

Child Left Behind Act is known by the States, and States are suing the Federal Government for a lack of funding. Meanwhile, as we speak here on this floor, the Ways and Means Committee is meeting to make sure that the tax cuts are permanent for millionaires.

So I am glad that some members of the Senate last week said I cannot vote, at the same time that I am cutting Medicaid for poor Americans free and reduced lunch for children, veterans benefits and then within the same time period, within a couple of days I am going to vote to give millionaires a permanent tax cut?

What I am saying is that there are things that we should get passionate about, and there are some things that we really need to be passionate about. I can tell you right now, there are a number of issues not being addressed, and like you said, the outing of a CIA agent is just like someone running over and telling the enemy about the Marines are going to be on this beach at this time and this day; I just wanted you to know that because I know it. That is what it is like.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is irresponsible.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And it is setting us back. My message for the majority and also for the President is get passionate about the right issues. You want to get passionate about some of the actions in the White House, it is happening right there under your nose. Passion stops at we will just give an ethics course on not sharing national secrets with the press. You have to go far beyond that. Too many people have died. Too many veterans right now need assistance to just go use the restroom right now to give that speech.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, if I can for a moment, I want to take issue with the President's statement relative to support the troops and that asking questions somehow undermines that support. That is false. That is inaccurate.

There is not a Member in this House on either side of the aisle, I cannot believe there is an American anywhere in this country, that does not fervently pray that these young men and women come home, come home without wounds, but I will talk about support for the troops because I believe that if there is a grade to be given for supporting the troops by this White House, it is a failure. It is a failure.

How many letters have we, and again, not just Democrats, but Republicans, sent to this White House complaining about the lack of vests, complaining about the unarmored humvees that so many of our young troops have been killed, permanently maimed, and yet we still have problems? It is an issue that has been lingering for years, not just for months.

I am not suggesting that that was intended, but it is a demonstration of the incompetence of this administration, and underscores, if we are talking about supporting the troops, the lack of that support.

You referenced earlier about veterans. It is easy for the President to wish the troops well as they march into war, and yet it was this White House, this administration, that submitted a budget for the Veterans Administration that was \$2.5 billion less than hopefully the budget that this Congress will pass.

Let me suggest to the White House that that demonstrates callousness and turning your back on those young men and women in Iraq, and it is absolutely a stain on our national honor.

#### INTELLIGENCE ISSUES AND THE WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLES of South Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized and the opportunity to address the House tonight and until tomorrow begins I understand.

First, I would speak to this issue that we have heard as the conclusion of my friends and colleagues from the other side of the aisle, however optimistic they may not be in their presentation to the American people on a regular basis.

As I go through some of the things that are in front of me and I listened to the allegations that have been made that somehow the President has manipulated the intelligence and led this Nation into war because there never were any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, I will point out that I flat out reject that statement. It is not possible to prove a negative in the first place, and a rational person would understand that from the beginning.

Additionally, we know that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. We know that he used them 1 time.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that we know that he did have weapons of mass destruction because we provided, during the 1980s, the means for the development of those weapons to Saddam Hussein.

Members of this administration, former Secretary of State Colin Powell, the Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, they clearly knew because they were involved in assuring that the means to develop weapons of mass destruction were provided to the Saddam Hussein regime.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would point out that I will not concede the accuracy of that, and I do not because I do not have that evidence and I have not seen that. I acknowledge the gentleman's statement for the honorable individual he is, and I would point out that we can

concur then that Saddam had weapons of mass destruction.

In fact, President Clinton made that statement in 1998 very clearly and unequivocally, and my point is that either Saddam Hussein used his last canister of mustard gas on the Kurds and simply ran out of inventory or else those weapons of mass destruction still have to be someplace, and he constructed then an elaborate ruse to dupe the world and dupe seven or eight or nine different countries on the intelligence.

I point out President Clinton's statement: Other countries possess weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. This is December 1998. With Saddam there is one big difference; he has used them. The international community has little doubt then, and I have no doubt today, says President Clinton, that left unchecked Saddam Hussein will use these terrible weapons.

Again, 1998, Mr. Speaker, and allegations here on this floor and around this country are that somehow President Bush has manipulated intelligence and apparently misrepresented this to the American people, and the implication is also that he has duped these people that have made these statements, including former President Bill Clinton and a number of other high-profile people within his administration.

The allegation would then have to hold true that somehow the governor of Texas, now President Bush, found a way to dupe the national leaders to somehow manipulate and maneuver hundreds of billions of dollars worth of national intelligence to produce these kinds of results.

