

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

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN OPPOSITION TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 557

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, today, in the floor debate on H. Res. 557, the Iraq resolution, though a member of the Committee on International Relations, I was unfortunately denied time to express my dissent on the policy of pre-emptive war in Iraq. The fact that the Committee on International Relations held no hearings and did not mark up the resolution further challenges the fairness of the process.

Mr. Speaker, I now rise to express my opposition to H. Res. 557, obviously, not because our Armed Forces do not deserve praise, but rather because our policy in the Persian Gulf is seriously flawed. An effort to commend our forces should not be used to rubber-stamp a policy of folly. To do so is disingenuous. Though the resolution may have political benefits, it will prove to be historically incorrect.

Justifying preemption is not an answer to avoiding appeasement. Very few wars are necessary. Very few wars are good wars. And this one does not qualify. Most wars are costly beyond measure, in life and limb and economic hardship. In this regard, this war does qualify: 566 deaths, 10,000 casualties, and hundreds of billions of dollars for a victory requiring self-deception.

Rather than bragging about victory, we should recognize that the war that rages on between the Muslim East and the Christian West has intensified and spread, leaving our allies and our own people less safe. Denying we have an interest 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 a justification for the war further emphasizes our sacrifice of sovereignty and Congress's reneging its constitutional responsibility over war.

This resolution dramatizes our forgetfulness that for too long we were staunch military and economic allies of Saddam Hussein, confirming the folly of our policy of foreign meddling over many decades. From the days of installing the Shah of Iran to the current worldwide spread of hostilities and hatred, our unnecessary involvement 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 others are not po-

tential targets of an Islamic attack. Falsely believing that the al Qaeda was aligned with Saddam Hussein has resulted in the al Qaeda now having a strong presence and influence in Iraq. Falsely believing 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. Al Qaeda recruitment, sadly, has been dramatically increased.

We all praise our troops and support them. Challenging one's patriotism for not supporting this resolution and/or policy in the Persian Gulf is not legitimate. We should all be cautious in endorsing and financing a policy that unfortunately expands the war rather than ends it.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1375, FINANCIAL SERVICES REGULATORY RELIEF ACT OF 2003

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-439) on the resolution (H. Res. 566) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1375) to provide regulatory relief and improve productivity for insured depository institutions, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

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

IRAQ: ONE YEAR LATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Iraq, 1 year later.

First of all, I want to commend our brave troops who proudly serve our great Nation and risk their lives to preserve our freedom. I praise their courageous efforts to protect our country, and I am with them 100 percent. They are the best of the best. And I can truly say every Member of this House, this body, supports them 100 percent. What I do not support is this misleading Bush administration and this House that follows them like sheep. Let me repeat that. What I do not support is this misleading Bush administration and this House, the people's House, that follows them like sheep.

A new report has been released that shows that George Bush, DICK CHENEY, Donald Rumsfeld, and Condoleezza Rice made 237 misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq in 125 public appearances. Eighty-four of those statements misled the American people

about Iraq's chemical and biological weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I was horrified last year to learn that 44,000 of our troops were sent out to battle without proper armor. Forty-four thousand. How can we ask young men and women to trust us when we make decisions that involve life and death and then not outfit them with the best that they need to save their lives. We deployed our young men and women to Iraq with Humvees that lacked armored protection and bulletproof windows.

I personally went to Walter Reed where six troops had lost their legs while riding in Humvees. If they had been riding in the right type of vehicles, this may not have happened. This use of Humvees in Iraq was not what they were made for. We need to get our troops the equipment they need now.

And, Mr. President, you need to spend more time planning for the safety of our troops and their families in your war efforts and less time fundraising and cutting taxes for the rich country club friends of yours.

There are two or three other points that I want to make. One, many of my constituents approach me about BRACC and the base closing amendment that we will be doing in 2005. They are telling me we are looking forward to your fighting to make sure our bases are not closed in our area. And my question to them is, why do you think that this Bush administration insisted, insisted, after the House and Senate both voted down and said we should not have a base closure, or BRACC scenario, during this time of war, why do you think this administration insisted that we go through this? It is destabilizing to the families and the communities during a time of war.

I have heard that someone from the other body indicated that if they were elected that that is one of the first things they would scrap.

I also want to comment on the 2000 election, which I cannot get past because the election determined who is in charge, and certainly I do not think we are headed in the right direction. I am going to submit for the RECORD an article that was in The New York Times last week indicating that Florida could be Florida again. In other words, the problems that we experienced in the 2000 election have not been corrected. It is a disservice to the people that we serve that we do not straighten out the problems with the elections, not just in Florida but all over this country; and we have not properly funded the program.

Lastly, let me mention the coup d'etat that took place a couple of weeks ago in Haiti. It is very unfortunate that this Bush administration has chosen to go in and take out a duly elected president. Just take him out. Just take him out. The poorest country in the western hemisphere. We have to make sure that the Haitian people get the assistance that they need from the super Bush administration, after going

in and taking out the duly elected president.

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

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

THE CARBON CYCLE AND CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present what I hope you will find as fascinating facts about the carbon cycle. There has been a great deal of discussion over the last several years about climate change: Is human activity causing the climate to change or is that not the case?

