

tray, and as he is walking to the little cafeteria, he looks over and sees the very agents that had secured him, and he looks and says, can I pick you up anything while I am on my way? I am on my way to do that; can I help you get anything? This is the attitude of many of these young men and women who attend our universities, and it is a shame. They give us support, and the problem is that we may do away with that support in the future.

Madam Speaker, I have heard over and over the media, and even some of our Members of Congress, purport that Saudi Arabia is evil. They have problems in Saudi Arabia. I sit on the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, and I also sit on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I will tell my colleagues directly, not rhetoric, not spin, but the Saudi Government is working with the United States intelligence service in which on Monday, I will purport and submit for the record reams and reams and pages of al Qaeda that they have captured, that they have killed of their own soldiers dying to help us and the rest of the world live in peace from these terrorists. Again, have they had problems in the past? Yes. Do they have problems now? Yes. But we need to help a nation that is trying to help us instead of bashing that nation. In trade, in oil, they have always been there.

Now, in the 1970s, when we had our oil shortage, Saudi did not help us. But since that time, under the first George Bush, under President Clinton, and now under George W. Bush, while the world is providing us oil at \$50 a barrel, Saudi Arabia is working to give it to us at \$38 a barrel. In the 1970s, when some of us were old enough to remember the gas lines, it was \$72 and \$73 a barrel. Yet, Saudi is pushing their own wells to make sure that the United States is taken care of, not just for Republicans, but for Democrat administrations as well. Colin Powell is working desperately to resolve this as well.

Let me get into one last issue before my time runs out. Some of my friends that I meet with regularly, and I meet with Jewish constituents, with Persian constituents, with Muslim and Arabic constituents, and they have told me, those who have served in Saudi Arabia, that the Saudi curriculum, education curriculum has not changed in 40 years. Eighty-five percent of that curriculum was okayed by U.S. standards. Fifteen percent was in a gray area. Five percent taught the Wahabiism, the antitolerance system. Well, guess what? Saudi not only supported the 85 percent that we support; they got rid of the 15 percent that was in a gray area. The 5 percent that taught intolerance; they fired those individuals, over 3,000 teachers that were teaching intolerance were eliminated, fired. And they actually have schools that go to purport a new curriculum to help not only not teach intolerance, but to help the Saudi education system itself. Many

Americans do not recognize that, that they are trying to work in that direction.

So the students coming to the United States and establishing a bond, the curriculum that they have changed to make sure that it is a curriculum not of intolerance, but of tolerance for other nations and adhere to the United States standards. I think that is significant.

Madam Speaker, I am not sure how much time I have left, but I think it is a good start to set forth on Monday, when we talk about the issues and how do we get from this vision of having Palestine and Israel secure, yet to have a strong Middle East with support for a peaceful system in the viable future.

Madam Speaker, I will start by saying on Monday, I am going to talk about a controversial issue. The Crown Prince Abdullah purported U.N. resolutions and supported U.N. resolutions 338 and 442, and those resolutions were adopted by the United States. They were adopted by the U.N. and NATO and all of the Arab nations. And what that did is it established a Palestinian state, a Jewish state, and if anyone violated those resolutions, the Arab nations would come to the rescue of Israel and support it.

Now, I ask my colleagues, Madam Speaker, can we in today's environment continue the Israeli-Palestinian issue as it exists today? Every day people are losing their lives. I strongly feel before we ever have peace in Iraq and in Afghanistan and Egypt and Syria and Lebanon and other areas that the resolution between the Israeli and the Palestinian people has got to be fixed, and that is no easy issue. They have been fighting for a long time.

So on Monday I want to give my colleagues a vision, not my vision, but a vision that has already been adopted by the United Nations, by the United States, by all of the Arab world, and supported by Crown Prince Abdullah. That is the antithesis of the direction that I would like to go forward in on Monday and give examples of how Saudi Arabia has helped the United States and other nations in the war on terror and the directions that we can go to have peace in the Middle East.

□ 2300

IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor tonight and will be joined shortly by my colleagues who have been consistent in manning our stations in the Iraq Watch. Now, for several months, my colleagues and I in the Iraq Watch have been coming to the floor of the House of Representatives to discuss our policy in Iraq and to ask if we are on the right course in Iraq.

I am reminded why we have been doing that when just before I came to the floor in the cloakroom, watching the TV, I saw a tribute to another fallen American hero in Iraq. That is all too regular an occurrence recently and reminds us why we come here for the Iraq Watch, because we are dedicated to the proposition that the men and women who fall in Iraq should not be shuttled off to page 12 and 14 and forgotten by Americans and have this trial and tribulation in Iraq somehow become sort of a back-burner issue.

We who have participated in the Iraq Watch are committed to the proposition that we need to be diligent in asking hard questions of our government as to whether or not our government is doing the right thing or making mistakes in Iraq. This is important to do for a variety of reasons.

The Vice President of the United States has suggested that only Members of Congress should just act as good little Members of Congress and be silent about Iraq and simply defer to the administration. The Vice President has suggested, at least implicitly, that whatever the administration is doing must be right and that all good Americans must fall in line and be silent about the Iraq policy and to do otherwise would give somehow aid and comfort to the enemy.

