failure to find stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction.

Whereas Saddam Hussein and his regime committed crimes against humanity, systematically violating the human rights of Iraqis and citizens of other countries;

Whereas Saddam Hussein's terror regime subjected the Iraqi people to murder, torture, rape, and amputation;

Whereas on March 16, 1988, Saddam Hussein's regime had and unleashed weapons of mass destruction against Kurdish citizens, killing nearly 5,000 of them;

Whereas in September 1988, the United States Senate unanimously passed legislation (S. 2763) to impose economic sanctions against the regime of Saddam Hussein for the use of chemical weapons against its Kurdish citizens, but the bill failed after the Reagan Administration opposed the legislation and threatened a veto;

Whereas as many as 270 mass grave sites, containing the remains of as many as 400,000 victims of Saddam Hussein's regime, have been found in Iraq;

Whereas rape was used to intimidate the Iraqi population, with victims often raped in front of their families;

Whereas the regime punished the Marsh Arabs by draining the marshlands, which created hundreds of thousands of refugees and caused an ecological catastrophe;

Whereas in 1991, explaining the Bush Administration decision not to advance on Baghdad, then Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney stated, "Once you've got Baghdad, it's not clear what you do with it. It's not clear what kind of government you would put in place of the one that's currently there now. Is it going to be a Shia regime, a Sunni regime or a Kurdish regime? Or one that tilts toward the Baathists, or one that tilts toward the Islamic fundamentalists? How much credibility is that government going to have if it's set up by the United States military when it's there? How long does the United States military have to stay to protect the people that sign on for that government, and what happens to it once we leave?";

Whereas the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-338), passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 360 to 38, made it United States policy to support efforts to remove from power the regime headed by Saddam Hussein;

Whereas on September 8, 2002, Secretary of State Powell said, "There is no doubt that he [Hussein] has chemical weapons stocks.";

Whereas on September 8, 2002, Vice President Cheney said, "We do know, with absolute certainty, that he [Hussein] is using his procurement system to acquire the equipment he needs in order to enrich uranium to build a nuclear weapon.";

Whereas on September 8, 2002, Secretary Powell said, "With respect to biological weapons, we are confident that he has some stocks of those weapons, and he is probably continuing to try to develop more.";

Whereas on October 2, 2002, President Bush said, "The Iraqi regime is a threat of unique urgency.";

Whereas on October 10, 2002, the House of Representatives passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243) and on March 19, 2003, the United States initiated military operations in Iraq;

Whereas with the Iraqi regime failing to comply with 16 previously adopted United Nations Security Council resolutions, the Security Council unanimously approved Resolution 1441 on November 8, 2002, declaring the Iraq "has been and remains in material breach of its obligations under relevant resolutions, including resolution 687 (1991), in particular through Iraq's failure to cooperate with United Nations inspectors";

Whereas on January 28, 2003, President Bush said, "The British government has

learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa. Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production.”;

Whereas on February 5, 2003, Secretary Powell said, “Our conservative estimate is that Iraq today has a stockpile of between 100 and 500 tons of chemical weapons agent. That is enough agent to fill 16,000 battlefield rockets. Even the low end of 100 tons of agent would enable Saddam Hussein to cause mass casualties across more than 100 square miles of territory, an area nearly 5 times the size of Manhattan. . . .”;

Whereas on March 7, 2003, IAEA Director General Mohamed ElBaradei reported to the United Nations Security Council that: There is “no indication of nuclear activities . . . nor any indication of nuclear-related prohibited activities at any inspected sites . . . There is no indication that Iraq has attempted to import uranium since 1990.”;

Whereas on March 7, 2003, IAEA Director General Mohamed ElBaradei concluded that the documents purporting to show a uranium purchase in Niger provided to the IAEA by the United States were unsubstantiated and likely forged. He told the United Nations Security Council that “Based on thorough analysis, the IAEA has concluded, with the concurrence of outside experts, that these documents, which formed the basis for reports of recent uranium transaction between Iraq and Niger, are in fact not authentic. We have therefore concluded that these specific allegations are unfounded.”;