□ 2315

It is simply a ludicrous position to take. It will not hold water, it is not logical, it is not rational, and the more the American people hear about this, the more they begin to think about it, the more they begin to understand it, the less they are going to believe these allegations.

I would also point out that the individual who has had his 15 minutes of fame and then some, the erstwhile ambassador who was sent by the CIA to go to Niger to investigate the question as to whether Saddam Hussein was seeking yellowcake uranium from Niger, that individual, of course, we know as the husband of now publicly discussed Valerie Plame, at her recommendation. As we understand, he was sent by the CIA.

He had not been in Niger in 20 years. He was not a weapons expert like his wife may have been. But he went there, and he came back and gave one story to the New Republic Magazine. He gave another story under oath to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence which thoroughly eviscerated his viability and his credibility.

So the statements that were made for publication for the fame did not hold up under oath, did not hold up under scrutiny. One thing we are confident of is that erstwhile ambassador

who went on a mission to supposedly represent the United States, Joseph C. Wilson, the individual who went over there for the CIA, if one is on a mission in a foreign country for the CIA, one would think that they would have some level of integrity they would have to hold up, have some level of confidentiality that they would have to hold up. One would think that if they went on a mission, a secret clandestine mission, first, that they would be qualified; second, that they would maintain that level of secrecy and confidentiality, that they would come back and report back to their superiors and it would be an accurate report and it would be precise and it would be credible and it would hold up under oath.

That report, alleged to have been delivered in print by one Joseph C. Wilson, erstwhile ambassador, was not delivered in print. It was delivered verbally, and the verbal report that we have the notes of and the knowledge of, Mr. Speaker, is a verbal report that indicates that the Iraqis were seeking weapons of mass destruction, yellowcake uranium in Niger. It indicates the very thing that he alleges today was not true.

Yet this seems to be some kind of allegations by the other side, if they like what they hear, are enough for them to say this is confirmed and absolute proof; and rational, thinking Americans know better. Critical thinking Americans know better. In fact, this President would not use any language in a State of the Union address or any other kind of speech unless he knew that it had been thoroughly vetted, it was reliable. And it was, by the way, vetted and reliable and delivered into that speech on January 28, 2003, in these Chambers from just in front of where the Speaker is right now when the President gave his State of the Union Address.

Those now infamous 16 words that are alleged to have been untruthful to the American people start out with "we have learned from the British" that the Iraqis have been seeking uranium from Africa. Now, "we have learned from the British" is true. That is a fact, and no one has challenged that fact. "We have learned from the British that the Iraqis are seeking," that qualification precludes any of the rest of that statement as long as the rest of that statement is consistent with what we have learned from the British; and to turn that into something that is now called a lie is disingenuous and dishonest to the American people.

I reminded the body here last week, last Wednesday night, that there were commercials that were run across this country on television in the 1996 Presidential campaign. There were issues there about integrity and honesty in that Presidential campaign. Charlton Heston went on television, and he said, looking into the camera, "Mr. President, when you say something that is wrong and you do not know that it is

wrong, that is a mistake. But, Mr. President, when you say something that is right and you know it is wrong, that is a lie." That is the distinction between a mistake and a lie. That distinction has not been recognized by the other side of the aisle, and it is willfully being ignored.

I will not concede that a mistake was made. I think the words in that State of the Union Address are precisely accurate. I think the British would concede that point today. I think any rational, critical thinking person would concede that point today, Mr. Speaker. But this has been twisted and warped to the point where it is jeopardizing our national security, and that is why I am on the floor here tonight.

I have been over in the Middle East a number of times. The last time I came back was August 20 of this past summer. I have been there with our men and women in uniform when they are strapped on with helmets and bullet-proof vests. I have been in and ridden in and inspected some of those armored vehicles that have been hit by enemy fire, hit by IEDs. I happen to have inspected an armored Humvee that was hit by a rocket and an RPG almost simultaneously. It rolled off the road upside down, and the four American soldiers that were in that armored Humvee walked away and were on patrol the next day thanks to the armor that is there.

I have been to Fallujah, I believe a year ago last May, where the Marines were bolting on armor then and preparing for battle that was ahead. So we have accelerated the production of our armor for all of our vehicles there. Some of them are not armored. They stay on the base where they are safe. But almost all of our vehicles that go out anywhere where they are in danger are fully armored, top, bottom, and sideways, with bullet-proof windows in them. We have done a fantastic job to ramp up the construction and development of armor and done a pretty good job.

