

American people can see it. The White House chief of staff and the counsel to the President, the counsel to the Vice President, all of them were called here, spent over 568 hours in depositions with staff. That is just with staff. They also provided discussions between the President and his advisers. President Clinton waived the executive privilege and allowed these advisers to testify before the committee about their discussions with him.

Internal White House e-mails, over \$12 million was spent to reconstruct those e-mails. Confidential conversations within the White House counsel's office were provided to the Congress, but now we have questionable intelligence that sent us to war. We have a CIA agent that has been outed, and this is what the Republican Congress does now.

Well, we know that CIA agents are being outed, but we are not looking over there because our friends may be embarrassed. It may jeopardize national security, but that is not important. It is all about making sure that we stay in power and that we do not pay attention to what the American people constitutionally have asked us to do, to provide oversight and to give the American people a voice when wrongdoing is evident, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

It is a shame. It is a shame that this is happening as we speak in this Congress.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. But do not worry because last week President Bush rode in on his white steed to the rescue of the American people and addressed the culture of corruption and cronyism and lack of competence that is going on and emanating from the White House.

Mr. DELAHUNT. What did he do?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. He required all of the White House staff to take an ethics refresher course this week.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Is that mandatory?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Oh, yes, do not worry. White House staff attendance is mandatory for anyone holding any level of security clearance.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Is this a semester-long course?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. No. This is a 4-hour class that actually I think it is being given this week by White House counsel Harriet Miers' office, who, of course, we know has been doing such a bang-up job at guiding the White House through their ethical moxie.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Not being facetious for a moment, we have, I would submit, a very serious problem in terms of the health of our democratic institutions. There has not been, and if you reflect, you will not be able to identify another administration with the obsession for secrecy that this administration has.

What I found particularly interesting, the Republican chairman, highly respected, former Governor of New Jersey, Tom Kean, who headed the

independent 9/11 Commission report, he observed that many so-called classified documents he reviewed in the course of their investigation were not true secrets as much as there was information that was publicly available.

□ 2145

It just did not make any sense at all. And what we have seen is a 25 percent increase on documents being classified almost on an annual basis in this administration. We know that they refuse to submit to any oversight or any accountability, and the American people should know that.

In a moment of candor, a friend of ours, again a senior member of the Republican Caucus, had this to say. He aptly characterized recent congressional oversight of the administration. This is Mr. RAY LAHOOD, a very solid Member and someone respected on both sides of the aisle. These are his words, not mine. This is RAY LAHOOD, whom the Speaker and every Member in this body knows and respects.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Good man.

Mr. DELAHUNT. "Our party controls the levers of government. We are not about to go out and look beneath a bunch of rocks to try to cause heartburn."

In other words, you have a shroud of secrecy that has descended around the democratic institutions that are controlled by the majority party. That is dangerous.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, this is about protecting their party. If the Republicans control the House and the Senate and the White House, and they are not being investigated to find what went wrong, whether it was Katrina or the CIA leak or Karl Rove or "Scooter" Libby or the Vice President's role in all this, or how are we going to balance the budget, if the Republican Party is not willing to investigate those problems, those situations, then they are putting the Republican Party before the interests of the country. And that has been the consistent modus operandi of this institution.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And if you disagree with them, what happens?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You get punished.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Right. Ask General Shinseki, who was dismissed when he disagreed, when he gave just a different opinion as to the number of troops that were going to be required in Iraq. He said 300,000. The then-Under Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wolfowitz, said, Hey, that is vastly overrated. Subsequently, we have discovered that the good general was correct.

What about Larry Lindsey, who was an economic adviser to the President and who came out with an estimate that the range of dollars that would be necessary in Iraq would go from \$100 billion to \$200 billion. We are way past \$200 billion now. But the administration, the White House, kept saying it will not exceed \$60 billion. The American people should remember that.

And what happened to Larry Lindsey? He got bumped too.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. If my colleague will give out the Web site before we have to close.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We want an opportunity to take this Congress and this country in a new direction, change the way we are going and derive some independence. We are at 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. That is 30, the number, at mail.house.gov.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Members for joining us here this hour. I look forward to being back on the floor, all of us, in one more hour when my colleague claims his hour so that we can continue sharing good information not only with the Members but the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have this hour.

THE PRESIDENT, AND THE WAR ON TERROR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be recognized, and as I get organized here, I would point out that I have had the privilege to listen to this dialogue here tonight. I know that this group comes to the floor nearly every night, and that shows a certain kind of tenacity, and I appreciate that effort they put into this. But I wanted to just start down the list of some of the things that I heard and address some of the remarks.

I happen to have seen a poster that I hope was not presented here, because I believe it would have challenged the mendacity of the President, and I believe that would have been out of order here in these Chambers, Mr. Speaker. So I hope that kind of poster is never presented. But I will say that I have heard that challenge made in a number of different oblique ways.

I have looked into the eyes of this President, and I think there is a distinction that should be made in a very clear way to the people here on the floor every night, the 30-something Group and all the Members of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, and the people in this country, and that is there is a difference between a mistake and a lie.

I look back on a Presidential campaign, and I remember the face and the voice of Charlton Heston as it came on television over and over again. He said to the previous President over the airwaves of television, "Mr. President, when you say something that's wrong and you don't know that it's wrong, that's a mistake. When you say something that's wrong and you know that it's wrong, that's a lie." That distinction seems to be lost amongst many of

the Members of the minority party in this Congress.

And by the way, I would not concede that the President has made a statement that was even wrong, let alone a mistake, and certainly a long ways away from a lie. When you look into the eyes of this man we have as our commander in chief, you see those eyes look back at you with conviction. You hear it in his voice, you can see it in his bearing, and you can see it in his actions.

I would like to go back to an event that maybe was not designed to be spoken about necessarily in public, but I think it speaks well of this President, so I want to mention it at this time.

A few Members of Congress were invited to the White House for a small luncheon. It was on a Monday noon, and I recall it was the Monday noon after the *Columbia* had gone down on Saturday. It was a hard time for all of us. We saw our space program go up in flames, along with the lives of the brave men and women that were up in space. We knew that our NASA program was going to be suspended for a good, long time.

