

WE ARE MAKING PROGRESS

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion about the progress, and I applaud my colleagues for talking about the issues, with Iraq and the war on terrorism.

I have got to tell you when I flew out here on Tuesday afternoon, and you have a question as to whether or not we are winning the war on terrorism, but the question is whether we are making progress. Just a small note in USA Today, on Tuesday, on page 8, "Inspectors complete the Libya arms inventory."

It was only about 4 or 5 weeks ago that I had the opportunity to travel to Libya and to meet with Colonel Qaddafi. We had planned the trip to Iraq and Afghanistan in December, never expecting that 6 short weeks later we would be invited to go to Libya and to meet with Colonel Qaddafi to talk about the change in the attitude that has been highlighted for the last 6 or 8 weeks.

Qaddafi's mea culpa on terror. Libya explains reversal, sees new era with the United States. What does that mean? What does that mean for the war on terrorism? Here is a real benefit that I think is an indication that we are making progress.

The inspectors complete Libya arms inventory. International inspectors completed their inventory of Libya's chemical weapons stockpiles and confirmed that the country's only chemical weapons factory had been disabled, a watchdog organization said Monday. The inspectors said Libya had more than 20 tons of mustard gas and the materials to make thousands of tons of saren nerve gas.

The Organization For the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons said it had inventoried materials at two storage facilities. Libya announced in December that it was scrapping its nuclear and chemical weapons programs in hopes of ending international sanctions. Washington has already lifted most sanctions.

Libya is also working with inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency of the United Nations to dismantle its nuclear weapons programs.

Who would have thought that a few short months ago, who would have thought a few short months ago that we would have made that type of progress with Libya?

For more than a decade, probably closer to 2 decades, Libya had been identified and characterized as a state sponsor of terrorism. It is obvious that with what the experts have found in Libya, the tons of mustard and saren gas, that they had an active chemical weapons program. Also, through the negotiations and through the relations that they have made, we have got

much better insights into their nuclear program, not only the status of how far their nuclear program had advanced, but perhaps more importantly, how they had gained access to the nuclear materials, the nuclear technology and the equipment to get into the nuclear business.

By learning how they gained access to these materials, we have a better sense of what other countries might have been able to acquire, when they might have been able to acquire it, and how far they might have progressed in their own nuclear weapons programs, countries like Iran and countries like North Korea.

Once we have identified the distribution network, the marketing network, the group of individuals, the organizations that made these materials available, it has given us an insight into the nuclear proliferation program that we never had before. There is no doubt that we are making progress in the war on terrorism that has been identified through much of the 1990s.

Some say that this President, President Bush, was the one that after September 11 identified this new threat. Some say he pulled it out of the air; but when you take a look at the evidence, you see that a war on terrorism and the threat of terrorism had been identified through much of the 1990s.

President Bill Clinton, February 17, 1998, here he is talking about Iraq. They have harassed the inspectors, lied to them, disabled monitoring cameras, literally spirited evidence out of the back doors. Continuing, and they will be all the more lethal if we allow them to build arsenals of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and the missiles to deliver them. We simply cannot allow that to happen. 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. There is no more clear example of this threat than Saddam Hussein's Iraq. His regime threatens the safety of his people, the stability of his region and the security of all the rest of us. A rogue state with weapons of mass destruction, ready to use them or provide them to terrorists who travel the world if we fail to respond today, Saddam will be emboldened tomorrow by the knowledge that they can act with impunity. I have no doubt he would use them again if permitted to develop them.

So during much of the 1990s, President Clinton identified not only the threat of Iraq but the threat of terrorist organizations coming from rogue states or coming from safe havens who would threaten the lives of American citizens and the security of the United States. What did others say?

Some of our Senators have said, Iraq possesses a chemical weapons program and a biological weapons program. Name another leader on the face of this Earth who has decided not once but on numerous occasions to use weapons of

mass destruction against his own people and his neighbors. Name one other country. Only Iraq, only Saddam Hussein.

Another Senator has stated, Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction programs and the means to deliver them are a menace to international peace and security. They pose a threat to Iraq's neighbors, to U.S. forces and the Gulf region, to the world's energy supplies and to the integrity and credibility of the United Nations Security Council.

Now, because of the customs of the House and the rules of the House, I cannot identify the specific individuals who have made those statements; but the interesting thing to me, and I can share the names with my colleagues off-line, not here on the floor of the House, but I can share the names with my colleagues, and now it is some of these same individuals who are saying it was all made up. Excuse me. These individuals were saying the same thing and identifying the same issue that President Bush identified when he took action after September 11; but more importantly, almost immediately after taking office, President Bush identified that terrorism was a threat and that maybe the United States should consider alternative strategies.

During much of the 1990s, we treated terrorist attacks as criminal acts. We waited for the attacks to occur. We put in place our policing authorities and our police resources, and then we prosecuted them as crimes, tried to find the bad guys and to prosecute them as crimes.

