

when I asked if the King was now being protected. "You don't expect us to act that fast do you?"

Just like at the FBI, there was something wrong with the mindset at the CIA. Yes, George Tenet must be placed on that 9/11 blame list; perhaps his name should be underlined.

It is time for those who made possible the rest of the Taliban; the rise of bin Laden and yes, the tragedy of 9/11 to be held personally accountable.

The list stretches over both Republican and Democratic administrations. Through the failures of the CIA under Reagan to the blunders of the State Department under Bush to the incompetence and disingenuous posturing of the diplomats under Clinton, accountability requires that their names be given.

Retired General Patrick Hughes, who as head of the DIA fired Julie Sirrs and who today holds a high position in the Department of Homeland Security.

Former Ambassador and now Governor Bill Richardson, who save the Taliban from military defeat.

Former senior CIA Officer Milt Bearden, who armed the most fanatic of the Afghan factions in this struggle against Soviet Occupation.

Former Assistant Secretary of State Rick Inderfurth, who weakened the anti-Taliban forces.

Former CIA Director George Tenet, whose culpability should have led him to resign long ago.

Former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, who was the point person for the policy of covert support for the Taliban, and who derailed the opportunity to receive a detailed account of the entire al Qaeda terrorist network.

And finally, Richard Clarke, former senior Clinton official, who along with a few others was in a position to argue against if not to change the grotesquely mistaken policies of the 80s and 90s, but failed to do so.

If another 9/11 is to be avoided, we need accountability, not rearranging of bureaucratic organization charts. There was nothing wrong with our system that brought on 9/11, which will not be corrected by having different policies in place and different people in positions of authority.

Let us now, if nothing else, be honest with each other and insist on an honest accounting. Then let's beat our murderous enemy so completely that no one will ever miscalculate about our power and courage ever again.

#### IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized until midnight.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, we come to the floor this evening in the continued responsibility of keeping a very close eye on this administration's policy in Iraq in the continued series of what we style the Iraq watch.

I will be joined by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) this evening, and hopefully the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND.)

We have been now coming once a week to the floor of the House because

we believe that the House has a duty not to sweep under the rug the accumulation of errors, misjudgments and deceptions that have been foisted on the American people by the Bush administration leading to the war in Iraq.

The reason we are here every week is that there is too much tendency to forget the sacrifices that are being made by our men and women in uniform in Iraq; to treat them as sort of background noise; to sort of say, well, the casualties are down to several a week, so we can just sort of forget about Iraq. That is wrong.

We have been here for months blowing the whistle on this administration's repeated failures in Iraq, and we will continue to do so, because this Nation owes it to our men and women in uniform to continue to be vigilant about what this administration is doing and not doing in Iraq.

□ 2320

Perhaps, even more importantly, we owe it to the cause of democracy itself not to allow it to go unnoted when a President of the United States starts a war based on deception of the American people. We are here to say there is perhaps no greater abuse of democracy, no more dangerous event in the great American democratic experiment, than for an American President to foist falsehoods on the American people to start a war, which we believe occurred in this case.

Now, I would like to start our discussion tonight by quickly setting the stage for the history of the Iraq war to date. Unfortunately, this administration has made not 1, not 2, but 10 serious mistakes, deceptions, errors of judgment, negligence, and carelessness that have led to the troubles that our people are facing in Iraq. I would like to run through those very quickly before I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

There are 10 major errors the Bush administration has made in Iraq. Error number 1: This administration told America in no uncertain terms, with no doubt, with no vagueness, with no ambiguity whatsoever, that it was required to start a war in Iraq because Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. The President said, in a culmination of his multiple statements, and this must not be forgotten; on August 26, 2002, the President said, "Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction." And there was not only no weapons of mass destruction, there was plenty of doubt. This President's statement was false, and this was falsehood number 1.