We were not ready for this. The Humvees were not designed to go into combat. They were not designed to drive over IEDs. They were not designed to take direct hits from RPGs or rocket fire. In fact, they were not designed to take hits from AK-47s. They were not a combat vehicle in the beginning of those operations. So we had to adapt to the circumstances that were there.

We began sending steel over there, and it was cut and fitted and it was bolted on or welded on, and our military went right to work as quickly as they could to get as much armor up as fast as they could. We started our factories up here. We took an existing production line and multiplied its production capability by at least 10 times to get our armored Humvees out in place and to put the armor on our trucks and to get ready.

Now we do send out convoys that are fully armored on a regular basis, and it

has been a long time since we have exposed significant numbers of vehicles or American soldiers out there in vehicles that were not armored, Mr. Speaker. So this argument that it is something other than that I think is specious, and I do not think it is based on fact.

The statement that the President made about the irresponsible statements when people undermine our military efforts, I will go further than that, and I will relate an incident for me a year ago last June, about June 17. I was in a hotel in Kuwait waiting to go into Iraq the next day early. I turned on the television to Al-Jazeera TV. As I watched that television, it was Arabic audio and it was English subtitles, and on that television came Moqtada al-Sadr, a big black beard, and as he spoke in Arabic, the English subtitles came on underneath on the screen, and the subtitles said, "If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu."

Listen to that echo in the ears of Moqtada al-Sadr, and we know that his voice was echoing in the ears of our enemy, the people we call the insurgents on our nice days, the people who are sitting somewhere in a mud hut or a stone building and they have some 155mm rounds. They have got explosives. They have got detonating devices. They have got shrapnel built into this, and they are making improvised explosive devices. They are watching their new satellite dish TV.

Some of the communities there in Iraq have more than one satellite dish per household. They were illegal when we first came into Iraq, but every Iraqi today has access to satellite TV. Every Iraqi today can watch Al-Jazeera TV. And on Al-Jazeera TV, they would see these kinds of scenes of Moqtada al-Sadr saying, "If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu." And the enemy who are making improvised explosive devices see that on television. It encourages them. It causes them to build more bombs, not less. It causes them to plant more bombs, not less. It causes them to detonate more bombs, not less. It causes them to have more courage, more hope, a stronger spirit to fight our American soldiers because of the words that came out of Moqtada al-Sadr.

Now, imagine how encouraging that is to our enemy over in Iraq, and many of them are not Iraqis. In fact, most of the enemy, I understand, are not Iraqis but imported fighters from other countries. Imagine how encouraging it is when they see on their Al-Jazeera TV, when they hear the voice and see the face of a quasi-leader of the United States of America, someone from the floor of Congress, someone from the floor of the United States Senate, someone who is doing a press conference out on the steps of the Capitol,

someone who is doing talking head television, someone who says, wrong war, wrong place, wrong time, get them out of there, Mr. President, we need to get out of Iraq. Imagine how much encouragement that gives to the enemy. And what is the enemy going to do? They are going to recruit more. They are going to build more bombs. They are going to attack more Americans.

I reject the idea that one can say they fervently pray that the troops come home and they support the troops. I reject the idea that they can support the troops and reject their mission. Mr. Speaker, if you are for the troops, you are for their mission. And if you are against the troops, you are against their mission. But these things are inextricably linked. They cannot be separated.

We cannot ask an American soldier to go in this country or overseas, risk their life, perhaps give their life on a mission that we do not believe in. We would not send them on a mission we do not believe in. We would not ask them to do that. It would be the most dishonest, disingenuous thing we could do as the United States Government in Congress and the President of the United States and Commander-in-Chief to order men and women into a theater of battle and not support their mission.

When I talk with the families that have lost a loved one in this war on terror, it is a sad time, and that price they have paid cannot be felt unless we ourselves have had that loss, but we can empathize with them. We can pray for them. We can sympathize with them. We can try to understand. But invariably those that I talk to, those that I meet with, will tell me they want their son or their daughter's life to have meaning. They want that sacrifice to have meaning. And they will say do not give up on this mission. My son believed in what he did. He volunteered for this mission. Let us have meaning. Let us have freedom for the Iraqi people. Let us have freedom for the Afghani people.