In 2001, after watching what happened during the 1990s, the successful attacks on the World Trade Center in 1993, the attacks on our barracks in Saudi Arabia, the attacks on our embassies in Africa, the attacks on the USS *Cole*, all together creating a devastating loss of life, this President said, you know, maybe it is time that we should at least consider alternative strategies rather than treating these as criminal activities, recognizing them for what they are.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would note that even when President Clinton was making the allegations about the strength of the effort in Iraq and about the threat that Iraq posed to the world, he was systematically dismantling the information-gathering network that the United States had in place. He began to pull the operatives out of our spy networks so that we had no information on the ground. The Clinton administration was saying that we will gather that information electronically, we will use satellites and we will use monitoring of phones.

The truth is you cannot know actions until you understand the heart of the individuals who are planning actions,

until you can assess the threat by listening to the rhetoric; but President Clinton dismantled that at the same time he was acknowledging the threat, and President Bush was faced with a situation in the world where we did not have information and we were struck without warning, without provocation.

I think that before we consider all the ramifications, if we are to listen to the left, talk to America today, about retreating away from the war, about coming back home, about the mistakes they are claiming that we made, we have to understand the risk of retreat.

We have now Pakistan who is engaged with us, but it would guarantee instability and overwhelm the President of Pakistan if we were to retreat. The fundamentalists, the extremists in Iraq would overwhelm the growing government process there. Our friends who have helped us get there, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, would face certain instability if we were not there to offer the moral support and the troop strength which we are offering today.

It was well-known through the 1990s the threat that Iraq and many of the terrorist states, the risks that they posed to the United States; but in treating these not as acts of war but as a crime, like my colleague has said, we have to understand that the person who perpetrated the 1993 attack on the World Trade Center was actually in prison. He was only a criminal. It was his uncle who conducted and led the 2001 attacks with the certainty that they had communicated frequently.

The failed policies of appeasement simply are not going to work in this war on terror; and if we understand that the instability of the world is the goal of the terrorists, that through the instability they represent a very small percent of the population but they will gain tremendous power in instability, we begin to understand why they are doing what they are doing.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding back, and when my colleague is talking about what was happening during the 1990s, I am on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and I have had opportunity to go back through and look at what happened during the 1990s.

What he was talking about and describing was what we described as the Deutch Doctrine. The Deutch Doctrine or the director of the CIA who in 1995, 1996 decided that they would kind of cleanse and purge our intelligence network, believing that, yes, we could rely on satellites and electronic eavesdropping to get all of the information that we needed, that with the collapse of the former Soviet Union, the end of the Cold War, the need for spies was gone, and in reality what happened after the collapse of the Wall, a very new threat was emerging. There are statements from President Clinton, from his administration, that clearly identified that this threat was emerging.

□ 2215

They all saw terrorism as something that was coming, but they put in place a series of policies. One of the things that I give President Bush a tremendous amount of credit for, after September 11, he never went back and said, you know, I wish that this had happened during the Clinton administration; or, boy, they really left me with the cupboard bare, no spies, no intelligence capabilities, no human intelligence collection capabilities. He recognized that fighting the war on terrorism is a very, very difficult process with a lot of different strategies that should be employed.

That is why shortly after he took office he brought together his team and said we need to explore other alternatives. We will continue moving full speed ahead on some of the more aggressive policies the Clinton administration had put in place, but we are not going to back and publicly critique the Clinton administration for what they did or did not do. That is not the issue. We are fighting a war on terrorism, and it is time to put in place a strategy and a program that we believe will be effective. So we started rebuilding human intelligence.

What happened under the Deutch Doctrine in 1995-1996, what happened is we said, number one, we are not going to recruit people who have human rights violations or who have criminal records. When you look around the room of Saddam Hussein's cabinet and you see who is sitting at the table, you say I wonder how many of those folks do not have criminal violations or human rights violations. Obviously, none of the folks inside the room are going to qualify to give us the information that we need. These are individuals who systematically have executed at least 400,000 of their countrymen. The estimates range from 1.2 to 1.5 million of their countrymen are buried in mass graves around Iraq.

These are people who used weapons of mass destruction. Yes, they used chemical weapons. It is not a question whether they had them. They used them against the Iranians and they used them against their own people. Obviously, none of the people who had some insight into what Saddam Hussein was thinking were going to qualify to work for our Central Intelligence Agency. The people sitting in a cave with bin Laden planning and training terrorists in Afghanistan and the remote regions of Pakistan, would they qualify to work for our Central Intelligence Agency in 1995 and 1996? Absolutely not. So we knew we could not recruit any more individuals.

But then the Deutch Doctrine went one step further. They said we are going to scrub the assets that we currently have. What does that mean? That means that for those folks already spying for the United States and trying to tip us off and give us the information we need to stay secure, if we have people on the payroll of the Cen-

tral Intelligence Agency who have human rights records or criminal violations, we are going to scrub them. They are gone.

These are individuals who had made the decision and obviously they did things that were pretty damaging and ugly in the past, maybe were still involved with regimes that were doing that, but had committed and said we are willing to give information to the United States, for whatever their motivations, whatever they may be, whether it is money, whether it is sanctuary, whether it is a promise that they are not going to be prosecuted for their crimes. Whatever their motivations or agreements that they had, they were now being told, sorry, thanks for helping us for the last 3 years, 5 years; you are no longer part of the program.

They are sitting there and saying, let us see. We made this commitment to the United States, we have been feeding them information for such number of years. They have now sold us out. I wonder how long before they tell people who we are.