Let me suggest that that would be the least patriotic thing for Americans to do, from the U.S. Congress all the way down to the voting booth on November 2, because the people in Iraq serving tonight deserve the right American policy. That is only going to happen if Americans stand up on their hind legs and speak their minds about what we should be doing in Iraq.

So we are doing that, and representing my 600,000 constituents, and I know I will not be alone in expressing some sentiments tonight, to suggest that this administration has not made the right decisions in Iraq and, in fact, has repeatedly made the wrong decisions in Iraq that have now been responsible for us being in this terrible situation that we are now in tonight in Iraq.

Before I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), I would suggest in our discussion tonight there will be two parts of our discussion. One, we will ask whether or not this administration has been right or wrong on a variety of decision-making in Iraq. That is the first part of our discussion. The second part of our discussion is what should we do now to get a fresh approach in Iraq to increase our chance of success in bringing our troops home in a reasonable fashion. Those are both important parts of our discussion.

I have some questions that I would like to pose to the administration, but before I do so, I would like to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), who has been a very stalwart member of the Iraq Watch to start our discussion this evening.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Washington State for yielding.

Why do we stand here and talk about this subject late at night? The reason is because the people who have made the decisions which have brought us to this current situation, this mess that we face in Iraq, where we have lost well over 1,000 of our soldiers' lives, where approximately 7,000 of our American soldiers have been injured, these same people, and I am talking about from the President to the Vice President CHENEY on down to Secretary Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle and others, the so-called "neo cons," they have made the decisions which have led us to this place where we are tonight.

We are in a mess. We are in a quagmire in Iraq, and we talk about what has happened in the past because the same people who have brought us to this point want to remain in positions of decision-making. They want to remain in power, and they want to make decisions for what we do in the future.

I just a few moments ago left a dinner that I had with some of my friends from Ohio. These are people who have children and young relatives, and we were talking about the fact that we are in a situation in this country where our military is stretched so thinly that we are literally extending Reserve and National Guards persons well beyond any reasonable length of service in Iraq. They have been jerked out of their communities, away from their families, away from their jobs and professional responsibilities, and they find themselves now in Iraq.

We have a situation where we have instituted the so-called backdoor draft where those who had felt that they had long since fulfilled their military obligations to this country, some in their forties, even I believe many in their fifties, are being pulled out of their communities, away from their families, sent to Iraq.

We are taking our troops away from other really troubled spots in this world, and I would especially mention South Korea. We know that North Korea has stated they are going to go ahead and pursue their nuclear strategies. We are bringing troops away from South Korea simply because we cannot meet our military obligations.

We have got about 135,000 to 140,000 American troops in Iraq tonight. The next country that has a significant number of troops in Iraq is Great Britain. They have got somewhere in the vicinity of 6,500. We have got 135,000 to 140,000, and the reports are that even Great Britain is considering withdrawing up to one-third of their troops from Iraq.

So what do we have? We have a situation where every mother and father in this country should pay attention if they have a child and they do not want that child facing a military draft and being forced to go fight this war that George Bush has started in Iraq. I do not care if a parent's child is 10 years

old or 14 years old or 18 years old. If they do not want that son or daughter to be subject to a military draft, they should be paying attention, because although the President says he has no intention of instituting a mandatory draft, if you look at the situation, you look at our manpower needs, you look at the fact that the National Guard is currently having difficulty recruiting sufficient numbers, that they are even taking people who are pre-enlisting, they may still be completing their education, for example, and will not actually be eligible to enter the military for another year or so, they are counting those people as new recruits in order to at least pretend that we are meeting our current manpower needs. That is happening right now.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I just want to add to the point backup for what you are saying.

I read in the last 3 days two very disturbing things. Number one, for the first time in 15 years, the National Guard has fallen over 5,000 people short in their recruiting, for obvious reasons, that we see the stretch that has resulted in a silent draft already of pulling people back repeatedly, and 50-year-old people who have gone to Iraq once for a year, come back for several months, now have to go back again, leaving their families and careers. Of course, the National Guard is going to fall short.

We already have a silent draft because now the Army's pulling people back who served 4- and 5-year terms already, who never understood that they could realistically thought they would be pulled back, and it is disturbing to show you how bad this is. I think something like 25 percent of those people have not appeared for duty. They are so upset about what has happened. This is a major problem in our military because the President planned so poorly about what was going to be involved in Iraq.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, my understanding is that those people, those citizens out there, are now being considered deserters because they have not reported.

This is a serious matter. I think the President should be talking to the American people in a very straightforward way about how he intends to meet our military personnel manpower needs without a draft.

□ 2310

Just simply saying we are not going to have a draft is not an answer, because we have the need.

What happens, for example, if something were to break loose on the Korean peninsula? What happens? North Korea is basically thumbing their nose at this administration and basically saying, what are you going to do to us? You are bogged down there in Iraq. Your military is stretched thin. What are you going to do to us if we decide to continue to pursue our efforts to acquire nuclear weapons?

Then there is Iran. Iran is saying basically the same thing. Do they feel intimidated by us? Well, apparently not, because they are indicating they are going to go right ahead with their nuclear program. And we are bogged down in Iraq.