By the way, while I bring that up, what is the distinction between Afghanistan and Iraq? Why do I not hear from the other side of the aisle "get your troops out of Afghanistan"? The statement is never made. We forget about the naysayers that were here before we went into Afghanistan and before we liberated the Afghans. There were plenty of naysayers. They said we cannot go into that part of the world. No one has ever been able to be go into that part of Afghanistan or even Afghanistan at all and be able to liberate, invade, occupy because the terrain is so difficult, that Mujahideen are such tough fighters.

So 2 months after September 11, the American military were in there, coalition forces were in there, and we still heard the naysayers. But as the operation got wrapped up, as there was more security and more safety and votes coming along in Afghanistan where people had never voted before on

that particular piece of real estate, they did so and they have done so twice. They have done that because of the American soldiers giving them that liberty. But the critics essentially shut up about Afghanistan but not about Iraq.

Is the difference the number of lives, Mr. Speaker? Is the difference that 200 Americans have lost their lives in Afghanistan and 2,000 Americans have lost their lives in Iraq? If that is the difference, then I would challenge the left, the pacifist left, the people who have difficulty figuring out how they are going to support the troops and oppose the mission, and if they were rational, they would admit that that dichotomy could not be accepted or tolerated. They cannot seem to draw the line on what the difference is between Afghanistan and Iraq, 200 lives versus 2,000 lives. If the number of lives were the difference, then they should tell us from their position how many are enough. How many lives would they spend to free 25 million Afghans? How many lives would it cost to free 25 million Iraqis?

And, yes, the price has been high, and it has hurt. And it will hurt far more if this job, this task, is not completed, if this freedom that has been so hard fought and won is allowed to go back to a state of tyranny where a dictator would take over in Iraq and where we would see a center for Islamic terrorism for al Qaeda.

□ 2330

It would clearly be there if we pulled out of there today. I would wager if you put this up for a ballot to the Iraqi people and asked, do you want the United States and the coalition forces to pull out as fast as they can, that ballot referendum, I believe 95 percent would say, no, we would like to have the Americans leave not real soon, just soon enough to get control of our country.

That is moving along at an acceptable rate. I will not say I am happy about the speed. It is a tough job. The infrastructure in Iraq has been depreciated and dilapidated over 35 to 40 years of neglect. So there is old equipment that does not function very well. Parts and materials to keep it in shape, many have to be manufactured. The oil fields need new wells and distribution systems. They need to get their refineries up to shape. They need a distribution system that will get that oil out of the country so they can get some cash coming back in.

But Saddam Hussein, when he was in power, was killing an average of 182 of his own people every day. Every day on average. Hundreds of thousands of them have been found in mass graves. The 800,000 Swamp Arabs that were there before Saddam Hussein decided they were an enemy of the state were decimated down to 220,000. Some escaped. In the end, about a fourth of the population of Swamp Arabs in the area of the wetlands, Saddam Hussein dried

them up in order to take away their livelihood and way of life. That area is twice the size of the Everglades, and that way of life was destroyed by Saddam. We have reconstructed about the size of the Everglades, and the Swamp Arabs are starting to repopulate. But that is one-thirtieth of Iraqi population doing what they can.

The argument that Saddam Hussein did not have weapons of mass destruction, and now we hear from the gentleman from Massachusetts that he did, what did he do with them? Where did they go? Matter can neither be created nor destroyed. Saddam Hussein said, I have those weapons of mass destruction. He defied 17 U.N. resolutions stretching back to 1990. We know from September 11 that we cannot wait until a threat is fully developed.

The question still remains, we do not know, we do not know how large the stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction were. We just know he had stockpiles. He used them. We do not know what happened to them. But the King rule of physics is everything has to be someplace. So where are they? There is no evidence he destroyed the weapons of mass destruction. But due to Saddam Hussein's obstruction, the materials once declared by the Saddam regime were never accounted for, even though he declared them.

I also want to point out that in October 2002, a bipartisan majority of Congress authorized President Bush to use force if necessary to deal with the continuing threat posed by Saddam Hussein. We also had a national policy that Congress endorsed of regime change in Iraq.

All of these things were consistent with the will of the people of America, as debated and voted on in Congress. H.J. Res. 114 stated that by continuing to possess and develop a significant chemical and biological weapons capability, and actively seeking a nuclear weapons capability and supporting and harboring terrorist organizations, those were the activities going on by Saddam Hussein.