Thankfully, we are back on track, at least to some degree.

I was surprised that the President had gone ahead with the luncheon that day, because I believed he would be taking care of so many issues that he would not have time to sit and talk with us, but he did. There were maybe 15, 20 people in the room, a few of the President's closest staff and about 10 or so, maybe a dozen Members of Congress, myself among them.

As we sat around the tables and had our lunch, the President got up and stood at an old, rickety, wooden podium, a podium not as stable as this one. I wondered if it was really quite suitable for the White House. And as he leaned on the podium this way and that way, he went through the whole spectrum of issues that we were concerned about at the time, Mr. Speaker.

He talked about the impending operations in Iraq. He talked about our national security and al Qaeda, and about September 11. He talked about the overall budget and the tax cuts that we needed to stimulate this economy. And he talked about education. Now, remember, we had not gone into Iraq at that point. It was speculated about certainly, but we had not gone in at that point.

As he got through the education cases, he said, just a minute. I want to back up a minute and I want to tell you this with regard to Iraq. My critics have me wrong on Iraq. The media has me wrong on Iraq. There is only one person that orders our men and women into battle, and that is the person that hugs the widows and the widowers of those who do not come back home.

I will never forget the tone of his voice, the look in his eye, and the look on his face. He told me afterwards that to finally give that order, he knew it was going to be hard, but it was a lot

harder when the time finally came that he had to make that decision and give that order.

I look at this entire operation in this view of the war in the Middle East and in this war against terror and this war against militant Islamic extremism, and I will always see those eyes and hear that tone in his voice; and I will always understand that this is not a President that would give an order that would put anyone in harm's way and do so for any reason other than a profound conviction that it was necessary for the protection, the preservation, the future of the people in this country and the destiny of the United States of America. Never would that order come unless it fit that standard, unless it fit that very high standard and that qualification.

The order was given. And it seems as though there are a couple hundred Members in this Congress that do not understand this war against terror, as we define it, and this war against militant Islamic extremism, as I define it.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that this battle that is going on in Iraq right now is a battle. It is not a war; we are at war with an entire group of people who are philosophically opposed to us, and we have known that for a long time.

We did not do anything to offend their sensibilities, not to such an extent to justify losing 3,000 Americans in the attack on the Twin Towers and the Pentagon and on the plane that went down in Pennsylvania. That was an unprovoked, sneaky, stealthy, I guess I would say a pretty well strategized attack on American people. We had never had that loss of life on our own shores in the history of this country.

That should epitomize the level of the hatred that is embodied in the people who are pledged to kill us. Yet I still hear from the other side of the aisle that somehow, if we would just pull our troops all back home to the shores of the United States of America, plant more flowers around our bases, and ask them how can we better understand you, can we sit down and have some kind of an encounter session, can we somehow feel or emote in some other way so we can connect with the people pledged to kill us.

I do not believe you can negotiate with people like that. They want to establish their caliphate across this country and across this world. Their number one enemies are capitalism, coupled with Jews or Christians. I think they actually prefer Jewish capitalists first, probably Christian capitalists second, but anybody that is not like them, even other Muslims. If you look at the death loss around the world, I think you will see that al Qaeda and their colleagues have killed really more Muslims than they have any other category.

But, Mr. Speaker, they hate us worse than they hate the other Muslims, because some of the other Muslims are

sympathetic. In fact, many of them are sympathetic, and that is another part of the problem. But we have seen the terrorist cells in Afghanistan and in Pakistan, and we went there and settled that question.

And, by the way, for the first time in the history of the world they had free elections on the soil of Afghanistan, Mr. Speaker. It was an astonishing accomplishment, something never accomplished before in their history.

We went there so quickly and were successful so quickly that most people in this country do not remember the voices of the naysayers, the voices of the people that said no one has ever gone up the Khyber Pass and not been slaughtered. No one has ever been able to go into Afghanistan and invade or liberate and occupy. It is impossible to bring freedom to people that have never experienced freedom before. The American military cannot do what has never been possible before in the history of the world.

It came from this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, over and over and over again. And it was only muted when it was clear that there was a full victory established in Afghanistan. And when we saw the elections come up, we had at least 750 Iowa Guardsmen on the ground in Afghanistan protecting the voting booths, protecting the travel routes to and from the voting booths to make sure that there would be free and fair elections in Afghanistan. It was an astonishing accomplishment, an accomplishment that came about because of the vision of George W. Bush, because of the courage, the training, the tactics and technology of our U.S. military and because of the selfless sacrifice and risk that was taken by our men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, those men and women in uniform went to war as the single highest quality military ever to take the field in any war, and I am including this entire war against the militant Islamic extremists in Afghanistan, Iraq, and whatever theater we might be in right now and not know about, or whatever theater we will be in in the future and find out about sometime down the line.

The reasons for that high quality are many. One of them is that we have a strong mix of our National Guard people. These volunteers had a little more age on them, probably more gray hair in this military than we have ever had before in a foreign war. But this is a day when we have high technology. It takes a lot of technology and a lot of training to be able to manage that technology.

Our National Guard and military Reserves are seasoned to the point where they bring their professionalism from their walks of life into their military, and when they are deployed overseas they perform extraordinarily well. Couple that with an outstanding active duty force, all of them volunteers, because everyone who has gone to war has gone as a volunteer, that does

something for the spirit. That does something for the esprit de corps, as they say in the part of the world that is in flames now, which would be France. And I may get to that subject matter before this hour is over, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2200

I want to speak highly of the people who went to Afghanistan. We have lost 200 Americans in Afghanistan, liberated 25 million people. That is a legacy for the world and a legacy that the United States is leaving there for them to pick up as they earn their freedom.

Why is nobody saying, Pull your troops out of Afghanistan? Can their troops not handle the security? Can Afghanistan run their country themselves? Why is no one on this side of the aisle addressing that? Why are they not saying, Get the troops out of Afghanistan, or Kosovo, for example.