What happened during the mid-1990s, our intelligence community was gutted from exactly the resources that we needed to fight a war on terrorism, which is human intelligence. Not a satellite that tells us there is a building and a suspicious truck going in and out that has some materials on it that if you put it together, X, Y, Z, it is a legitimate material; but if you put it together differently, it becomes a weapon of mass destruction or a toxic gas.

We did not understand the plans and intelligence of the terrorist organizations that we were fighting and that posed a threat to us. So we end up getting into, just prior to 2001, as the planning for the attacks were going on, understanding very little about our enemies other than knowing they are out there and consistently highlighting them, whether it is from President Clinton, whether it is from our colleagues in the other body, or whether it is from other members of the Clinton administration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman brought up a personality trait of the President. When he inherited a bad problem, the President did not whine about it, did not take it to the American public, did not point fingers. He just set to work to solve the problem. There are many things that the President could have talked about that existed in the military at the point that he took over. Raises had been ignored for the 8 years under President Clinton; the inventory of our weapons were depleted seriously through many actions taken under President Clinton. Spare parts for vehicles and tanks were depleted, and the maintenance readiness status of our equipment was sadly lacking; but the President has not said one word about that during this war. He simply went to work, asked for the money to take care of the problems, and began to take care of the problems.

Today, I heard a speaker who described leadership as seeing a need, then taking a personal responsibility to take care of that need. As I look back on the President's performance since 9/11 in a situation that was tremendously challenging for any person, I see a person who saw a need and took a personal responsibility to begin to address the problems. He has addressed them well. If we look at the changes since 9/11, we see the dramatic changes in the situation in the world today. He talked to our friends in Saudi Arabia and said there were networks financing terrorism there, and that has changed. He compelled them to make a change in that.

Today Saddam Hussein is not in power, but instead is in prison. Who can forget the image of that leader who had killed a half a million people, his own people, and here was that leader, that vicious, violent leader crawling out of a hole in the ground where he had been hiding, whipped and beaten by the steadfast determination of American forces to rid the world of that evil and to keep him from doing more destruction, either in the world or to his own people.

Afghanistan this summer has already had elections. They are looking at a Constitution that is offering new freedoms in that country. Iraq has approved the temporary Constitution, the one that for the first time gives women rights in that Middle Eastern country, one that recognizes private property rights.

Children are back in school in Iraq today because of the President's actions. As my colleague has mentioned, Libya has given up their chemical and nuclear weapons. Iran is acknowledging their participation in this dramatic build up of weapons of mass destruction. The Pakistani President has vowed to fight terrorism in his country with his troops and is doing a dramatic job of that.

These are significant changes in the history of the world. And make no mistake about it, if the changes were not made to the better, toward the more stable governments, the changes will be made in the world to more unstable governments. That is the choice in the world today, stability versus instability. It is not so much a question of those countries that are democrat or not democrat. The question is stability and the protection of humans and human rights in those countries.

So the President inherited a military that was depleted, one that seemed to be on its heels. I would point out that when I went to Iraq in October and early November, I talked with many of the soldiers there. For 3 days we had lunch and dinner with American soldiers, both men and women fighting the fight. Every day I would walk through the large dining halls of 800 or 900 people, and I had a chance to visit with a lot of young men and women. In unison and one by one they said please tell the President we love him. That

was prior to when the President went there on Thanksgiving morning. When I saw him about to come around that curtain, I realized what the American troops would say to him because they had said the same thing to me a month earlier.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman probably agrees with me that one of the most rewarding things to do during a trip to Iraq is to meet with the troops, especially those troops patrolling the streets of Baghdad, especially those troops rebuilding the schools and health clinics, doing the different construction projects around Iraq, because they are the ones that are interacting on a daily basis with the people of Iraq. They are the ones who are experiencing firsthand the sincere expressions of gratitude and thanks for the work that the United States and our coalition partners have done.

People ask, Is Iraq better off today than what they were before? Before they were under a dictator that was killing them. We have heard the stories of what his sons would do. One of the troops that I met with this week indicated he had an opportunity to talk to someone who told him a story about the excitement that the Iraqis are expressing about fielding an Olympic team. There is a young boxer who is looking forward to making the Olympic team. His brother was a boxer for the Iraqi team before, but his brother lost an international match. He got back to Iraq, was picked up and was never seen again. His brother figures somewhere in a mass grave is his brother killed and buried for the simple fact that Uday or Qusay said you did not do a good enough job, and you are dead. There are many stories of what Uday and Qusay would do in the streets of towns where they had palaces. It was an unbelievable, brutal regime.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman was talking about the soldiers in the streets, there were three young men from New Mexico, and they brought me a picture from their patrol that morning. These young men were in their early 20s. They graduated from New Mexico high schools. I had watched one play in the State championship ball game. We talked about that game, but their greatest pride came from the recognition that was given to them by the Iraqis in the streets over a period of time. They said when they got there, people were peeking out of the curtains. They were unsure because they had been told for 35 years that the Americans had only one intent, and that was to kill when they came.

□ 2230

Yet through the weeks families became familiar with them being in the same streets and in the same alleyways, and protecting and guarding, and gradually they began to open their doors. On that morning, the morning

they took the picture in the street, they brought it to me to put into my office here. One of the families brought out their young kids and held them up to see them eye to eye. He said it brought tears to his eyes to see the changes in the Iraqi people in just a few short weeks.