And the intelligence of countries that concurred with ours. The 15 members of our intelligence community in this country, and additionally some of the other countries who concurred with our intelligence were Great Britain and France. France opposed our operations there, concurred with our intelligence. Germany opposed our operations and concurred with our intelligence. Russia same story: concurred with our intelligence, opposed our operations there.

What do those three countries have in common? The answer is those three countries were three of the most vocal opponents to the liberalization of Iraq. I said at the time that the decibels of their objections to the liberation of Iraq can be directly indexed to their interest in the oil development contracts that they had access to that they designed with Saddam Hussein prior to the beginning of our operations of the liberation of Iraq.

They had a vested interest in the oil in Iraq. They had contracts signed with Saddam Hussein, which of course were nullified by the liberation of Iraq. Come to find out after the fact, it was not just legitimate oil contracts that had them all in a dither; it was also the Oil-For-Food fraud campaign that was replete through those three countries, a number of others besides, and through the United Nations itself. Also, the U.N. Security Council echoed the congressional assessment of the threat posed by Iraq. Even the U.N. Security Council agreed with our intelligence: there was a fair amount of fraud going through the Oil-For-Food program.

I have to point out George Galloway, as a Brit, was apparently profiting significantly from Oil-For-Food, and his wife had a number of six-figure checks deposited in her checking account; and the facts are coming home to roost in the case of Mr. Galloway.

So the objections to the liberation of Iraq, many of the countries that objected had a conflict of interest. That vested interest reminds me of Barbara Conable's famous statement of hell hath no fury as a vested interest masquerading as a moral authority.

That is what we heard prior to the liberation of Iraq. We know Saddam Hussein had sufficient time to shuffle his weapons of mass destruction. They could have buried or spirited them out of the country.

By the way, Iraq is a country where everybody digs holes. It looks like one big prairie dog village. That countryside has a lot of open holes and a lot of things buried. We found a fully operational MiG-29 buried in the desert in Iraq. That is a whole lot bigger than you would need for a stockpile of the weapons of mass destruction. Did we find it because of intelligence or we had a metal detector or because somebody had good instincts, or because we had some scientific way to fly over the top and notice the difference in the terrain? Or did somebody tip us off to find that fully operational MiG-29 buried in Iraq?

Mr. Speaker, no, we found it because the wind blew the sand off the tail fin. If there had been weapons of mass destruction inside that plane, if it just filled the cockpit, that would have been plenty enough to convince even the skeptics on the other side of the aisle that the weapons of mass destruction are not really the question that is before this country or the world, but a red herring that is designed to throw the American people into a frustration with the decision-making process and the effort to convince Americans that things are going badly there.

Whenever we lose an American, that is something going very, very badly. Whenever we have Americans exposed to enemy, we will have casualties, Mr. Speaker. But when we look objectively at what has been accomplished in Iraq, when we objectively look to see that there were milestones set on the cal-

endar, the effort over there has met or exceeded every single milestone.

Certainly the liberation of Iraq came around a lot faster than anybody thought it would. I point out to the American people that the city of Baghdad, about 5 million people, is the largest city in the world, ever in the history of the world, to be invaded and occupied by a foreign power. It happened in the blink of a historical eye with an extraordinarily small number of casualties for a city that size. No one quite believed on that Thursday, an American armored column had gone into Baghdad, driven in and came back out, and the enemy had given up the ghost and essentially disappeared.

But that is what happened. They met that deadline. They set a new milestone for armored columns going across the desert and for the liberation of 5 million people. They were way ahead of the agenda, the targeted timetable.

And then we set up the CPA, the provisional authority under Paul Bremer. The idea was to establish a functional government in Iraq and be able to pass that over to the Iraqis so they could govern themselves. This began in March of 2003. March 22 was the date Baghdad was liberated.

I happen to know, since I was in Mosul sometime after that, that General Patraia and the 101st Airborne that liberated Mosul, they held open and free elections in May of 2003. They elected a governor and vice governor and put together a government of the people by the people and for the people, a Kurd, and I am not sure actually of the religious definition of the other individual, but I watched them interact with each other and I watched them do business. They brought a businessman that could speak English. They were optimistic about the city of Mosul.

In fact, when the 101st Airborne left Mosul and deployed after their year tour of duty, the Iraqis took a boulevard, a broad boulevard in Mosul. And I only saw one street sign in all of Baghdad my first trip. Most everything had been looted and stripped for the metal. The one street sign in Baghdad was a street named Jihad. So they left that up and tore down the other street signs.

