

goods they need, but now they will have to pay higher prices, a difficult prospect when even doctors only make an average monthly salary of \$25.

Mr. Speaker, this is one more example of Castro's attempt to impose sanctions on the Cuban people, all while blaming the United States and essentially playing the martyr. This should be an example to all of my colleagues on why we need to continue the embargo. Opening our markets to a regime that uses its people as economic and political pawns and has no interest in a market economy, rather, works only to funnel money into the government and its wealthy leaders, is not an example of an honest business partner.

This, Mr. Speaker, is how Castro treats the average Cuban citizen. Let us not forget the countless situations Castro has committed against pro-democracy forces, throwing pro-democracy advocates in prison or independent journalists, many of whom have been jailed in the last year.

So I simply ask my colleagues to join with me and take notice of what happened with these dollar stores as an example of how Castro treats his people. And I think it also should make us reconsider whether we want American companies doing business with this kind of a regime. I do not think we should.

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

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

DESPITE THE WRONGS OF A FEW, THE MISSION IN IRAQ MUST CONTINUE

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, along with many of my colleagues, had the opportunity to view the photographs of the prisoner abuses in Iraq this past week, and I have had many of my constituents calling me and questioning me about these issues. I certainly agree with all of those who express outrage to see this kind of abuse going on, perpetrated by Americans. However, I disagree strongly with many of those who look at these recent developments and assert we should never have gone into Iraq in the first place, considering these great problems that are developing over there.

I continue to feel very strongly the President did the right thing in using force against Iraq, and that Iraq was a serious threat from a terrorist perspective. And I think Tony Blair expressed this most clearly and most succinctly when he addressed the House of Representatives and the Senate in joint session right in this very Chamber. The

reason we went into Iraq was because if you ever had the joining of weapons of mass destruction with the terrorist elements of al Qaeda, instead of 3,000 dead, as we had on September 11, we could have 30,000 or 300,000 killed.

We went into Iraq for the right reasons. And to those who would say that the war in Iraq is unwinnable, I would assert that we have won the war in Iraq. The challenge that we face today is winning the peace. And clearly winning that peace is critically important.

By taking the war against terror into the Middle East, there are many of our detractors, supporters of totalitarian regimes in that part of the world who would like to see us fail in establishing democracy in Iraq and would like to see some sort of totalitarian regime re-emerge in that country.

I will say this. If we cut and run as some people are proposing, there will be tens of thousands of Iraqis who will die unnecessarily. I was in Iraq in November of last year, and many Iraqis are cooperating with us. They want to see a democratic institution established that can govern their country, and many of those people will be imprisoned, tortured, and executed if we see a regime resume in Iraq similar to Saddam Hussein's regime.

Now, many are questioning as to how this could have happened and are raising questions about Americans' character. How could it be that Americans are guilty of these kinds of terrible things? And, indeed, many of our detractors in the Middle East are trying to assert that we are no different from Saddam and his henchmen in that they torture people, and here we were, torturing people.

I think if we look at the brutal execution that we saw recently where an American was executed in front of video cameras, we can clearly see there is a difference between us and them.

The American people are rightly outraged, and they demand these abuses stop and that investigations be conducted. Well, in reality, the U.S. military responded appropriately months ago when they recognized this problem. Investigations have been underway for a while, and the abuses stopped long ago. Indeed, all we are seeing right now is a media and public reaction because the photographs were made available.

The American people are good people, the American people are a moral people, and we are reacting appropriately. The perpetrators of these deeds will be brought to justice. Indeed, as I understand it, court marshals are underway almost now as we speak. The real question is why could a small few be driven to such terrible deeds? And that is a legitimate question for us to ask.

Clearly, one important thing is a breakdown of command and control of authority, and we need to seriously investigate what happened here with the brigade commanders and the company commanders. How did we have breakdowns in our military intelligence op-

erations where standard Geneva Conventions were ignored? But those investigations were underway, and we will find out. And that is how America is different. That will play out in the eyes of the public.

To compare the United States to Saddam Hussein and his brutal regime, where this was business as usual, indeed it was official policy of the regime, is just totally inaccurate and totally distorted.

What struck me most about viewing these photos was the simple fact that many of these photos were pornographic. How could it come to pass that American servicemen and women are perpetrating these kinds of acts and recording them all on camera? Certainly we need to ask those questions in this country today. But I do not think we can escape asking the question of whether or not this is an impact of all the availability of pornography in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we have too much pornography in this country, and this body needs to act more and our court system needs to act more to try to stop it. We need to ask the questions of how could a small few carry out such morally reprehensible deeds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

SMART SECURITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's war in Iraq has failed. It has failed to make the world safer from terrorism. And, actually, it has made the world less safe and more susceptible to acts of terror. Who should be held accountable for this mess?

The war is not going well. Over 740 brave American soldiers have already lost their lives as a result of this deadly conflict, not to mention the innocent Iraqi civilians who have been killed and the thousands of troops injured.

The Pentagon just released a report that 18,000 American troops have been evacuated from Iraq for medical reasons. That is 18,000, or one-seventh of the number currently stationed in Iraq. This speaks to a systematic failure of leadership, Mr. Speaker. And, sadly, examples of this failure are widespread and easily recalled: the failure to secure Iraq's borders; the failure to prevent postwar looting; and the failure to provide the security necessary for reconstruction.

In fact, the recent abuse of POWs at the Abu Ghraib Prison is yet another

example of failed leadership by the Bush administration. But one of the most shameful aspects of our involvement in Iraq, our greatest failure of all, I believe, is the failure to adequately provide our soldiers with the equipment, the guidance, and the leadership they need to ensure their survival and their success in Iraq.

