

able to elect and disseminate best practices and provide training and support around re-entry.

It will create a Federal task force that will identify programs and resources, identify better ways to collaborate, develop Interagency initiatives.

Finally, it will create, in addition to the grants to nonprofit organizations, offender re-entry research to authorize the National Institute of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Statistics to conduct research around re-entry.

We know there are programs working out there that are being run by churches, that are being run by other organizations, and we need to collect some of that data in order to implement some of the programs.

Again, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, and I often say to people that it is not really just about the ex-offender, and it is not just to help those individuals.

If I am walking down the street and there is a person who needs \$15 to get a bit of crack and I am carrying a briefcase and he thinks that I am an insurance salesman rather than an elected official or politician and that there might be something in there other than notes, if he attacks me, then of course I am at risk. I may end up in the hospital with a \$200,000 hospital bill, \$300,000, \$500,000.

All of the misery, poverty, all of the things that are associated with crime, many of those can really be reshaped, refocused and changed with a sensible re-entry policy, and so I want to thank both of my colleagues for coming and sharing.

WHAT THE FUTURE HOLDS

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address my colleagues and the people in this country.

There are some important issues before us, as there always are in this Congress, and sometimes I have a little difficulty sorting between which of those issues it is that I would like to speak to my colleagues about, Mr. Speaker.

Tonight, I would like to address the subject matter of the future of this country, the future of the Middle East, the future of this global conflict, this assault on Western civilization that comes from radical, militant, Islamic extremists, the will of the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and defend the cause that our Forefathers have fought so hard for and to preserve not just our freedoms which are essential and worth the struggle and worth the sacrifice, but our very safety and lives are at risk, Mr. Speaker.

We need to understand this war that we are in. We need to understand our enemy, and as I listened to the debate here on the floor a couple of weeks ago on a Friday when we debated the resolution to immediately pull out of Iraq, it occurred to me that there were a lot of people actually on the floor of this chamber, Mr. Speaker, that I thought did not have a long-term view for the future of the United States of America or the free world for that matter.

I want to raise a point, and I want to then continue to illustrate that point. I have brought in a picture and a poster to help with that point.

This is not the number one villain in all of Iraq or all of this war against radical, militant extremists, but this is Muqtada Al-Sadr, who is actually a Shiite leader, an individual we have heard quite a lot about. He got into the military business and brought his militia to bear against U.S. and coalition military forces and Iraqi military forces and with mixed results I think we can say at best.

I made a number of trips over to Iraq, and what we do is we go into Kuwait and then usually leave very early in the morning to go into Iraq in the morning. In the evening, I was sitting there, and I had turned on my television set in the hotel in Kuwait and turned it to Al Jazeera TV because watching Al Jazeera TV tells me a lot about what people are seeing in the Middle East and across the Arab world.

As I watched that television, it was Arabic audio, but it had English I call them subtitles. On that date, which was June 11, 2004, this particular CODEL, I watched the television and saw Muqtada Al-Sadr come on there, and I heard him say in Arabic, with the English subtitles underneath, just what you see here, Mr. Speaker. He said, "If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq, the same way that they left Vietnam, the same way that they left Lebanon, the same way that they left Mogadishu."

Now, what does that mean? It means that the word has been spread throughout al Qaeda world that Americans do not come and stay till it is over, that they will pull out, and that we are not committed to this cause. He would like to convince his followers and those he would recruit to be his followers that Americans are prepared at any moment to pull out of Iraq.

That is far from the case, Mr. Speaker, and this is the cause where we must stay, and we must carry this message across this world to our coalition partners, to our soldiers that are over there, those soldiers that have just not too long ago celebrated a Thanksgiving in foreign soil again, and again to our allies but especially to our enemies.

This language, this statement, that Americans do not stick to it, is a thread that goes through many of the writings and the statements of al Qaeda leaders. I believe I can find that in a Google search in words phrased a little bit differently but the same

meaning, out of Osama bin Laden, out of Zawahiri, out of Zargawi, and that coupled with Muqtada Al-Sadr.

