

crossroads. I urge my colleagues to grasp this historic opportunity, and join me in support of this vision that will reinvigorate our Nation's space program.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support NASA's new space exploration vision. Americans might ask: What is that vision? It means we are committed to these goals—

- Return the space shuttle to flight;
- Complete the International Space Station;
- Develop the Crew Exploration Vehicle;
- Go back to the Moon;
- Go to Mars;
- Increase NASA funding by almost 6 percent.

This new space exploration vision is a turning point for NASA.

We know there are inherent risks that come with space exploration, which is the pursuit of new knowledge and new worlds. Skepticism and doubt are often linked to NASA and its goals. But history provides the answers to those concerns.

The *Mercury*, *Gemini* and *Apollo* programs culminated in a great achievement: landing an astronaut on the moon.

In the past 45 years, NASA's explorations and scientific experiments have led to technological breakthroughs that have changed our lives. They include a heart pump implant system that prolongs lives, smoke detectors that have saved thousands from death and shape memory metal used in eyeglasses and golf clubs that make them bendable. Advancements have also included the unexpected, such as a new line of shock-absorbing athletic shoes.

I believe the new space exploration vision is affordable and achievable. To succeed it requires congressional support, leadership from the White House, and an unwavering belief that the impossible can one day become the possible.

Mr. Speaker, NASA has inspired the public since the *Mercury 7* astronauts had "the right stuff" to launch our space exploration program. Their legacy is secure.

Our challenge today is to honor the legacy and build upon it with a new vision. I believe we can. America still has the right stuff to make other giant leaps for mankind.

————— HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 2004

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn tomorrow, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 8, 2004, for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FEENEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

————— 30-SOMETHING DEMOCRATS

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to address the House of Representatives and also the American people on issues of importance. A part of our democracy is being able to provide information to the

American people so that they can make the right decisions at the right time when they are given the opportunity. Also, to hopefully have an opportunity to speak to our colleagues about some of the issues that are facing this Congress and the American people, that they can also make the right decision at the right opportunity and at the right time.

We have more opportunities, the American people do, to make major decisions. They get an opportunity every couple of years as it relates to the House of Representatives, and in many cases every 6 years as it relates to the other body. But every 4 years they get an opportunity to vote for the leader of the free world, the President of the United States; and it is important that we understand exactly what is going on in our country, what is going on in the world.

This is an hour, Mr. Speaker, that the minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), has put together for our 30-something Caucus that we have on the Democratic side on the aisle. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is my co-chair as it relates to our working group.

We have a number of members, some 14 Members of this House, that take time out every week to come to the floor. We have an opportunity to talk about issues that are facing young Americans and also middle-aged Americans and older Americans, because when we start talking about education, we start talking about health care, we start talking about jobs.

I think it is important we talk about Iraq. It is also important to all Americans, but we try to make sure that we be able to give voice to those individuals that are young parents and those individuals that are going into college and even young people that are looking to go to college to make sure that they have a great opportunity to do what they have to do.

I am so glad that my good friend from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is here with me, who is just an outstanding gentleman. We both serve on the Committee on Armed Services together, and we sit next to each other, almost next to each other, but we are there on the same level on the bottom row.

I thank the gentleman for being here.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Over the past week, we had a break. We normally are doing our 30-something event on Tuesday nights, but we are here on Thursday night tonight, and we are going to take a little different twist here. Normally, we talk about issues that are facing young students, young people trying to make their way in the workforce.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Can I just, when the gentleman mentioned that, because we need to get into what we are getting ready to discuss right now, but I know the gentleman has a couple of e-mails. If we can just take 5 minutes and talk about this voter suppression issue.

As you know, over the last couple of weeks we have been getting phone calls and e-mails about students throughout the country going to supervisor of elections offices and being told that they cannot register to vote there. Those students that are now in summer school, students that would like to go into the fall and be able to have the opportunity to vote in the primary elections in many States and also in the general election. They are being told that they can not register to vote in that State because they are not a permanent resident. But, as you know, in 1975 the Supreme Court said you can register. It is legal.

So we got a response back from a number of people saying this has happened to me, and we asked them to go to rockthevote.com.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Rockthevote.com to help with voter suppression across the country. It will inform you about whatever your situation may be locally.

I just brought a couple of these that I wanted to read, because we are going to, obviously, move to another topic. We received a couple of e-mails that we pulled out here, one from a Luther Lowe from the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia, and one also from Alleyn Harned from Columbus, Ohio, who lives in Delaware. I am going to read a couple of paragraphs out of the e-mail we got, because most adults will say why are kids not participating and being active in the process? There is youth voter apathy.

I just want to read these. This is Luther Lowe from William and Mary. "Rather than sit and watch our local representatives make laws which are unfair to young people, I decided to participate in my local democracy. I applied to register to vote at Williamsburg which required I also fill out a detailed two-page questionnaire in addition to the normal form. One week later, I received a notification of my registration denial. The reasons? I was claimed on my parents' income taxes. I drove a car owned by my mom who lives in Arkansas. According to the local registrar, I should have been voting in my parents' hometown. The problem with that is I have never voted in my parents' hometown. I voted for Al Gore from my boarding school in high school. I spend less than 2 months a year in Arkansas, so why should I be participating in local elections there? With the help of a local attorney from the ACLU, I fought back. It was only after two lawsuits that I was able to register on a technicality that I am a member of the Virginia National Guard and Governor Mark Warner is my primary commander in chief."