Mr. Speaker, the President that ordered the troops into Kosovo promised the world that our troops would be back from there in 1 year. I have to go back and check the calendar, but I know it has been over a decade; I expect it is 12 years. They are still there. No one on the other side of the aisle is saying, Bring the troops home. No one is saying the President previous to our current President Bush, no one is saying, He did not tell the truth to the American people when he ordered troops into Kosovo and said, They will be back in a year. But I would submit that the accuracy of this President exceeds the accuracy of that statement.

So we have troops in Afghanistan, and 200 Americans have lost their lives there. One of my constituents was lost there, the son of a friend of mine. I stop at his grave, and I commemorate him and all of the soldiers we have lost from time to time. That is how I symbolize his loss, it is how I remember everyone.

I remember the freedom in Afghanistan and the pride that the remaining troops had when they came home, how his father led them all in with a big American flag on the back of his motorcycle, and how the highway was lined with American patriots who stopped, took off their hats and saluted that young man that had given the ultimate sacrifice and helped free 25 million Afghans, and no one is saying, Let the Taliban grow their ranks or let al Qaeda go back into Afghanistan. No one is saying, Bring them home, Mr. President. What is the difference between Afghanistan and Iraq?

I think the people that are critics of the operations of Iraq ought to draw a distinction between Afghanistan and Iraq. I believe from a national strategic standpoint they are one and the same. They are not the same by the numbers of casualties. By those that say, We have reached the 2,000 death casualty list in Iraq, bring them home, that is too many casualties, none of those people had the courage or the foresight or the conviction to make an

announcement as to what was a tolerable number of casualties to free another 25 million people.

No one was willing to speculate how many lives they would be willing to invest of American patriots to preserve and protect the lives of 282 million Americans. No one is willing to say it is not worth risking a single American life to protect 282 million Americans. No one is willing to look back in history and say, I wish we had not stepped in and defended ourselves in Korea or World War I or World War II, I wish we had never fought the Civil War to free the slaves or fought the Spanish American or Mexican American, or I wish we had never fought the Revolutionary War.

None of those people that say that risking a single American life is never worth it is willing to go back and unravel history. They would not be standing on the floor of this Congress if not for the lives of the brave men who have gone before us who have carved out our freedom from the jaws of tyranny.

That brings us back to 1898. I recall a speech by President Arroyo of the Philippines here in Washington, D.C., at one of the hotels. My wife and I went to that dinner and sat and listened to that speech. I believe I was the only Member of Congress that was there to hear the speech, the rest was downtown people and other Representatives.

She was not speaking to the faces of Congress, she was speaking to Americans. She saw that group as a few hundred Americans that had gone to dinner to listen to her keynote address. But President Arroyo said, Thank you, America; thank you, America, for sending the United States Marine Corps to the Philippines in 1898. Thanks for their sacrifice, thanks for liberating us. Thank you for establishing that stability and establishing a stable government in the Philippines and allowing us to be a free people.

Thank you for sending your missionaries over to the Philippines that taught us Christianity. Thank you for sending 10,000 American teachers over to teach the Filipinos reading, writing and arithmetic. Thank you for teaching us your language because we learned English, and today 1.6 million Filipinos leave the Philippines and go work anywhere else they want to in the world, and send that money back to the Philippines because they have a command of the language that is universal in the commercial world. All of these blessings have come from the freedom that came to the Philippines as part of the Spanish American War, I will say.

Now we have a friend over there in the Philippines. Now we have a people that speak English, who are engaged in commerce. And because of that, a people who understand democracy and a constitutional republic. That is an example of what happens when you are willing to take a risk, when you understand that this mantle of freedom is not something you can wear lightly,

and it is not something that comes without responsibility.

There were people that believed that prior to September 11 and, in fact, even after September 11 that we did not have a responsibility to the rest of the world, that we could just retreat back to our own shores, our own borders, run the United States of America, disregard the rest of the world, not do any trade treaties, not engage in any foreign conflicts. If we were not at risk, we should not be involved in anything else going on in the world.

But we know what the history of the world is. In fact, I take you back to the years that built up to World War II, and I want to compare that to the war we are in now against terror and the militant Islamic extremists.

We are having trouble today connecting the idea that you can have al Qaeda that is run out of perhaps the mountains in Pakistan, Afghanistan, up in that region. So al Qaeda is there, and some of the other sympathizers that are around the world. There are a whole number of different splinter groups, groups that are in Iraq and Indonesia. We have seen these attacks around the world, and we know there are cells all around the world.

We know there are second-generation Pakistanis that set off bombs in the subway in London. We have first-and second-generation Middle Easterners, both North Africans and Middle Easterners, mostly Muslim, probably all Muslim, that are running all over the streets of Paris as I speak, burning approximately 1,000 cars a day, and buildings, and attacking the very facilities designed for them.

So how is that Saddam Hussein could have been cooperating with Osama bin Laden when bin Laden is an Islamic fundamentalist and Saddam Hussein is a secular Arab and a Baathist and a Sunni? They could not get along, surely, because they are not motivated by the same things.

We forget about this thing that the enemy of my enemy is my friend. Well, we are the enemy of those enemies. It is easy for them to be friends, whether you are secular or a fundamentalist. In fact, Saddam had the entire Koran written inside a mosque with his blood. It is kind of hard to be secular when you give that much blood to be written inside a mosque.

So he kind of joined himself with his blood with Osama bin Laden. There is a philosophical connection. You do not have to be on a e-mail list and distribution tree from Osama bin Laden to be wired in with the philosophy worldwide. So this network rolls around here. People can work autonomously. The bombers in the subway in London may or may not have had direct orders from Osama or Zarqawi or whoever else the leaders might be.

The people that are out running in the streets of Paris today, I do not think each one of them gets their daily marching orders from on high. It becomes spontaneous after awhile. You

get a sympathetic support and a kind of synergy that grows and a philosophy that connects. And they start to think, if they can cause this trouble, so can I. If they can blow up this embassy, I can blow up the USS *Cole*. And if Ramzi Yousef can go in and strategize the first bombing of the World Trade Center, the next person can come along and figure out how to fly two planes into there and take it down. It does not have to be one command person sitting at the top distributing all of this.

