

FISCAL YEAR 2005 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2004—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	49,548

¹ For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the budget resolution does not include Social Security administrative expenses, which are off-budget. As a result, the current level excludes these items.

² Per section 402 of S. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2005, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, current level excludes outlays of \$19,902 from 2004 budget authority provided in the Defense Appropriations Act, 2005 (P.L. 108-287).

Notes.—n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law. Numbers may not sum to total because of rounding.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

REMEMBERING SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be here tonight speaking on what is very close to the anniversary date of 9/11, and joining me tonight would be the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY). I would like to at this time recognize the gentlewoman from New York to discuss the events and the things that we should be mindful of on this anniversary date.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the heroes of September 11, to offer my sincerest condolences to the family and friends of those who were taken from us on that awful morning, and to offer my prayers to the men and women of our Armed Forces who continue the fight spawned by those attacks.

Much has been said about the firefighters and police officers who ran into those burning buildings, never to

run out. I feel that we can never say enough about such unparalleled bravery. In the face of an unprecedented attack, they displayed unprecedented courage in fighting through smoke and flames to save people they had never even met.

□ 1930

They made the ultimate sacrifice for their country, and their selfless action helped thousands of people escape the burning towers.

The people I represent lost a number of their friends, their coworkers, and their family members, but because of the heroics of the ones who ran in, many mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, sons, and daughters did make it home to embrace their families, and we pay tribute to the heroic firefighters and police officers who helped save lives on the anniversary of this attack on America.

We yet mourn the 3,000 fellow citizens who lost their lives that day. These were men, women, and children who did nothing wrong; who had no enemies; no foreign policy. They were killed for merely living as free Americans.

As we speak, tens of thousands of young men and women carry the stars and stripes on their sleeves working in hostile regions around the globe to protect the security and freedom many of us took for granted 3 years ago. Though they may be physically detached from their families and their loved ones, we hold a special place for them in our hearts. The sacrifices that they make can never be fully repaid, but we in this House and this Nation must remain committed to see that we try. And we must try to do so by providing our men and women in uniform the wages, benefits and respect that they deserve and that the American people expect.

Mr. Speaker, following the attack on Pearl Harbor, President Franklin Roosevelt told a shocked and angry America, we will always remember the character of the onslaught upon us. I do not think a person in this House or in this country will ever forget the disbelief they felt on September 11. We must never forget the way we felt that day watching our friends and neighbors die before our eyes in an act of war. Our world was changed forever that day, as our Nation's otherwise passive course was suddenly and forcibly altered.

We need to continue the lessons learned from September 11 and continue our steadfast and resolute fight to rid the world of this radical form of terror. We must never forget.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for those stirring comments, and I would now like to yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) for any comments that she may have.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, the memory of September 11 and our reaction to it will be forever with us. Most of us experienced first shock, then disbelief, confusion, yes, great concern, certainly, but, above all, horror when we fully realized what had been done to us. Each of us remembers just where we were, what we were doing and how we felt.

When I am asked where I was, I am always met with surprise when I explain that I was at the Pentagon that morning. I was there with a handful of other Members at a breakfast meeting with Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld. He had asked us there to discuss the future of the military and what changes, transformation was the word used, what transformation had to occur for us to meet the challenges of the 21st century and the dangers of our time.

It was a thoughtful and serious discussion, of course, as we all considered what would be needed to meet the dangers we thought we understood. And then, in a matter of seconds, as that meeting broke up, we learned of that first dreadful deed. As we made our way back to the Capitol, our worst fears were realized when the second plane hit the second tower. Now it is 3 years later, and I often return to that meeting in my mind, thinking how prophetic it was to be looking into the future trying to see and prepare for what was to come.

The question being asked daily during this election period is: Are we safer today than we were on September 11? I sit on both the House Homeland Security Committee, and the Subcommittee on Homeland Security of the Committee on Appropriations, and I can answer that question. Yes, we are safer today.

We have torn down walls that kept our agencies from talking to each other and sharing information. We have locked the doors that were open that allowed those terrorists to use our airlines and our airports so easily. We have enabled local communities and States to plan for proper responses to attacks. We have undertaken one of the most massive government reorganizations in our history by creating the Department of Homeland Security. We have funded new technology to protect our borders and our ports. We have provided funding to develop agents to

treat bioattacks of anthrax and smallpox. Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, led by President George W. Bush, we have declared a global war on terror and showed the courage to fight that war and not stand down.