Go over to the city of Mosul and I did not notice any street signs there, but I have a picture of a street sign in Mosul, that sign is 101st Airborne Air Assault Division. They named that street after the 101st Airborne. And this was not something put up by the 101st Airborne unless they had the same difficulty with spelling that the Iraqis had. They misspelled "division" and they misspelled "assault." That makes it genuine in that effort.

I am quite proud of the way the Iraqis responded to the Americans. I am proud of the way they respond to them in most of the areas of Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to fly over Fallujah, where we have had as much conflict as anywhere, and see

people come out into the streets and wave and smile. They come out and wave because they are grateful to Americans for giving them a chance at freedom.

But this message that the American people are getting that the credibility of the administration is not there disappoints me a great deal. It undermines our American troops. It does give aid and comfort to the enemy. It encourages the enemy to attack more Americans. It is costing American lives.

When people come to this floor of Congress, when they step out into a press conference, when they speak on the floor of the Senate, they are viewed as quasi-leaders of the United States of America. This encourages our enemies. When I see a soldier anywhere in America, particularly in my district, serve their second tour of duty, and they lost their life defending freedom in their second tour of duty, it is infuriating to me because I believe if we stuck together as a Nation, if we stuck by the deal and the agreement that this Congress has when we have our vote on the floor of this Congress, when the vote goes up and men and women go to war, you stand with them, you stand beside them, you support them with everything you have. That means, yes, bulletproof vests; yes, armored Humvees; and, yes, support and equipment and training and tactics and technology and great leadership.

□ 2345

But it means support the mission, Mr. Speaker. You cannot ask a soldier to go to war and tell him that you do not support their mission. And so the pessimism that abounds that seeks to undermine the presidency here and seeks to establish a majority in the House and the Senate in the upcoming election is all about negativism. It is all about dragging down our foreign policy. It is all about trying to prove to the American people that the administration has not been successful.

But each milestone that is reached in Iraq, handing over the CPA of Paul Bremer's over to the temporary civilian government, that happened 2 days early. And then they had elections, and the elections were there to put people in temporarily into their temporary parliament and the temporary parliament got together and they agreed on a constitution and the constitution was rolled out on time. And they had an election to ratify the constitution, Mr. Speaker, all in an extraordinary amount of time.

The United States of America declared its independence July 4, 1776; and yet we did not get our Constitution ratified until 1789, 13 years later. Now it took a while to earn our freedom, I grant, and the war was long, and it was bloody, and it was costly, and it was brutal. We have our freedom, and we have our Constitution. In fact, the Iraqis have their constitution far sooner than the American Constitution has

been established, and it is ratified by a full vote of the Iraqi people.

Now, about 1 month from today, the Iraqis will go to the polls, and they will select a new parliament, and this will be a sovereign nation when that new parliament is seated. It will have all the legitimacy of any nation that sits at the United Nations today. Iraq will be fully, fully legitimized. The vote of the people will seat the members of parliament. They will select a prime minister and their leaders and that legitimacy that is there takes them to another level.

But this is an astonishing thing. This is far, far more freedom, far, far closer to establishing a functioning rule of law than has ever been seen in that part of the world before. And the inspiration for the Arab people all around Iraq that see that a nation like Iraq can have freedom, when people breathe free, they give inspiration to others who see them breathe free and out of that yearning will bring them to the streets like it did in Lebanon.

The Lebanese reached out for their measure of freedom, and that is part of the inspiration of Iraq, and it is part of the inspiration of Afghanistan. It is part of the inspiration that this President has laid out in an articulated way to the world, the inspiration that we have been attacked by enemies from without. We did nothing to provoke them. They attacked us and killed approximately 3,000 Americans on September 11, 2001. And we went to Afghanistan and liberated 25 million people, and we went to Iraq and liberated 25 million people. Fifty million people that had not been free before in any substantive way are free today. Those two countries can become and I believe will become the lodestar nations, the Arab nations that can be the inspiration for the rest of the Arab world.

The habitat that breeds terror is a habitat that breeds poverty, ignorance, jealousy and hatred. That is the environment that is being exploited by the wahabis and the madrassas that are teaching this hatred in the young people. And the pressure that comes on those countries from the measure of that kind of hatred, they are being taught that, somehow or another, it is part of this age-old philosophy.