Now going back to World War II, and that is that people in those days prior to World War II had a little trouble connecting how it could be that a national socialist, a Nazi like Hitler, could be connected with and allied with a Fascist like Mussolini in Italy. That did not quite fit. People said they are not philosophically connected. And we had the civil war going on in Spain, and people did not put it together as any kind of axis powers. There is no genesis of the axis of powers.

Furthermore, how could, for example, the Soviet Union be allied with and make any deals with Hitler because they really are not philosophically connected. One is a Nationalist-Socialist and the other is a Socialist or a Communist, take your pick. And I say, if you take people's freedom away at the point of a gun, you are a Communist. Stalin was a Communist.

You look across and you see that the revolution was beginning to form itself in China, culminating in 1949. And looking at the Japanese, they invaded Manchuria and wound down the coast of China. They invaded Singapore. How in the world could the Imperial Japanese have something in common with the Nazis in Germany and be tied with an axis power effort of the Fascists in Italy? And how does it work with the Soviet Union in the middle that really has a little bit of trouble figuring out who their friends are and who their enemies are?

All of that was an unfathomable equation to most people until September 1, 1939, when the Soviet Union, and I will say the Russians, and the Germans carved up Poland. It did not last very long. It was over in a matter of 3 weeks.

Then they began to see maybe they can find a way to cut a deal, shake hands and make a treaty. So World War II began. As it began, we did our best to stay out of it. We did a lend-lease program, and we tried to help the Allied powers.

The British essentially were standing there without a lot of help. The Australians were with them from the beginning, and then the attack came on Pearl Harbor from the Japanese. As soon as that happened, as quick as administratively it could be done, Hitler and Germany declared war on the United States.

Now it all starts to fit together. We know it from the historical perspective because we have seen it unfold. Now it makes sense. Now we do not even ask

the questions: What are the philosophical differences between Nazism, Fascism, Japanese Imperialism, and the Communism that was Russia at the time? How did they all get together?

Well, if you have a common interest, you can be joined together. This common interest of opposing the United States, this great Satan that they declare us to be, is plenty enough to join together the people that danced in the streets when the Twin Towers were hit on September 11, 2001, plenty enough to bind them together.

We should understand by now this enemy far better than we do, and it is predictable what is taking place in France right now. And I do not remember if this is the 12th or 13th night of riots going on in France.

The population of France, perhaps 10 percent, is Muslim. These people have come from North Africa and the Middle East. France opened up their doors and said, Let us have an open border policy. We will make a place for you.

I am starting to hear they did not make jobs for them, but I am not sure that is the government's job. I do not think government can create jobs. You have to set the structure and let the private sector do that, and we recognize the French have a different view.

What I saw were probably hundreds and perhaps thousands of radical Middle Eastern, North African Muslim demonstrators running all over the place with Molotov cocktails, torching buildings, torching cars and trucks, attacking schools and libraries and churches. Yes, churches. You will listen to CNN for a long time before you will hear "church burned in France." And you will listen to ABC, NBC and CBS a long time before you will hear the words "church burned in France."

□ 2215

In fact, we will listen to them for a long time before they will say "Muslim youth" torch anything in France. They will say "youth," "disgruntled youth," "unemployed youth," "disenfranchised youth." But they do not want to say "Muslim youth attack France."

So what do the French do when they are being attacked? Essentially we could define it as a civil war going on there right now. Had I been Jacques Chirac, I would have declared martial law a long time ago. I would have put the French troops out into the streets. I would have established a curfew. I would have had people on the rooftops with infrared sniper rifles. We would have said looters will be shot on sight. Anybody with a molotov cocktail, we will try to shoot that molotov for you from the roof so you can experience what it is like when you are at the other end of that bomb.

None of that is happening. They had their high-level meeting and put out some warnings; and as far as I know, they arrested 250 people or so. They have not done the hard things that needed to be done early to shut this off. So instead, 1,000 Frenchmen and

women put the tri-color banner on and marched in the street for peace.

Well, they have got a little trouble over there, Mr. Speaker, because we have an enemy that is not interested in negotiations. They are not interested in hand-holding. They are not interested in talking. They are interested in killing the people who are not like them.

And, by the way, we are not guilty of doing something. We are not guilty because of something we have done or failed to do. We are guilty and deserve a death penalty by their viewpoint because of who we are, what we are, what we are born; and it cannot be rectified. So we cannot talk and negotiate with these people. This is really difficult for the French, Mr. Speaker, because when 10 percent of their population lives within them and among them and they are out there burning things, some of which you built and provided those facilities for them, day care centers, schools, libraries. Maybe not the churches. I do not think they are burning any mosques. I am pretty confident they are not. But a people that are determined to kill them, and yet there is no organized head from the top to the bottom. The French cannot go surrender to Osama bin Laden. They cannot find him. They cannot find Zarqawi and surrender to him. In fact, if every Frenchman held up a white flag, and I imagine some have by now, there is nobody to surrender to. They do not want us to surrender. They want to kill us. They want to take over Western Civilization. They want to destroy Western Civilization.

And I happen to believe that Western Civilization, as civilizations go, has been a great gift to all the people in the world. I would be willing to state also, Mr. Speaker, that of all of the missionaries that have ever gone to Africa or to anywhere in the world, and God love them for all the work they have done and it has been a lot of good work, free enterprise capitalism has done more for the world, more for the well-being of humanity than all of the missionaries that ever went anywhere from a standard-of-living standpoint, from a medical care standpoint.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the investment of capital and the desire for profit has developed this technology that has raised everyone's standard of living. And the health care that we have, because we have research and development for pharmaceuticals, for example, for new surgery techniques, for preventative health care, most of that was driven as a desire to make a little money. Well, a good thing. A good thing that that happened. A good thing that we have a motivation in this country to lead the world in patents, lead the world in creativity. We have that because we have freedom. That all came from Western Civilization.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Western Civilization that our enemy wants to destroy, this great gift to the world, this

descendant that we can trace back to; and I will say Western Civilization has descended from the Greeks, the Age of Reason, the age where the Greeks sat around and analyzed and set up a structure that let them rationalize their way through and establish science, the beginning of the rationalization that has allowed us to develop technology. And the Greeks took great pride in their ability to reason. And there were philosophies and we can name many of them.

