

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 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

legally, rather than being used by people who thumb their nose at our law and come here anyway.

Limited health care dollars should be used for our own people rather than providing unlimited care for illegal immigrants. That is the issue of H.R. 3722. We will vote on it next week. If you agree with me that this money and these resources are important for the health of our senior citizens and for the health of our young people and should not be dissipated on trying to make America an HMO for the whole world, then please make sure that my colleagues understand how their constituents feel on this issue.

I believe my colleagues should be judged on whether or not they are concerned about illegal immigration and they are protecting the interests of our citizens and legal residents by this vote, H.R. 3722. No matter what type of smoke can be blown in the air to try to confuse the issue, it is clear: limited dollars should go to legal immigrants and citizens. I ask my colleagues to seriously consider the consequences of letting this flow of illegal immigration dissipate all of our money available to us to take care of our seniors in the future.

PRISON INVESTIGATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has presented an opportunity for us to have a vigorous debate next week on the issue dealing with health care for all of us who are in need of health care, and my challenge on the question of separating out individuals who are called illegal immigrants yet paying taxes and hard working is that any failure in the health care system in our communities impacts all of us. So I know we will have a vigorous debate on that question.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we have had a momentous week; and I think it is appropriate as we conclude our week here, as we head home to our districts, to pay honor to the many men and women on the front lines of law enforcement; and I work with the law enforcement in my community on a regular basis. We pay tribute to those who have lost their lives defending us domestically and the families of those, the survivors of those who lost their lives. Let me first of all conclude this week by acknowledging that this is the week that we honor law enforcement across the Nation.

I want to thank them for their service, including, of course, the Capitol Police and police that guard this city, and also those who work throughout the Nation.

The week is momentous because for some reason or other when we try to do our duty here in this Congress, we hear the ire and the voices of

politicalization, partisanship and accusations. Some begin to go off of the margin and talk about campaign contributions, things that I myself would chastise and suggest is not the basic crux of why we have asked for extensive investigations on the last week's activities.

It also pains me to note that a Member of the other body would even participate in a hearing to begin to suggest that he is overwhelmed, if you will, with the constant statements of outrage about the abuse of prisoners because he wants to equate the idea of terrorism and what has happened in battle and it is no worse than the fact that Americans are there trying to do good, and of course citing terrible incidents that have occurred against American citizens and wanting to downplay what has now occurred and what the world has now seen as to the abuse of prisoners in Iraq.

I say to that individual that you are not contributing to what America is all about, and that is although we hear many voices and the talk shows are raging, fueling the fires of course of dissent, I know that the bulk of Americans agree that what happened in Iraq in that prison was not American, it was not in compliance with the Geneva Conventions, it was not moral, it was not spiritual, it was not kind, it was not befitting of how America has come to be known in this world. We are promoters of life over death, and we are promoters of peace over war.

So, Mr. Speaker, I come today to be able to clarify, if I might, what we should be doing. I certainly cannot comment as to the credibility of the visit of Secretary Rumsfeld to Iraq because I have not yet been briefed; but if it is to provide a rally, cheerleader-type atmosphere, then it is inappropriate. If it is to reaffirm good soldiers, certainly we must do that because I applaud them as well. But I believe Secretary Rumsfeld needs to come home, and I have already expressed my opinion of his need to resign or be terminated.

But I believe the administration has a duty to go forward with a full investigation into the matter dealing with the prisoner.

Lastly, we must have a complete investigation into the use of women in combat and the sexual promiscuity that is going on, the increased incidence of rape of female combat persons in Iraq, and the question of whether or not nudity and other sexual abuse is proliferating throughout the United States military. I want a full investigation, and I believe we can do no less than to undo what has been done to ruin the reputation of Americans and others.

CONGRESS IS NOT A RUBBER STAMP

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today the Committee on International Relations had a hearing on the Iraq transition. Actually, it was not so much a hearing as a briefing. While interesting, the real need for the Committee on International Relations and other committees of appropriate jurisdiction is policy development and oversight. I hoped ours would be the first in a series of oversight on the war in Iraq and the war on terrorism.

Deferring to the administration might have been understandable, if questionable, in the aftermath of September 11, but certainly not today. Congress cannot afford to be a rubber stamp, nor can we continue to rely on the media to embarrass us to action.

□ 1815

Had we held today's hearing 2 years ago, Iraq, our troops, the world and American taxpayers would be better off today. We would have clarified that the challenge was never to win the battle and remove Saddam Hussein. That was a given, once the might of the United States was unleashed. The real challenge was winning the peace. For that, sadly, the leadership of the United States was unprepared.

I will in the course of the official record submit questions for response from the Department of Defense and the Department of State, issues like the status of the new United Nations Security Council resolution, or getting the international donors to deliver the \$2 billion in outstanding pledges, and whether the United States is going to shortchange Iraq's needs after the transition to sovereignty like we have in Afghanistan.

The most important question, however, for us as a committee and for individual Members of Congress is to see if we can play a role in improving this situation. Can we help the President, who is unable to think of any mistakes, understand, admit and even be candid about where he and his team have fallen short of the mark? Can we provide to the American public real budget numbers as we clearly see now a \$300 billion price tag emerging?

The public demands an open and honest budget process. Can committees make it easier to get rid of the architects of this failed policy? Can we help place less emphasis on the shadowy military contractors and more emphasis on working through the nongovernmental organization community? I would note as an example the Mercy Corps operation, extraordinarily cost efficient and extremely effective in working with foreign nationals in trouble spots around the world. To the extent that we continue to use military contractors, can we in Congress rethink how it happens, clear up the ambiguities in law and policy and to have, finally, rigorous standards for performance and cost accountability? Can we help the administration avoid using artificial deadlines for key governance decisions based on our political calendar in the United States? Can