The greatest question that our soldiers ask us is, why don't Americans hear this in the American press? Why don't my mom and dad hear about the good things that we're doing on the streets? I could not give them an answer but when I was there in my 3 days I took 5½ hours of video. I have consolidated that onto a CD that I take into the schools in my districts and I talk over and over and over about the good things that American soldiers are doing there in the reconstruction, not only in the reconstruction of the facilities in Iraq, but in the reconstruction of the hope and the dreams and the human spirit that we see taking place right now.

Our young men and women are recognizing the very valuable thing they are creating in the human spirit in Iraqis, and both the young men and women got tears in their eyes when they were telling me about it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding for that brief story.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague. I think we also want our colleagues to recognize in the times that we have been to Iraq, we recognize that Iraq is still a very dangerous place. Our troops will tell us that. There are Iraqis who clearly were part of the brutal regime of Saddam Hussein who received and reaped all the benefits of the Oil for Food program, the health care system and all of those types of things. Obviously, Iraq for them will not be a better place because now instead of the few benefiting from the riches of Iraq, all 26 million people will benefit.

Obviously, the terrorist organizations have made Iraq a battleground, the point of intersection with those who are fighting terrorism.

We recognize that Iraq continues to be a very dangerous place for our troops, for the Coalition troops and for the Iraqis that are working for us. The Iraqis that are now working for us are the targets frequently rather than Coalition forces.

My last trip 4 weeks ago to Iraq, we went to the police academy. The police academy is one of the first institutions of building a civil government after 30 years of a brutal regime, a lawless regime. We want to get a constitution in place, we want to get a set of laws in place as well, we want a police force in place, we want a judiciary in place, we want representative government in place, we want a free press. All of this stuff takes time, but one of the first building blocks is putting in place a functioning police organization.

The terrorists, recognizing that this is one of the first blocks that needs to be put in place, have now targeted the

new recruits. In the week before we were there, over 100 recruits had been killed in two different bombings.

We went to the police academy where over 600 young men and women, young men and women, the new Iraq now creates opportunities for women. We went there to lay a wreath, to show our solidarity with the Iraqi police officers and the police recruits. As we got done laying the wreath, we then had the opportunity to go around and shake hands with probably 300 of the 600 Iraqi police recruits. You could see it in their eyes.

I think this is the experience that our troops go through. They see it in the eyes, in the faces of the Iraqi people, they feel it in the handshake that you get, a firm handshake, you hear it in the words that they tell you, the sincerity of saying "thank you," and I am sure that our soldiers have experienced the same thing that we did.

After they looked us in the face, after they shook our hands and after they said "thank you," they put their hand over their heart and brought it back to their side, demonstrating the sincerity and the earnestness with which they were expressing their thoughts and feelings to us for having American troops there, for liberating them from Saddam Hussein and providing them the opportunity. They recognize, these are young kids, they are 18 to 24, and they know that the day that they leave that academy, they have got a price on their head because the terrorist groups do not want the beginning of a civil society, and the police force is one of those first building blocks. So they leave that academy knowing that they are going to go out.

I think I just read this week again that in the last 7 or 10 days, another 20 Iraqi police have been killed. I am sure that some of those that have been killed, I would tend to believe that some of those that were killed were in that group of 600 that we met 4 weeks ago. But they were there, there is a new class there now, they are committed to building a new Iraq.

I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico. We have been joined by our colleague from Arizona.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. He is bringing up a very compelling story that occurred when I was in Iraq. We went to Kirkuk. At that town, we visited the police station. I am understanding that it is the same police station that was bombed several weeks ago in Iraq causing great damage.

But when we were there the police captain began to address this concept of liberty. He likened it to growing a garden. He said in his words that for the roses to grow in Iraq, the roses would have to be watered with Iraqi blood. He said, We're willing to do that. We're willing to shed Iraqi blood for Iraqi freedom. When I heard those words, I knew that Iraq, no matter what the trials, no matter what the troubles, would be in good shape as long as we are there to help, as long as

we are there to help until they get their strength.

The only thing that can cause Iraq to suffer worse is for America to lose its resolve, because the Iraqi police at that station in Kirkuk said two things, Don't leave Iraq too early and do not leave Saddam Hussein loose. That was before we captured Saddam Hussein. We have taken care of the second piece but America cannot lose its resolve. Otherwise, the Iraqi people will pay dearly for the terrorists and the extremists who would go in and punish anyone who has cooperated with the United States or with the Coalition forces.

Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague. I thank him for being here tonight. There is no doubt that we are making progress in Iraq and not only do Americans continue to pay the price, and our Coalition forces, but the Iraqis who are standing with us right now are probably the ones that are really on the front lines that scare the terrorists most, because they are demonstrating to the rest of the Iraqis that they are willing, as my colleague said, to pay the price with their blood to grow the flower of freedom in Iraq.

I yield to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. I want to compliment both my colleague from Michigan and my colleague from New Mexico for their leadership on this issue and for helping carry the message to the American people that what we have done in Iraq is working and that it has been a struggle that has been well worthwhile.