We are leading that war, but we are not alone, for the world is beginning to fully realize that none are safe from the hate and evil of terrorism. That came home to all of us as we learned of the tragedy in Russia, where hundreds were killed and injured in a school, and where parents were made to choose among their children as to who could be saved and who would be sacrificed.

We have broken the back of the Taliban, and we have taken Saddam Hussein out of hiding and put him forever behind bars. And in court the families of those hundreds of thousands of his subjects who were executed and dumped in mass graves can tell their stories and have some justice in their losses.

We are fighting there so we do not have to fight here, and that fight is worth it. We are in praise to our troops for what they are doing for us.

Mr. Speaker, the war of terror is a war we must win, and September 11 is a day we must not forget.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her comments. In just a brief reflection, the differences between the two parties, Mr. Speaker, I think become evident as we contemplate responses to such events as 9/11. I do not doubt that my colleagues who believe differently feel as sincerely as I do about the possible courses of action that they suggest. But, Mr. Speaker, we do come to different conclusions.

We heard just a moment ago from one of our friends on the other side of the aisle who wanted to choose a smarter way to fight terrorism, to choose a good way, a way that is right, and suggesting that stronger intelligence is going to be the key to that. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that in the very period of time when we were needing more intelligence, the previous administration chose to bring in all of the operatives out of our intelligence systems and only use electronic means. And it so blindfolded us, it blindfolded us to the heart and the passion of the people in these cells.

I have heard estimates that it could take as long as 20 years, Mr. Speaker, to return us to the level of information-gathering that we were prior to withdrawing all of our agents out of the field under the previous administration.

My friend also pointed out that we should treat war as a last resort. Mr. Speaker, war is a last resort. We have tolerated one attack after another after another, beginning with the Olympics in the 1970s, when the Israeli Olympic team was brutally murdered at those events. We have tolerated a world continuing attacks from these people who would kill innocent civilians for no reason and with no expla-

nation. With no notice they would come in and do the horrific crimes that they have committed.

War is a last resort, and this President has said we have gone far enough. When we lost the people, those innocent civilians on 9/11, almost 3,000 people in just moments, when we lost those, the President of the United States, George Bush, said it is time to respond, and he has responded with steadfastness, with intent, and with clear direction.

I remember perfectly when he said, just after 9/11, if you harbor a terrorist, you are a terrorist; if you are a terrorist, we are going to come see you very soon. And he has been good for that promise.

But President Bush also laid out three fundamental things in the fight on terror. We must first uproot the Taliban so they cannot continue the training of new terrorists. The Taliban was operating in Afghanistan with basic training camps of terrorism, bringing people in to train them in the techniques of terror, the techniques of explosions, the techniques of murder. President Bush said, we are going to uproot you and take you out of those training camps, and he did that.

The second thing President Bush said was that we were going to begin to choke off their funding worldwide, and we have steadfastly worked toward that target, even to the point that within the last 90 days, our friends in Saudi Arabia, for the first time, have admitted they have a problem with terror in their own country, and they have a problem with funding mechanisms in their own country funding terrorists. For the first time the Saudi Arabians began to help us dismantle those funding streams for terrorists that originate inside the borders of our friends, the Saudi Arabians.

So, first of all, we are going to uproot the Taliban. We are going to uproot al Qaeda out of the training camps from Afghanistan. We are going to choke off the funding, and we have to do that and continue to do that. And, thirdly, the President said we are going to take the fight to the terrorists.

Now, some may agree or disagree, but I will tell you that when I was in Iraq, the Iraqi police forces that were guarding the border said about 50 percent of the people coming across the border were al Qaeda members. These are people from Iraq, from that northern region in Kirkuk, who would know. They were compelling in saying that we must continue the fight on terror.

They had two requests: Do not leave before you catch Saddam Hussein, and please do not take your troops home before the job is done. President Bush is firmly committed to that course of action, and I would say that we are making great progress toward the goal of eliminating terrorism worldwide.

