

COMMUNICATION FROM CHIEF OF STAFF OF HON. ZOE LOFGREN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from David R. Thomas, Chief of Staff of the Honorable ZOE LOFGREN, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 23, 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 grand jury subpoena for documents issued by the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

DAVID R. THOMAS,
Chief of Staff.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

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

There was no objection.

WOMEN'S PROGRESS IN IRAQ

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

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a moment to report on the progress of women in Iraq. I am the vice-chair of the Congressional Women's Caucus, and it gives me great pleasure to tell about the progress that we have made.

Iraqi women greeted the capture of Saddam Hussein on December 13 with joyful relief. As one woman reported from an Iraqi women's conference taking place in Jordan, Almost all broke into tears and sobs that the man who had managed to reach into every individual's personal life and rip it apart by killing their husbands, sons, and fa-

thers, and raping and maiming their daughters, their mothers, and very often themselves, was brought to justice.

The United States is working with women in Iraq on programs that will broaden their political and economic opportunities and increase women's and young girls' access to education and health care.

In early 2003, the United States Government committed approximately \$2.5 billion in humanitarian and reconstruction aid to Iraq, and women were and still are full partners in this process. However, women's involvement in politics in Iraq actually is nothing new. Women have a long history of being involved in their country's development.

Prior to the Baathist regime, Iraqi women were the vanguard of women in Islam. I would note that the first woman's organization in Iraq was actually formed in 1924. The signing of an Iraqi interim Constitution on March 8 marks the beginning of a new role for women in the country. The Coalition Provisional Authority, or CPA, and the Iraqi Governing Council agreed to a process to restore Iraqis' sovereignty beginning with a fundamental law leading to a permanent Constitution. They agreed that a Bill of Rights would ensure equal rights for all Iraqis, regardless of gender, sect, or ethnicity.

Let us talk about the women's role in the new government. Three Iraqi women who are members of the new Governing Council are fully engaged in promoting the involvement of women in Iraq's future. An esteemed former female Iraqi judge in the Ministry of Justice is undertaking a review of all laws, legal practices, and the legal profession in Iraq for ways to increase equality and participation of women. The Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs has adopted a policy of equal access to services and benefits for all of those who are eligible. And this policy will ultimately expand services as well for a larger quantity of Iraqi women.

Quotas restricting the entry of women into certain university courses have been raised or lifted altogether. Iraqi women's organizations are being created to expand opportunity for women to improve their lives and those of their families.

Let me talk more specifically about what kinds of activities are taking place and what kind of progress is actually being made.

After the fall of Saddam Hussein in 2003, Iraqi women were among the first demonstrators and have steadfastly sought equal rights. On a very brief trip that I took to Iraq, I spoke to many women and they are indeed very, very happy with American action.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART).

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

There was no objection.

APPEASEMENT DOES NOT WORK AGAINST TERRORISTS

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, the images of 9-11 are very vivid in my mind. That unsolicited, unprovoked attack on the American population is one of the most heinous things that this generation will see.

Mr. Speaker, we are given two choices when we are struck like that. We can choose appeasement. That was the policy of the preceding 10 years.

□ 2145

Appeasement where we do not respond or we can respond to try to stop the threat. Under President Bush we have responded. President Clinton chose appeasement. If you watch the graduation of the attacks under the appeasement policy of President Clinton, you will see that the attacks began to escalate. The severity of the attacks began to take a greater toll.

The terrorists have one thing in mind when they attack innocent civilians and countries that have not provoked them. They desire to create instability, understanding that if they create economic instability, they will create political instability.

That was the mode of operation for the terrorists as they graduated through the 1990s. We recall that the World Trade Center was struck previous to 9/11. It was struck 10 years previous. On 9/11 we lost over 2,000 lives and it cost our economy \$2 trillion, and it is still costing today as businesses face increased insurance premiums to cover the losses of that 1 day.

When I hear critics talk about the war and the cost on the war, and it is an expensive war, make no doubt about it, the costs are up around \$200 billion now. \$200 billion though is not yet 10 percent of the cost of that 1-day strike.