What I would like to present tonight, Mr. Speaker, is somewhat of a science lesson about the carbon cycle. Carbon, when burned, turns into a gas called CO₂, and CO₂ is a gas in the atmosphere that is needed to sustain life in its cycle. Excessive CO₂ would add to the greenhouse effect or cause the climate to warm. Thus, the climate would change.

What I would like to do tonight, Mr. Speaker, is to give some interesting facts, almost like a 7th grade science class; and I would like to go back to 1771, where an English minister named Reverend Priestley performed an experiment. Now, this is 1771.

He took a glass jar, about a foot high and about 8 inches in diameter, and he wanted to see how long air would stay good in that glass jar. And he discovered the air stayed good as long as he sealed it. Whether it was a week, a month, 3 months, it was always good air. What he did next, though, was put a flame next to that glass jar, which he found immediately fouled the air.

After that, he got another glass jar, and he put a mouse in that glass jar, and he sealed the glass jar. And it was not too long before the air was fouled again and the mouse died.

What he did next was pretty extraordinary. He took a glass jar, put a sprig of mint, a small green growing vegetable in that glass jar. Then he saw that the air stayed fine for a long time. He then put a flame to it. And we know that CO₂ comes from burning wood. The air stayed fine.

Then he put the mouse in the glass jar with that mint sprig and the mouse stayed in there for a long time and the air stayed fine.

□ 2115

Now Reverend Priestley did not realize what he had in that glass jar with the mint sprig and the mouse was a carbon cycle. The mint absorbed the carbon, built up its woody structure

and exuded oxygen and so the mouse could live.

Trees across the planet breathe in carbon dioxide. They turn it into leaves and wood and breathe out oxygen. If we tested around the globe different areas and tried to discover the level of the CO₂ in the atmosphere, which is less than 1 percent, you would discover if you are near a forest, the CO₂ level is less than in other areas, if you are in an urban area. The trees breathe in CO₂, make wood and breathe out oxygen. This is the carbon cycle.

Every time you start your car, turn on a light, turn up the thermostat, you contribute more CO₂ to the atmosphere because you are burning carbon. Coal, oil, and natural gas fuel the world's economy, and they all use carbon dioxide which are inhaled by our forests and they turn that into oxygen.

But when we burn a lump of coal, when we burn oil, when we burn natural gas, we are releasing into our environment what took the natural processes, 20 million years ago, millions of years to lock up. So we are releasing into the atmosphere the same amount of CO₂ that took millions of years to lock up in about 150 years. So we are being excessive more than we have seen in eons of time by putting excessive extra amounts of CO₂ that goes against the grain of the natural cycle into our atmosphere.

Are there consequences to that faster releasing of CO₂? There are. The consequences are we see coral reefs around the world dying. We see deserts expanding, and we see the ocean currents themselves changing and in some cases slowing down. We see sea levels rise. In the northern parts of Canada, Alaska, and Russia, beetles are infesting millions of acres of forest that never infested those forests before because it was not that warm in the Northern Hemisphere. Forests, grasslands, and even our oceans absorb CO₂ that we emit into the atmosphere as humans.

If we diminish those carbon sinks, we accelerate CO₂ release into the atmosphere, and the consequences are that we are changing our climate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time allocated to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

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

There was no objection.

AMERICA'S PREEMPTIVE WAR

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the House today debated America's first preemptive war. If this were about the courage and valor of our soldiers, I would ask that we act by unanimous consent to praise our troops, but this resolution is really about the Bush policy of global domination.

A year ago America launched a preemptive war. Today we are considering the consequences of that war. Words of great Presidents and great Americans offer guidance. In 1848, Abraham Lincoln expressed the fear of President Polk's power when he wrote to oppose U.S. annexation of Mexican territory. "If today, President Polk should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada to prevent the British from invading us, how could we stop him? You may say to him, 'I see no probability of the British invading us' but he will say to you, 'Be silent; I see it, if you do not.'"

Does that sound like George Bush to Members, with all of the misrepresentations we had?

One of America's greatest soldiers was President Dwight Eisenhower. In what many regard as his finest speech, President Eisenhower said this about war: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in the final sense a theft from those who are hungry and not fed, those who are cold and not clothed."

Eleanor Roosevelt, "We have to face the fact that either all of us are going to die together or we are going to live together, and if we are going to live together we must talk."

Finally, Martin Luther King, "Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do that. Hate multiplies hate, violence multiplies violence, and toughness multiplies toughness in a descending spiral of destruction. The chain reaction of evil, hate begetting hate, wars producing more wars, must be broken or we shall plunge into the dark abyss of annihilation."

Today, we are considering whether to endorse the Bush doctrine of domination. The world the President claims to be making safer finds our actions offensive. The nonpartisan Pew Research Center, as reported in today's Washington Post, conducted a survey in nine countries. The results are frightening. It found people in several Middle Eastern countries increasingly support suicide bombings and other violence against Americans.

Majorities in Jordan and Morocco said attacks against Americans were justified. These same people now favor Osama bin Laden. These opinions are coming from ordinary people, not armed terrorists. In Europe, nations