It is going to be a very, very long fight. It will not probably be accomplished in our lifetimes. But I will say that the United States, and my chil-

dren and my colleagues' children, and my grandchildren and my colleagues' grandchildren, Mr. Speaker, are safer today with Saddam Hussein in jail than they were previous to the removal of his regime.

Mr. Speaker, a comment was made that we need to confront the root cause of terrorism: poverty. I am sorry, but I disagree with that fundamentally. The cause of terrorism is not poverty. To say that terrorism is created by poverty is to say that poor people have no standards. It is to say that poor people do not have discretion; that poor people cannot understand right from wrong.

Mr. Speaker, having grown up in a desperately poor family of six, with a father who worked in the very basic lowest level of the oil field economy of Hobbs, New Mexico, I can say that our family understood right from wrong, no matter our income status.

Mr. Speaker, I often wonder how the people who say that poverty causes crime and poverty causes terrorism justify that. If that is true, then the opposite would also be true. The corollary would be true, Mr. Speaker; that if poverty causes crime, then, as my colleague Dennis Prager says, affluence causes kindness.

I think that each one of us would recognize that that certainly is not the case. If poverty causes crimes, then those people who raise themselves up out of poverty by selling drugs into our high schools would certainly become more kind and more noble and more generous. But instead we find exactly the opposite is true. It is simply a false statement to continue to say that poverty causes crime, because affluence certainly does not cause kindness.

Mr. Speaker, the root cause of this terrible scourge of humanity, this terrorism that is being inflicted on the world right now, is not poverty, it is caused by a radical fundamentalist religious group who want to take power at any cost. At any cost. What else would explain a group who would go in and kill innocent children in a school in Chechnya?

I was in the district, Mr. Speaker, during this last August period, and I confronted questions that really were wrestling. There were people of noble intent wrestling with what is causing terror, and they had read the things on Web pages that were declaring it is the United States' policies.

□ 1945

My answer to them and my answer to them before the Chechnyan event is if it is the United States policy, then what on Earth is going on with the terrorists who are in Chechnya, a place that does not have troops in Afghanistan, a place that did not side with the United States in its current war? Russia was completely hands off, and yet they are being attacked the same as anybody else.

We know of the French resistance to our positions in the war; and yet the

fundamentalists, the radicals, have taken two French reporters as hostages. The cause of terrorism is not poverty, the cause of terrorism is a desire to gain power at any cost with no public vote. The desire of the terrorist is to destabilize world economies, individual countries' economies; and by destabilizing them economically, they have the potential to destabilize them politically.

Mr. Speaker, this question goes far beyond whether or not countries are democratic or non-democratic. It has to do with stability and stability on the world stage. We find that in many ways we might not agree with the Mainland Chinese; but make no doubt about it, when they stand side by side with us, and when they ask for North Korea to quiet down the rhetoric, North Korea knows that they ought to quiet down the rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to find that we have allies of unusual sorts in this battle against terrorism. We are going to find that sometimes our friends are there and sometimes they are not, because we are going to find unusual circumstances in their nation which cause them to move in and out based on the resolve.

Prime Minister Tony Blair was in this body, in this Chamber, and spoke to a combined group of the House and Senate. He asked one of the most compelling questions rhetorically. He said you as Americans must be wondering why us, why us? Why should we be the ones to lead this international war on terror? He said history has placed you in the position to where you can lead it. You have the resources, the financial resources, the young men and women who will fight for freedom. You have the standing military. He said history has placed you in the position to where you can respond, and it is your duty to respond.

I remember that comment to this day, and I use that answer when my constituents ask me why, why is it us? I will tell Members that no deeper disappointment has been felt by this Nation than the response of some of our friends. It is understood now with the Oil-for-Food scandal where nations were taking payoffs underneath the table, where nations were taking that oil for food money and enriching themselves; and it is understood now that probably even the vote in the Security Council, especially by our friends, the French, was probably a vote that reflected the payoffs that they were getting, the fact that they were getting oil at below world prices, the fact that they were taking payoffs.