Error number 2: The President told us on repeated occasions, and his administration, that they had clear, convincing and cogent evidence that there was a working relationship between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda which led to the attack on September 11. They told us this over and over and over again, and now that the evidence has been made clear from the multiple

reports that have come in on a bipartisan basis, this President's statement that Saddam Hussein was associated with the attack on this country, this venal, evil attack on this country was false, and it led to a war. And there is no greater error, breach of democracy than an American President saying that when this was false. And it continues to this day. With all of this mountain of evidence showing the falsehood of this President's statement, the Vice President of the United States has the chutzpa, if one can stretch that word that far, to try to continue to foist this on the American people, and it is falsehood number 2.

Number 3: The American people were told repeatedly that we would be welcome as liberators in Iraq. We would be welcome with rose petals at our feet. We would be welcome with nothing but clear sailing because the people would see us as liberators. There is no question in the belief that Saddam Hussein was an evil tyrant, and there is no question he abused thousands of Iraqis. But this President made a massive misjudgment by listening to Mr. Chalabi, one of the great sycophants in failures of predictions in international history, and the President was suckered and the American people were suckered by this misstatement, and we have paid dearly with our treasure and our lives and the health of our service personnel in Iraq.

Falsehood number 4: This President ignored the clear, professional judgment of people who said we needed to have more boots on the ground to prevent anarchy in Iraq, but this President ignored that advice because he has wanted to fight this fight on the cheap from day 1, and we have suffered as a result. General Shinseki told him that we needed several hundred thousand people in Iraq to quell disturbance after the Iraq war, and he ignored it, and our people paid dearly for error and falsehood number 4.

Number 5: The President said we did not need the United Nations, we could go in there alone, as long as we had the Philippines and a couple of other small island nations. Well, the Philippines have now withdrawn. This President decided to go it alone in Iraq, and our people have suffered dearly. Falsehood number 5.

Falsehood number 6: The President said that by implication, everything would be aboveboard. There would not be any war profiteering in Iraq, people would not make millions of dollars worth of profits in Iraq. Now we see Halliburton, this company so intimately tied with this administration, reaping millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, wrongfully. The GAO has reported on it. This is a scandal, and Harry Truman rooted out world profiteering in World War II. We need to get to the bottom of this war profiteering by Halliburton and the like. Falsehood number 6.

Falsehood number 7, and error number 7: This President and this administration led us down one of the most

embarrassing breaches of American integrity, and that is the horrendous occasions of abuse at the Abu Ghraib prison, and it happened because people at the top of this administration gave a green light to stretching our well-accepted rules of following the Geneva Convention. The memos are now in and public information that multiple memos were sent saying that we did not have to give the protections of the Geneva Convention to people. This is something we do to protect our own troops so that they will be not abused if they are captive. This is a long held principle of America. But out of hubris, out of outright arrogance, this administration ignored those rules and we have suffered in the eyes of the world grievously. Make no mistake, 99.9 percent of our troops are doing a magnificent job, but this was error number 7.

Error number 8: This President sent American troops into battle without adequate armor. Even today, our troops are driving around thin-skinned Humvees that should have armor, and I believe our people have been injured with shrapnel grievously.

Error number 9, and this is one that is going to haunt us for a long time: The President started and continued a war with absolutely no plan whatsoever in how to pay for it. He has tried to hide the ball over and over again on the costs of this war to the American taxpayer, and he is still doing it. This year, this budget my colleagues in the majority party put out with \$25 billion, we know it is going to be \$60 billion next year. There is no question about this. Why did they hide this information from the American people? Do they think the American people will be so sleepy they will ignore the fact that another \$60 billion will go to Iraq instead of schools and health care in America? Do they think that will be forgotten? I do not think so. This deficit is now in the billions of dollars and it is growing rapidly because the President wants our children to pay for the Iraq war rather than us. And this is that continued attitude of trying to fight this war on the cheap. This President needs to be honest and forthright with the American people about the real costs of this war, which are grievous. Error number 9.

And error number 10: And this one rankles me greatly as a person who has read the casualty reports of what hot steel and shrapnel has done to our troops, sending our troops into combat without flak jackets, and it took us a year-and-a-half to get this administration to get flak jackets. Is that too much to ask of an administration for our troops? Error number 10.