That message has been sent. It keeps getting sent. It is echoed out off Al Jazeera. That means whoever is watching Al Jazeera hears this message. Many of them believe this message that America is not going to stay until the job is done.

We had a debate on this floor, Mr. Speaker, and that vote took place in the fall of 2002. It authorized the President to use force to enforce the United Nations resolutions, all for a good cause. That is how a free Nation should do this. We should have a free debate, and it ought to be an open debate. The people in this country should engage in this debate and carry their message to their Members of Congress and let that echo in these chambers, Mr. Speaker, and it did in that debate.

The resolution after the vote went up, and it was a solid majority to give the President the authority to enforce those U.N. resolutions and to use force, if necessary, to bring Saddam Hussein in line. In fact, it is the policy and was the policy of this Congress to establish a regime change in Iraq. We had our debate. When debate is over and there is a majority vote that prevails, then the people in this chamber need to abide by that decision.

If we pass a law in here, we do not go out and say, okay, I am going to ignore that law and undermine that law. We live by that decision. It is a majority decision. There is nothing more important than when you have men and women in uniform, put their lives on the line, and you do so by a majority vote and you endorse it, you do not want to see people undermining that effort. Undermining that effort indexes directly with this statement by Muqtada Al-Sadr.

Mr. Speaker, I will pick that up in a moment and carry some more details of this, but I want to take the privilege of yielding to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. KING), my friend, the first of the Caucus States, the first in the Nation primaries.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

I would like to thank you for your leadership and your willingness to talk about what is a very important issue for the future of our country and for the future of the Middle East.

Like you, I have traveled to Iraq on two occasions, and I have seen both the problems that our troops are confronting there, but I have also seen the progress. I think it is important when we talk about Iraq that we have a balanced perspective and we look at both those problems and the progress.

□ 2320

There is no question that today was a very difficult day for the Iraqi security forces, as the suicide bomber killed over 40 police recruits, and the U.S. Marines that were killed on Friday by

an improvised explosive device. We see those problems every night on our TV, but what we do not see is the progress that is being made.

There was a show on one of the major cable networks on Saturday night, and I would urge anybody that wants to see a very balanced picture of what is going on in Iraq and much of the progress being made to try to watch that show. It spoke of the sacrifice that our troops are making and their commitment of courage, of valor, of sacrifice, of willingness to defend the values of our country, the democratic values and the ability for myself and my colleague tonight to be able to debate this issue, to be able to debate it with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

And we should have a debate in this country about the policy of it. But what is also important to remember is that we must support our troops and to support their mission that is so critically important. Much of the debate we have had in this country, Mr. Speaker, revolves around the strategy of how we bring our troops home and bringing our troops home to a job well done. There are two critically important elements I want to talk about tonight, because that strategy is in place, and if it is going to work, we need to follow through on it.

Number one is the continued movement toward democracy in Iraq. On December 15, there will be the third major election. We saw the election in January, where nearly 8 million Iraqis went and defied the terrorist threat of reprisals and killings and murder to vote, to elect an interim parliament. And then more recently, we saw, again, millions of Iraqis go to the polls and ratify a constitution. There was a good political debate in both of these instances, but the constitution was ratified and an interim parliament was chosen. Hopefully, on December 15, a permanent parliament is going to be chosen.

When that happens, that move to democracy, the Iraqi people, much as we have for over 200 years been able to make these kinds of decisions, they will have given birth to an Iraqi democracy. Yes, it will be different from ours in many fundamental ways, but it will be a government that they have created and it will be a government that will lead them through the religious, the tribal, and the ethnic differences that are so much a part of their culture that need to be resolved and have to be resolved through a democratic process.

Now, our troops, those men and women who we see every day on TV and we hear about from e-mails at home, from letters coming back, they are doing a fantastic job of moving the country toward that democracy. As I said, there are problems, there is no question about that, but there is major progress going on. Hopefully, on December 15, we will see another watershed that will lead to the political solutions that will enable the Iraqi peo-

ple to finally put behind them the murderous legacy of Saddam Hussein, the violence, the many human rights abuses, the barbaric nature of his regime. Hopefully, this move to democracy will enable that to happen.