Whereas according to UNMOVIC’S 13th Quarterly Report, between November 27, 2002 and March 18, 2003, the 731 inspections conducted by UNMOVIC did not reveal any “evidence of continuation or resumption of programs of weapons of mass destruction or significant quantities of proscribed items.”;

Whereas in March 2003, United Nations weapons inspectors requested additional time to determine whether Iraq possessed stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction;

Whereas the Bush Administration rejected the United Nations request for additional time, to complete the mission;

Whereas on March 16, 2003, Vice President Cheney said, “. . . we know he [Hussein] has been absolutely devoted to trying to acquire nuclear weapons. And we believe he has, in fact, reconstituted nuclear weapons.”;

Whereas on March 16, 2003, President Bush said, “The dictator of Iraq and his weapons of mass destruction are a threat to the security of free nations.”;

Whereas on March 25, 2003, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld said, “The threat posed by Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction will be removed.”;

Whereas on October 2, 2003, Chief Weapons Inspector David Kay said, “Information found to date suggests that Iraq’s large-scale capability to develop, produce, and fill new CW munitions was reduced—if not entirely destroyed—during Operations Desert Storm and Desert Fox. 13 years of UN sanctions and UN inspections . . . Our efforts to collect and exploit intelligence on Iraq’s chemical weapons program have thus far yielded little reliable information on post-1991 CW stocks and CW agent production. . . .”;

Whereas on October 2, 2003, David Kay said, “. . . to date we have not uncovered evidence that Iraq undertook significant post-1998 steps to actually build nuclear weapons or produce fissile material.”;

Whereas to date, despite an extensive search by the United Nations and the United States no chemical, biological, nuclear or any other weapons of mass destruction have been found: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) affirms that the United States and the world have been made safer with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime from power in Iraq; however, the main question for the American people is not whether the United States is better off without Saddam Hussein, but whether the United States is better off for having gone to war in Iraq to remove Saddam Hussein;

(2) finds that, despite the removal of Saddam Hussein from power, it is premature to conclude that going to war in Iraq has made the United States safer; indeed, the weight of the evidence to date suggests that President Bush’s approach to Iraq has not made the United States safer;

(3) affirms the findings of former Chief U.S. Weapons Inspector David Kay, that no weapons of mass destruction have been found in Iraq;

(4) affirms that no evidence has been found to support the statements made by president Bush, Vice President Cheney, Secretary of State Colin Powell, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice between September 8, 2002 and the present that are cited in the “Whereas” clause above;

(5) commends the Iraqi people for their courage in the face of unspeakable oppression and brutality inflicted on them by Saddam Hussein’s regime;

(6) commends the Iraqi people on the adoption of Iraq’s interim constitution;

(7) commends the members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces for liberating Iraq and expresses its gratitude for their valiant service; and

(8) extends condolences to the families of the American forces who have been killed in Iraq.

Ms. MAJETTE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise because we have reached the 1-year anniversary of the war in Iraq. One year ago, we invaded Iraq because the President said Saddam Hussein posed an imminent threat to the United States. A “mortal threat,” he said.

We were told Saddam Hussein possessed weapons of mass destruction. We were told the international community would be involved, providing troops and financial assistance. We were told the troops would get whatever they needed to get the job done.

So on March 19, 2003, we invaded Iraq. And here we are, 1 year later. Let’s examine the facts:

CIA Director George Tenet said intelligence agencies never told the White House that Iraq posed an imminent threat. No weapons of mass destruction have been found.

American taxpayers are paying almost all the bills—\$120 billion and still rising. Most importantly, American soldiers are enduring almost all the casualties—more than 560 Americans killed and thousands more wounded.

Our troops did not get the equipment they needed to do their jobs safely—the President failed to include enough funds in his budget to pay for the war in Iraq. Moreover, there is no money in the President’s own proposed budget for 2005 to pay for the war in Iraq. He apparently chooses to keep Congress and the American people in the dark about how much we will need to spend.

Let me tell you what’s going on today with this resolution. It is an attempt to rewrite history. And if any of us vote against it, we will be attacked for not “supporting the troops.”