Give me a break. Here is a kid that wants to participate in the system, and he has got to hire a lawyer from the ACLU to get a right to vote from the university.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And he is a National Guardsman.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And he is a National Guardsman. The kid loves his country, loves the State of Virginia, has not been in Arkansas all that much, and they are trying to limit his right to vote.

I think that is the perfect example of why we are doing this, why we want to keep doing this, and slowly, over time, allow us to at least communicate to the young people of this country that sometimes it is a little bit of a fight. It should not be, but let them know that there are people here working on this for them.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. It is just amazing that you have to sue. I mean, it is amazing that you have to sue to participate in democracy.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It would be funny if it was not so sad.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And the level of insight that went into the letter he received from an official office of saying not only do we think you do not reside in this State but you have your mom's car, and the last time you voted you were in another State. It is very, very important that Americans understand that we have to fight day in and day out, even within the borders of our own country, to make sure that our voices are heard. And young people they are getting it handed to them right now not only by the Federal Government but the State has to do the same thing because we have cut our commitment to them.

We will talk about spending money and spending irresponsibly. But I cut the gentleman off. He was about to head down a path that we are fully prepared to talk about this afternoon. But I want to encourage our listeners and watchers to go to rockthevote.com. I understand we are going to do some things in the 30-something Caucus to make sure that does not continue to happen.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We will move on a little bit to the topic that we have been talking about a lot in the Committee on Armed Services and also been talking about a lot in Congress; and, obviously, the President of the United States has been talking about this a great deal.

Notice the picture that I have next to me. The gentleman on my far right, on the gentleman's far left, is President George Bush II. And on my near right here is Mr. Chalabi, who was the main informant, the main intelligence gatherer for the United States of America in leading to the war in Iraq.

The reason why we are going to talk about this is because some people may be asking, what are two 30-somethings that primarily have been focused on long-term debt for the country, increase in the deficit, annual deficits that we have in this country, student loans and college debt for students, debt for the country, debt for students, job access, outsourcing, we have talked about a lot of these issues, why are we going to talk about the war?

I think, and I know the gentleman knows this, that there has been nothing

that has damaged this country fiscally or with our political bank account more than the latest war in Iraq. I was against the war, as I am for full disclosure for the American people, for a lot of reasons that we are talking about today.

And I see that there are some young students that are up in the gallery now, so we actually have a live audience here. Why should they care about what is going on in Iraq?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members not to make references to visitors in the gallery.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Why should we talk about Mr. Chalabi? Why should we talk about his relationship to President Bush? Why should we talk about his relationship to Vice President CHENEY?

This gentleman stood up in the gallery during the State of the Union address as a friend of the President of the United States; and now we see in the paper today, from CNN's Inside Politics, Condoleezza Rice is now downplaying the relationship that this administration had with Mr. Chalabi. And she says, we had a relationship with Mr. Chalabi's Iraqi National Congress just like we have relationships with a number of Iraqi organizations devoted to the overthrow of Saddam Hussein.

That is not true. It is not just like every other relationship they had, because this gentleman was sitting in this gallery during the President's State of the Union address which, as we know, it is an honor to be recognized here in this Chamber, whether it is legally or illegally acknowledged. But he was acknowledged as a friend of the administration.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, obviously, he has represented himself as a friend of the United States. But there is a big discussion about him giving away the fact that we had Iran's secret codes and to be able to get intelligence on what they are doing inside Iran. Now that is major. That is major. That is just another investigation that is going on.

But how much did we pay him a month? Does the gentleman remember that number? Was it like \$365,000 a month? I believe that that was the number that they had. And if I can, I pulled my credit card out last time. I pulled it out of my wallet, and my wife said, do not pull that credit card out. And I told her I was using it as a prop.

But with a little help from my graphics people, when we start looking at this we are looking at really \$477 billion, which is \$4.7 trillion dollars in debt right now. And this is, of course, the U.S. Treasury that this money is coming out of.

So not only did we pay for a double spy to be able to share information with Iran, had a relationship, a very close relationship and family ties to Iran, which I must say that day in and day out we are trying to do what we

can to make sure that we play down the nuclear threat in the region, but we paid him. We paid him almost \$400,000 to provide this information.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. \$400,000 a month.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Almost \$400,000 a month. It is between 375 and 400. But when you are dealing with a \$4.7 trillion deficit, it seems like individuals that are in control of this House or the White House, they are not really concerned, or the Pentagon.

Now, I must say that it is important for us to remember that our credibility is at stake and American troops' lives are at stake. Any time we say that some folks stand behind our troops, we stand with our troops. And I will tell you right now that it is important that this information, that is bad information that we are getting from this gentleman, and also he is turning around and sharing our secrets with Iran. This is serious business, and this is nothing to play around with.