Those are a quick summary of the errors that have been made in Iraq. Today we heard about some new ones. We found out that, in fact, it was Iran that was allowing 10 of the terrorists who injured us so terribly on September 11, they were passing through Iran, not Iraq. The President never leveled with us and told us that. It turns

out it was Iran that was trying to buy the Iranian yellow cake, not Iraq. It is not a good enough excuse that they are one letter apart. That is not a good enough excuse for this President.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Maybe it is the wrong enemy, maybe it is the wrong war.

But before I explore that, I thought I would just take a few minutes to amplify a bit on two of the points that the gentleman made. The cost of this war in terms of dollars and cents. I have this memory of the Under Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wolfowitz, testifying before a congressional committee saying that there would be no cost to the American taxpayers because Iraqi oil would obviously be more than sufficient to pay for the costs, not just of our military presence, our security presence, but the cost of reconstruction.

□ 2330

Well, that clearly was a mistake. In fact, I thought it was interesting that the criticism from the other side of the aisle, from Republicans, about the costs and the misestimates was probably even louder than that that came from this side, from Democrats.

I have a memory of reading a particular column that was penned by Senator DICK LUGAR, the prestigious Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where he described the postwar phase. Of course, I would suggest we are still at war. When one reads the casualty list, on a weekly basis it is clear that American troops are still being killed, and a large number of course are wounded. Many of us have visited them at Walter Reed and Bethesda Hospital here in Washington, DC, but going back to what Senator LUGAR said, he said the postwar planning was totally inadequate. And, again, where is that oil money?

And a further observation. If we remember the first Gulf War, the cost to the American taxpayers was approximately \$4 billion. We have already expended somewhere between \$150 and \$200 billion, and as you suggest, many hundreds of billions of dollars more will be added to the bill, the bill that will be passed on to the American taxpayers for generations.

In the first Gulf War, there was a real coalition, a genuine coalition of the willing. There was participation in terms of the military presence. There were more non-American troops in the first Gulf War than there were American troops. Other than those forces from Great Britain, as you indicated, there are only small detachments of security forces from other countries.

And as was noted in a story last Thursday in the Washington Post, four countries have already left, four more are due to leave by September, and others are now making known their intention to lying down a depart before the political transition is complete next year.

Norway pulled out its 455 military engineers this month. New Zealand intends to pull out its 60 engineers by September, while Thailand plans to withdraw its more than 450 troops that same month. The Netherlands is likely to pull out next spring after the first of three Iraqi elections, while Polish military officials told the Pentagon that Poland's large contingent will leave probably in less than a year. And as you indicated, the Filipinos withdrew already. The Spanish have withdrawn. We are going to end up there alone, Mr. Speaker, and the bill will be paid for by the American taxpayers.

Now, much was stated back five or six months ago about a donors' conference in Madrid, Mr. Speaker, where the coalition was brought together in an effort to have nations other than the United States contribute, contribute financially even if they had no military presence there.

Well, quoting the Los Angeles Times of July 12, "Little of the \$13 billion promised for rebuilding has been donated, and countries are hesitant to waive that, frustrating the new Iraqi government." Countries have provided only a small fraction of the reconstruction aid they promised at a conference nine months ago, Mr. Speaker. Of the \$13 billion in non-American aid pledged, less than \$1 billion has been turned over to the United Nations and the World Bank, funds set up to take in most of the donations.

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

Mr. DELAHUNT. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. INSLEE. I think it is important to realize what this President's unilateralism has done to the American taxpayer by putting it in context, vis-a-vis the first Iraq war, because the first President Bush did in fact work with the rest of the world community, and as a result, the rest of the world paid well over the majority. I think it was close to 80, 90 percent of the total cost of the first Iraq war. It was not borne by the American taxpayer.

But the cost of this second President Bush's go-it-alone strategy to the American taxpayer is enormous, because as of May the American taxpayers had spent \$174 billion. Now, to put that in perspective, we are going to pass the total inflation-adjusted cost of World War I sometime early next year in the cost of Iraq, which was \$199 billion. And, again, the insidious part about this is that the President, because he is unwilling to do what Winston Churchill did, which was to call for blood, toil, sweat and tears, this President just wants to put this war on the credit card, and every single dollar of the Iraq war is going to deficit spending.