This resolution is intellectually dishonest. It selects facts that portray the President and his decision to invade Iraq in a positive light, while conveniently ignoring other facts that do not

support the President. It tells only of what we already knew—that Saddam Hussein was an evil tyrant. No one disputes that. It tells us of the atrocities he inflicted on his people—no one disputes that. It tells us that the American people applaud the Iraqi people for adopting an interim constitution—and no one denies that. And it affirms our country’s unending support for our troops.

All of these accomplishments are worthy of our commendation, and I support them.

But this resolution ignores other facts—that we went into this war with faulty intelligence and sent our soldiers in without adequate body armor. It ignores that there were no weapons of mass destruction, and that Saddam did not pose an “imminent threat” to the U.S. It doesn’t tell us that the administration continues to veil the true cost of this war—and it does not say that these costs will be borne by our children because this administration refuses to pay for them today. Instead, this administration gives tax cuts to the people who make over \$1 million—and does not provide adequate resources for the veterans and their families.

It does not even acknowledge the deaths and injuries suffered by the men and women in uniform.

So I cannot in good conscience support such a deceptive resolution. It simply does not tell the whole truth.

Make no mistake—I support our troops, and I will do everything I can to help them get what they need. It is not their fault they were sent to Iraq—they are doing their sworn duty for this country. I will do everything I can to fight for their safe return and for an end to this sham of a war.

The authors of this resolution might think it will provide them political cover, but I am here to tell you that the American people are wise and will not be fooled. They understand that domestic priorities are being sacrificed to fund a war it turns out we didn’t have to fight. They understand that landing on an aircraft carrier and floating a banner declaring “mission accomplished” does not make it so. They understand that the Republicans refused to allow anyone to offer amendments to the language of this resolution.

After last week’s explosion in Madrid, Spain, and today’s bombing in Baghdad, I cannot in good conscience state today that the United States and the world has been made safer than it was before we went to war with Iraq.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, as the war in Iraq continues, our military personnel, veterans and their families face a myriad of hardships. Our troops in Iraq have lacked adequate body armor and armored vehicles to keep them safe. Their families have to scrape by because of the pay disparity between serving in the military and in civilian life. When the troops return home, they do not have the health care and benefits they have earned through their service to our country.

Republicans proposed a resolution to supposedly honor our troops. But it does not truly acknowledge the real hardships our troops and their families face. It merely “commends the members of the United States Armed Forces and Coalition forces for liberating Iraq and expresses its gratitude for their valiant service.”

Republicans also say in their resolution we are safer now that Saddam Hussein has been removed from power. But we cannot claim the

mission is accomplished. We must continue to fight the battle against terrorism to ensure safety and stability in Iraq. And we must be honest about the true task ahead of us, or risk America's credibility with our international partners diminishing further.

Ironically enough, on the same day Republicans claim to honor our troops, they approved a budget proposal for the next year that would slash funding for military pay, health care, education and training for military personnel, veterans and their families. It also fails to extend imminent danger pay and family separation pay for troops in Iraq past December 31 of this year.

I supported an alternative resolution that would appropriately honor the military personnel and veterans who have served our country so courageously. It praises the work our troops are doing and urges the President to provide protective gear for our troops, ensure quality health care to treat both short- and long-term injuries among our troops, and correct pay disparities among civilian and military pay for guards and reservists.

We need to stand behind our courageous men and women in uniform who are bearing the burden of this military action in Iraq. Supporting our troops and giving them the tools they need to carry out their mission in Iraq is the only way to truly honor their service, courage and sacrifice.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of my State recently went on a trip to Iraq. When she returned, she announced that the President's Iraq policy should not be the subject of political discussion. That suggestion is as problematic as it is unrealistic. Foreign policy and defense policy are always legitimate topics of political debate. That's how we do things in a democracy. The voting public has every right to a full and open airing of different points of view—especially when the lives of our service members and the treasury of our Nation are being committed.

Now, with this resolution it seems the Republicans want it both ways. They tell us Iraq policy is out of bounds for political discussion, and at the same time they present us with this resolution. This document amplifying the administration's spin is nothing less than an election-year endorsement of the President's Iraq policy. It will no doubt be denied that it has anything to do with politics. In fact it's blatantly political. It's transparently political. It's in-your-face political.