Equally important, and a very necessary part of the strategy for being able to bring our men and women home is the continued growth of the Iraqi security forces. The first time I was in Iraq was November of 2003 and we went to Baghdad and we went to Tikrit, and to Kirkuk. Kirkuk is what I want to talk about for a moment, because it is an ethnically mixed city in the northern part of the Sunni triangle, and certainly an area where there have been some problems over the years.

In November of 2003, we met one of the first groups of Iraqi-trained police officers that were actually in the very beginning stages of starting to provide the security so necessary for their country, and they were one of the first batch of recruits that had gone through the training process and were in uniform, and were going to confront the threats of terrorism in their country. They indicated to us in the clearest possible language that they knew that they would be the subject of attacks. And as they said to us, they were willing to shed their blood, as they have done so many times, to help rebuild their country. That was November 2003.

In April of this year, April of 2005, I had the opportunity to go back to Iraq a second time. At that point in time, there were 150,000 Iraqi security forces, army, border guard, police, and a work in progress, obviously. We had the opportunity to meet with several Iraqi women leaders who told us of the improving characteristics of the Iraqi security forces in April.

There have been many news reports about the difficulty of training the Iraqi security forces, but to hear it from actual Iraqi women leaders, a couple members of parliament, an ambassador, ministers in the interim government that the Iraqi people were beginning to trust and work with the Iraqi security forces, was very compelling to us.

We also heard the same information from General Patreas, who was responsible for the training, the arming and equipping of the Iraqi security forces. What he told us is that they were starting to be able to develop a command and control structure. They were beginning to be able to operate independently without being embedded with American forces, having American forces as backup, and that process was continuing. It is clearly a work in progress. Today, there are over 210,000 Iraqi security forces, and the process is not done.

The point I am making is that starting in November of 2003, when I first was there, to April of 2005, and then today, those Iraqi security forces are making tremendous progress. Yes, it is not perfect. There are continuing

issues that have to be dealt with, but the progress is measurable and quantifiable and is receiving the trust and the support of the Iraqi people, real people that we talked to, people who had had their lives threatened, who had had their lives disordered by the regime of Saddam Hussein.

As you know, there are 18 different provinces in Iraq. Fourteen of them in the north and in the south, primarily, are largely stable. Yes, continuing with some problems, but generally stable. The problem areas are that Sunni triangle around Baghdad to Tikrit, Fallujah, and Kirkuk, and those are the problem areas that both the emergence of the Iraqi security forces as well as the move toward democracy, as that grows in Iraq and thrives and the Iraqi people are buying in to the changes, the positive changes, it will enable them to put behind them the legacy of Saddam Hussein as well as some of these tribal ethnic and religious problems.

This is the critical element that Americans need to know is in place and is making progress; that the Iraqi people and our forces are making that progress every day. Is it dangerous? Is it difficult? Absolutely. And our troops there at great sacrifice. Over 2,000 of them have indeed paid the ultimate sacrifice to make this happen, but they continue to be extremely dedicated to their mission.

I had the opportunity to address a group of marine reservists who were being activated on Saturday before they ship off to training and then to Iraq, and their commitment to making this happen was certainly very present for all of us that were there, their family members and their leaders. And I salute this Bravo Company from my home State of New Hampshire and the men and women from our country who have given so much to provide not only for our security, but to improve the situation in Iraq.

We have further to go, there is no question about that, but every day I believe we are continuing to make progress. It is difficult progress, there is no question about that, but December 15 will be a watershed. The Iraqi people and the Iraqi security forces will continue to improve. Those two elements are what will allow our men and women to come home having achieved success in Iraq, with a job well done, as we will all say to them as Americans supporting their mission.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for offering me the opportunity to speak here tonight.

□ 2330

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to team up with Mr. BRADLEY and help direct our Presidential candidates on to South Carolina, too, in about another 3 years. I appreciate you turning this tone over to the tone of the progress that has been made in Iraq. We do not hear about that very often, and Mr. BRADLEY brings to mind

some issues I would like to add to that tally.