We have a \$7 trillion debt. This President Bush's budget is out of balance \$368 billion a year, and he is adding every single dollar of this going straight on our national debt. And it is our children that are going to suffer as

a result of this. Why? Because the President is unwilling to really face the truth in Iraq. He was unwilling to face the truth about weapons of mass destruction. He was unwilling to face the truth about a purported connection with al Qaeda. He was unwilling to face the truth about how many troops we were going to need. He was unwilling to face the truth about the armor that we needed. He was unwilling to face the truth, you name it, about anything you can think of in Iraq. And this is a continuing sore on our fiscal house as well as the suffering that we have had.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. As was indicated, it is only going to get worse, because I would suggest that what we are going to find is as time moves on, there will be fewer and fewer even pledges that will be made, let alone honored. We now know they are not being honored, at least if you accept the report from the Los Angeles Times.

It is easy to go out and say, yeah, America, you come up with \$19 billion to build roads in Iraq, to provide universal health care coverage, to rehab schools and to build affordable housing. If you do that, American taxpayer, we will promise that we will pledge or we will pledge at least half of what you do, and now we find out that less than \$1 billion has actually been transferred to the appropriate agencies. In fact, half of that \$1 billion comes from a single nation, Japan.

But I would like to get on to something else for just a minute. The President is prone to be saying, particularly at campaign rallies, that America is safer than ever. It is safer than it was three years ago. In fact, he extends it to the entire world. He is saying that the world is safer than it was three years ago. And yet, ironically, yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I think it was on Fox News, one of the magazine editions, there was an interview with the current, the so-called interim director of the Central Intelligence Agency, John McLaughlin.

□ 2340

And he said that while several al Qaeda plots against the United States, against our homeland have been foiled, the truth remains that the threat is as high as it ever was.

Now, there is an inconsistency here. All we have to do is count 14 to 15 days and there will be a new terror alert. How often do we turn on one of the cable news networks or turn on our TV and we see the Attorney General or we see Secretary Ridge talking about an elevated threat? In fact, Secretary Ridge was in my hometown of Boston, Massachusetts just recently talking about the threat. And here we have the new Director of the CIA contradicting the President of the United States who, and maybe he was simply indulging in campaign rhetoric, saying that we are much safer now and the world is safer.

And yet here, "U.S. Spy Chief: Al Qaeda Threat Strong As Ever."

Is this what we call winning the war on terror, Mr. Speaker. Is this making the world safer? I do not know that answer. I do not think the President really does either.

Mr. INSLEE. The fact of the matter is, and the sad fact is that this administration has taken its eye off the ball of the people who killed almost 3,000 Americans on September 11, al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden.

When is the last time you actually heard the President of the United States say the name Osama bin Laden? It is like he is the great forgotten person in this terrible tragedy that we suffered. I remember him and I think that our focus ought to remain on him.

Let me give an anecdote why it is not. We found out the other day in the Committee on Financial Services, the secret of stopping terrorists, you cut off their money. You cut off their money, you kill the beast, in part.

We found out that this administration has more people, more agents of the Treasury Department, this is the agency that is supposed to be in charge of lopping off the conduit of funds to al Qaeda, this administration has more agents chasing American tourists going to Cuba than it does chasing off money that goes to al Qaeda.

That is just one sort of sad indication that this administration has not focused on where the real threat has been which is al Qaeda which is still out there and which is still a meaningful threat.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Let me give another example in terms of seriousness. The administration's position, vis-a-vis tracking down the terrorists. There was a Committee on Ways and Means hearing where a representative of the IRS was posed a question and in response to the question indicated that the IRS's request for an additional 80 investigators who would be assigned to tracking terrorist financing throughout the world was rejected by the White House through the Office of Management and Budget. Is this how you fight the war against terror?

Mr. INSLEE. I bet they have got 80 bean counters that the American taxpayer are funding who work for Halliburton. This administration has no problem dishing out the dough for Halliburton and we cannot get 80 inspectors to track down Osama bin Laden. How is that for a sad commentary on taking your eye off the ball.