I have asked in this Chamber if Kofi Annan can continue in his position because his son is somewhat implicated in the scandal and can he objectively look at what the U.N.'s response is. When my constituents ask should the U.N. be more involved, I answer that I think we must have the best response to terrorism possible. We must ensure that our troops have the equipment

that they need, that the money that we intend for rebuilding Iraq and Iraq's economy is used for those purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I personally do not want to trust friends who just recently have been taking payoffs under the table and pulling money, almost \$10 billion, one-seventh. Almost \$10 billion of the \$70 billion in the Oil-for-Food program was scammed out of it by all estimates. Mr. Speaker, that is not the sort of results that I would like to trust the safety of our young men and young women to.

As we think about the war on terror, we must understand that our young men and young women are simply the last wedge between tyranny and freedom in the world, that if we are not willing to stand up, if our young men and women are not compelled to fight for this fight that benefits much of the world, and not so much their own homeland at this moment, if they stand up to fight, they are the last wedge between tyranny and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we owe them a debt of gratitude. We owe them the thanks of a grateful Nation. We owe their families the thanks. And for those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice, we owe an undying respect for the sacrifice that they have made to make this battle, to make this war, to make this struggle to ensure that freedom survives and sustains itself in this world. To honor the memory of those who have given the ultimate sacrifice, we must give respect into the system and that war to ensure that that loss has not been in vain.

Mr. Speaker, as I contemplate the accomplishments that we can point to in this particular war on terror, I have to understand that under the leadership of President Bush and the 30 or so nations who are working with us, significant things have been accomplished in this war on terror. As far as al Qaeda, nearly two-thirds of the senior al Qaeda leaders have been taken into custody or killed. That includes Khalid Shaykh Muhammad, the mastermind of 9/11; and Muhammad Atef, Osama bin Laden's second-in-command.

In Afghanistan 3 years ago, the nation of Afghanistan was the home of al Qaeda, a country ruled by the Taliban, one of the most backward and brutal regimes of modern history. Today in Afghanistan, a presidential election is scheduled for this fall. The terror camps are closed, and the Afghan government is helping us to hunt the Taliban terrorists in remote regions.

Mr. Speaker, this Chamber has hosted the current President of the Afghanistan Republic. Mr. Karzai came into this Chamber speaking to both House and Senate Members, and the strength of his comments reflected the change in that society. These are changes that are generations coming, not just a few years, but thousands of years. He was pointing out for the first time that women in Afghanistan are going to have the right to serve in public office; and if my memory is correct,

the Constitution is reserving 25 percent of the elected offices for women. This is in a nation where women did not previously have the right to vote.

Today more than 15 million Afghan citizens have been freed from the brutal zealotry of the Taliban. Women are experiencing freedom for the first time and thousands of Afghan girls are going to school. Simply going to school was an act which was illegal under the Taliban regime.

Because we acted to liberate Afghanistan, a threat has been removed, and in this Nation we are safer because the threat has been removed in that country. It has become obvious that we are going to fight this war on terror. The only question is are we going to fight it here or are we going to fight it in Baghdad or Kabul.

My vote has always been to protect our children and grandchildren. My vote has always been to take the fight to the terrorists so our moms and dads can continue their lives in this country without threat of another 9/11. I know it has been just 3 short years since the 9/11 attacks, but that is 3 years without another significant attack inside this country, and I think we should pay respect to the thousands of homeland security officers and those first responders who daily look at what they can do to interdict the potential terrorists coming into this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, other accomplishments that we have in prosecuting the war on terror include many things in liberating Iraq. We have 25 million people in that country who were liberated from the brutal Saddam Hussein regime. The vast majority of Hussein's regime have been captured or killed, including the dictator himself. This sent a powerful message to the Iraqi people that the tyranny of that regime will not come back. Saddam Hussein currently sits in a jail cell awaiting trial by his own people. This gives more reassurance than any of us in this country will know.

The press has done a very, very skimpy job of reporting on the 400,000 mass graves that have been uncovered already, and we have members from the Iraqi civilian population who tell us that the numbers will be far greater than that.