Our troops deserve better than this cursory salute swaddled in suffocating layers of political celebration. They've earned our gratitude for their patriotism, courage and spirit of sacrifice. More to the point, they deserve a solid commitment to their well being and the well being of their families. But that is something the majority refuses to do. Last week in the House Budget Committee, Mr. EDWARDS and others proposed some simple measures along these lines: TRICARE for reservists; a boost in imminent danger pay; improved military housing; higher pay for senior enlisted personnel; increased family separation allowance; and more funding for family support centers.

All of this is to be offset by a very modest rollback in the tax bonanza we granted to people making a million dollars a year and more. The majority's response? Forget about the troops—our allegiance is to people making a million or more. I don't have any statistics, but I suspect there aren't too many millionaires serving in Iraq or en route.

So let's not pretend this resolution has nothing to do with politics. It's about the politics of deception underlying this war. It's about the politics of delusion that we can remake the world in our own image. It's about the politics of desperation flowing from the realization that we're becoming stuck in a no-exit quagmire.

As for the troops, they're getting thin rations from the majority in this House. Saying you support the troops is easy. The issue here isn't whether anyone in this House supports the troops. We all do. The issue is whether we can fashion a policy worthy of their valor, dedication and sacrifice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 561, the resolution is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered on the resolution and preamble.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on House Joint Resolution 87. Votes on motions to suspend the rules postponed earlier today will be taken tomorrow.

RECORDED VOTE

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 327, noes 93, answered "present" 7, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]
AYES—327

Aderholt Burr
Akin Burton (IN)
Alexander Buyer
Allen Calvert
Andrews Camp
Baca Cannon
Bachus Cantor
Baird Capito
Baker Capuano
Ballenger Cardin
Barrett (SC) Cardoza
Bartlett (MD) Carson (OK)
Barton (TX) Carter
Bass Case
Beauprez Castle
Bereuter Chabot
Berkley Chandler
Berman Chocola
Berry Coble
Biggart Cole
Bilirakis Collins
Bishop (GA) Cooper
Bishop (NY) Costello
Bishop (UT) Cox
Blackburn Cramer
Blunt Crane
Boehler Crenshaw
Boehner Crowley
Bonilla Cubin
Bonner Culberson
Bono Cunningham
Boozman Davis (FL)
Boswell Davis (TN)
Boucher Davis, Jo Ann
Boyd Davis, Tom
Bradley (NH) Deal (GA)
Brady (TX) DeFazio
Brown (OH) DeLauro
Brown (SC) DeLay
Brown-Waite, DeMint
Ginny Deutsch
Burgess Diaz-Balart, L.
Burns Diaz-Balart, M.

Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslie
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch

Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pascrell
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen

NOES—93

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
Doyle
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Kanjorski
Kilpatrick
Kleccka
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Rahall
Rangel
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Solis
Stark
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez

Visclosky Watson Wexler
Waters Watt Woolsey

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7

Carson (IN) Johnson, E. B. Waxman
Davis (AL) Lantos
Davis (CA) Meehan

NOT VOTING—7

Hoeffel Simmons Weldon (PA)
Kucinich Smith (WA)
Sherwood Tauzin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1950

Mr. RUSH and Mr. JEFFERSON changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Mrs. NAPOLITANO changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. HILL changed his vote from "present" to "aye."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on the vote on House Resolution 557, I spoke on the floor in opposition to H. Res. 557 and by mistake voted "yes" on the floor. I seek the record to be clear that I intended to vote "no."

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 87.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 87, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 5, answered "present" 6, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]
YEAS—398

Abercrombie Berry Brown (SC)
Ackerman Biggert Brown, Corrine
Aderholt Bilirakis Brown-Waite,
Alexander Bishop (GA) Ginny
Allen Bishop (NY) Burgess
Andrews Bishop (UT) Burns
Baca Blackburn Burr
Bachus Blumenauer Burton (IN)
Baird Boehlert Buyer
Baker Boehner Calvert
Baldwin Bonilla Camp
Ballance Bonner Cannon
Barrett (SC) Bono Cantor
Barton (TX) Boozman Capito
Bass Boswell Capps
Beauprez Boucher Capuano
Becerra Boyd Cardin
Bell Bradley (NH) Cardoza
Bereuter Brady (PA) Carson (IN)
Berkley Brady (TX) Carson (OK)
Berman Brown (OH) Carter