Now, the fact is that Iraq did not have a nuclear program. Iraq was not an imminent threat to this country. Iraq did not present a danger to the American people, but we have diverted our resources and our military capabilities to Iraq, and now we are bogged down there. It is a quagmire. The President wants to avoid that word, but when you have large geographic areas and huge cities in Iraq that are off limits, that are "no-go zones," where our soldiers cannot even enter, then you are living in a make-believe world to say things are going well; that we are going to have elections in January; that democracy is on the march. It is not.

We are not winning in Iraq. And it is not the fault of our soldiers. We honor the service of our soldiers, all of us in this chamber do. But we are just sick and tired of the lack of candor coming from this administration.

Mr. INSLEE. Reclaiming my time, Madam Speaker, I want the gentleman to know that it is not only our sort of hard military assets, when we think of soldiers and tanks and ships that have been pulled away from the real threats that we face, it is our intelligence services. Our intelligence services were pulled off of hunting Osama bin Laden to deal with Iraq.

They actually took the Predator aircraft that was searching for Osama bin Laden up in Afghanistan and moved it to Iraq. And we still have not found Osama bin Laden. We actually diverted intelligence sources that could have been used to find out what Iran is actually doing with their nuclear program, a real threat to this country, a real statement that Iran wants to develop fissionable material. But we moved it to Iraq.

Instead of having intelligence services in North Korea to find out what they are really doing, it is in Iraq. Our intelligence services have been malpositioned as a result of this.

Before we go on into a lot of detail, I would like to suggest ten questions that we in Congress have a duty to ask the administration, and I think the American people have a duty to ask the President of the United States. I think, during the next 5 weeks, this is a very important time to ask these ten questions, and I will posit these ten questions and maybe even hazard an answer about the President's performance in Iraq.

The President's performance is a life or death matter, and we have to ask whether the President's performance has been up to snuff or whether it has been something below expectations and whether it has cut the mustard.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Before the gentleman asks those questions, Madam

Speaker, if he will continue to yield, I would like to make one further comment.

I would hope every parent in this country would ask themselves, as they contemplate this war and the situation in which we find ourselves, do they believe that this President's leadership is such that his wisdom, his maturity, his judgment is such that they would entrust their son or their daughter to go fight this war in Iraq?

And the reason I think that is a relevant question is because the President is asking no one to sacrifice for this war save the soldiers who are there risking their lives, in too many cases dying and being injured, and the people who love them back here at home. No one else is being asked to participate in this war.

We are not being asked to pay taxes to pay for the war. We are not being asked to in any way discipline ourselves by saving energy so that we are less reliant on the Middle East for oil and gasoline and such. The President is not sacrificing for this war. It has not touched his life in any direct way. Members of this House, our friends in the other body, by and large, are not sacrificing for this war. I believe there are maybe two Members of the 435 Members of the House and 100 Senators who actually have a child, a son or daughter, who is a part of the active military now.

So we are not sacrificing during this war. The American people generally are not being asked to sacrifice. Are we being asked to pay taxes so that the cost of this war will not be passed on to future generations? No. No. That is not happening.

So it seems appropriate that as we contemplate the fact that some moms and dads are sacrificing and have sacrificed, some husbands and wives have sacrificed, this very night they go to bed wondering whether or not their loved one is going to be safe, it seems that we should reflect upon what is happening here with regard to the fact that we have entered a war of choice.

Iraq did not attack us. Osama bin Laden attacked us. The al Qaeda network attacked us. Iraq was not an imminent threat, yet we find our sons and daughters fighting and dying in this war. So I think it is appropriate to pause and say to the mothers and fathers in this country, do you think this war is worth the sacrifice of your son or your daughter?

And if the people who are listening cannot answer that question in the affirmative, it seems to me then that they should start to question whether or not the sacrifice of some other moms' or dads' sons or daughters is worth the sacrifice.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, this Congress needs to ask an additional question. Do we have the right people making the decisions that have exposed our sons and daughters to this life-and-death situation? It is certainly appropriate to ask at least ten hard

questions in that regard to see whether this administration has been right or wrong in Iraq.

So I will ask quickly ten questions and posit an answer, and they all are very simple. Was the President right or wrong on various issues in Iraq? I will ask these ten questions, and then I have pretty clear answers that should be pretty obvious to anyone.

Question number one: Was the President right or wrong when he started a war under the statement clearly made to the American people that there is no doubt, no doubt, he said, that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction? Was he right or was he wrong on this life-or-death question?

The fact simply is, he was wrong. He was wrong not only in hindsight, which is easy, but in foresight, because we now have seen the intelligence, and we know there was lots of doubt. This President says there was no doubt, and he was wrong. Then when he made that statement, and over 1,000 Americans have died as a result of that misstatement. The President was not right. He was wrong.

Question number two: Was the President right or wrong when he led Americans to believe that Saddam Hussein was connected to the attack on America on September 11? Was he right or wrong when he led Members to believe that?

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to answer that question.