The President has boldly fought back. Dramatic things have been done since 9/11. The President has caused Saudi Arabia to dismantle the funding mechanism for the terrorists, the funding network that was established in Saudi Arabia, a worldwide network marketing nuclear components for nuclear weapons that was created by A.Q. Khan, a Pakistani. That network in a marketed nuclear armament has been dismantled. We are now in the process of collecting back the things, Mr. Speaker, that he sold to nations.

In Afghanistan the Taliban has been uprooted. They are out. Al Qaeda is on the run. That training camp where they trained 20,000 terrorists during the 1990s no longer exists, Mr. Speaker. And it is because of the bold action under this President. Libya has admitted to their participation in the weapons of mass destruction and they voluntarily have given up their weapons after the President took his bold action in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, Iran is acknowledging their problems and their willingness to create weapons of mass destruction. Pakistan now is helping us fight the war on terror and just days ago was involved in a tremendous fire fight along the Afghanistan-Pakistani border.

Mr. Speaker, those are the responses of strength. And I will tell you that we are going to fight the war on terror; 9/11 declared it to be that way. If we are going to fight the war on terror, I choose to fight it in their country rather than in this country.

I traveled to Iraq at the end of October and the first of November. I visited our troops there, wanting to express my appreciation for what they were doing. As a soldier in Vietnam, I never received one communication from my Congressman, but I did want to communicate to these young men and women how much I valued what they do because they are changing the tide of world history.

If we were to sit and always choose appeasement, if we were to sit and not respond, I would guarantee you that our economy would not survive another 9/11. On 9/11 I was in Paris, France, on a vacation. We were delayed 10 days in getting home. When we arrived, we arrived at Dallas-Ft. Worth Regional Airport, an airport that today when I travel through it has thousands of people every day. That airport was essentially shut down. There were no taxis. The hotels were empty.

We will see our economy completely collapse if we continue to let strikes like 9/11 happen without response.

The President has given bold response. Our soldiers are acting responsibly. They understand the value of what they are doing. They tell me they have pride in their accomplishments. I see the reconstruction is having dramatic effects. The Iraqis themselves believe they can create liberty.

Mr. Speaker, the President's responses of strength are a tribute to the great leadership that he is bringing to

this time of great stress; and I would like to support him in that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

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.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TIME WILL PROVE WAR TO BE RIGHT

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it is still an honor to stand in this body and speak to those Members of the House who are assembled.

Historians and politicians, political scientists, play parlor games, one of which is to rank the Presidents from best to worst. In that group almost always Washington, Roosevelt and Abraham Lincoln are put as the top three; usually Lincoln is listed as number one. They are able to do that because of the 20/20 hindsight of history, because of the dogged tenacity which prohibited him from taking a shattered country that was mired in what some people have called the "19th century Vietnam" and extracting themselves from the war even though he would have received critical acclaim from liberals at that time.

That same tenacity that we respect today was the element of criticism that was intense and unfair to him while he lived. The New York riot that took place in 1863, lasting 4 days, killing 105 people, when even the New York Times put three Gatling guns on the roof and in their windows to protect them, was blamed on him.

Horace Greeley in 1864 of Lincoln wrote, "Our bleeding, bankrupt and almost dying country longs for peace." The Democratic platform that same year said that after "four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war, we demand immediate efforts for cessation of hostilities."

A leading newspaper wrote that there is a "cowardly imbecile at the head of the government." And a Congressman said, "I am heartsick at the mismanagement of the Army and disgust with our government is universal, probably even amongst some of our European friends."

Sound familiar? I am sure, because those same feeble criticisms have been thrown at the U.S. policy in Iraq. Lincoln was great, just no one told his critics that he was. But that same mold of critics tells us the Iraqi policy has failed. Unfortunately, no one has told the Iraqis of that fate.

They still recognize that they have more power generated now than they ever had in their country. Two-thirds of all the water projects have been restored. There is a 6,000 percent increase in health funding in the country. All the hospitals, all the colleges, all the technical schools are now open again. Five-and-a-half million students go to school every day without having to say, "Long live Saddam Hussein" every morning. Seventy percent of the Iraqis see their future as better and brighter with a spirit, a new form of government and new policemen and soldiers who are enlisting every day. The impact has been significant in that particular area.