Just because we point these issues out, some may say, they are just being political. Let me tell you something. The lives that will be lost because of the information that has been shared with Iran and the information that we need to be able to fight the effort against terrorism, when it puts our troops' lives at stake, no one stops them, insurgents do not stop them and say, hey, let me ask you a question before we explode this improvised bomb here. Are you a Republican, Democrat or Independent?

□ 1700

Are you a male or a female or are you black or are you Hispanic or what have you? Are you partisan or Christian? Are you a Jew? They do not ask that question. They just carry out the act.

So we have decisions that are being made in the Pentagon, and I must say we have got to get to the whole resignation of the CIA Director, Mr. Tenet, and also what is not happening as it relates to Mr. Rumsfeld, who is kind of hard to find these days; but at the same time some of the bad decisions are still being made at the highest levels of the Pentagon. Everyone wants to get to the bottom of things, but no one wants to get to the top of it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman is passionate about this. I think your performance on our committee has been a passionate performance, and I think it is important for the young people who are watching it or the C-SPAN viewers who are watching this to understand at how much of a disadvantage the next generation is going to be because of the acts of today, the amount of credibility that we lost in the world, the amount of negotiating power that we have lost in the world; and I am going to give a couple of examples and tie this into something that we were talking about before a few weeks ago.

We were talking a lot about China stealing our manufacturing in the

United States of America, how we are losing the manufacturing base in this country, and the majority of these jobs and companies are moving to China, exploiting the labor and human rights and everything else. How does that tie into this?

Because of the political capital that we have been expending on Iraq, we cannot deal with a greater threat, which is North Korea, which has increased their nuclear arsenal by 400 percent in the last 3 years. So because we are so bogged down in the Middle East right now, we have to ask China to deal with North Korea for us, and therefore, we cannot play tough with China on manufacturing. So this has helped us not to be able to deal with the erosion of the manufacturing base. It is the same with the oil prices.

OPEC is now saying they are going to turn the spigots on. We are not sure. We will believe it when we see it, but we have to ask Saudi Arabia to help us with our problems in the Middle East and Iraq, and we cannot talk tough with Saudi Arabia for the gasoline prices. So we have put ourselves at a weak bargaining position with China, weak bargaining position with the Saudis to deal with the oil crisis and the gas crisis in this country.

I want the American people who work two jobs and deal with their grandparents and their parents and people are sick and they are sending their kids to school, who do not have time to digest all of this, and I want them to understand that we have made bad political moves, and we hire Presidents and hire Members of Congress to put us in good political positions.

I heard many Members on the other side talk about Thomas Jefferson. Well, we bought the Louisiana territory. That was a good political position. It put the country in a good position. NASA put the country in a good position. For us to just sit here and watch our country be put in a weak position, a weak bargaining position, a weak negotiating position, all in the process of pulling out the credit card and dropping \$200 billion in the Middle East, which now we have to stay and win, no one's arguing that, we have to support our troops, and I know we both voted for the Defense authorization bill. So this is not pacifist. We do not want any war ever, and we are going to support the Defense spending in this country, the Defense appropriations. We both have voted for that.

All we are saying is bad decisions have been made and they have been made because we have been taking advice from a con man who has conned everybody for the last 25 or 30 years in the world, who was found guilty of 30-some counts in Jordan, fraud, embezzlement, has been running around the Middle East and running around Europe over the past years. Everyone knew the reputation of this man; and he just told this administration what they wanted to hear, and they bought it hook, line and sinker; and now we are stuck.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let me just say this. I saw our con man on "Nightline" with Ted Koppel, and he said that he wanted to come before the Congress and address the Congress. He was willing to come to a congressional hearing. I am to the point that I will send him a ticket because I really want to see this one.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We will pay for the bus fare.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as you know, some of our troops secured the perimeter while Iraqi police went in and raided his office. This is the man we just cut payment off to in the last 30 days.

Also you mentioned outsourcing, and I just want, as it relates to this war and as it relates to the fight that we have tried to put on in the Committee on Armed Services, of making sure that our troops still get the things that they should have gotten when they first went in, armor, up-armor, Humvees, making sure that they have the things that they need to have so they do not have to write home and say, Mom, Honey, can you send me some equipment, can you send me a bulletproof vest. I mean, all of these things that the U.S. military is supposed to provide but did not have on hand because we went at this war in haste.

You mentioned something about outsourcing, and I want to tell you, I think maybe at this juncture, maybe 4 years into the business of trying to run the country, that one would understand past mistakes. Well, it seems like the White House is at it again.

The White House announced yesterday, led by President Bush, that they just gave the largest technology contract for passport screening, the largest contract in the history of the Department of Homeland Security to a Bermuda company, a company that has turned in its U.S. passport, moved to Bermuda to skirt paying Federal corporate taxes to be able to help this country run. Those jobs have also been encouraged and will continue to stay offshore of the United States of America to be able to provide the very jobs that individuals are looking for.

I must be able to share with you that unless some amazing magic trick happens in the next 5 months, this President will be the first President in a very, very, very long time that has not gained not one net job, one-plus net job for U.S. citizens or individuals that are here in the United States of America. I just want to make sure that we understand. The American taxpayers are paying \$10 billion, okay, that is with a capital B, for the passport inspections to a company that has turned its own U.S. passports in and their bank account is offshore.