He was absolutely wrong. And in spite of all the evidence, the evidence, for example, that is coming from the 9/11 Commission, this bipartisan commission that found that there was no credible relationship between Saddam Hussein and the attack upon our country, in spite of that evidence, the Vice President continues to try to mislead the American people and to cause the American people to see a connection that did not exist between Saddam Hussein and the attack upon our Nation.

So the answer to the gentleman's second question is, the President was wrong.

Mr. INSLEE. Let us go to question number three: Was the President right or wrong when he led the American people to believe that we would be welcomed as liberators, with rose petals aplenty, with joy in the streets for months welcoming us, which would reduce the need for American troops? Was he right or wrong?

He was wrong, unfortunately. And he was wrong not just in hindsight but he was wrong in not listening to his own intelligence reports that we now know that he had. A report came out last week about the intelligence report he had at that time that predicted because of the ethnic tensions in Iraq that we would be seen as occupiers from day one. He was wrong.

□ 2320

Question number four: Was the President right or wrong in rejecting the ad-

vice from his own military personnel that we would need several hundred thousand troops in Iraq to provide security immediately after the collapse of the Iraqi Army or else loitering would run crazy and anarchy would run through the streets? Was he right or wrong when he sent out his hit men to defame General Shinseki, to say that General Shinseki did not know what he was talking about when he said we would need at least 300,000 or 400,000 troops to do this job?

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, he was wrong again. The fact is that this question points to the fact that the civilian leadership within this administration really discounted the professional military advice coming to us from the military folks who had given their lives to studying and having knowledge about these issues. The fact is that General Shinseki, they say he was not fired, but he was pushed aside. He was forced into retirement because they did not want to hear what he had to say. When he gave advice that they found inconsistent with their own predetermined notions of what they wanted to do, they forced General Shinseki into retirement. Once again, the President was wrong.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, my fifth question: Was the President right or wrong when he said or the assumption was made that not all of our troops needed body armor and we did not need heavy armor in the streets of Baghdad because only the people in the front lines would be targets? He was wrong. Anyone who knows anything about insurgency should have reached that conclusion. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) has done yeomen's service in fighting this administration to get that body armor to our people.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, I know something about body armor. There have been accusations that one of the candidates for president voted against an \$87 billion supplemental request, somehow deprived our soldiers of body armor. I know something about this because, early on in the conflict, a young constituent of mine, a graduate of West Point and a gung-ho Army guy, wrote to me and said, my men wonder why they do not have this body armor protection. The fact is I started writing letters to Secretary Rumsfeld and General Myers.

I got letters back, and basically, they said to me, we did not plan adequately, we do not have the materials that are necessary to provide this body armor.

So the truth is, in answer to the gentleman's question, the President was wrong because the President chose to send our young soldiers into battle without body armor. It took this administration an entire year from March of 2003 until March 2004 to protect all of our soldiers with individual body armor. And the body armor I am talking about is referred to as the interceptor vest. It costs about \$1,500 a piece. It is composed of a vest made of

Kevlar with pockets in the front and back for the insertion of ceramic plates. This vest is capable of stopping an AK-47 round. I believe to the core of my being that we have had soldiers lose their lives and be unnecessarily injured simply because this administration prematurely sent our soldiers into battle without this vital equipment. The President was wrong when he sent our troops into battle without adequate body armor.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, the sixth question: Was the President right or wrong when he told Americans that, after the mission was accomplished and the President made his grandiose landing on the aircraft carrier in full regalia with the wonderful flight suit and helmet on, and stood in front of a banner that said "Mission Accomplished" and led Americans to believe it was going to be a decreased violent situation, was he right or wrong? And let me suggest that it was 800 lost American heroes ago. He was wrong sadly.

But the problem with this is this is a repeated circumstance with this administration. The administration said that after the Iraqi Army collapsed, things would get better. They got worse. The President said that when we had the turnover, the purported turnover to a provisional Iraqi government, things would get better. They have gotten worse. We are having an accelerated loss of men and women since the turnover.

The President says after the election, things will get better. The President simply has been wrong time and time again with his rose-colored glasses and not facing the truth of the situation in Iraq.

The seventh question: Was the President right or wrong when he decided that the way he was going to do the reconstruction of Iraq was not to hire Iraqis, not to hire Iraqi personnel to do the work, not to hire poor Iraqis which he might get off the street and reduce unemployment, but instead give the contracts to his friends at Halliburton so Halliburton could hire people from the Philippines with our taxpayer money? He was wrong in giving the money to Halliburton and the reason he was wrong is we know that every employed Iraqi is one less potential recruit for the insurgency, and we have been wasting billions of American taxpayer dollars, not using it effectively in the reconstruction of Iraq.

Madam Speaker, my final question, my eighth question is: Was the President right or wrong in saying now that we have done enough, at a proper rate of training the new Iraqi security force, was he right or wrong?

I am going to give Members one tidbit that I read today. Today, a year and a half after the invasion, this administration still has less than 40 percent of the infrastructure for the military necessary to train the Iraqi Army. So here we are with our GIs in harm's way and a year and a half later this administration has less than half of the people

they need to do the training of the Iraqi Army, and they expect to have an election in 3 months.

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

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, here we are again late at night asking questions.