Go back and look at these readings. They did not know a lot about science and technology then, but they established the theorem principles that have carried us through to this day, Mr. Speaker. And that Age of Reason that became the culture in Greece back in those years, 2,000 to 3,000 years ago, found its way into Western Europe in later years and established the Age of Enlightenment. The Age of Enlightenment, I have to say, centered in France. I will give the French the credit for that.

And as the Age of Enlightenment developed, we saw the technology come. We saw some of the mass production come. We saw that, as that technology and that science took a step forward, took another step forward, Western Civilization had successfully manifested itself in the Age of Enlightenment in France just in time to be transported across the Atlantic Ocean and be established here in the United States of America where it found the most fertile ground it could have imagined because here we were in the United States establishing a free country, a free country unfettered by taxes, by regulation, by restrictions, by managed economies, by managed societies, where we let people go out and invest capital and the sweat off their brow and their labor and to grow technology at the same time and energize this manifest destiny and settle this continent in record time, lightning speed, fertile ground here in the United States for Western Civilization to establish itself.

And, yes, we descended from Europe, but we are different than Europe. The difference is many of the people in this country came here to get away from the restrictions and the oppression that was there, both religious and otherwise. The royalty structure that was there kept people from really being free. The property right structure there kept people from owning and keeping property and passing it along to the next generation, they did not have the freedom that we have.

One of the examples that would be, and I am speaking in of all the Europe, Holland today is probably the most liberal country in the world. They have euthanasia. They have abortion. They have legalized drugs, legalized prostitution. And they have their troubles too with a lot of Muslim immigrants that are there.

But it is a whole different politic than the Dutch areas that I represent

in northwest Iowa, where they are very conservative. They would not think of ending someone's life at the end of life. They believe in life being sacred from conception to natural death. Life is sacred from the instant of conception until natural death. They have a maximum number of churches, a minimum number of bars. They do not believe in illegal drugs. Those things that I have said that are all legal and open and open and part and parcel of the culture and civilization of Holland did not get transferred here to the United States because they left there to get away from some of those things. They knew what they wanted to get away from. They knew what they wanted to establish.

That is just an example of the many people who came over here for religious freedom. They brought their standards with them. And the strength that we have in this Nation, Mr. Speaker, is a strength of a three-legged stool built here in this Western Civilization that we have.

And I will argue this: that the strength comes from Judeo-Christian values, free enterprise capitalism, and Western Civilization. Science and technology and the Age of Reason and the Age of Enlightenment and all of its descendants came over here where we had all of these natural resources and this unfettered free enterprise capitalism to join with this Age of Enlightenment and blossom this economy that was here and established more patents than any country had ever created, more creativity, more freedom, more opportunity, more economic growth. And all of that would have created an imperialistic Nation that would not have just been manifest destiny out to the Pacific Ocean, but imperialistic to dominate the rest of the world.

What kept us from doing that, Mr. Speaker? Our Judeo-Christian moral values put the brakes on that kind of a robust desire to occupy or command or own the world. We recognize our responsibility for freedom. We recognize our freedom comes from God. We have a morality and a responsibility to restrain ourselves because of the Judeo-Christian foundation that is the culture of this country. No matter how one tries to secularize America, we have a Judeo-Christian foundation that is part of everything that we do. And that has been the restraint, the brakes that have held us back, that has caused us to try to project and promote our way of life to the rest of the world without imposing it on the rest of the world.

Which brings me back, Mr. Speaker, to Iraq, Iraq where we have lost more than 2,000 Americans. 300 to 400 of them were not combat deaths, but they gave their lives for freedom and liberty just the same. And I have held some of those widows and looked them in the eye and prayed with them, the mothers, the fathers. It is hard, but they are some of the most patriotic people that I have met. And some of the most

meaningful times I have ever had as a Member of this United States Congress have been standing in that living room, understanding and to some extent trying to take some of the pain away from a family.

Mr. Speaker, Iraq is a country that is a cell. It is a place where, yes, there was al Qaeda; yes, Saddam did send agents around the world; yes, he did provide sanctuary for the first planner and strategist for the first attack on the Twin Towers; yes, he did send one of his security operatives, who was a colonel in the Iraqi military security, over to Malaysia. He was there. He was in the meeting that planned the second attack on the Twin Towers.

Not only that, but there were al Qaeda training camps in Iraq. And whether or not there were massive quantities of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, the President could not take that chance. We cannot take the chance of having hundreds of thousands of people there and an ability to fund this kind of enemy and someone who has continually funded terrorism around the world, give him weapons of mass destruction.

And, by the way, a lot was made of David Kay's report when he came back to this Congress and reported. As I listened to the other side of the aisle, their interpretation was there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq; David Kay said so. And I read the report. It is kind of interesting sometimes when we read the actual text of something after we hear the interpretation. What I read in there was David Kay did not find mass quantities of inventory of weapons of mass destruction when he was there. He was not sure what might or might not have happened to them. He could not argue that they never existed. Certainly not. But in his report he did say that Saddam Hussein maintained the ability to reestablish his system to develop weapons of mass destruction and could do so within 2 weeks.

And, by the way, it does not take a lot of bacterial germ agent to produce a lot of problems. And I would argue that if you give me \$2 million and put \$1 million in one coffee can and \$1 million in another coffee can and give me a posthole digger and send me to California with a GPS, I will go out there and bury those two coffee cans somewhere in California and then come back out of there, let it rain, if it rains in California, and you go to California and look for those \$2 million. There is almost no chance of finding that. And that is about what chance we had of finding some of the weapons of mass destruction. And we are continually digging up different weapons in Iraq that we stumble across. I read an article just the other day.

But I would argue this to the people on that side of the aisle: we know Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. He used them against Iran. No one argues that. He used them against his own people in Kurdistan

and killed at least 5,000 people there, perhaps more. In fact, I met with the judges in the tribunal, and in a moment we will hear from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS). Those three judges talked about, if I have got the number right, and I am going to ask Mr. BURGESS to give us a precise number, but it was over 100,000 Kurds killed and slaughtered by Saddam. I do not know how many were by gas, at least 5,000.