Yes, I am a Democrat; but you know something, there has to be a change, and when I said in the opening that the American people have to make a decision on when they get the opportunity, it is up to us to make sure they have

good information. This is not the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) saying, hey, what can we write to make it seem like we are right. This is straight out of the White House, and this was yesterday. It is not last week.

I encourage Americans, if you can, I do not have any stock in Time Warner, but please get this Time magazine that I am holding here, and I encourage Members of the Congress to grab a copy of this Time magazine.

I get Time in my office, and of course, the issue on obesity in America, I need to read that story, too, because I need to put down a few things. But there are a number of issues that we have been talking about in the Committee on Armed Services that I would like to talk about if we would have a public hearing for a change to be able to share with the American people about what is happening to our troops, what is happening for our troops and to be able to share with the rest of the world that we do care about the good, bad, and ugly that goes on in America, and we are able to address it.

I will tell you, I will continue and with your voice and other folks' voices, and I am so glad I was on this morning on the Washington Journal, on C-SPAN, with one of our Republican colleagues who concurs that we should have hearings about what is going on in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, our base where we are detaining insurgents, the al Qaeda individuals that are providing us the very information that we need to be able to save American troops' lives. I want to talk about the drug issue in Afghanistan that is also putting American troops' lives at risk.

So we cannot sit here and say, well, let us pass another resolution supporting the troops. No, we should not pass another resolution supporting the troops. The troops already know that we support them. We support them. There is no question. There is no great mystery in the Congress about who does not and who does support the troops. Everyone does.

The 5-year-old kids that are walking around in this building, if you ask them do they care about our military, I guarantee you nine times out of 10 and 99.9 percent, you are doggone right, I do. I look up to them. They are heroes and sheroes. They are in the community; they serve. They are Reservists that have been in Afghanistan and Iraq and other areas and the Horn of Africa where we are fighting the issue of terrorism.

Let me share with you a few things in the Time magazine this month. This is very interesting. It has a picture in here of children that are playing in front of a painting of the famous picture in Abu Ghraib prison where the individual has the wires hooked up to him, and I think it is important for the Committee on Armed Services and this House of Representatives, to the majority, that not only we get to the bottom of it, I am sick and tired of looking at sergeants and privates. We are

going to hold them accountable. We are going to court-martial. We are going to put them in jail, but how do we get to the culture of how the individuals felt comfortable in doing this? By us addressing the issue all the way up to the top, okay, and it is important that we do that.

I am talking about the Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, who I did in committee thank him for his service to the country. He was a Member of this Congress, a two-term Secretary, serving his second term as Defense Secretary, but there becomes a point when you say, you know something, maybe I need to allow someone else to lead at this point, when we gave inaccurate information about weapons of mass destruction; when we gave inaccurate information as it relates to what is going to happen after the shock-and-awe campaign that was misleading; when we gave information of the fact that we were ready equipment-wise to go into Iraq for a year and 15 months, going on 2 years, all of our troops would have what they need.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, and that intelligence was based on information that they were getting from Chalabi, who is a known criminal. I mean, you are taking the country to war on intelligence, none has been true yet. We repeatedly hear: Saddam's ties to 9/11, treated as liberators, the whole list, use the oil revenue, whole list. All of that intelligence was wasted on information that we were getting from this guy. That is what is frustrating to me.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let me just share with you a bid-for by the Defense Department, some \$360,000 on a monthly basis.

I tell you the reason why we will not have hearings here in the House, public hearings, about what is going on in this war is that no one has the right answers for what has actually happened today. Forget about the argument of yesterday. Let us talk about today.

There was a point when the Secretary of Defense could not answer in a straight way how many U.S. troops we had on the ground. Mr. Secretary, well, we have maybe, the indicators say maybe, you know, the rotation. We do not need to hear that. The American people need to know more about what is going on with this war.

Also, in Time magazine, I must add, Halliburton. So after all, now this e-mail appears because the cream will rise to the top, or the truth will, that Vice President DICK CHENEY did have something to do with the no-bid contract and Halliburton. It is not the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) report. Check out Time magazine, and here it is in black and white, an unclassified letter that was sent to the highest levels.

Secretary Paul Wolfowitz said, one of his superiors said it is fine, go ahead, move on it, it is being coordinated by the Vice President's office.

Let me share something with you. This is not small stuff. It is huge. The

whole outing of the CIA agent. This is huge. We had a young lady in harm's way, and in this White House somewhere she was outed, and then the President goes and talks to an attorney. It is not a good sign.

So I want to say that the American people have to really pay attention to what is going on. We are far beyond Democrat and Republican right now. We are far beyond that. American lives are at stake, and by the fact of us having these hearings, letting not only the world but the American people know that we are going to address prisoner abuse and that we are not going to allow it to happen because, guess what, we are not them. We are not the terrorists. We are not the insurgents. We are not individuals that are parking cars in front of buildings waiting on those cars to explode.