Madam Speaker, it is a rare commodity, unfortunately, in Washington, D.C., when one speaks of courage. We witness courage all over America. We witness courage in terms of our men and women overseas risking their lives. We observe courage every day in our streets, particularly with our public safety officials. We clearly witnessed an extraordinary level of courage and heroism on September 11, but we seem to have a paucity of political courage because I believe and I think that most Americans share the view that political courage involves admitting that you are wrong when it is clear that you have made a mistake.

Madam Speaker, all of the questions that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) posed to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) elicited an obvious answer, that the President was wrong.

□ 2330

But what I find most disturbing is the inability of this President to summon the political courage to acknowledge that he was wrong. It is certainly no disgrace to make a mistake, to be wrong. We have all done it. I do it every day. But what I think is particularly un-American, undemocratic, is a reluctance to be forthright and honest about your failures. We do not hear that from this President. That is sad. Because that kind of courage would be the earmark of genuine leadership, of leadership that would be embraced by all of us, irrespective of partisan differences. But it is so sorely lacking at this moment in our history.

We need a leader with political courage. I think it became clear to me last March when David Kay, the man who led this White House postwar effort to find the weapons of mass destruction that were purportedly in Iraq, called on the President to come clean with the American people. I think when he made that call, he felt that the President was receiving poor political advice and that what was necessary was to acknowledge that a mistake had been made. I know that the two of you remember his appearance before a committee in the other branch that appeared on the front page of, I think it was Time magazine, but it was eloquent in its courage when he said, "We were all wrong." It is not a sin to be wrong, but it is not being patriotic and American to lack the courage to admit a mistake was made.

David Kay said, and I am quoting from a story that appeared in the Guardian, a highly respected English magazine. He said that the administration's reluctance to make that admis-

sion was undermining its credibility at home and abroad. He called for a frank admission, even though it was embarrassing.

Not only are we losing our prestige, not only are we losing our claim to moral authority but because of this President's failure to admit he was wrong, let me suggest we are losing the war on terror, because we are losing allies every day and the American people should know that. Because when you review the hard evidence that shows that incidents of terror are increasing dramatically every day all over the world, particularly in Iraq and in Afghanistan, I fear that we are losing that war, a war that every American wants to win. I thank the gentleman from Washington for enumerating that list of mistakes. But I could even forgive this President if he could accept responsibility, but he cannot. That is a failure of courage.

Mr. INSLEE. I think the ninth question dovetails with what you are saying so eloquently that all of us can make mistakes. It is human. And these are difficult situations, obviously. But my ninth question, I think, goes to an issue that exposes why we are in such a difficult situation in Iraq. The ninth question is, Is the President right or wrong when he tells us, or leads us to believe that most of this violence against Americans in Iraq are outside forces of Iraq, sort of these outside terrorists who are coming into Iraq to commit this horrendous violence against us? The reason he has said this, I think, is he wants to believe that because he does not want to believe that the Iraqis themselves do not view us as liberators, because he always believed that apparently we would be greeted as liberators. He apparently cannot get out of that mind-set that some Iraqis view us as occupiers.

So was the President right or wrong when he says that most of the violence against Americans is caused by people from outside of Iraq? The President is wrong. The reason I know that is they finally did an evaluation of the people in custody in our prisons, Abu Ghraib where we obviously had a lack of leadership as far up as the Secretary of Defense; but what they found was of all the people we had in custody, less than 2 percent were from outside of Iraq. Less than one out of 50 of these people that we had in custody were from outside Iraq.

What does that tell you? That is bad news for us, because what it means is that 49 out of 50 of those people are Iraqis who are fighting, who are domestic and who live there. That means that the President's working assumption from day one that we would be seen as liberators simply is not the case, and he refuses to recognize that reality.

Mr. STRICKLAND. On this question, this ninth question, I think the President is partly right. I think he is mostly wrong because as my friend from Washington has indicated, the people

in Iraq simply do not want us there. All the opinion polls indicate that. When you see the people dancing in the streets when one of our tanks has been exploded or something, oftentimes you see young Iraqi children. These are not foreigners that have invaded Iraq. But I will admit that the President is partly right, because some of the people in Iraq now are in fact terrorists from outside the country.

But that leads to another question. When did they come there, and why are they there? The evidence is that Iraq was not a country that was filled with al Qaeda terrorists prior to this war, but in fact since this war has started, now Iraq is becoming a haven for terrorists. Terrorists are in fact coming. Some of the Taliban, we are even being told, the former Taliban terrorists that were in Afghanistan are now finding some haven for themselves in Iraq. Some of the large cities in Iraq are havens for the terrorists. These are the so-called no-go zones where our troops cannot go and say they are places which are really breeding terrorists.

So I do think that we have created a mess in Iraq. We have taken a country that was not an imminent threat to us, we took a country that was controlled by an authoritarian, despicable dictator who abused his own people, that is true. That is Saddam Hussein. Are we glad he is gone? Absolutely. He was a terrible human being, a terrible person. But the fact is that does not cover the problem we have of justifying invading Iraq as the President indicated because they were connected to the attack on our country or they were somehow an imminent danger to us or were developing nuclear weapons or had weapons of mass destruction.