Now, I want to suggest how this has happened a little bit, how this emphasis has been misplaced. And it has because of this President's administration's focus on Iraq and their efforts to hoodwink the American people into believing that the real culprit or at least one of the culprits behind September 11 was Saddam Hussein. I want to spend just a moment talking about that because I think one of the single most serious affronts and dangers in a democratic system is for elected officials,

particularly in the powerful position of the President, to tell things to the American people which are false that end up starting a war.

We found out that last September a poll of American people said that 65 percent of American people believed that Saddam Hussein was behind the attacks on us on September 11, and Saddam Hussein has a list longer than my arm of his depredations against the Iraqi people. But 65 percent of the Americans had been convinced by someone that Iraq was behind the attack on September 11.

Now, who was that someone? Where did the American people get that idea which has turned out to be false and it is pretty clear where they got it. They got it from the President of the United States who was standing right there and tried to convince, and he did by and large, convince the American people of something that is false. The President did not let this slip on one iota. We all make mistakes and misspeak on occasion. This was a concerted, organized and consistent effort to fool the American people into believing that the culprit was Saddam Hussein behind September 11.

Look at some of his quotes. May 1, 2003, the President says, "The liberation of Iraq is a crucial advance in the campaign against terror. We have removed an ally of al Qaeda and cut off a source of terrorist funding." Vice President CHENEY, September 14, 2003, says, "If we are successful in Iraq, then we will have struck a major blow right at the heart of the base, if you will, the geographic base of the terrorists who had us under assault for the many years but most especially on September 11."

What do we find the truth is? Our intelligence people knew at that time but was shielded from the American people? The bipartisan committee under the chairmanship of a Republican Governor Keen concluded there was "no credible evidence of a link between al Qaeda and the attacks against the United States." No credible evidence. Not some credible evidence but not much. Not just a scintilla of credible evidence. Not a couple of ounces.

They said no credible evidence, but this President stood right there and started a war based on a falsehood, and he knew he was doing this to the American people and he is responsible for this. He is personally accountable for this and the American people need to hold him accountable for this depredation and affront to democracy as soon as they can.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Is not it ironic that on Sunday there appears a story in the New York Times about that report that will be forthcoming later this week, and the gentleman alluded to it earlier, when he mentioned Iran. And by the way, the acting director of the CIA confirmed the fact yesterday on the Fox News Program, yesterday morning that, yes, there was information that a number of the 9-11 hijackers had safe

passage through Iran, Iran, not Iraq but Iran. I guess we made a mistake as far as what country to invade.

But seriously, let me just read several excerpts from the Sunday editions of the New York Times. "The final report of the commission investigating the September 11 attacks will offer new evidence of cooperative ties between Iran and al Qaeda including information drawn from intelligence reports suggesting that Iran provided several of the hijackers with safe passage in the year before the attacks, government official said. The evidence raised enough questions about why the Bush administration focused on the possibility of Iraqi ties to be Osama bin Laden's terror network after 9-11 when there may have been far more extensive evidence of the Iranian connection. The panel had recently obtained intelligence showing that Iran had ordered guards at its border stations not to stop the passports of al Qaeda members from Saudi Arabia who were moving through Iran after training at terrorists camps in Afghanistan."

□ 2350

My memory is this Iran, according to the President, was a member of the axis of evil club, but as you pointed out, there is no collaborative relationship according to the commission between Iraq and Iran. But why did we end up attacking Iraq rather than Iran?

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I will answer that question. The reason we attacked Iraq is that the day after September 11, maybe it was 2 days after, it has been reported that the Secretary of Defense goes in to the President and says now is our chance, now is our chance to go after Iraq. This was like 48 hours after September 11. There was no evidence whatsoever that Iraq was associated with September 11, but this President and his political advisers knew one thing. They knew if they could fool the American people into believing that Saddam Hussein was behind September 11, the neo-cons could con the American people into supporting a war in Iraq, and to some degree, their maliciousness was successful to the detriment of our proud men and women in service who are there tonight in the heat of Iraq, 130 degrees, suffering, dying in the sands of Iraq because an American President's administration was not forthright with the American people and consciously, willfully gave false information to our fellow countrymen.