Mr. Speaker, just before we went home for the August break, many in this Congress were treated and privileged to hear eight Iraqi women who came to speak to Members of Congress. When one particular Republican asked should we be in your country, and the obvious intention of the question was to find out if the Iraqi people felt like we had a right to be there, there were two comments that I was made aware of that seemed to sum it up. The first person that spoke said, let me tell you about my son. He simply spoke up and when he spoke up against Saddam Hussein, they arrested him and they cut out his tongue and then they put him on the phone trying to explain to me after they had cut out his tongue what

had happened, and then they cut off his hand. She said these were the sorts of things we were used to under Saddam Hussein.

Another woman raised her hand and said, one person of my family spoke up, and 52 members of my family were gathered up, some summarily executed, some were tortured horribly and then executed. The 52 members of my family are dead, she said, because one person spoke up, and she said, and your question is, Should you be here? She said that is the wrong question. She said the more compelling question is what took the world so long to come here.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I think we have grown accustomed in this Nation to such debates that are so removed from actual fact that we think in some corners of this country that this war on terror is an intramural contest, one in which after all of the flags are pulled out and we take our positions on the sidelines, we will get to come back out and start a new game.

Mr. Speaker, these women who came here to talk to us understood that terrorism is a game for keeps. They understood that what we are fighting is for freedom and for life itself.

Mr. Speaker, we have also handed sovereignty over in the interim to the Interim Iraqi Government. The new government is leading reconstruction of the country. In early 2005, we are going to have an election there. When we look at the effects that the new regime is having, we find that they can take instances that we could not. Some of our Middle Eastern partners were very disillusioned and angry about some of our stances; and yet when the new interim regime took strong stances, the Middle Eastern partners in that region began to get quiet and support them.

□ 2000

Mr. Speaker, the changeover from the coalition forces who are governing the Iraqi region into the interim government have resulted in much more stability, much more ability to fight vigorously the terrorists that live inside the population there in Iraq. I think that we are going to see continued attacks that may even escalate up until the time of our election, but, Mr. Speaker, we are making progress in the war on terror as we capture or kill the terrorists. There are simply fewer of them who have been through the training camps.

The other advances that we have made in the Middle East, Mr. Speaker, cannot be overlooked. Libya was a country which had weapons of mass destruction. They had nuclear weapons components. They voluntarily offered to give those up, but it was not out of the gracious heart of Muammar Qaddafi that they gave them up. The President has told me personally that they received the first call in the White House the day after we put the first Tomahawk missile through the restaurant where Saddam Hussein had

been sitting 3 hours before. Mr. Qaddafi knew that Saddam Hussein had moved for years, close to 30 years. He had had a regimen where he would physically move every 3 to 4 hours. So we missed him on that day, where we started the war a couple of days early, but Muammar Qaddafi understood that we had information that placed him in the building a couple of hours earlier. He knew that he did not have the same strong discipline, and so when we stuck the Tomahawk missile through that window in the restaurant where Mr. Hussein had been sitting, Mr. Qaddafi suddenly realized, I don't think I want to play the game. He called the White House within 24 hours, negotiations took 9 months, but he voluntarily gave up those weapons of mass destruction that he had, asking for someone to please come and take these things out of the backyard.

Mr. Speaker, he did that not because of a doctrine of appeasement on the part of the world community. He did that in the face of the strength of the response on the part of the world community. And so my friends across the aisle who say that there should be a kinder and gentler way simply do not understand the thought processes of terrorism. You cannot appease terrorists. You cannot negotiate with them. Their intent is to get political power with as few people as possible. Even in their own nations they cannot win elections, so they depend on terrorism.

I have heard and understood that there are approximately 31 conflicts going on in the world today, and that the great majority, approximately 29 of those, involve radical Islamic states. Mr. Speaker, these people who would like to end freedom in the world as we know it insist that their standards of behavior, their standards of treatment of women and their standards of treatment of other people is the standard that we should have. They fear the freedom that exists in this country. They fear the freedom that might begin to cause people to choose a different system than what they currently live in, and, Mr. Speaker, they are willing to kill, they are willing to maim, they are willing to torture, they are willing to destabilize the entire world to make sure that their value system holds.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we are in very much a civil war in the world. I think that it is very similar to the United States prior to the Civil War. We as a Nation were beginning to wrestle with such different value sets that we as a Nation understood that we could not have both slave and free States in the same Nation, and we fought a civil war to eliminate the slave-holding properties of this Nation.