□ 2340

None of those things are true. So what I am trying to say to my friend in regard to his ninth question, which I think is a thoughtful question, we have created in Iraq, or this administration has created in Iraq, a breeding ground for terrorists, and many of those terrorists are homegrown Iraqis. Some of them are the result of outsiders seeing an opportunity now to go into Iraq because of all the chaos that exists there and join this effort against the United States.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I really think that is a perceptive comment, what he said, which I agree with, that while Iraq may not have presented a terrorist threat before this invasion, it does now. And I think that is a very perceptive thing to say and I agree.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, to make an effort just to clarify what I am saying, the President has made every attempt to convince the American people that the war in Iraq is the war against terror, and he has tried to blur the distinctions between Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein. He has tried to imply that al Qaeda, this terrorist network, was operative in Iraq.

The fact is that the American people know better. They know the war on terror is the war against Osama bin Laden and against those who attacked our country. And the fact is that when the President tries to blur that distinction, I think he is doing a disservice to the American people.

There is a war in Iraq, a preemptive war which we initiated. There is a war against terror, against those who were associated with Osama bin Laden and who are determined to once again strike our country. And I would just remind the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) that the leader of the war against us in terms of a terrorist network is Osama bin Laden. And Osama bin Laden is alive and well somewhere. And this President spoke for 63 minutes at the Republican convention and never once mentioned his name.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I have heard it said that he is really "Osama been forgotten," and unfortunately that has some truth to it.

Let me ask my tenth question about whether the President has been right or wrong on these critical issues.

Was the President right or wrong when he told us that the American taxpayer would not have to pay for this effort because the Iraqi oil fields would be producing enough to essentially pay for this operation in the reconstruction of Iraq? Something Mr. Wolfowitz told I think every single Member, 435 Members of Congress, looked us in the eye and said not to worry, the Iraqi oil revenues will pay for this; the American taxpayers are not going to have to sacrifice a dime for this operation.

Madam Speaker, I yield to Mr. DELAHUNT to answer that question, was the President right or wrong in that regard?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, not only was he wrong, but what the administration did, and we have heard much about \$87 billion, and the White House attacks JOHN KERRY because he voted against the \$87 billion, but what they failed to do was tell the other half of the story, like we all voted against the \$87 billion also, because not only did he fail to tell the truth about the cost of reconstruction but rather insisted that the monies that were to be utilized in rebuilding Iraq were to be a gift, a giveaway. So all of those American taxpayers who are out there who were misled about the cost of the war being paid for by the Iraqis in the first instance, they should understand that all of the money we are pouring into Iraq is not a loan. It is a gift. It is a giveaway. It is welfare, if you will.

We heard today about welfare, welfare to work. We are providing welfare for the Iraqi people. We are building them 6,000 miles of roads. We cannot get a transportation bill through here to help build American roads and repair them. We are building schools in Iraq, and we are rehabilitating schools

in Iraq, thousands of them. But there is no money to rebuild and rehab schools in America.

And do my colleagues know what else we are doing? We are building affordable housing, 25,000 units, for Iraqi people. In the United States, with our population, which is ten times that of Iraq, we are building 5,000. And do my colleagues know what? Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer are not going to get a dime of it back. Sure, there are other nations that are giving something, nowhere near what we are, but their governments insisted it be a loan.

So, in short, Madam Speaker, we were misled, and the American taxpayer has been duped, and the American taxpayer is not going to get a dime back.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me add insult to injury. The President has essentially wanted to fight this war on the cheap and not pay for it, the first time in American history where a President has done massive tax cuts in the middle of a war. And as a result of that, what this President has done has put the real cost of this war and the reconstruction of Iraq not on our generation. It is all deficit spending. The \$200 billion-plus is all deficit spending because the President has not had the gumption to go to the American people and ask them to pay for this war. Winston Churchill said, "All I have to offer you is blood, sweat, toil, and tears." This President has not been willing to level with the American people to really say, I am asking them to buck up for the cost of this. And when one is not willing to be candid with the American people in that regard, how can we continue to maintain support for this operation? This deficit spending is wrong.

I just want to summarize before we go to the future and use our remaining time talking about where we go in the future. I just want to summarize our discussion. We have asked ten questions tonight, the ten critical questions about this President's performance in Iraq, was he right or wrong? Here is the summary of the answers:

He was wrong on WMD. He was wrong about al Qaeda's links. He was wrong about our being greeted as liberators with rose petals. He was wrong about the number of troops that we would need to maintain security in Iraq, despite the advice of his own generals. He was wrong about not saying that we needed body armor for everyone. He was wrong about saying, as soon as mission is accomplished and there is a new government, things would get better. He was wrong about saying it is better to give deals to his friends at Halliburton than it is to Iraqis working to get this work done. He was wrong about saying there would be a decrease in violence. He was wrong about saying that the majority of the people essentially are outside of Iraq. He was wrong about not providing enough trainers early enough to get an army of Iraqis up to face this threat. And, lastly, he

was wrong in not facing the real cost of this operation and wrong in making this all deficit spending.

