

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees:

From the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. KOLBE, KNOLLENBERG, LEWIS of California, WICKER, BONILLA, VITTER, KIRK, CRENSHAW, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. ROTHMAN and Ms. KAPTUR.

From the Committee on Appropriations, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, REGULA, HOBSON, OBEY and VISCLOSKEY.

There was no objection.

□ 1900

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. COLE 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 Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL 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 Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

SMART SECURITY AND PRESIDENT BUSH'S SECOND TERM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, George W. Bush will lead the United States, and the free world, for another 4 years. With the weight of the Presidential contest behind him, it is my sincere hope that he will take this opportunity to shun the aggressive, unyielding, and unilateral approach to world affairs that has bedeviled his first term and

ostracized the United States from our allies. Instead, Mr. Speaker, the President must lead the country in a new, stronger and safer direction, one that makes use of aggressive diplomacy and the rule of law to accomplish what needs to be done. The point has never been clearer that, in the vast majority of situations, negotiations work; and the recent developments in Iran are a perfect example. The Bush administration's approach to Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons has consisted of little more than saber-rattling and aggressive posturing. While the U.S. has attempted unsuccessfully to flex its muscles, three European countries have banded together to achieve real results. The United Kingdom, France, and Germany announced earlier this week that they had reached a deal to prevent the development of Iran's nuclear program for the purpose of creating nuclear weapons. In exchange, the three European powers promised that Iran would not face U.N. Security Council sanctions. The promise will be upheld because France and the U.K. are both permanent members of the Security Council and can veto any sanctions against a fully compliant Iran. To be sure, it will take months, if not years, to assure that Iran does not pose a nuclear threat to the rest of the world, but the consequences of these negotiations are significant.

By engaging Iran in direct talks, instead of a political wrestling match, three European powers were able to achieve tangible results. Negotiations worked, while U.S. aggression has not.

There has to be a better way to respond to the threats America faces, a better way than the chest-thumping aggression that was adopted by the first-term Bush administration. That is why I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392, a SMART Security Platform For the 21st Century. SMART stands for sensible, multilateral, American response to terrorism. SMART security treats war as an absolute last resort. It fights terrorism with stronger intelligence and multilateral partnerships. It controls the spread of weapons of mass destruction with uncompromising diplomacy, strong regional security arrangements, and vigorous inspection regimes. SMART security defends America by relying on the very best of America, not our nuclear capabilities but our capacity for multinational leadership and our commitment to peace and freedom around the world.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush should view the example of Iran as a lesson in how to engage so-called "rogue nations" over the next 4 years. He no longer has a reelection campaign to worry about, and there is nothing to stop him from using smarter alternatives when conducting America's foreign policy.

What kind of world will the President leave when he steps off the global stage in the year 2008? A world at war for the foreseeable future, or a world at peace, guided by the smart choices of diplo-

macy and engagement? The choice is in his hands.

THE SITUATION IN IRAQ

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, to find out how chaotic, how messed up the situation in Iraq is, all you need to do is read the front page of yesterday's Washington Post. The top headline said, "Trouble Spots Dot Iraqi Landscape." The subhead read: "Attacks erupting away from Fallujah."

The story says:

"The fighting started in Mosul 2 days after U.S. tanks entered Fallujah. Armed men appeared in a sudden tide on a main street in Iraq's third largest city, a wide avenue where so many American convoys had been ambushed that locals nicknamed it 'Death Street.'"

"At 11 a.m. Thursday, the target was an armored SUV. Witnesses said that after its Western passengers were chased into a police station, the driver was burned alive atop the vehicle as the attackers shouted, 'Jew!' The city of 1.8 million people then devolved into chaos. Thousands of police officers abandoned their precinct houses. The governor's house was set alight. Insurgents took the police chief's brother, himself a senior officer, into his front yard and shot him dead.

"By Sunday, the dawn of a 3-day festival celebrating the end of Ramadan, control over sections of the city remained in doubt. In streets emptied by fear and gunfire, insurgents battled hundreds of Iraqi National Guard reinforcements dispatched by the interim government to quell an uprising that was at once largely expected and disquieting."

This is a story about fighting in Mosul.

U.S. troops have taken control of Fallujah, but the insurgents have simply moved out to fight alongside supporters in several other Iraqi cities. At least 38 additional U.S. troops have been killed and at least 320 more wounded in this most recent fighting.

Fortune magazine, Mr. Speaker, in its November 25, 2002 edition, a couple of months before the war started, had an article entitled "Iraq—We Win—What Then?" The Fortune article said:

"A military victory could turn into a strategic defeat. A prolonged, expensive, American-led occupation could turn U.S. troops into sitting ducks for Islamic terrorists." How right this article was.