I really do believe that if you would scramble up all of our cultures and all of our people and erase our institutional memory and toss us into a totally new environment in a random way, some of us would wake up in the morning and think, huh, my glass is half full, and I am going to go to work and see if I can fill it up the rest of the way. And others, they look at their glass and say mine is half empty and that fellow over there, he is seeking to fill his glass. If he were not doing that, mine would fill spontaneously. That is the class envy, jealousy, hatred that comes.

It has always been this conflict between freedom and communism, freedom and fascism, freedom and national

socialism, and freedom and militant Islamic extremism, all the same kind of class envy jealousy, the hatred that comes from the idea that if somehow other people were not industrious and did not earn a profit, somehow those resources of the world are finite and they will flow at random to other folks who do not quite try so hard or have the technology or have not developed the education. But this spirit of entrepreneurship and free enterprise will establish itself in a strong way in Afghanistan and in Iraq.

In fact, I gave a speech to the Baghdad Chamber of Commerce. I did not know they had a Chamber of Commerce. We pulled into Baghdad at the al Rashid Hotel, and they asked me if I would give a speech to them. So I said yes I would.

It was about 3:00 in the afternoon. Walked in there, and they were getting ready to introduce me, and I said introduce me to the interpreter first. That is going to be really helpful. And they said, no, we do not have an interpreter. You do not need an interpreter, Mr. Congressman, because they all speak English here at the Baghdad Chamber of Commerce. About 56 to 58 of them sitting at the dinner tables.

So I gave them a little speech, and you could tell they understood English. They laughed at the right time, and they smiled at the right time, and they clapped at a time that I thought was appropriate anyway. I was quite encouraged at the level of interest in developing a culture of free enterprise in Iraq.

When that speech was over, I needed to get on to the next meeting, but it was an instantaneous cluster, huddle like, actually. They had to eventually just pull me out of this huddle. We were passing back and forth business cards and writing notes and trying to find a way to connect with the inspiration of free enterprise that is embodied in almost every American that walks the streets of Baghdad or Iraq. They look to us to be leaders in a lot of ways, not just military but on free enterprise capitalism perspective, and as they continue to develop that their economy will grow.

It takes a level of integrity and morality to have a functioning free enterprise system. It works on trust is why. As that trust gets built and established in the culture in Iraq, it is going to be a stronger and stronger economy. As the free enterprise economy flows out in Baghdad and the other cities in Iraq and connects itself with the new thing that will come, that will be available for the Iraqis after December 15, when they are a truly sovereign nation in control of all of their own assets, then they will be able to sit down and negotiate or have competitive bids for the development of the oil resources in Iraq.

They must have that. They must have outside capital, foreign capital and foreign technology and foreign know-how, and a lot of it should be and

hopefully is American technology capital know-how to pour into Iraq, to go out and punch in hundreds of new oil wells and new pipelines and distribution systems and refineries so that that oil can pour out of that country and the money can pour in.

Another allegation that comes from the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, is that somehow we did this all for oil. But oil is something that you can purchase on the open market around the world. We did not go in there to steal anybody's oil. We went in there to protect that oil for the Iraqis.

It is absolutely clear that the oil resources of Iraq belong to the people of Iraq, and we protected that, preserved that, and we are keeping our pledge with the Iraqi people. They will develop the oil resources with foreign capital and, when that happens, then the cash will flow into the economy and it will multiply itself over and over again. And Iraq becomes the lodestar Arab nation that brings freedom to that part of the world.

Like, as the European, the eastern European nations saw, an echo of freedom go across eastern Europe when the wall went down on November 9, 1989, I believe we will see an echo of freedom go through the Arab world, probably not as dramatically, probably not as quickly, probably not as bloodlessly. But I believe we will see a free Arab people some time within the next generation.

At that point, the habitat that breeds terrorists will disappear. It will not be the culture that can create that kind of a thing. And I mean that two ways. But the culture of freedom does not produce a culture of terror. In fact, free people never go to war against other free people. This country has never gone to war against another democracy, another group of people that had an opportunity to go to the polls and select their leaders and their national destiny. That is another known fact that does not seem to get out on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker.

So I am optimistic about the solutions there. I applaud the President's vision and having the courage to step in and take the initiative to free 50 million people, 50 million Arab people, to give them an opportunity. And those people will be our allies, by the way, for a long, long time to come in a part of the world where it is pretty important to have those kind of allies.

As I listened to some of the other lamentations that were here earlier this evening, the discussion about the Budget Reconciliation Act, the people who are critical of that, of the Deficit Reduction Act that we brought some \$53 billion to come out of the proposed spending up until the year 2010, not enough, but a start. A half of 1 percent of our budget is all that amounts to, Mr. Speaker. I do not think it is very hard to step up and do a very small half of 1 percent trim, given the kind of spending that we have had.