This is not just a little happenstance. We have a memo from a political operative of the President about how to talk about this. This was a cold-blooded, calculated act, and you talk about having your missed priority and what country you would be involved in.

I have been asked by one of my constituents if I have seen the movie "Fahrenheit 9/11." He said, JAY, is it true, did the President allow the family members of Osama bin Laden, who

are Saudi Arabian, to fly out of the country when all the other planes were grounded in the country? Did this administration let his friends from Saudi Arabia fly out of the country without a full and thorough investigation of their relationship? Did that really happen?

The sad fact is, yes, it did, and we have discovered that, in fact, did occur in our Committee on Financial Services hearing, and I pressed for an answer of who made that decision. I never got that answer, who made that decision, and 3 days later, the President is on the south portico of the White House smoking cigars with Prince Bandahar, the ambassador of Saudi Arabia, where two-thirds of the terrorists came from that attacked this country, and we let their families fly out without even a decent interrogation of them. Talk about having a mixed-up relationship about who our enemies are and who our friends are.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Does it come as a surprise to you that at least according to Bob Woodward in his most recent book, a book that was praised by the White House, in fact, there are excerpts of it I understand on the President's campaign Web site, but in that particular book, it was noted by the author that Prince Bandahar was informed of the attack on Iraq prior to the Secretary of State Colin Powell.

Let me go back just for a moment, because I know we are wrapping up, to another observation by Mr. Woodward, and this I would suggest is where ideology colors reality and affects the truth, the objective truth.

The passion of some in this administration, and I put beside you there a Newsweek cover with a picture of the Vice President DICK CHENEY, emblazoned that says how DICK CHENEY sold the war. It was clear that this individual was obsessed with Iraq, for whatever reason. I am not questioning his motives.

But in the book by Mr. Woodward, it is noted on page 175, for those who might have it, that the Secretary of State "detected a kind of fever in CHENEY. He was not the steady, unemotional rock that he had witnessed a dozen years earlier during the run-up to the Gulf War. The Vice President was hell-bent for action against Saddam Hussein." It is very dangerous when ideology colors the objective truth and reality. In the end, it gets us in a mess, and this is where we are now.

Mr. INSLEE. Well, I am going to close with a couple of comments.

We are here to discuss a basic principle of American democracy, and that is, accountability, that people in public service need to be held accountable, both for their successes and their failures.

There is a group that we should recognize for valor and effectiveness and honor in our government and our government personnel, and that is our Army, navy, air corps, Coast Guard, marines, who are serving in Iraq. Those

folks deserve to be held accountable by being praised for their tremendous service to this country in difficult circumstances tonight, and they are still continuing to suffer the pangs of war tonight, and we have come here to make sure that their sacrifice is not forgotten and that we treat them with as great an honor as we can and that we restore our Veterans Administration health care system so that when they come home they are not exposed to the cuts in the veterans health care system that this administration has proposed.

This group of public servants, we cannot forget their contribution. It should never be forgotten, but there is another group of public servants whose massive failures and deceit should not be forgotten either, and that is the Bush administration who has made at least 10 major failure, falsehoods, negligence and carelessness, to the great cost of the American public, and those public servants should not be forgotten in their failure either and should be held accountable, and we will continue to have this discussion until they are.

Would the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) like to close? Do you have any closing comments?

Mr. DELAHUNT. No, I concur with those sentiments.

#### OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF THURSDAY, JULY 15, 2004, AT PAGE H5851

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR) assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the following enrolled bill:

S. 15. An act to amend the Public Health Services Act to provide protections and countermeasures against chemical, radiological, or nuclear agents that may be used in a terrorist attack against the United States by giving the National Institutes of Health contracting flexibility, infrastructure improvements, and expediting the scientific peer review process, and streamlining the Food and Drug Administration approval process of countermeasures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of physician's advice.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. FROST (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal business.