James Webb, a hero in Vietnam and President Reagan's Secretary of the Navy, wrote in The Washington Post before the war: "The issue before us is not whether the United States should end the regime of Saddam Hussein but whether we as a Nation are prepared to occupy territory in the Middle East for the next 30 to 50 years." Secretary

Webb was strongly opposed to such an occupation.

Charley Reese, the very popular conservative columnist, wrote, again before the war: "Just let the United States try to occupy the Middle East, which will be the practical result of a war against Iraq, and Americans will be bled dry by the costs both in blood and treasure."

A few months ago, our own government took a poll and found that 92 percent of Iraqis regard us as occupiers rather than liberators. These people really do not appreciate what we have done for them. No one can legitimately criticize our troops, and I certainly would not. They are simply following orders and doing a great job. But when people say we made a mistake going in there but now that we are there we have to stay, we have to get the job done, that is like saying we know we are going the wrong way down the interstate, but we have to keep going anyway. I think you get off at the next exit.

We should announce to the world that we have done far more than any other nation has done for another country in the history of the world. We have spent almost \$200 billion, more than 90 percent of the money and casualties have been American, but we really cannot help any more until Iraqis stop killing our young soldiers and stop blowing each other up. That is what we should announce.

For those who say Iraq would go into chaos if we leave, they should read yesterday's Washington Post. The chaos is already there.

Columnist Georgie Anne put it best: "Critics of the war against Iraq have said since the beginning of the conflict that Americans, still strangely complacent about overseas wars being waged by a minority in their name, will inevitably come to a point where they will see they have to have a government that provides services at home or one that seeks empire across the globe."

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of turn on the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY's) time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

IN PURSUIT OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC JUSTICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on November 2, Ohio Democrats took our moral values to the polls. For many of us, our faith guided us, too, and our final vote for President was far too close to declare us or assail us, as some now do, as a State full of evangelical fundamentalists. For many of us, moral values are grounded in our religious faith. My Lutheran upbringing instructs me, and my fellow Christians, in the teachings of Jesus, to read and to follow as best we can the words of the Beatitudes, to try to live our lives and practice our faiths as Jesus would have wanted us to. For others of us, those moral values take the form of a faith in our country's greatness to solve our most pressing problems of racial inequality and inaccessible health care, the poverty of millions of American children, and the war in Iraq.

For 3 years I have worn a lapel pin depicting a canary in a cage. A century ago, miners took a canary into the mines to warn them of toxic gases. Miners were forced to provide for their own protection. No mine safety laws. No trade unions able to help. No real support from their government.

A baby born 100 years ago had a life expectancy of about 47 years. Today, because of public health initiatives, worker safety laws, Medicare and Social Security, we live decades longer. Every bit of progress in the struggle for economic and social justice, often rooted in our Judeo-Christian beliefs, every bit of progress prevailed over the opposition of society's most privileged and most powerful.

Today, those struggles continue. Our fight for seniors who are forced to choose between medicine and food and our fight against the large pharmaceutical companies' greed is our understanding of the Holy Word. Our opposition to tax cuts for America's most privileged adults and Head Start cuts afflicting our least privileged children follow from the teachings of Christ. Our opposition to the death penalty, George Bush approved an execution of a Texan every 2 weeks as Governor, is grounded in the Scriptures. And our belief that government programs like Medicare and Social Security, not privatized imitations of them, should serve all Americans bespeaks a faith in the greatness of our country and its ability and willingness to lift up all of God's children.

□ 1915

As we have seen over the last 4 years, Republicans campaign on their religious beliefs and on their moral values, mostly opposition to abortion and gay marriage; and then they govern for and with their corporate allies and contributors.

On this floor of the House of Representatives, in the light of day, we hear much talk about moral values. But in the committee rooms and the cloakrooms, choices are made that run

counter to the teachings of Christ and Mohammed and the Jewish prophets, and fly in the face of the values upon which this Nation was founded.

This Congress hurts families by underfunding Leave No Child Behind and college student loans, while giving tax cuts to the wealthiest among us. This Congress hurts the elderly by defeating legislation to bring down the price of prescription drugs and then passing a Medicare bill that further enriches the drug industry and insurance companies. This Congress hurts God's Earth when it caves to the energy and chemical companies. This Congress hurts our communities when it gives tax breaks to encourage the largest corporations, most of them big contributors to the Bush administration, to outsource our jobs. And this Congress hurts our grandchildren when it loads huge burdens of debt on future generations.

Tens of thousands of Ohioans worked feverishly for months to help change our Nation's course because of their moral values, because of their faith in God, because of their belief in our Nation's history of using the Biblical term "taking care of the least among us."

In no way do I question the faith of my political opponents. But I am weary of the far right's claim that they are the only ones guided by the hand of God. My understanding of the teachings of Christ and my religious upbringing call me to walk a different path and to express and act upon my faith in the cause of social and economic justice.

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

(Mr. BLUMENAUER 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 the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her 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. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STUPAK 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.)