□ 1715

We do not gun down innocent people. We are the United States of America. We have to uphold the history and the integrity that our veterans have put forth in foreign lands and in this country of being men and women of honor and integrity. For individuals in shirts and ties to make decisions and then anyone that questions their decisions is considered helping the terrorists or being on the other side is really far beyond anything that I can remember. So I think it is important that the American people pick up that magazine.

Also, there is an article here talking about how we are in full retreat on our Iraq policy. But I think it is important that we understand that outsourcing in the White House is still going on, some of the bad decisions that are going on in the Pentagon, decisions that are being made and putting America's troops' lives at stake so that this Congress has to rise up. The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in the other body is being criticized by his colleagues, Republican colleagues, for having open hearings about what is happening wrong in Iraq. Something is fundamentally wrong with that. His having those hearings may help save American lives.

So I think it is important we have this open government. No one wants to give away secrets, but it is important to share this information with the people and the world to protect America's interests.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I think we need to add on to what my colleague just said, as we welcome our good friend from the great State of Alabama here with us, is that after 9/11, and we all have agreed that 9/11 was an intelligence failure. Everyone has agreed on that, regardless of party. So if you are in a position of power where you are about to go to war and you know that your intelligence apparatus has just failed the country completely, you would think that you would ask a million more questions. Not a hundred thousand, a million. And you would think you would be shaking

the intelligence community left and right to try to get accurate information. Instead, we were relying on a con man to get the information that we wanted to hear.

So what I do not understand is why, after a major intelligence failure, you do not try to rectify that problem by having and assuring that you have good intelligence. Not to make a minor decision, but to go to war and to send 140,000 troops to war. Why are you not making sure we have good intelligence?

I think that is something that maybe in many ways Members of Congress did not ask enough questions, the media did not ask enough questions, that we were not confrontational enough as to what the Iraqi policy was going to be.

We have been talking here for a while, so I would like to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio, and I am always glad to see my friends from Florida and Ohio with all the promise that you all represent for this institution.

Let me just share an anecdote with you and then talk about that for a moment. I was in rural Alabama, in my home district, about close to exactly a year ago now. It was mid-June of 2003. And I had the honor of being the commencement Speaker at Judson College in Perry County, Alabama.

I remember a woman walked up to me after I had done the commencement speech, and she had tears in her eyes. I made the reasonable assumption that she was tearful because her child had graduated that day and they were tears of happiness. She walked up to me and said something that has stuck in my mind for the last year.

She said, "Mr. DAVIS, I have a husband who is in Iraq right now as a member of the Alabama National Guard, and our daughter did graduate today. My husband, her father, could not be here because he is serving our country." And then she went on to say, and she said it brokenly, in the midst of her tears, she went on to say, "Every morning I get up and I turn my television on CNN and I see the little crawler at the bottom of the screen, two Americans killed, three Americans killed." And she said, "Every morning, when I see that, something just jumps up from my stomach to my throat, and I remember that they always notify the next of kin before they make a release of the names. And that gives me relief for a moment. But until I see those names, I always have the lingering sense of dread."

That is what she said to me. Mind you, that was a year ago. That was before what has happened in April, it was before what has happened in May of this year, it was before Fallujah, it was before another 300 some Americans had lost their lives. That woman still gets up every morning, and I suspect if I ran into her tomorrow it would be the same conversation.

When you talk about Alabama, when you talk about one of the conservative States in this country, there is a myth in this city that people have made up their minds about the war. There is a myth in this city that people who live in the Alabamas of the world have made up their minds. Let me tell you, people in my State and I think people all around the south are searching for some wisdom. They are searching for some guidance. They want enough humility from this city and from the institutions of power in this city to recognize that we are struggling and we are trying to find our way.

These are not easy questions by any stretch of the imagination. We know the basics. We know that we have a significant investment of forces in a far-away land and that we are losing our men and women. We know that we have made a commitment, and we know that we are not a country that shirks from commitments once we make them. At the same time, we know that there are so many uncertainties. On June 30, there will be a transfer of power. We do not know what that transfer of power will beget.

As I have told so many people who live in my district, there should be no expectation on July 1 that soldiers will be drawn down, that large numbers of soldiers will leave. We do not know what will happen if this new government of 33 people is attacked or falls under siege in the next 6 months. We do not know what will happen if Iraq has elections and they elect a government that is hostile to the United States and we are invited to leave. What would we do at that point? What are our interests at this point in Iraq? Or to put it more basically, under what circumstances will we stay and under what circumstances will we begin to think about going?

Those are the questions that the people that you represent in south Florida and the people you represent in central Ohio and the people I represent in west and central Alabama are wondering about today. They are searching for a little bit of humility and a little bit of guidance.

There are two labels that get tossed around in this town a lot, pro-war and anti-war; and it strikes me that this, of all conflicts, this, of all foreign policy crises, may be a little too subtle for those simple terms.

Like you two gentlemen, and almost all of our colleagues, I spent Monday attending Memorial Day events. And on Monday morning in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, I had a chance to stand as close as I am to you right now in proximity to the widow of a gentleman who died in Iraq. His whole family was there. And something occurred to me. What do you say to a woman in that circumstance?