Two elections already this year in Iraq, one in January that elected the interim Iraqi Government and the one in October which was for the referendum that ratified the Constitution. We have heard the Iraqis cannot hold elections. There will not be enough safety, they will not be legitimate. And all of those criticisms got rolled out.

In fact, I would take us back to the first election after the liberation of Iraq that I know of, and Mr. BRADLEY mentioned General Petrais who commanded the 101st Airborne that went in there in March 2003, and he liberated the region of Mosul and approximately three of the provinces up in that area. That was March.

I was in the region of Mosul in the fall, and I met with the governor of Mosul and the vice governor of Mosul, and one or two other officials of that region. How can you have a governor and vice governor of Mosul? They were not appointed by General Petrais. It was interesting, the governor sat at the head of the table next to the vice governor, and General Petrais sat at the side of table, and he was giving deference to the elected leaders. The governor and the vice governor, and I do not know how many other officers were elected in May of 2003, but there were free and fair and open elections in Mosul. The governor was a Sunni and the vice governor was a Kurd. You could tell by the way that they worked and cooperated and laughed and did those things that they worked together comfortably. At the time in Mosul, it seemed like it was very much back to normal.

I point out that the first successful election was in May 2003, and since that time there have been a number of elections in Iraq. The milestones established early in this process, at that point it was liberation first and it was martial law to stabilize the security in the country, get a handle on the looting but put the military law in place, and then shortly after that we established the CPA, the Coalition Provisional Authority. That was headed by Paul Bremer, who ran that region then, as Coalition Provisional Authority had, for quite a long time. But there was another milestone that was set on the calendar and that was the following June.

Not recalling the specific date, but before that date by 2 days we handed over the control of Iraq to a civilian government before the targeted deadline to do so. We established the dates for elections and set the milestones to elect an interim parliament, and the voice of the people would then write and draft the Constitution, present the Constitution to the people of Iraq, and then the people of Iraq would have the opportunity to vote and ratify the Constitution. Each one of those milestones was met or exceeded by the Iraqi people at the direction and cooperation of the coalition forces.

Now, you may think that is not such a difficult task, you simply open up the polling booths and hold an election. In order to have a legitimate election, you need to have voter registration. You want people to have an opportunity to vote and only vote once. It has to be safe to travel to the polls, and you have to maintain the confidentiality of their vote and the integrity of the tally of the ballots and the reporting process.

An election has no value in a free country if the people who are being represented by those elected in the election, if the people do not have confidence in the process. But they had confidence in Mosul in May 2003. They had confidence in the process in January of this year when they elected their interim government. It was not as safe in January as it was later, but there were 108 different places attacked by the terrorists when they elected their interim parliament, but still the turnout for that election was greater than the turnout for the Presidential election for the President of the United States.

We saw millions of Iraqis proudly waving their purple fingers in the air, proud that they voted. In fact, the fear factor was supposed to set in and cause people to stay home and not vote, but instead they voted. They voted with a proud and a free and a patriotic and, in fact, a defiant attitude, waving their purple fingers in the air and saying they directed their national destiny when they waved their fingers.

But 108 of those polling booths were attacked by terrorists on that day. That did not deter the Iraqis. They went on without interruption. No one has challenged the legitimacy of the election. It was a legitimate election. That was January. On October 15 when the Constitution that was drafted by that interim parliament, and it was hard fought and there were many tough decisions to be made, and to reconcile the differences between the regions in the country, the resources in the country and the differences between the religious factions that were there and the tribal factions that were there was a very difficult thing.

How do you divide up the resources of a country so all of the people benefit from those resources when you have that proprietary notion that because the oil is underneath the soil in one region, it should not be shared with people of another region that does not have oil underneath their soil?

They came to an agreement on that, and the known and developed reserves are distributed equally around the country with exceptions to put extra resources in those regions where they have been at a greater disadvantage, and it is going to take greater resources to get them up to speed. But, essentially, the language in the Constitution calls for taking existing resources and providing kind of a parity so the Iraqis can benefit almost equally.