As my colleague from Michigan well knows, I went with him to Iraq in August, and we were there largely before any Members got in. We spent 3 days. As my colleague from New Mexico mentioned, he went to Kirkuk. We also went to Kirkuk and Tikrit and Mozul in addition, of course, to going to Baghdad. For anyone who has been there, it is a tremendous education to go and to meet the people and to see the progress that is being made. We were there early on.

It was interesting to me, you were discussing the threat that is posed to anyone who goes to Iraq right now. When we went, we were freely allowed to travel by helicopter and did indeed travel by helicopter from the Baghdad International Airport to downtown Baghdad and around downtown Baghdad and then to each of the other places that we visited. We spent a lot of time in helicopters.

My colleague from New Mexico mentioned having taken about 5 hours of video. I think I took about 20 hours of video, in part because that is what we were allowed to do. We had a fair amount of time in helicopters. It does show you a great deal about the country.

My first and probably most striking recollection of it, and this was in Au-

gust, so the climate was different than it is now, was of taking off from Baghdad International Airport, and I had a TV news camera with me, and of shooting the neighborhoods surrounding the outskirts of Baghdad as we flew into downtown, and the young kids rushing out into the streets and out into the parks and waving up to us and giving us the thumbs-up and expressing their joy and their appreciation for what we as Americans have done for them.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We were there in August and I think even then we also flew over the city and we saw the tremendous amount of commerce, the cars on the roads, Baghdad looked much like a functioning city until you got to some of the compounds where we had built the protected barricades. I can tell you that having been back there 4 weeks ago, the commerce has even expanded much more significantly.

There are more cars on the road. We drove by the gas stations. The lines are gone. The kids are still out there on the streets. It is still a dangerous place, but this is a place that is making progress.

Mr. SHADEGG. It seems to me as I listened to you each speak about this, it has got to be hard for the average American citizen to appreciate all that we have done, because we in America take our freedoms so much for granted. We cannot even imagine the kind of repression that they suffered.

The gentleman refers to commerce in the streets. One day, I believe when you were getting a classified briefing, I was up in a helicopter in our trip not eligible to get that classified briefing and we flew over a market. This bustling market with hundreds of people there buying and engaging in commerce was just a tremendous display.

Also, thinking about the perspective of the average American out there, it seems to me that we have heard so much about this issue of weapons of mass destruction and I think we are as a nation kind of second-guessing, well, was it appropriate to go, did we do the right thing given that David Kay and the others that we sent were not able to document huge stockpiles of WMDs?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The gentleman is right. There has been so much focus on weapons of mass destruction. Let me read a quote for you:

"There is no doubt in my mind that Saddam Hussein still seeks to amass weapons of mass destruction. You know as well as I do that as long as Saddam Hussein stays in power, there can be no comprehensive peace for the people of Israel or the people of the Middle East. We have made it clear that it is our policy to see Saddam Hussein gone."

Mr. SHADEGG. Bill Clinton?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Everybody would say, of course, that is George Bush, January 2002. No.

We have made it clear that it is our policy to see Saddam Hussein gone. "If entrusted with the presidency, my resolve will never waver." Al Gore, May 23, 2000.

These people are now revealing these secrets that the President had this secret plan to get rid of Saddam when he came into power. Excuse me. This was the policy of Bill Clinton in 2000, forcefully articulated by then-Vice President Al Gore saying, "We have made it clear that it is our policy to see Saddam Hussein gone."

Mr. SHADEGG. I think that is a great transition for a point I wanted to make about the whole issue of WMD. Some now, in hindsight, would say, Well, the entire rationale for going to war was WMD. They try to make the argument that only now are we justifying our effort in part on liberating Iraq from the awesome and repressive rule of Saddam Hussein. What they forget is that the technical, legal reason for going to war in Iraq was, in fact, fully satisfied. They do not want people to think about that anymore. Even some people on this floor do not want you to think about that.

But David Kay, the weapons inspector with whom you and I met in Iraq, who in fact was not able to demonstrate or establish beyond a question of a doubt now that there are stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction, told me a week ago here in this Capitol building pointblank that there was absolutely no doubt but that Saddam Hussein was in violation of U.N. resolution 1441 and of the earlier U.N. resolution, I believe the number is 468, maybe you can recall the number, but, and this is David Kay, said there is absolutely no question but that Saddam Hussein was in clear violation as of when the war started of both U.N. resolutions. That was the legal premise for going to war in Iraq.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Going back to the speech by then-Vice President Al Gore in May of 2000:

"As Senator I voted for the use of force, as Vice President I supported the use of force. If entrusted with the presidency, my resolve will never waver."

And then, going on, talking about this time in the case of Iran, but it is also true for Iraq:

It is still a major sponsor of terrorism, a seeker of weapons of mass destruction. That is a deadly and an unacceptable combination.

There is no doubt that the Clinton administration and, at that point in time, Vice President Al Gore got it right. Iraq was a threat to the United States, Saddam Hussein had to go and that was a policy and a vision that was carried through under President Bush and his new administration with one big difference. Saddam Hussein, al Qaeda, bin Laden, the war on terrorism were seen through a very different lens. They were seen through the lens of 9/11. And so what we had to do is we had to take a look at the broad expanse of terrorism and the threats that were out there, recognizing that terrorists do not take a break. They do not take a vacation. 24/7 they are looking at how they are going to attack the United States, when, how and where.