She really did not want to hear from me about politics. She really did not want to hear about Bush or Rumsfeld or Tenet. I do not know if she wanted to hear anything about policy or mat-

ters of state at all. But I do know that she wanted a little bit of comfort, a little bit of solace, a little bit of understanding.

There are so many families like that. That is what they want from us. They want some sense that we empathize with their pain.

And we do. There is not a one of us who sits in this institution who does not 100 percent support the men and women who are fighting there. Because at this point they are not fighting for a policy. They are fighting for survival. They do not pick up *The New York Times* to see if Bush is up or KERRY is up. They are simply trying to stay alive for a few more hours. And a lot of them, by the way, are younger than we are. We are three of the youngest people in this institution. A lot of these people are far younger than we are.

So the terms pro-war and anti-war, what do they mean? We have questions in this country, and what we need right now is a little bit of candor, and what we need is a little bit of direction. We have to get past this obsessive focus on personalities.

I, like most of you this afternoon, watched the news reports on George Tenet. I do not know the outgoing CIA Director. I do not know if you all do or not, but I do not know him. This does not seem to me to be about George Tenet. It did not seem to me to be about Condoleezza Rice when my fellow Alabamian testified before the 9/11 Commission. It did not seem to me to be about even Don Rumsfeld when we saw the excesses that happened at those prison camps. It is about something larger: What kind of country are we? What kind of values do we have? And how do we operate our institutions to reflect those values? Those are questions that are deeper and more abiding than anything that we are debating from day to day in the halls of public opinion and in the halls of this Congress.

So I would just say that what the people need from the President of the United States is enough humility to acknowledge that even the President does not know all the answers.

We are close to the 60th anniversary of Normandy, and I do not know how many of my colleagues know the story of the letter General Eisenhower wrote. General Eisenhower, as he was contemplating sending thousands of young men to their fate, wrote a letter that was meant to address a failure, a failure that he personally might not have survived. And the letter said something to the effect that this is my responsibility alone. If there is an error that has been made, it is my error.

That seems like more than 60 years ago. It seems like light years ago, sometimes, in this town. Because as you two know very well, sometimes we occupy a town where "I am sorry" is the last thing people will say. "I am responsible" is the last thing people will say. Or, at best, "I take responsibility" is what you say and not what you do.

So I think as we move deeper into this election year, as we contemplate the loss of life in Iraq, we all need to find some way to appeal to the better angels in our nature and some way to be true to our spirit and our values. And if we do that, we will find our way home, literally and figuratively. We will find our way to a policy that works for our country, a policy that is oriented in the best of our instincts.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my colleague.

The gentleman brought up General Eisenhower and spurred thoughts in my mind of the gentlemen of that day, of the Churchills and the Roosevelts and the Eisenhowers and the larger-than-life figures that participated in the greatest conflict. You just cannot help but to compare them to what the behavior is today. However, it just cannot be compared.

If we look at how Roosevelt handled himself and when we look at how Churchill not only stood up and gave his great Nation an enormous amount of confidence at a time when no one thought England would be able to stand tall, the big contrast I can recognize with Churchill and President Bush is in the preparation that Churchill gave and the leadership that London gave their people before anything was happening. This is going to be a long struggle, but in the end it will be our finest hour. We are not going to surrender. Churchill just kept saying, we are not going to surrender. If you take it, you are going to take it by us being knocked senseless onto the ground, was one of the great Churchill quotes. The preparation.

In this country, I think it was the exact opposite. We are going to be greeted as liberators. It is going to be great. Do not worry. It will be a drive-by war. We will use their oil. They are going to love us and hand us roses.

Yet when you look at the monumental figures of that era, who, like the gentleman said, kind of raised everybody's eyes up and tried to put the institutions in line with the values of the country, I really did not see that during this.

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. And the difference is, if the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that in the 1930s and the 1940s the leaders of the world had a fair amount of confidence in the people that they served. Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt had a certain belief that the people they served were capable of rising to the occasion and that they would respond to candor and common sense.

□ 1730

Sometimes in this television soundbite era that we live in, we do not have enough confidence in the people of our country. We have a mind-set that we cannot tell the people in our country full information, and that we cannot let them know a commitment may be a

long one because they may not have faith. We cannot let them know the money is going to be three times what we say it is because they may not have faith. We cannot let them know all of these uncertainties because we fear they may not have faith.

I have spent a fair amount of time in my life trying cases before juries, and I have won them and I have lost them; but I can confidently tell Members that every jury that I have ever appeared in front of I felt did the right thing in terms of what the facts were, whether it was what I advocated or not. I have that same kind of faith in the American people, that if we tell the American people the facts, I have confidence in our ability to apply those facts to policy and to apply our values to those policies; and maybe we need more of a sense of confidence. Maybe if the administration had had more confidence in the quality of our people, we would have had a clearer, more accurate path painted on where we are going in Iraq.

We all know from the work both of you do, we know there is a reason why certain facts were not emphasized. What was the old saying from the movie, you cannot handle the truth, a movie back in the 1990s, there was a feeling and fear that maybe the people just could not handle the truth. I do not know about other Members, but I think they can.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure hearing the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) and what the gentleman brings to the table as it relates to philosophy and history. Part of our democracy is making sure we level with the American people, the good, bad and ugly. They need to know because they need to be able to prepare themselves.