But the other side of the aisle does not offer \$1 in fiscally responsible cuts,

not one; and they do not offer one vote to support our fiscal responsibility, not one. Additionally, they demagogue the very things we have done that are responsible.

The statement was made over here earlier tonight that we have cut \$40 billion from the student loans and that somehow it is going to come out of the students, their loans and their aid. Not. Not \$40 billion from the student loans. The students are not going to notice any difference unless there is more cash available, not less, because we have made administrative changes, changes that affect the interest rates and the fees that are being charged by the lenders. This is not going to affect the students. This is reform. That is efficiency in government and efficiency in business.

But you know the demagoguery again. If I was as pessimistic as this and if I had this philosophy, this argument that everything is wrong and you cannot trust your leadership night after night after night, I think I would swim to Cuba and try to find a place where I would be happy. That would be my advice to the people that are here every night tearing down the optimism of America, undermining the truth that is America and making it difficult for us to move forward into this bold and brave future that we need to.

And, by the way, they have no confidence in our economy. I would go down through the whole list of economic indicators. We have had the longest period of consistent growth over 3 percent for 10 consecutive quarters. That is the longest since for the last two decades to have that kind of growth. Unemployment is down to 5.0 percent, when 5.6 is considered to be a pretty good position to be in. It has been ratcheting down. This economy has been creating more and more jobs. Nearly every economic indicator is stronger and stronger and stronger.

That in the face of the negatives, that in the face of Hurricane Katrina. This in 10 consecutive quarters of growth over 3 percent is after we got hit by September 11 and the attack on our financial markets. It is after some of the business circumstances that were brought up short by this Congress, and I am pleased that they were, hit the markets as well. After people lost confidence in the markets, September 11 came and destroyed the financial industry. We still came back and recovered with 10 consecutive quarters of growth over 3 percent, Mr. Speaker.

So this is a strong and robust economy, and it is a credit to the Bush tax cuts, those tax cuts that we need to make permanent, the extra resources, the billions of dollars that we have in our Treasury today because we had the courage to cut taxes so our economy could grow and create jobs. That is the kind of vision that is sorely lacking on the other side. They are good at criticizing, but I am waiting for a positive agenda, Mr. Speaker.

This idea that American soldiers should be, go off and fight without support for their mission has got to come back to the people who believe somehow they can support our soldiers but not support the mission, Mr. Speaker. So I just tell you that I am optimistic about the future of America. I know our economy is strong. I am optimistic about the future of our economy.

I am watching a confirmation process begin over in the United States Senate for Judge Alito. I think he will be the individual that comes to the Supreme Court and begins a constitutional restoration process. I am looking forward to that. We must restore this Constitution. It has been eroded over the last 30 to 40 years with activist judges.

The Kilo decision was the last straw for me and a lot of us. I agreed with the liberals on that. I will say that the gentleman from Massachusetts and I, whom we most generally disagree, he and I agreed and spoke essentially back to back here on the floor in opposing the Kilo decision. That is Mr. FRANK from Massachusetts. When he and I agree on a constitutional issue I am going to say and oppose the Supreme Court, chances are the text of the Constitution ought to be respected.

We will get back to that, Mr. Speaker, with this confirmation of Judge Alito. The corner needs to be turned. The American people need to be informed on how positive things are over in Iraq and that our economy is strong and we are going to move forward in a bold future with a bold agenda.

We need to pass this reconciliation act so that we can offset the costs of Hurricane Katrina. I will do more. We need to drill for oil in ANWR. We need to drill for natural gas and oil on our Outer Continental Shelf and hand this future over to our children and grandchildren with oil supplies, good tax programs, a national security program, a whole package. So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence tonight and the privilege to speak to this House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL 2:00 A.M., NOVEMBER 16, 2005 TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3058, TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until 2:00 a.m., November 16, 2005 to file the conference report to accompany H.R. 3058, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ING- LIS of South Carolina). Is there objec-

tion to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and November 16 on account of a funeral in the district.

#### 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. ZOE LOFGREN of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today and November 17.  
Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, November 16 and 17.  
Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and November 16, 17, and 18.  
Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and November 16.  
Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, November 16 and 17.  
Mr. KING of Iowa, for 5 minutes, November 16.  
Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.  
(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)  
Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2419. An act making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.