But I would argue this: either Saddam Hussein had significant quantities of weapons of mass destruction, and we know because he used them on Iran and on the Kurds and other places, either he had those quantities or he used up his last can of mustard gas on the Kurds. Is there anybody over here willing to say they believe Saddam Hussein, out of all that inventory that he used against the Iranians and the Kurds, used up his last can of mustard gas and we just lied to America because we knew his warehouse was empty, but nobody else did, not even Bill Clinton, not Al Gore, not the Israelis, not the French, not the United Nations, not the United States, not Great Britain. Everybody's intelligence said the same thing. It was logical. It was rational. And now the ridicule that comes from the other side is an irrational ridicule, Mr. Speaker.

And with that I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), who, by the way, last August joined with me over in Iraq where we saw some extraordinarily interesting things, one who performs so well for the people from Texas.

□ 2230

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for organizing this hour, for being here. I know the gentleman has been a little bit under the weather, and I was concerned about his voice holding up for the whole time, but I am so glad he was talking about this issue.

Mr. Speaker, just the other day I pulled out the joint resolution from the 107th Congress. I would point out that the 107th Congress was the term before either the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) or myself was in Congress. This was the joint resolution authorizing the use of force in Iraq. It is really quite an interesting document. It is instructive to read through this document.

To be sure, there is mention of weapons of mass destruction, but there is also a good deal of discussion of Iraq being in breach of its international obligations, failure to follow United Nations resolutions, oppression of their own people, using weapons of mass destruction against his own people and, perhaps very interestingly, the violation of Public Law 105-338 which was passed in a previous President's administration in 1998 where it was a sense of Congress that it should be the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove from power the current Iraqi regime and promote the emergence of a

democratic government to replace that regime. That was passed in 1998, and we had to wait until 2003 to have a President who had the courage to actually execute that. I am glad we have a President who had that wisdom, because I would not like to think of the world in 25 or 30 years time had we not taken the effort that has been undertaken in Iraq.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is quite right. We were in Iraq in August. It was my fourth trip there. Boy, big steps. Every time I go to that country, it is incredible the amount of work that has been accomplished, hard work in sometimes tough, tough climatic conditions, the weather is hot in the summer, cold in the winter, dusty all year-round, and then of course the constant threat of danger from terrorists and insurgents who live in that country.

But the actual quote that the gentleman was talking about from the judges, I think they were referencing the beginnings of the trial of Chemical Ali, the man who was responsible for the killing of the Kurds in Halabja, and he was accused of killing 180,000 Kurds. Chemical Ali's defense of that was, it was not one bit over 100,000, and I do not know why you continue to lie about it. So perhaps he will get his day in court soon. I hope that is true.

Mr. Speaker, I had been on the Floor earlier tonight talking about the debate that we are going to have on the budget, and I know the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) has referenced some of those points. I do get so frustrated, and the group that was here the hour before us, continuing to vilify the productive sector of our society, the productive segment of our society that provides the tax revenue for us to be able to do all of those free market capitalism things that the gentleman from Iowa referred to, all of those things that we want to do that are good things for people who are less fortunate than ourselves. All of those things are made possible because of the productive segment of society. This angst over the \$55 billion that was returned to the most productive segment in society in May of 2003, legislation that I voted for and I believe the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) voted for, this \$55 billion they desperately want to have back. But what has that \$55 billion that we passed in May of 2003, what has that given us? It has given us 262 billion additional dollars in tax revenue for fiscal year 2005, the fiscal year that just ended on September 30.

So, Mr. Speaker, to get back the benefit of that \$55 billion that we reinvested in the American economy, we would have to raise taxes, not that \$55 billion, but you would have to double that and double that again to get the same number of dollars back to the Federal Treasury that the tax relief provided in May of 2003.

I think one of the most telling things I have seen in the past several days as we prepare for the debate was a quote

from Roll Call from just yesterday. This fall is not the time for Democrats to roll out a positive agenda, said a House Democrat aid. That is some of the most unfortunate language that I have heard since coming to this House a year-and-a-half ago. If the other side is so bereft of ideas, if they are intimidated or frozen by their leadership, if they are afraid to show up for the debate, then that is truly one of the saddest comments on this body and this country.

Because we need their ideas. We need their enthusiasm, we need their participation. I think, Mr. Speaker, hopefully, over the days and weeks to come, we will see more of that. We will see more of a willingness to have and to engage in debate, and not just the talking points that are in the top drawer of your desk. We can have talking points read to us by a commentator on CNN. We do not need people to come down here and read their talking points, we need them to come down here where really it should be the free exchange of ideas. This should be the marketplace of great ideas in this country where they are talked about and debated. So I would welcome the opportunity if the other side would some day wish to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) has some other very important data that he wants to share with us, and I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a person who has become a good friend, and such a good friend that he is over working at night in his office and he sees me having a little difficulty with my voice and comes over to help me out. That is the kind of camaraderie we have here. We have seen a lot of Iraq together, and we do see it through the same eyes, and I appreciate his 4 trips over there and my 3 trips over there, and each time we are there, the troops appreciate it. But I can tell my colleagues that we appreciate them a great, great deal, and it is an honor to be with them at a time like that.

There are so many pieces of subject matter, Mr. Speaker, that I really intended to talk about tonight, and as I got into the depths of this Iraq issue and this worldwide war we are fighting, militant Islamic extremists, I wanted to make sure that we defined our enemy and defined them accurately.

There are a lot of places on this globe, and they are perhaps 16,000 Madrasas in Pakistan alone, places where they teach a kind of fundamentalism that sets the framework, sets the foundation for them to turn that into an active hatred. France and Great Britain perhaps are higher populations and more concentrations and further along in the growth and development of the kind of societies that reject those who have accepted them. They have rejected assimilation, they do not want to live as French or British. In fact, many of them do not really

want to live as Americans. So I am a great proponent of assimilation. I will not take up that subject.