Worldwide at this point, Mr. Speaker, I think what is happening is that the world is realizing we cannot live with both tyranny and freedom; that the Internet, that satellite TV, that quick, fast communications are eliminating the potential for terrorists to keep

their people completely isolated from the current world. And I think what we have going on is a struggle between the two value sets, and this war on terror in essence is simply a civil war fought among the world's countries to determine exactly what values we as a world will hold.

We sometimes think that we in America are removed, but 9/11 has changed everything. 9/11 brought to our understanding for the first time that we can no longer hide. Many nations around the world had experienced terrorist acts firsthand in their own nations prior to us experiencing them, but now then we also understand that we will fight the war on terror, that we will fight the war on terror here, or we will fight it there.

Mr. Speaker, there have been tremendous changes in many parts of the world. Pakistan for the first time is beginning to fight with us against these radical fundamentalists. Saudi Arabia has begun to work inside their own borders. Iran, although they are not exactly where we would have them, has begun to have discussions about the different programs they have that would create mass hysteria or create mass casualties.

Mr. Speaker, these are the ways that the war on terror is working right now in the world, changing literally thousands of years of history. No one of us could have expected 4 or 5 years ago that we would be where we are today in Afghanistan and Iraq, that we would be where we are today in Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. The worst thing we can do is lose our resolve, change our commitment, become less steadfast.

Many of the things that we find today in our discussions politically do not help the situation. They do not help ensure the safety and the security of our homeland. Many of the things in the discussion today would have been absolutely outlawed in World War II. I am not sure exactly why our friends on the other side of the aisle are making some of the comments that they do regarding our war on terror, because every time they make comments that indicate that they would pursue it differently, the terrorists simply say, We've got to wait out to the next election and maybe there will be a change, and we'll be emboldened more.

Mr. Speaker, we are doing our young men and women no favors by some of the comments that are being made in the Presidential debates on how this war should be handled. I know that there can be differences, and I do not think that the Republicans have every single answer, but in this particular regard I think that we do ourselves great harm and great danger by some of the ways that the debate is being handled.

Mr. Speaker, as we look at strengthening homeland security, we have spent billions of dollars that were unanticipated prior to September 11, 2001, but now we recognize the need to protect our skies, our borders, our ports and the critical infrastructure, as well

as support intelligence-gathering capabilities.

President Bush and Congress created the Department of Homeland Security in 2002. We began to pull the agencies together and to insist that they communicate the problems that each one saw at the border, communicate them back and forth. Previously that was not accomplished. So far we have conducted more than 124,000 port security patrols and 13,000 air patrols, boarded more than 92,000 vessels, interdicted over 14,000 individuals attempting to enter the United States illegally, created and maintained more than 90 maritime security forces. We have hired, trained and deployed over 45,000 Federal security screeners to America's airports to inspect all people and baggage to keep our skies safe. We established the Terrorist Screening Center to consolidate terrorist watch lists and ensure that government investigators, screeners and agents use the same unified, comprehensive set of antiterrorist information.

The majority party, the Republicans, have also enhanced America's ability to prevent, prepare for and respond to acts of terrorism by providing nearly \$27 billion for our first responders since 2001. Congress has also approved Project Bioshield, which will provide incentives for America's brightest scientists, physicians and researchers to develop lifesaving vaccines and medications to fight chemical and biological weapons in the event of an attack.

Under the present administration, under the Bush administration and under this Congress, the majority of which are Republicans, we have begun to reverse years of underinvestment in both our intelligence-gathering community and also in our military. We have increased the number of CIA operations officers. We have begun to reverse the crippling effects of the adverse attitude toward human intelligence-gathering, and currently in Iraq we are finding that the human intelligence-gathering has increased tremendously.