But that Constitution that was so hard fought, the one that down to the last minute they were changing some language in it so they had the best chance of getting it ratified in the referendum, on October 15 of this year they ratified their Constitution.

Now, one might say, so Iraq has gone through these milestones and the milestones of liberation in March and April of 2003, and the milestone of martial law converting into the Coalition Provisional Authority under Paul Bremer, and then handing it over to the Civilian Provisional Authority, and then having the elections that elected the Iraqi interim parliament and then having the referendum that ratified the Constitution on October 15, one might say what is all of that about.

Well, all of them together were required sequentially to get to the point where they are today: poised to have an election of a new parliament in Iraq, a new parliament that will be established upon the Constitution that the people have ratified in their referendum last October 15. The new parliament that will be seated shortly after those elections of December 15 will be a parliament that truly represents a sovereign nation of Iraq.

When they seat themselves at the United Nations and the representative that is appointed to represent Iraq in the United Nations, they will be the most legitimate government represented in the United Nations of the Arab world that is there because they will be the ones that are elected by a free people. The voice of the representative from Iraq will actually be the voice of the people of Iraq.

That is a misconception that many of the people in the United States of America have about the United Nations themselves, the idea that the United Nations is a voice of the world, that it is a free and democratic global forum where we can resolve all of our differences, when in fact many of the countries represented are not free countries. They do not allow their people to have freedom of speech, press, and religion. They do not allow their people to step forward and voice their opinions. In fact, some of those countries will cut their tongues off for doing that, but they have a voice for their dictator sitting at the table of the United Nations.

This will be an Arab country, Iraq, which has a free and duly elected government that sends a representative to the United Nations that will be more representative of the people of that country than any other Arab country represented in the U.N.

□ 2340

And so this is a huge milestone coming up December 15. But for a lot of other reasons too. Now the Iraqi people can start to direct their national destiny. This really is the milestone that allows that to happen. And I have traveled over to Iraq three times. The last trip in was in August, and I asked to go

down into Basra where I believe we were the first congressional delegation to visit the coalition forces down in that region. General Dutton commands the forces there. He is a British general. And I stood in one place with soldiers in the coalition forces that represented Romania and The Netherlands and Denmark and Australia and Great Britain and Poland. I am sure I am missing one or two others. Put them in a group and took their picture because they really did represent the coalition forces.

And down in that region, there the largest oil reserves are down in that region around Basra and we reviewed that and then went up to Kirkuk, as the gentleman from New Hampshire had mentioned, that he had been up there earlier during this conflict. And there, I saw places where oil seeped to the top of the ground. There was so much oil that I could drill a well and hit oil on it because I would hit the oil before I started to drill. But there needs to be a lot of oil that is developed in Iraq in the south around Basra and in the north up around Kirkuk and those distribution lines and refineries and the export systems have got to be set up so that they can get some cash flowing back into that country. This milestone of a truly sovereign Nation with a duly elected parliament that will select, that will elect themselves a prime minister so that they can move and act and build on the future of the country is an essential milestone. And it has taken blood and treasure to get to this point, and it will take blood and treasure for a while beyond this point. And it has been a price that has been painful to pay, but it is also a price that has freed 25 million people and it has the opportunity for Iraq to become the lone star nation that inspires the entire Arab world, inspires them to freedom and that freedom that becomes contagious like it did in eastern Europe after the Berlin Wall came down in 1989, November 9.

Freedom echoed across eastern Europe and almost bloodlessly and in almost the blink of a historical eye, Mr. Speaker. And I do not expect that kind a change to take place in the Middle East that fast, but we are seeing those yearnings for freedom and yearnings for democracy. We have seen Libya give up their weapons of mass destruction and openly show that they are were further along on their process of developing nuclear than one had ever imagined. Our intelligence did not get that one right either. And intelligence, by the way, is never perfect, and I do not mean to be critical of our intelligence. It is the inspiration that Iraq was becoming a free nation, that American and coalition presence in that region comprised a threat that might have deposed Qadaffi, I think was his motive to turn his nuclear cards over face up and drop and eliminate any weapons of mass destruction.