Those are ten very serious failures of leadership by this American President. And these are not peripheral issues. And it shows a pattern. And one thing the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) said and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) both, these are difficult issues. We can all make mistakes. But this is a pattern of repeated failure that has now resulted in a terrible situation where things are getting worse rather than better in Iraq. There has been one person in the administration who has said that, and that is the Secretary of State. Exactly one person in the administration has recognized how dire this situation is. And now the American people are going to be called to ask, was this good enough performance in difficult situations? And that is a decision they will make in November.

I hope we can turn our discussion for our remaining time now about our suggestions about where we go from here, what we suggest we need to do because we are in this pickle together. Democrats and Republicans, we are all in the lifeboat together. Let me just make one quick suggestion I would make.

□ 2350

I believe it is important for the American President to make very clear to the Iraqi people that we are not going to be in Iraq forever. We are not going to be a permanent presence in Iraq. Unfortunately, he is sending different messages and building 14 permanent military bases in Iraq that obviously are going to be there for decades, the way they are under construction.

We need Iraqis to realize their destiny is in their hands, that they cannot rely on us. They need to get on their own two feet and shoulder these burdens. These groups we are putting in the army have to decide they might have to engage for their own benefit, they cannot rely on us as a crutch forever. We need to make that statement very clear to the Iraqis to encourage them to take responsibility for their own destiny.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, I like that suggestion from my friend from Washington State, that we need to convey to Iraqis that we do not intend to stay there.

A second suggestion I would like to make is we need to convey to the world community that this is their problem, not just an American problem. Stability in the Middle East, access to the resources, the oil resources in the Middle East, is important for so many countries, not just us. But the fact is that this President and this administration really have stuck their thumbs in the eyes, figuratively speaking, of so many of our traditional allies.

The fact is that we had this administration announcing right off that the work to do the reconstruction in Iraq

would only go to certain companies, Halliburton being the primary one, and no other countries could or would be involved. So we basically said we do not want you involved, because, as was said earlier, we thought it was going to be easy sailing. We would go in there, they would love us, democracy would bloom, we would have access to oil, and we did not want the help of other countries.

Now it has gotten pretty tough, and we find more and more of even the coalition partners pulling back, pulling away. Some countries have pulled out entirely. Even Great Britain, they are talking about the possibility of reducing their force in Iraq by one-third. So I believe we do need to internationalize the effort in Iraq.

We need to go to the UN, we need to go to NATO. We need to say this is a problem that is of importance to all of us, the solution must come from all of us, and the burden must be borne by all of us.

Now, can President Bush do that? I doubt if he can. I think he has so poisoned the water in terms of our international relationships that it is highly unlikely that we will ever be able to develop the kind of international cooperation and coalition that will enable us to extricate ourselves from Iraq in a timely manner with honor. So that is why I believe we need a change in administration.

Now, our traditional allies, and I am talking about the Europeans that have fought wars with us and been our partners, I do not think they like to be alienated from us. I do not think they like a division between our country and their country. I believe they would welcome an opportunity for a rapprochement, for a coming together, even to deal with this most difficult issue. But I do not think it will happen under the leadership of this President or this administration.

So my suggestion, in addition to the one I have heard from my colleague and friend from Washington State, is that we move forward with a renewed effort to internationalize the conflict in that part of the world, and I think it can be done, and I think it will be done under new presidential leadership.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) for a suggestion.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, I would simply add to that is what we have now is the President in terms of world opinion that has very little credibility. Let us just state the truth, the reality: If we are going to internationalize, we have to have an administration that has credibility and respect throughout the world.

There was a recent survey of some nine Islamic countries, and in fact Secretary Powell just indicated that the magnitude of anti-Americanism throughout the world and specifically among Muslim nations is growing at a fearful rate. But the survey that was done of these nine countries indicated

that the vast majority of those people in those nations believed that we went there for oil; for oil.

I would like to leave you with this question: Before September 11, according to an anecdote that was related in a book by the former Secretary of Treasury, a Republican, a conservative who served in the Reagan and the Nixon administrations, indicated that on February 26, 2001, months before our national tragedy, he saw a map. It was prepared by the Secretary of Defense, Secretary Rumsfeld, with markings for a super giant oil field and earmarked for production sharing and dividing the largely undeveloped southwest of the country into nine blocks for future exploration.

In other words, in February of 2001, according to Secretary of Treasury Paul O'Neill, the administration had a map, and the map is to my left. This was before any issue of weapons of mass destruction or links to al Qaeda came up.

Now, where did this map come from? Well, it was produced as a result of a lawsuit, a lawsuit by a group called Judicial Watch, which certainly is no fan or ally of partisan Democrats. They secured it as a result of discovery proceedings in a lawsuit against the vice president of the United States, DICK CHENEY, because of the secrecy surrounding his Energy Task Force. That is where it came out. And here is the map of Iraq.

We need some answers and the rest of the world needs some answers about this map, about Secretary O'Neill's reference to it, so that we can clarify, once and for all, what the real motive of our military intervention in Iraq was all about, because it is stories like this that lead the rest of the world to doubt our motives and our proclamation, Madam Speaker, that we are bringing democracy to the rest of the world.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman brings up the issue of our relationship with these contractors.