Mr. Speaker, as we look at ways to protect our troops, today I visited with a company from my district who are here, they have currently 11 prototypes in Iraq right now of an antenna that transmits a signal to make sure that the IEDs do not explode. They are in the process of making another 850 of these, these devices which will help protect our troops. Mr. Speaker, I know that everything is being done by this administration and this Congress which we can do to ensure the safety of our young men and women who are fighting the war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, it would be appropriate at this point to review some of the conclusions which were reached by the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence as listed in their report on the U.S. Intelligence Community's prewar intelligence assessments on Iraq. Conclusion number 1 of this U.S. Senate select committee was that the intel-

ligence reporting did show that Iraq was procuring dual-use equipment that had potential nuclear applications. Conclusion number 1 went on to say that the intelligence reporting did support the conclusion that chemical and biological weapons were within Iraq's technological capability, that Iraq was trying to procure dual-use materials that could have been used to produce these weapons, and that uncertainties existed about whether Iraq had fully destroyed its pre-Gulf War stock of weapons and precursors.

Conclusion number 91 told us that the Central Intelligence Agency's assessment that Iraq had maintained ties to several secular Palestinian terrorist groups and with the Mujahidin e-Khalq was supported by the intelligence. The CIA was also reasonable in judging that Iraq appeared to have been reaching out to more effective terrorist groups such as Hezbollah and Hamas and might have intended to employ such surrogates in the event of war.

Conclusion number 92 was that the Central Intelligence Agency's examination of contacts, training, safe haven and operational cooperation as indicators of a possible Iraq-al Qaeda relationship was a reasonable and objective approach to the question.

Conclusion number 93 was that the Central Intelligence Agency reasonably assessed that there were likely several instances of contact between Iraq and al Qaeda through the 1990s.

Conclusion 94 was that the Central Intelligence Agency reasonably and objectively assessed in "Iraqi Support for Terrorism" that the most problematic area of contact between Iraq and al Qaeda were the reports of training in the use of nonconventional weapons, specifically chemical and biological weapons.

Conclusion number 95 was that the Central Intelligence Agency's assessment on safe haven, that al Qaeda or their associated operatives were present in Baghdad and in northeastern Iraq in an area under Kurdish control, was a reasonable conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, the 9/11 Commission also reiterated the substance of our prewar conclusions. First of all, the Chairman of the Commission, Thomas Kean, on the News Hour with Jim Lehrer, June 16, 2004, said, "Yes, there were contacts between Iraq and al Qaeda, a number of them, some of them a little shadowy. They were definitely there."

Vice Chairman Lee Hamilton on that same date said, "I don't think there's any doubt that there were contacts between Saddam Hussein's government and al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden's people."

Lee Hamilton is a former Democratic Congressman from Indiana who served for 34 years in this U.S. House of Representatives.

The 9/11 Commission staff statement number 15 said that bin Laden also explored possible cooperation with Iraq during his time in Sudan, despite his

opposition to Hussein's secular regime. A senior Iraqi intelligence officer reportedly made three visits to Sudan. Bin Laden is said to have requested space to establish training camps as well as assistance in procuring weapons, but Iraq apparently never responded. There have been reports that contacts between Iraq and al Qaeda also occurred after bin Laden had returned to Afghanistan.

□ 2015

The 9/11 Commission continues to discuss the reasonableness of the assessment that Iraq was involved in terrorist activities. "The Butler Report on British Intelligence," chaired by Lord Butler of the British House of Commons, declares that "we have reached the conclusion that prior to the war, of the Iraqi regime," number one, "had the strategic intention of resuming the pursuit of prohibited weapons programs, including, if possible, its nuclear weapons program, when the United Nations inspections regimes were relaxed and sanctions were eroded or lifted."

Secondly, they concluded that in support of that goal, Iraq was carrying out illicit research and development and procurement activities to seek to sustain its indigenous capabilities. And, thirdly, they commented that Iraq was developing ballistic missiles with a range longer than that permitted under relevant United Nations Security Council Resolutions.

They continue in the report: "We conclude that, on the basis of the intelligence assessments at the time, covering both Niger and the Democratic Republic of Congo, the statements on Iraqi attempts to buy uranium from Africa in the government's dossier, and by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons, were well-founded. By extension, we also conclude that the statement in President Bush's State of the Union Address of 28 January, 2003, that: 'The British Government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa was' in fact 'well founded.'"

They continued later, paragraph 449, conclusion 21: "We have found no evidence of deliberate distortion or of culpable negligence." In paragraph 450 they comment that "we found no evidence that the Joint Intelligence Committee's assessments and the judgments inside them being pulled in any particular direction to meet policy concerns for senior officials on the JIC."