There is only one way you can respond to that kind of a threat with people who are, I believe, fully committed. If they got their hands on weapons of mass destruction, the technology, they would manufacture them, they would use them against us, they would use them against the West and against our allies.

□ 2245

And the only way to stop them is not to negotiate with them, but is to put the pressure on them 24-7, 365 days a year.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I think the point is precisely made. I think it is exactly right. It shows that this administration was willing to take action. The kind of fine point I want to put on it was in addition to all of those things, the legal rationale for the war was their violation of the U.N. resolutions. And in point of fact, those resolutions said that if Saddam Hussein and Iraq did not comply with the U.N. resolutions, then the United Nations and the world would be justified in taking whatever steps were necessary, including force, to enforce the resolutions. And that was the legal basis for the war, and I think that is an important point to understand.

But the gentleman has raised a wider issue, and that is the war on terror. And it seems to me that today of all days we ought to talk a little bit about the war on terror.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a key word that we need to spend time on, maybe not tonight, but that the American people and our colleagues need to think about. Are we really at war? It was not that long ago that we had the opportunity to be at an event where one of the deputy Secretaries of the Defense Department, Steve Cambone, spoke and was very definitive. And he said we are a Nation at war, that we do not know exactly how long it will last, but it will not be short, recognizing that we are at war in that the situation that we face is very different, and we should realize it is different than how we treated it during the 1990s which was what my colleague and I talked about earlier, saying that these are just random criminal activities. This is much more serious.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to take the conversation forward to some of the events of today. We are at war, and it is a war against terror. And of course the news of the day is the investigative work of the 9-11 commission and the question of whether or not either the Clinton administration or the Bush administration appropriately has responded to the war on terror, that the kind of overarching news on that is the criticism which has surfaced in the last few days by this Richard Clarke of the Bush administration, a rather scathing book that he has written saying that the Bush administration did not take the war on terror seriously enough before 9-11. And he testified today before the 9-11 commission.

I happened to be in a position to watch his testimony, at least a substantial part of it, and I thought it absolutely fascinating because it was brought out in his testimony today that while he was accusing and is accusing the Bush administration of not having been sufficiently aggressive in the war on terror before 9-11 and in his testimony he detailed his frustration in not being able to get the Bush administration to do as much as he wanted, one of the members of the commission brought forward the text of a briefing that he, Richard Clarke, had given to the press in February of 2000 and again, I believe, in June of 2000. And the text of this briefing by Mr. Clarke said the exact opposite of what he is saying today. The text said, and this was a briefing by Mr. Clarke to the American press on the Bush administration's efforts on the war on terror, and he said the Bush administration is going far beyond what the Clinton administration had done. And at one point, he said, for example, in this particular aspect of the war on terror, the Bush administration has increased funding fivefold. That is a direct quote from Richard Clarke to the American media in a briefing he presented at the White House to our media about the efforts of the Bush administration.

In the course of the questioning, the questioner said, Mr. Clarke, that statement that the Bush administration was being much more aggressive in its efforts to go after the war on terror seems to stand at odds with the premise of your current book. And he went on and said, Specifically you told the press that there was a fivefold increase in the amount of money dedicated by the Bush administration to the war on terror than had been dedicated by the Clinton administration. Mr. Clarke was then asked, How do you justify that, how do you rationalize that, how do you explain that in the light of your book?

And Clarke made an interesting statement. He said, Number one, with regard to the statement that the Bush administration was being far more aggressive, it turns out that I was wrong; that is just what I believed they were going to do, and they did not do it.

And then the questioner said, What about this claim that they had increased funding by fivefold? If they increased funding by fivefold over what the Clinton administration had been doing, certainly that is inconsistent with your claim that they did not take the war on terror seriously.

And I thought Mr. Clarke's response was fascinating. His response was, Well, I was then a spokesman for the White House and my job was to put the best face on it I could, and so I highlighted the strong things or the positive things, not the negative things.

The questioner said, This is not a matter of opinion. This is a matter of fact. Did the Bush administration increase spending fivefold?

Clarke said, Well, they did in authorization. They did not in actual spending or in actual appropriations.

The questioner said, Wait a minute. Appropriations are done by the Congress.

Clarke said, No. There is also a two-fold process in the administration. They initially propose a number, and then they actually spend the number or put a number in their budget. And Clarke said, In point of fact, the five-fold increase that I was talking about is what they wanted to spend. They ultimately did not actually put that number in their budget.

The questioner did not follow up with the question I would have followed up with, which is I think the \$64,000 or in this case maybe the \$3 million or \$3 billion question, which is, Let me understand this, Mr. Clarke. You told the press that they had increased funding fivefold. You did not clarify this detail; so you were misleading the press back then.

And I think that begs the question of if he was willing to mislead the press back then, is he willing to mislead the press today.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I was not prepared to talk about Clarke because I am not sure that the whole debate can be dignified by a debate or discussion on the floor of the House. It, from my point of view, is one of the more disappointing things that I have seen. People who are coming out of positions where they have been entrusted by more than one administration with the security of the United States, the lives of American citizens, the lives of American service people, the lives in the CIA, and they very well know that they can go out and they can make whatever claims they want because the information that could thoroughly embarrass them and discredit them, and I believe it exists, is classified.