Let me make a third suggestion, and that is that this administration stop pouring money into Halliburton and start getting it to Iraqis so they can get to work rebuilding their own country.

There is no reason for us to be giving our taxpayer dollars to Halliburton so they can hire Filipinos and take, I don't know what the percentage is, but to skim profits off the top in this cost-plus kind of contract, no-bid contracts. That is wrong to taxpayers. But, more importantly, it is wrong in our effort to stop the insurgency in Iraq.

You have got thousands of idle young men in Iraq with no job, and yet we are paying our taxpayer money to hire Filipinos in Iraq? This makes no sense whatsoever. Whatever relationship the vice president had with Halliburton, it should not be driving bad decision making when it comes to contracting in Iraq. That has got to stop. That is my third suggestion.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, I just want to thank my friend the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) for participating tonight. What we are talking about is quite serious, it involves life and death, it involves the future of our Nation, and the American people need to be paying attention, because this war could drag on for 50 years or more.

We have unleashed a hornet's nest in the Middle East and I see no plan to bring it under control. All we are promised by this administration basically is more of the same or something worse, out-and-out civil war, with our troops caught in the cross fire.

So it is important that we talk about these matters, it is important that the American people pay attention to these matters, because we are going to be making a decision in 32 days, or something like that, regarding the future of this Nation, and I believe under the current administration we will have nothing but more of the same.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, we will note that we will continue our discussion about Iraq in the weeks to come. We owe this obligation to our men and women serving proudly tonight. We will not be intimidated into stopping to ask these hard questions of the Federal Government. Americans deserve these questions to be asked, and they will be answered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MEEK of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and September 30 on account of personal reasons.

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:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, today and September 30, October 4, 5, and 6.

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and September 30 and October 1.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2742. An act to extend certain authority of the Supreme Court Police, modify the venue of prosecutions relating to the Supreme Court building and grounds, and authorize the acceptance of gifts to the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1308. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for working families, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3389. An act to amend the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 to permit Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Awards to be made to nonprofit organizations.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 41. A Joint Resolution Commemorating the opening of the National Museum of the American Indian.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 30, 2004, at 10 a.m.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

U.S. CONGRESS,
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,

Washington, DC, September 29, 2004.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 304(b)(1) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 ("Act"), 2 U.S.C. 1384(b)(1), requires that, with regard to substantive rules under the Act, that "[t]he Board [of Directors of the Office of Compliance] shall publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking under section 553(b) of Title 5, United States Code . . . [by transmittal] to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate for publication in the

Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses are in session following such transmittal." Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance is transmitting herewith the enclosed Notice of Proposed Rules implementing certain substantive rights and protections of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, for publication in both the House and Senate versions of the Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses of Congress are in session following this transmittal.

Any inquiries regarding this Notice should be addressed to the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, 110 2nd Street, S.E., Room LA-200, Washington, DC 20540.

Sincerely,

SUSAN S. ROBFOGEL,

Chair of the Board of Directors.

FROM THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OFFICE
OF COMPLIANCE

Implementing Certain Substantive Rights and Protections of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as Required by Section 203 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA), 2 U.S.C. 1313.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Background: The purpose of this Notice is to initiate the process for replacing existing overtime pay eligibility regulations with new regulations which will substantially mirror the new overtime exemption regulations recently promulgated by the Secretary of Labor.

Do FLSA overtime pay requirements apply via the CAA to Legislative Branch employing offices? Yes. One of the regulatory statutes incorporated in part through the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA), 2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq., is the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (FLSA), 29 U.S.C. 201 et seq. Section 203(a)(1) of the CAA states: "[t]he rights and protections established by subsections (a)(1) and (d) of section 6, section 7, and section 12(c) of the [FLSA] . . . (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1), 207, 212(c)) shall apply to covered employees." Section 7 of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. 207, includes the requirements regarding the payment of time and one half overtime pay to employees.

Are there existing overtime exemption regulations already in force under the CAA? Yes. In 1996, the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance promulgated the existing CAA overtime exemption regulations based on the "old" 29 CFR Part 541 regulations which were in force until August 23, 2004. These regulations were adopted pursuant to the CAA section 304 procedure outlined herein below. Those regulations are found at Parts H541 (applicable to the House of Representatives), S541 (applicable to the Senate), and C541 (applicable to the other employing offices covered by section 203 of the CAA) of the FLSA Regulations of the Office of Compliance. These regulations remain in force until replaced by new regulations. Office of Compliance regulations can be accessed via our web site: www.compliance.gov.

Why is this Notice being issued? This Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is occasioned by the recent promulgation of new overtime exemption regulations by the Secretary of Labor at Vol. 69 of the Federal Register, No. 79, at pp. 22122 et seq., on August 23, 2004. The new regulations of the Secretary of Labor are set out at 29 U.S.C. Part 541, and replace the regulations which had been in effect prior to August 23, 2004. The Secretary of Labor's regulations do not apply to employing offices and employees covered by the CAA.

Why are there separate sets of existing FLSA regulations for the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the other employing offices covered by the CAA? Section 304(a)(2)(B) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. 1384(a)(2)(B),