The President recently asked Americans to make the sacrifice that they made in World War II, make the sacrifice that they made in World War I and other conflicts, some of the great wars that have taken place; but it was a different approach to those wars. We planned; we made sure that individuals had equipment. We made sure that we had a strategy going in and coming out.

There was a Senator from Missouri, a junior Senator during World War II. His name was Harry S Truman. He had a select committee that was dealing with contracting, dealing with the needs of World War II at that particular time; and he did what he had to do during a time of war. During the time of World War II, they had a number of hearings to make sure that the troops had what they needed and they were able to respond real-time to issues that were coming up during that war.

For us to say, well, we do not have time to do that, we should not question the Pentagon about things that they are doing, we are muzzled as a Congress. Not to clear my conscience, not to say this needs to be said, but when the annals of history are reflected upon, I want to make sure that those of

us on this side of the aisle, that we did everything that we could to give the facts as we see them printed in documents.

A Pentagon report recently released said 25 percent-plus lives could have been saved if we had the right equipment at the right time.

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, that sparks another thought I had which I think is worth noting. There was another principle that those leaders had, and it was the principle of sacrifice. They had the moral authority and the willingness to say to this country this cause is so mighty, we have to sacrifice.

Contrast that with about a year ago. We were here when all three of us very strongly felt if we were going to continue to have to pay the cost of the war in Iraq and have to bear that burden, maybe it was time to suspend the tax cut for just the top 1 percent of Americans, or maybe just for people earning more than \$1 million, and pay for the war and occupation with that money. Now that is sacrifice. It is proportionate sacrifice. It is going to those most able to bear it instead of those least able to bear it, and you are saying that our cause is so strong and righteous we are going to come to the American people and ask them to forgo something. It would have meant something a year ago if the President had done that. If the President had come to the body and said, I care so deeply about this cause, I am willing to abandon one of my own programs, I am willing to walk away from this tax cut for people earning a million dollars a year or more, not because I want to, but because this is a time of sacrifice.

That kind of inspiration I think would have moved this country and would have produced an overwhelming response from people on both sides of the aisle. But somehow we have entered a zone where we talk the language of sacrifice at Memorial Day events and events around the country, and we will talk the language again on the Normandy anniversary on June 6; we talk the language of sacrifice, but we run from the substance of sacrifice.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure, because I was on the floor last night with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the Congressional Black Caucus, and I shared that I was at the World War II memorial with my mother and uncle, who is a Korean War veteran. They asked for all of the veterans to stand up. A number of them stood up. Those individuals that could not stand up, they put their hands up. I could not help but think "America the Beautiful" playing in the background, planes flying over, what was going to be their reality on Tuesday, when they go to the VA to try to receive services, the reality of calling for help and having to wait 6 months to see an eye doctor.

When we start looking at how we treat our veterans and how we respond

to them, the gentleman mentioned the deficit, and I am going to say we had this credit card made up. This is the U.S. Treasury credit card, Republican Congress. That is a big number, \$477 billion. That is a lot of money. That is an awful lot of money. And we look at, hopefully, the expiration date is good through 11/04 so we can get a new majority in here to be able to do something truly about the deficit. I appreciate the gentleman's work on that committee and on the Committee on the Budget to talk about true fiscal responsibility. And I will say it is important on the Committee on Armed Services, on behalf of troops and what the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) has just shared with us, families, we watch the news without even worrying about a family member, will their name scroll across the screen. Will they become a picture in the wall in the backdrop of a newscast. We have that privilege of not worrying, but we have individuals not based on the troop decisions, and many of the individuals on the ground, but the decisions that are made right here in Washington, D.C. that are endangering the lives of American troops.

We are going to support them, and we want to make sure that they have the equipment that they need to have; but if we do not do our job here in this Congress in giving voice to the voices, giving voice to that Reservist and that family that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) talked about where the father could not see the graduation of his own daughter, but he is fighting for the very freedom she is celebrating right now.

Do Members know why the President would not say, I am going to sacrifice one of my own programs? Because, guess what, he is never wrong. I am sorry to say it, he is never wrong. He never says, hey, I am wrong. The only thing he says, and we need to watch this word, and I need the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) to share some of the things we discussed earlier, but when we hear that somebody is doing a superb job, watch out.

The President today said, George Tenet, and I must say after the President stood up here in the well and said we believe that Iraq has received the necessary materials they need to make a nuclear weapon, and then once we found out that was inaccurate information, he was prepared to throw George Tenet under the bus, and now he said he has done a superb job. That sounds like the same thing he said about his Secretary of Defense. It is not a personal thing, but it is an issue of decisions. Especially when you are appointed and not elected, you have to make the decision if the leader does not take the prerogative to make the right decision and say, you know something, thank you for your service. In an honorable way, we will give you a gold watch and we appreciate your service. But he is saying nothing at all. That is what inflames insurgence on American troops.

I will leave it at that.