But I have 2 others that I would like to address here in the next 12 or so minutes that we have here. One of them is I wrote down a list of the things that I heard from the people on the other side of the aisle and I really only got to subject number one. The next one that I heard was energy.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things we can do with energy in this country. We are not getting help from the Democrats. There is a strong segment of I will call them environmentalist extremists. I do not claim to be an environmentalist myself. I am a conservationist. I have spent my life protecting soil and water. I have built more terraces than, I said earlier tonight, than any Member of Congress; waterways, farm ponds, larger reservoirs. You name it, we have protected the water and also protected our soil and sent the rain drops down through the soil profile. I believe in all of that. I am one of the people that has been up to ANWR, and I challenge anybody here in this Congress out of the 435, if you are opposed to going up there and drilling in ANWR and have not been there, to see the environmental success that has been established on the north slope.

We began drilling up there with that entire operation in 1972. You could fly an environmental extremist over the oil fields in the north slope and they could look down from a thousand feet, and they would not know they were over the oil slope oil fields. They would say, where are the derricks? Where are the pump jacks? Where are the oil spills? Where are the pipelines? Where are the roads? Where are the electrical lines? Where are the distribution systems? Where are they burning off the gas here? How come I do not see an oil field below me, when you tell me I am right over the top of it?

The reason is because there are no derricks, there are no pump jacks, there are no electrical lines visible, there are not any collection pipelines visible. All of this is underground. The pumps are all submersible pumps.

When you fly over there and look at that, it is simply rock pad for a work-over rig. It is perhaps 50 by 100 or 150 feet long of I call it limestone; it is probably not; say 3 feet above that swamp floodplain. There are ice roads to go in there in the wintertime and work on it only. The ice roads melt. There is no impact whatsoever on the environment, except caribou herds now have gone from 7,000 in 1970 to 28,000 head today. So they have done pretty well. We should go up there and drill. God put the oil there. I could not think of a better place. I cannot improve upon that. Where would you have the oil if you cannot have it up there where nobody goes, or we cannot have it up there where nobody goes, where we can do that with almost no impact on the environment, and if we can do so with .04 percent, 4 hundredths of 1 percent of

a footprint on that region. Yet, where is our help over here from the other side of the aisle?

Mr. Speaker, 406 trillion cubic feet of natural gas offshore in the United States. There has never been a natural gas spill that has impacted anybody's environment. It is just scientifically and physiologically impossible. The gas dissipates.

By the way, there is natural gas bubbling up out of the ocean all the time. No impact on our environment, 406 trillion cubic feet, many times more gas on the outer continental shelf than there is on the north slope of Alaska. Where is our help over here to lower the highest price of natural gas anywhere in the world? And we pay that price, every American. If you want to help, let us do something proactive. They come to the Floor and every single night, negative, negative. I could not get out of belt if I felt like that. By the way, I do not believe that stuff anyway.

The argument about outing a CIA agent, Mr. Speaker. I listened carefully twice through to the special prosecutor's presentation that did bring out the indictment of Scooter Libby. He did not make any allegations that there had been any CIA agent outed. It was the purpose of his investigation. He apparently did not discover that, or he would have brought an indictment for that. But if the special prosecutor cannot find it in 2 years, how can the 30-Something Group find it over here? I would like to hear some more details on that. By the way, I read Bob Novak's column too and he argued that it was a common known thing that there was a CIA agent that was married to the gentleman who went to Niger, and I am not talking about Joseph C. Wilson, our Member of Congress who is Joe Wilson from South Carolina, we call him the good Joe. But the Joseph C. Wilson that went via the CIA to Niger to look and see if Iraq was out there seeking to purchase yellow cake uranium, came back with a report that apparently conflicts his public testimony.

By the way, if you are a CIA agent and you are being paid to go to Africa and investigate as to whether Saddam Hussein is trying to purchase uranium so that he can develop nuclear weapons, weapons of mass destruction, I might add, would that not be a classified report, or is that individual going to come back here and give a report that says, well, yes, there were some people negotiating to do business with Niger, but no, I do not think they are trying to buy uranium. I do not know what else he would buy there, and neither did he. But he makes that report, that when he disagrees with his own report, he makes that public? Why kind of an agent of the CIA would do that, and why are we not challenging that in this country? Why are we not going to wait until there is a trial and find out what really happened under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker. So it saddens

my heart that these conclusions can be leaped to from the same people who would say that the impeached President was innocent until proven guilty. Talk about a culture of corruption. No, I do not believe it exists, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, looking at this clock, I want to bring up one more piece of subject matter here and it is of significant importance, especially to the Midwest, but all over this country, and that is the issue of methamphetamines.

I want to point out on this chart, this is the Iowa experience. Mr. Speaker, we have some of the worst meth abuse in Iowa than of anyplace in the country. We have busted quite a lot of method labs. There are only a couple of States that can compete with us in the number of meth abuse labs that there are. We recognize that it takes some things to make methamphetamines, the worst illegal drug this country has ever seen. It takes pseudoephedrine, ephedrine, or a product called PPA. Those things are all available in the midwest. We have more experience with it than anybody else, Mr. Speaker. So we began addressing this.

When I was in the Iowa Senate about 5 years ago, we did some things to take some of that off the shelf. We did not do enough. So in our first try, we found out that these people are creative and they will find a way around you. So they wrote some new legislation. I was not involved in that. But I want to commend the Iowa legislature and the governor for signing legislation into law that was enacted on the first day of June 2005.

This red line on this chart, Mr. Speaker, here are the meth labs that were busted from the previous year, this year, for the same period of time, 2004-2005, meth labs running per month: 229, 185, 122, 127, 213, 146. A law was passed right here, kind of at the peak of the meth labs being busted. March is a big month. And they began, the retailers began pulling the precursors off the shelf by April. By May, by the end of May, we had seen a dramatic reduction in the number of meth labs that were busted by our, I will say, very efficient drug enforcement people in Iowa.

□ 2245

And that May number went down from 42 in May to 29 in June, to 25 labs only in July, to 12 in August, to 12 in September, to 10 in October, and then this is up until October 28. That is an 80 percent reduction in meth labs because we took the precursors off the shelf, except we made sure that moms that had kids that get sick in the night could go down to the convenience store or the grocery store and pick up enough pseudoephedrine to get those kids through the next day.