So report after report indicates that we have good reason and we had good reason to expect that the Iraqis were involved deeply in terrorist activities and that our operations there have certainly made the world more safe.

Mr. Speaker, all of us wish that 9/11 had not occurred. All of us wish that we were not having to fight this war on terror. All of us wish that we were not

losing American troops in this effort. But I will tell the Members that the young men and women who I talked to in Iraq have declared that they feel like their efforts are worthwhile, that their efforts are resulting in definite changes in Iraq, and they feel like their efforts are noble.

Mr. Speaker, we should keep in our prayers the families who lost loved ones on 9/11 and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) made very compelling comments about that. I would reiterate their comments that we could keep those families in our prayers, the families of 9/11, but also the families who lost loved ones in this war on Iraq.

The men and women who had done nothing wrong on 9/11, the families who have suffered so much loss deserve our continued memory and our continued remembrance. We must rid this world of the radicals who would kill innocent men, women and children. The event in Chechnya, the event in that schoolhouse, was not an isolated incident. It reflects the heinous attitude that some in the world terror community have toward other human life, even the most innocent, our children. In order to keep my grandchildren and my children safe and your grandchildren and your children safe, I would hope that we would all maintain our resolve to make sure that we all fight this war on terror in another land and not fight it here.

I would like to associate my comments with the gentleman from North Carolina, who commented that here we are fighting for freedom and the rest of the world and ministers in this country do not even have freedom of speech.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2004, AT PAGE H6850

SEC. 506. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice of describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(c) If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or sub-contract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LANGEVIN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 4:30 p.m. on account of a family emergency.

Mr. KANJORSKI (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 2:00 p.m. on account of official business in the district.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today after 4:00 p.m. on account of family commitments.

Mr. CANNON (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for the week of September 7 on account of family illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, September 15.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 13, 2004, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9478. A letter from the Principal Deputy Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Family Subsistence Supplemental Allowance (FSSA) program, covering the period October 1, 2002, through September 30, 2003, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 402(a) Public Law 106-398, section 604(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

9479. A letter from the Actuary, Department of Defense, transmitting an updated copy, current as of September 30, 2003, of a tabulation showing the distribution of DoD military retirees and survivors by State and Congressional districts as well as tabulations showing Congressional district ranking by number of retirees and monthly annuity payments from DoD; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9480. A letter from the Director, Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Risk-Based Cap-

ital Guidelines; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance: Consolidation of Asset-Backed Commercial Paper Programs and Other Related Issues [Regulation H and Y; Docket No. R-1162] Department of the Treasury, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency [Docket No. 04-19] (RIN: 1557-AC76); Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (RIN: 3064-AC75); Department of the Treasury, Office of Thrift Supervision [No. 2004-36] (RIN: 1550-AB79) received July 30, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9481. A letter from the Under Secretary for Domestic Finance, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report on the Resolution Funding Corporation for calendar year 2003, pursuant to Public Law 101-73, section 501(a) (103 Stat. 387); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9482. A letter from the Acting General Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-B-7446] received July 14, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9483. A letter from the Acting General Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received July 14, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9484. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Eligibility of Mortgages on Hawaiian Home Lands Insured Under Section 247 [Docket No. FR-4779-1-01] (RIN: 2502-AH92) received June 28, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9485. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — FHA Single Family Mortgage Insurance; Lender Accountability for Appraisals [Docket No. FR-4722-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AH78) received July 30, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9486. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Requirements for Notification, Evaluation, and Reduction of Lead-Based Paint Hazards in Housing Receiving Federal Assistance and Federally Owned Residential Property Being Sold, Conforming Amendments and Corrections [Docket No. FR-3482-C-10] (RIN: 2501-AB57) received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9487. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Market Regulation, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Covered Securities Pursuant to Section 18 of the Securities Act of 1933 [Release No. 33-8442; File No. S7-17-04] (RIN: 3235-AJ03) received July 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9488. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Division of Investment Management, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Disclosure Regarding Portfolio Managers of Registered Management Investment Companies [Release Nos. 33-8458; 34-50227; IC-26533; File No. S7-12-04] (RIN: 3235-AJ16) received August 30, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.