We have seen Lebanon for the first time since 1979 throw off the yoke of

Syrian occupation and move towards freedom. And we have watched some things change in Saudi Arabia and in Egypt. So it is happening, Mr. Speaker. There is progress that it is being made and the inspiration that is there, the inspiration of a free Iraq is an important inspiration.

But 108 of those polling booths were attacked in January of 2005. And the following October, the security situation in Iraq had improved so much that that number became 19 polling booths attacked as opposed to 108 just the previous January, 10 months before.

So that is an indicator, I think, Mr. Speaker, of the progress that has been made in Iraq. There are a number of other indicators and some of them are, we need the cooperation for intelligence of the Iraqi people. And so what are we getting for tips? Where are they coming from? We are finding about 50 percent of the improvised explosive devices, about 50 percent. Almost all of those IEDs are being found because of tips from the Iraqi people. The tips that we were getting in March, 483 in the month of March of 2005. In April, 1,591, it has grown five times better, a little greater than that, just from March to April. That is the sign that they have more confidence, that they can take the risk, that their country needs them to weigh in and put their neck on the line to give tips that will protect the lives of American and coalition forces. So March, 483, April of 2005, 1,591, May of 2005 up to 1,740 tips in that month, in June 2,519, in July 3,303 tips, and in August, 3,341. This trend is a fantastic trend line that shows that the Iraqi people see the future and they are committing themselves to helping save and protect the lives of the American soldiers. This goes on.

There is more and more good news. And Mr. BRADLEY talked about 210,000 Iraqis in uniform that are trained or in training to defend their own country. And that is what needs to happen. Of that 210,000, there are quite a lot of battalions that are really combat ready. We keep hearing that there is only one battalion that has no American advisors in it and that can operate in a combat situation, Mr. Speaker, without having U.S. support.

Well, I do not know that we want to be in that situation where we do not have any U.S. involvement in combat battalions in Iraq. There is too much at stake there. And we have handed over 20 bases that were coalition American controlled that now it is all Iraqis that control those 20 bases. And at least a third of the battalions that are there are ready for combat. And a lot of them are engaged in combat. And they are going in with American forces. And so the question of whether they are totally 100 percent independent, it is just a moot point. And the question of what is our exit strategy, when are we going to leave, you know, when the previous President sent our troops into Kosovo, he told

America they would be out in a year. I never hear that from the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, as to this is the longest year.

I think this year is over 3,000 days long, and we are still waiting to get the troops out of Kosovo. Well, no one raises that issue because the situation is stabilized there. And American casualties are not zero, but they are very, very low. And I support our efforts there to provide peace in that region. But look around the world, Mr. Speaker. We have troops in nearly every place that they have been engaged over the last 60 to more years, and those troops remain in Germany. They remain in Korea. We have other troops in other locations around the world because we need them there strategically.

And so, you know, when are we going to get out of Iraq? Why would we want to leave? Why would it be our goal to go there and pull the troops out, especially if it risked the goal of the mission entirely? And I heard Mr. BRADLEY address the importance of supporting our troops and their mission. And I want to emphasize that, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot send a soldier off to war, ask him to defend your freedom, put his life on the line for you, and then say, I support you, soldier, I am with you, but I do not like your mission. You cannot ask somebody to put their life on the line and tell them you support them but you oppose their mission.

And that is what I am hearing over here. That is what I am hearing from the liberal news media. That is what this fellow right here, Muqtada al-Sadr hears. It is what Osama bin Laden hears, it is what Zawahiri hears, and it is what Zarkawi hears. They hear I am with you, troops. I think you ought to be home but I do not support your mission, and if something happens to you, then you know, you were a casualty of a failed and flawed mission. Not true. This is, I believe, one of the most noble things that the United States of America has ever done.