I can tell the gentleman there are few documents that I would just kind of like to take and put in Richard's face or give to the media and say, Now, just like this memo. It is not a memo. Here is what you briefed, not to the Bush administration in an internal memo, here is what you briefed to the press a year ago. Here is the letter of resignation that you sent, I believe, into the White House that praises this President for some of the work that he has done; and now that it comes to be an election time and it is time to sell a book, all of a sudden you are rewriting history. You can go out and make whatever accusations you want, knowing that most of the information that would rebut what you are saying is classified and so, hey, you are basically entitled to a free shot to do whatever you want.

And 2 years ago this person was holding the secrets and the strategy of the United States in place to some of the most dangerous elements that were challenging us. It is disappointing to see this kind of behavior. We deserve better.

I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I am sure the gentleman has a fascinating perspective on these issues which many of us do not, and I think he makes an excellent point with regard to the ability of someone who has had access to that information and knows what can and cannot be used to refute or rebut any arguments they make now. And I certainly empathize with and would share the gentleman from Michigan's concern about somebody who speaks out under those circumstances knowing that the information that might set the record straight is classified and cannot be brought out.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, we have had a wide variety of people come in and testify, and I can tell the Members that one of the things that I really appreciate on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is the seriousness with which individuals on both sides of the aisle take the job that they have got on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. We do not find the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence members participating in this gotcha type of game. We recognize that the responsibilities of the committee are too serious. We also recognize that we have had Richard Clarke testify in front of us, we have had a lot of folks who were in various capacities testify in front of us in secret session, and not everybody agrees. There is a variety of opinions, and it is our job on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to put the package together that tries to make sure that something like this never happens again.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I do want to conclude with this point, and I want to get it across. As a nonmember of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, as someone not privy to that information, I certainly would agree with the gentleman that perhaps this whole episode does not merit acknowledgment and debate here on the floor of the House except that I have long believed and indeed kind of grew up with the notion that the unrefuted lie becomes the truth. And in this case, I want to make this point very clear. Today in sworn testimony before the 9-11 Committee, Richard Clarke said, "The briefing I gave actively misled the press because I told the press there was a fivefold increase in funding, and now I am telling you some 2 years later that that was not correct."

If Mr. Clarke was willing to actively mislead the press 2 years ago and lead the press to believe that there had been a fivefold increase in funding when he knew darn good and well that no such fivefold increase existed, then I would suggest that his willingness to mislead the press then and admit it today, acknowledge "I made this claim, I was trying to explain the Bush administration's position," it absolutely was not true because it was only in discussion

or in, as he called it, authorization, not spending, an acknowledgment that he was willing to actively and aggressively mislead the American press and the American people 2 years ago, and what does that say about the validity of the claims he is making today? And I think that is a question that the American people unfortunately in this kind of tawdry discussion that is going on deserves to know about, be aware of. And unfortunately buried in that hearing today, not many people might have picked up the fact that what Richard Clarke said was, yes, I said to the press and the American people we had increased funding fivefold, but technically I was really lying because I needed to to keep my job. And I think that is shocking conduct on his part. I hope the press will comment on it in tomorrow's papers, and I certainly think the American people need to be aware that Mr. Clarke made a pretty startling admission today when he acknowledged, if his claim today is in fact true, that what he was saying 2 years ago or in February of 2000, now 4 years ago, was misleading the American people about what was going on.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) for bringing this important subject up because I have asked the President because many people asked me, Why does the President not fight back? Why does he not explain? And his simple answer to me was he cannot take the Presidency down into those baseless claims of people that are coming from everywhere. He stays focused on the job of fighting the war on terror. He has made tremendous accomplishments in the war on terror as we look across the history of the changes in just the last 3 years and even the recent incident along the Pakistani-Afghanistan border where U.S. troops are on the Afghanistan side and Pakistani troops were pinching in together al Qaeda troops in the middle. I think that indicates some of the most dramatic changes going on in the region, and this President, in spurning a policy of appeasement but choosing instead to respond in strength and remaining dignified and not dipping the Presidency into the baseless accusations that have been hurled from every direction during the last 8 or 9 months, indicates a steadfastness, a commitment to duty that this President brings that makes me proud.

I thank both of the gentlemen for bringing these conversations in front of the American people.

□ 2300

I think this is the right place to refute the lies that are being thrown about.

I thank both gentlemen for allowing me to participate this evening.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank both my colleagues for joining me tonight. As we began, there is no

doubt that we are making progress. There is no doubt that there is still a tremendous amount of work to do, both in Iraq and Afghanistan, but there is also no doubt that these countries have a long way to go, whether it was 12 years under the Russians and Taliban government in Afghanistan, those governments and those regimes which destroyed what little that country had, or whether it was 30 years of a brutal regime in Iraq. These countries both now are experiencing for the first time in a long time the taste of freedom, of building a civil society, of building a country that is based on a Constitution, that is providing opportunities to all of their citizens.

There are potholes on the way to success, but there is no doubt in my mind that we need to keep moving forward; that these countries have a tremendous potential to set an example for that part of the world, especially Iraq, to set an example for the rest of the world as to the types of things that can happen. They are good people, they are moving in the right direction, and they are taking ownership for their country, the future of their country. What we need to do is we need to stand alongside them and to help guide them in the right direction.