Case Hooley (OR)
Castle Hostettler
Chabot Houghton
Chandler Hoyer
Chocola Hulshof
Clay Hunter
Clyburn Hyde
Coble Inslee
Cole Isakson
Conyers Israel
Cooper Issa
Costello Istook
Cox Jackson (IL)
Cramer Jackson-Lee
Crenshaw (TX)
Crowley Jefferson
Cubin Jenkins
Culberson John
Cummings Johnson (CT)
Davis (AL) Johnson (IL)
Davis (CA) Johnson, E. B.
Davis (FL) Jones (NC)
Davis (IL) Jones (OH)
Davis (TN) Kanjorski
Davis, Jo Ann Kaptur
Davis, Tom Keller
Deal (GA) Kelly
DeFazio Kennedy (MN)
DeGette Kennedy (RI)
DeLahunt Kildee
DeLauro Kilpatrick
DeLay Kind
DeMint King (NY)
Deutsch Kirk
Diaz-Balart, L. Kleczka
Diaz-Balart, M. Kline
Dicks Knollenberg
Dingell Kolbe
Doggett LaHood
Doyle Lampson
Dreier Langevin
Duncan Lantos
Dunn Larsen (WA)
Edwards Larson (CT)
Ehlers Latham
Emanuel LaTourette
Emerson Leach
Engel Lee
English Levin
Eshoo Lewis (GA)
Etheridge Lewis (KY)
Evans Linder
Farr Lipinski
Fattah LoBiondo
Feeney Lofgren
Ferguson Lowey
Filner Lucas (KY)
Forbes Lucas (OK)
Ford Lynch
Fossella Majette
Frank (MA) Maloney
Franks (AZ) Markey
Frelinghuysen Marshall
Frost Matheson
Gallegly McCarthy (MO)
Gerlach McCarthy (NY)
Gibbons McCollum
Gilchrest McCotter
Gillmor McCrery
Gingrey McDermott
Gonzalez McGovern
Goode McHugh
Goodlatte McNinnis
Gordon McIntyre
Granger McKeon
Graves McNulty
Green (TX) Meehan
Green (WI) Meek (FL)
Greenwood Meeks (NY)
Grijalva Menendez
Gutierrez Mica
Gutknecht Michaud
Hall Millender-
Harris McDonald
Hart Miller (FL)
Hastings (FL) Miller (MI)
Hastings (WA) Miller (NC)
Hayes Miller, Gary
Hayworth Miller, George
Hensarling Mollohan
Herger Moore
Hill Moran (KS)
Hinchey Moran (VA)
Hinojosa Murphy
Hobson Murtha
Hoekstra Musgrave
Holden Myrick
Holt Nadler
Honda Napolitano

Tauscher Turner (TX)
Taylor (MS) Udall (CO)
Taylor (NC) Udall (NM)
Terry Upton
Thomas Van Hollen
Thompson (CA) Velázquez
Thompson (MS) Visclosky
Thornberry Vitter
Tiahrt Walden (OR)
Tiberi Walsh
Tierney Wamp
Toomey Waters
Towns Watson
Turner (OH) Watt

NAYS—5

Bartlett (MD) Hefley Paul
Flake King (IA)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6

Crane Everett Kingston
Cunningham Johnson, Sam Pence

NOT VOTING—24

Akin Gephardt Otter
Ballenger Goss Rohrabacher
Blunt Harman Sherwood
Collins Hoeffel Simmons
Dooley (CA) Kucinich Smith (WA)
Doolittle Lewis (CA) Tauzin
Foley Manzullo Weldon (PA)
Garrett (NJ) Matsui Weller

□ 1958

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM OFFICE MANAGER OF HON. HOWARD COBLE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Chris Beaman, Office Manager and Constituent Services Representative for the Honorable HOWARD COBLE, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 11, 2004.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the General Court of Justice for the State of North Carolina, Guilford County.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

CHRIS BEAMAN.

□ 2000

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1673

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1673.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.