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there is another historical point worth making. None of us were here, we were all too young, but we have all read about the Bay of Pigs in 1961 in Cuba. For some of the younger people listening that do not know what the Bay of Pigs was, it was a failed effort to invade Cuba back in 1961. Lives were lost, and it was seen as a dismal policy mistake. John Kennedy had every reason politically to say this was a plan conceived by the previous President. He had every reason to say that this was something my CIA director foisted on me, this was something I did not want to do, and the military pushed it down my throat. He could have fired a number of people.

President Kennedy said something that is worth repeating. He said, "I am the responsible officer of the government. Defeat is an orphan, victory has a thousand fathers." That rings across the last 43 years. Defeat is always an orphan. It is something that happened. I did not do it; it happened. It is always something that no one wants to claim. Whereas victory, everyone wants to share in that and say, I did my part, you did your part.

We come back again to the same place. What I think so many of our people want is enough humility from up high, enough humility from the throne that we can conceive the possibility of error.

World War II is a wonderful analogy. We got some things wrong in World War II. The greatest President of all time, in my opinion, Franklin Roosevelt, signed the order that led to the internment of Japanese Americans. A Supreme Court that consisted of some of the finest jurists we have ever had approved that internment of Japanese Americans. We all know that was perfectly wrong now.

If men as great as Franklin Roosevelt and Robert Jackson and Hugo Black could be that wrong, maybe it should occur to us today that some of the individuals who sit in circles in power today could be wrong. Again, there is a lesson about humility to be learned there.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was just enjoying listening to the gentlemen talk. I want to clean up a couple of things that were mentioned. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) mentioned that now we want to make sure that our soldiers have the equipment that they need, we want to make sure that the vehicles are up-armored and they have the vests and the plates to go into the vests and everything else.

We have gotten so caught up in the fact that we want to get it to them, we forget to ask, you are telling me we went to war and we did not have our troops properly equipped? Lack of preparation.

In the Defense appropriations bill that we just passed out of the House, we reimbursed parents or whoever for

people, parents who paid for vests for their kids. I mean, you have to be kidding me. We had to reimburse parents that paid for their protective vests for soldiers in Iraq.

The general that testified about the prison abuse said that there were a couple of problems, major problems. One, lack of training. One, lack of supervision. To me, after almost 2 years on the Committee on Armed Services and a layman, civilian, lack of training and lack of supervision to me means we do not have enough troops there. If you are not training them properly, you do not have enough people to train; and if you are not supervising them properly, you do not have enough people to supervise. I think that is basic common sense to say this group has not prepared us for this war.

One other thing I would like to say because some young people are probably sitting at home listening to this, remember as soon as President Clinton got in office, there were always investigations, investigating this, Travelgate, Nannygate, this gate and that gate. They were always investigating the man. Why? The House and the Senate were Republican. The White House was Democrat. We are now in a one-party rule system. The House is controlled by the Republicans, the Senate is controlled by the Republicans, the White House is controlled by Republicans. I am not saying that they are always wrong, and I am not saying that we are always right. All I am saying is when there is one-party rule, we cannot subpoena people out of this House because the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) from the Committee on Government Reform is not the chairman of the committee.

□ 1745

If he was the Chair of the committee, we could subpoena some of these people who wear the suits and bring them before committees in the House and have them sit and tell us what happened and why and make sure we are starting to hold people responsible for their actions.

That is just what I want to say to the American people, is you cannot have one party rule the whole government. It is unhealthy for the institutions; it is unhealthy for the country.

There is no balance right now. There is no one overseeing what is going on. We get fed a line from somebody like this, and no one can stand up and question it. That is not a good way to run your country. This country was founded on all the different aspects, the branches and everything else, in order to bring some balance to these institutions we have.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FEENEY). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to the television audience, and to

refer to other Members in debate only in the third person, by State designation.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. FRANK R. WOLF TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH JUNE 8, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, June 3, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable FRANK R. WOLF to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through June 8, 2004.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

THE CASE FOR A SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP WITH CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, "China is a sleeping giant. Let her lie and sleep, for when she awakens, she will astonish the world," wrote Napoleon Bonaparte. I would like to title this speech "The Case for a Special Relationship With China."

Great nations almost always miss important changes outside their world. Such errors threaten their future in ways they never dreamed. History also has examples of leaders who saw challenges early and responded well.

The leaders of Great Britain's late empire entirely missed the rise of the United States. Britain suffered years of combat in World Wars I and II before their American allies joined the fight. During both wars, the British Empire teetered in the balance. Conversely, President Truman wisely perceived his challenge in the Soviet Union and responded well. His actions contributed mightily to the winning of the Cold War.

In the 19th century, not everyone missed the rise of the United States. As early as 1835, Alexander de Tocqueville saw in the future clearly when he wrote, "Americans are already able to make their flag respected. In a few years, they will be able to make it feared."

Looking from Westminster across the Thames River in 1870, the British Empire's leaders did not share de Tocqueville's view. It was an easy mistake for them to make. Queen Victoria presided over the largest economic block on Earth. In the glare of an empire where the sun never set, her ministers largely ignored the significance of their American cousins.

Well-schooled leaders of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office were distracted by a number of small wars at