And this is what you can buy in Iowa off the shelf today legally. This product right here, Mr. Speaker, is 360 milligrams active ingredient of pseudoephedrine in this product that is by one of our grocery stores, a good old

home-grown Iowa chain grocery store. They private-label package this in a 360-milligram package because that is the amount that you can purchase for a single day in Iowa. And you can go out and do that the next day and the next day and the next day in Iowa, or you can go into the pharmacy, in either case, in a monthly supply you can purchase 7,500 milligrams. But in 1 day what I have on display back here, Mr. Speaker, is what I bought in a single day, and all but this from a pharmacy in Cherokee, Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, this represents the pseudoephedrine that you can purchase at one stop, all of these behind me that you can purchase in one stop in Iowa. And that is plenty enough to take care of a family for a good long time.

We have passed some legislation out of the Judiciary Committee today. Instead of limiting it to 360 milligrams a day, it limits it to 3.6 grams or 3,600 milligrams a day. We have a 7,500 milligram per month purchase that we can do in Iowa, but that quantity needs to be purchased from a pharmacist who will watch that volume. The law that passed, the language that passed out of the Judiciary Committee today, that 3.6 grams a day will allow a meth cook to go and make 19 stops around through retail establishments. Now, they sign up each place. They give their ID at each place, but there is not a way to track one retail place to another. So they will go from place to place. They will do 19 stops. They will pick up perhaps 70 grams of pseudoephedrine, go home and make an ounce of methamphetamine and they can get that all done all before noon.

And that ounce of methamphetamine will last one addict 90 days, or their 1-day supply, and then they go sell the 89-day supply, go back again in the afternoon and produce another 90 days' worth of methamphetamine under law that came out of the Judiciary Committee today.

We can do better. I have introduced the Meth Lab Eradication Act. These are the conditions that are part of it. We have set it to comply with Federal law. Schedule 5 drug, penalties are associated with the Schedule 5. This was so easy to adapt to in Iowa with regard to the retailers, the pharmacists and the consumers that the adjustment, according to the author, of this bill was simply pathetically easy. We need to do that in this Congress so we can eradicate meth labs in America.

Mr. Speaker, I promised earlier tonight that I would solve all the world's problems in 60 minutes. And you know, in fact, it is possible, but I did not solve them all tonight. So I am going to pledge to come back and keep working on the world's problems in an optimistic, solution-oriented way. And I appreciate the opportunity to address this Congress.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4241, DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. PUTNAM (during Special Order of Mr. KING of Iowa), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-281) on the resolution (H. Res. 542) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4241) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

OUTING OF CIA AGENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the opportunity for the 30-something Working Group to be back in action, and our friend from Iowa has not solved all the world's problems tonight. We will take it from here. We are ready, willing, and able to take the country in a new direction. A couple of the issues that the other side has addressed, one is the meth labs. I had a meeting recently with some sheriff deputies in Trumbull County, Ohio, from Geauga County, Ohio, and Ashland, Ohio, who were saying that they were unable to confiscate the methamphetamine labs because the drug program, the Federal drug task force program has been cut. So maybe we can work together in a bipartisan way to try to increase the funding for that, and you will be supportive, I am sure, so that we can make sure we crack down on these methamphetamine labs. This is something that we want to do.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the other side brought up the fact that a CIA agent was outed, and there was some disagreement. The prosecutor here, Mr. Fitzgerald, said that the reason Scooter Libby was not charged with outing a CIA agent is because he lied so much to the grand jury that he could not prove it. And he used the example, he said that I am like the umpire. I am the Federal prosecutor. I am the umpire. And as I was trying to make a decision here of whether or not he outed the CIA agent, Scooter Libby threw sand in my eyes. So I was not able to get to the point where I could actually charge him with outing a CIA agent because he threw sand in my eyes.

So he charged him with two counts of making false statements to a Federal agent, two counts of perjury to a grand jury, and one count of obstruction of justice. And how the other side could somehow say that that is all right, that is okay, I cannot believe that they would just charge him with that. You just lied to a grand jury? That was all you did? Okay. Well, that is all right. You did not out a CIA agent, or at least

we could not prove it. And before we get going here, there are some CIA agents, former covert operatives that I think would disagree.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Those are third-party validators that were actually CIA agents. Am I correct, sir?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is absolutely right. Here is one CIA agent, Jim Marcinkowski. This was on "60 Minutes." He says exposing Brewster-Jennings, let me give a little background here. When Joe Wilson's wife was outed, when it became public, the world all of a sudden knew that everyone she was associated with and affiliated with was a part of the CIA in some way, shape or form, and so they also outed Brewster-Jennings, which was a front company, CIA front company in Boston, not to mention the 20 years' worth of contacts that also got outed.

But here is a quote from Jim Marcinkowski on "60 Minutes," a former covert CIA agent. He said exposing the Boston firm Brewster-Jennings could lead foreign intelligence agencies to other spies. There is a possibility that there were other agents that would use the same kind of a cover so they may have been using Brewster-Jennings just like her. Another one from The Washington Post, a small Boston company, listed as Valerie Plame's employer, suddenly was shown to be a bogus CIA front and her alma mater in Belgium discovered it was a favored haunt of an American spy.

By Karl Rove and Scooter Libby and the executive branch outing Joe Wilson's wife, they put a lot of people in jeopardy, and they hurt our intelligence capabilities all over the world because now people who have dealt with Americans who went to the University of Belgium or who had dealings with Brewster-Jennings are now being looked upon as suspect.

Not only that, the word now is that the spouses of American ambassadors are being looked at suspiciously because now people think just because Valerie Plame was the spouse of an American ambassador and she was a CIA agent that every other spouse of an ambassador all over the world may be a CIA agent. This has ramifications, Mr. Speaker, that we do not even realize yet. And that has done nothing but weaken the country.

Now, here is the ultimate third-party validator on why the corruption going on in the White House right now must stop, because it is hurting our ability to fight the war on terrorism. They are weakening our ability to fight this war. This is Melissa, who was a 14-year covert CIA operative, and she was asked a question on "60 Minutes." She says because we are talking about lives, and we are talking about capabilities, we do our work. We risk our own lives. We risk the lives of our agents in order to protect our country. And when something like this happens, it cuts to the very core of what we do. We are not being undermined by the