SEARCHING FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening basically to ask one question, and that is, where is Vice President CHENEY these days? Every once in a while he pops up at a reelection fund-raiser. In fact, he was just up in my home State of New Jersey on Monday. And last week he appeared at the Ronald Reagan Library in California, which is always a tough place for Republicans. CHENEYS went there to attack Senator KERRY's record on defense and national security issues.

Finally, this Monday, presumably on his way to New Jersey for his fund-raiser, the Vice President made time to go on Rush Limbaugh's show to attack his administration's former top counterterrorism official. Rush Limbaugh allowed the Vice President to get out his main message that Richard Clarke, the Bush administration's top counterterrorism expert, "Wasn't in the loop, frankly, on a lot of this stuff."

Mr. Vice President, I think that says a lot. When your top counterterrorism expert supposedly is not in the loop on what your administration is doing, how can you honestly say that you are giving terrorism the kind of attention that it warrants?

So, over the last week the Vice President has hung out with some Republican donors in New Jersey, Republican

loyalists at the Ronald Reagan Library, and Republican talk show host Rush Limbaugh. But for the better part of last year, the Vice President has been keeping a low profile. Why is he so afraid to step out of his Republican comfort zone?

I would suggest that the reason is that the Vice President does not want to have to answer more questions about his continued relationship with Halliburton. I have mentioned the Halliburton issue many times on this floor, along with a lot of my democratic colleagues. Back in the year 2002, Vice President DICK CHENEY said these words: "Halliburton is a fine company, and I am pleased that I was associated with the company."

But, you know, Mr. Speaker, the facts show otherwise. Halliburton, a fine company? Well, let me give you some facts, Mr. Speaker.

First, Halliburton has acknowledged that it accepted up to \$6 million in kickbacks for its contract work in Iraq.

Another fact: Halliburton is now being investigated by the Pentagon for overcharging the American government for its work in Iraq.

A third fact: Halliburton faces criminal charges in a \$180 million international bribery scandal during the time CHENEY was CEO of the company.

A fourth fact: Halliburton has been repeatedly warned by the Pentagon that the food it was serving 110,000 U.S. troops in Iraq was dirty, and the Pentagon audit found blood all over the floor of the kitchens Halliburton supplied over in Iraq.

A fifth fact: Halliburton is getting around an American law that forbids doing business with rogue nations. Thanks to a giant loophole, Halliburton is able to do business in Iran, of all nations, through a subsidiary in the Cayman Islands.

Mr. Speaker, how can the Vice President characterize Halliburton as a fine company? Things are getting so bad with the company in Iraq that the Army is now considering other companies to compete against Halliburton for more than \$4 billion worth of additional contracts. But the Vice President continues to condone the actions of his former company.

From a purely financial perspective, it probably makes sense for Vice President CHENEY to lay low. After all, it is also financially beneficial for the Vice President to continue to praise Halliburton and duck questions about his continued connection with the company.

The Vice President tried to squash such a story when he appeared on Meet the Press last year. Vice President CHENEY stated then, "And since I left Halliburton to become George Bush's Vice President, I have severed all my ties with the company, gotten rid of all my financial interests. I have no financial interests in Halliburton of any kind, and haven't had now for over 3 years."

But, Mr. Speaker, despite the Vice President's claims, the Congressional Research Service issued a report several weeks later concluding that because CHENEY receives a deferred salary and continues to hold stock interests, he still has a financial interest in Halliburton. In fact, if the company were to go under, the Vice President could lose the deferred salary, a salary he is expected to continue to receive this year and next year.

Now, while the loss of more than \$200,000 over 1 year would not put a big dent in the Vice President's wallet, he clearly still has a stake in the success of Halliburton.

Vice President CHENEY also neglects to mention that he continues to hold more than 433,000 stock options with Halliburton. The Congressional Research Service report that states that these stock ties "represented a continued financial interest in those employers which makes them potential conflicts of interest."

Again, this was not the first time that Vice President CHENEY has misrepresented his role in Halliburton. Earlier this year, the Vice President stated in reference to government manipulation by Halliburton during his tenure, "I wouldn't know how to manipulate the process if I wanted to."

What the Vice President neglects to say is that Halliburton cashed in after CHENEY took over. Under CHENEY's leadership, Halliburton doubled the value of its government contracts. According to a report by the Washington-based Center for Public Integrity, the company took in revenue of \$2.3 billion on government contracts, which was up \$1.2 billion from the 5-year period before the Vice President arrived.

Now, I am not saying it is not possible that Halliburton is the right company to do this work, but then how does the Bush administration and the Republican Congress explain why there is so much secrecy surrounding the whole deal? Could it be that the Republican Congress and the Bush administration are concerned that the more light that is shed on Halliburton's use of taxpayer money, the more examples of waste and mismanagement are likely to be exposed?

Under the circumstances, it is no wonder that the Vice President continues to hide.

I want to talk this evening a little bit about the Vice President's Energy Task Force and the relationship with the Supreme Court Justice Scalia and the case that is now before the Supreme Court relative to the Energy Task Force.

Vice President CHENEY might also be staying out of the limelight these days because he does not want to answer tough questions about how he continues to abuse his power as Vice President by refusing to release documents that could significantly impact our Nation's future energy policy.

For 3 years now, the Vice President has done everything he can to keep the