We failed to immediately provide our soldiers with the essential survivor tools, body armor capable of stopping bullets, armor for tanks that would help prevent the destruction of U.S. military convoys, and the necessary water equipment to keep them hydrated in the desert heat. This issue is one that should have been accounted for during the planning phases of the war, not as an afterthought when our troops were in harm's way, already halfway around the world.

In fact, this protective equipment has not been fully provided yet, after Congress approved \$155 billion in supplemental spending bills last year. I ask again, who should be held accountable for this mess? Should it be Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, who President Bush claimed was doing a superb job, and who Vice President CHENEY, in a recent statement, called the best Secretary of Defense in our Nation's history? If Donald Rumsfeld is doing a superb job, then I really want to know what is a bad job.

For his consistent failure to adequately plan for the war in Iraq and the postwar phase, during which the lives of far more American soldiers have been lost than during the war effort itself, Donald Rumsfeld should resign his post with the best interest of this Nation in mind.

We must also take heed of the quote made famous by President Harry S. Truman: "The buck stops here." President Bush would be well served to embrace this policy, a policy which served President Truman and our Nation well during an earlier war.

To prevent a similar situation, I have introduced legislation to create a SMART security platform for the 21st century, H. Con. Res. 392. SMART stands for Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. SMART treats war as an absolute last resort. It fights terrorism with stronger intelligence and multilateral partnerships. It controls the spread of weapons of mass destruction with a renewed commitment to nonproliferation, and it aggressively invests in the development of impoverished nations, with an emphasis on women's health and education.

□ 1800

The Bush doctrine of unilateralism has been tried and it has failed. It is time for a new national security strategy based on America's commitment to peace and freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for multilateral leadership. Let us be smart about our future. SMART security is tough, SMART security is

pragmatic and patriotic, and it will keep America safe.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRANT EMERGENCY HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, let me note that this President is taking care of the business of our national security; and, yes, it is a tough and hard job to do, and it is a job that requires tenacity and character. Our President is providing that leadership. He is not cutting and running. He is not trying to claim that the responsibilities for defending our country should be put off on the United Nations or other organizations.

In fact, if we have to rely on the United Nations for our national defense, as seems to be the Democratic plan, that means that the Communist Chinese and the security council would have veto power over anything done to protect the United States of America. I do not think we want to do that.

I think our President and Secretary Rumsfeld deserve a recommendation for their courage and willingness to stick out a situation until the victory is won, otherwise there would never have been any victories by American forces anywhere.

Tonight, however, I am here to talk about another threat to our national security, and that is the threat of an uncontrolled flow of illegal immigration into our country. On Tuesday, H.R. 3722, that is a piece of legislation that I wrote, will be voted on here on the floor, probably Tuesday. It is designed to control the flow of illegal immigration into our hospitals that is destroying health care in so many of our States. This legislation, H.R. 3722, sets the parameters for the use of a \$1 billion fund for illegal alien emergency health care that was allocated in the Medicare bill that passed Congress a few months ago.

If we do not act, this billion dollar fund will create a perverse priority at America's emergency hospitals throughout our country, that is, we will be using this billion dollars to reimburse the hospitals for taking care of illegal immigrants in the emergency rooms, but not for American citizens; illegal immigrants then whose emergency health care costs will be covered by a Federal grant, and will be given priority over uninsured U.S. citizens and legal residents. This is as perverse a priority as I have ever seen. What is wrong with this picture? We have to act to stop that.

We are literally telling our legal citizens and legal residents to sit in a line while illegal immigrants will be taken care of. My legislation, H.R. 3722, will rein in the cost of illegal immigration on our health care in several ways. Number one, it is minimal in paper-

work. It is being charged that my bill will create new paperwork. That is a bogus charge. If anyone wants this billion dollars in funds, they will have to fill out the paperwork anyway. Hospitals that are going to get reimbursed for illegal immigration health care are going to have to fill out a couple of forms, not by my bill, but in order to get that money. My bill simply says that information has to be available to the INS and the INS should start proceedings against an illegal alien to get him out of the country if he is sucking up dollars in our health care system that should go to American citizens. It also requires the hospital to take a Polaroid picture or get a fingerprint and ask the illegal who his employer is.

The reason we ask who his employer is is because H.R. 3722 says that if the last employer of that illegal immigrant has not provided health care insurance, it is not the taxpayers who should be paying for the health care of that illegal immigrant; it is that employer. If we cannot show that he has done due diligence, the employer, in trying to find out that he is hiring an illegal immigrant, they will have to pay for that.

H.R. 3722 also sets a limit on health care treatment requirements on illegal immigrants. Only in life-threatening situations do our hospitals have to give treatment to illegal immigrants. Today we see billions of dollars, heart transplants, 12-month long treatments for leukemia, all of these things, we are talking about billions of dollars are being spent for the health care of illegal immigrants. Genetic problems that they brought into the country with them, that is coming right out of the money that is available to take care of our senior citizens and take care of our own young people.

It is a sin that we are letting that go on. My bill takes care of that. It takes care of the mandate on our hospitals saying they have to treat anybody who comes in their door. We only have to treat them if their life is in danger at that moment, otherwise they get sent back to their native country where they can pay for their health care.

This legislation is being attacked from all sides by bogus arguments. Remember, it does not create new paperwork. This bill will be voted on the floor next week. Everyone needs to hear from their constituents about whether we believe our limited health care dollars should be going to pay for the health care of illegal immigrants. If you think that the money, the limited money we have available to take care of your family should be spent on someone who has come here illegally, then you need to look at who is voting against my bill. But if you think we should make sure that our limited health dollars are put to use for our own citizens and legal residents, then make sure your Congressperson knows, and my colleagues should know that their constituents support the idea of making sure that our limited resources help our own citizens and legal residents, immigrants who have come here