Many, many times we have sent our soldiers off into foreign lands and here in this city, Mr. Speaker, if one would go down to the Korean Memorial and there in the sidewalk, etched in that stone in the sidewalk is a message at the Korean War Memorial that says, our country honors the men and women who answered the call to defend a country they never knew and a people they never met. A very profound statement etched in the sidewalk there at the Korean Memorial. It definitely reflects the sacrifice of the Korean war. It reflects, I believe, Mr. Speaker, the character of the American people, the American soldier and marine. The history of this country has always been to reach out and promote our freedom.

I think about a speech that I heard here in Washington, D.C. a couple of years ago about this time of year. It was given by President Arroyo of the Philippines, and as she delivered that

speech, it was in a hotel downtown and I was not before a Congressional delegation. I may have been the only Member of Congress that was there. But I point this out because she was not speaking to Congress. She was speaking to a gathering of people that showed up for a dinner in a downtown hotel in Washington, D.C. and we went out of respect and her message was that she said, thank you America, thank you America for sending the Marines to the Philippines to liberate us and free us in 1898.

Thank you for sending over your interests that taught us your way of life, free enterprise and the freedoms that you have and the constitutional structure that you have. Thank you for sending the missionaries to the Philippines where we learned Christianity, and thank you for sending 10,000 teachers to the Philippines.

□ 2350

She had a Filipino name for those teachers, and one day I will learn that name.

Thank you for sending 10,000 teachers who taught us the English language, who taught us the American culture, who educated us, and today we have over 1.6 million Filipinos that travel elsewhere in the world that can get a job anywhere because the universal language of business is English and they make good money, and they send that money back to the Philippines in significant dollars. She is grateful. She made that message to the United States of America 103 years at least, probably 105 years, since the time that the Marine Corps landed on the shores of the Philippines in 1898.

That is a profound message, and I believe the gratitude that I heard from President Arroyo will come from the mouths of the Prime Minister of Iraq 100 years from now. It will come here to the United States, and Iraq will have established this image, this vision, of a free Arab country; and I believe that the rest of the Arab countries will see the prosperity that comes and they will adopt that same kind of freedom hopefully through a peaceful change rather than a violent change. But I expect the people of Iraq will express their gratitude to our descendants 100 years from now.

So a loss of 2,000 American lives in Iraq, painful, every one, a personal loss to every family, a real profound sacrifice on the part of every soldier and Marine. We have lost over 200 of them also in Afghanistan. I have heard nothing from the other side of the aisle about why it is right to be in Afghanistan and wrong to be in Iraq. It is just on their part wrong to be in Iraq, and it seems to be that the number of casualties is the measuring stick.

So I would submit that it is time now for the people on the left side of the aisle to give us a number of how many casualties they are willing to sustain in Afghanistan before they say we ought to get out of there too. This is

not a cause that is measured simply in direct relationship with casualties. It is far more important. It is far more timeless. It is far more profound. It is something that the echoes of this will flow throughout history.

Beyond 100 years from now, the world will be a different place because of the nobility of the American soldiers and Marine Corps. And the voices of Muqtada Al-Sadr and Zarqawi and Zawahiri and bin Laden, those voices that are saying things like, if we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq-Afghanistan, name your country, the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu. Those voices must be silenced. They must be silenced in this place at this time.

I picked up a quote from the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Howard Dean, and I listened to him campaign in Iowa for 1½ years as he sought the Presidency and I heard some of these things then too. But in typical fashion he said, "The idea that we are going to win the war in Iraq is an idea which is just plain wrong." He said that to more than 150,000 Americans who are there in Iraq and the numbers of coalition forces that are there.

And they hear that and he compares it to Vietnam. Even Zarqawi describes the difference between Vietnam and Iraq. He said there are no mountains to hide in in Iraq. There are no forests to hide in in Iraq. This is in a letter that he wrote, I think, a year ago last April. And he lamented that they cannot stay in Iraq very long because they do not have places to hide. And he said that the only place that they can hide and operate out of would be houses, the homes of the Iraqi people that would be willing to take them in and let them run their operations out of there, and that the Iraqis that would be willing to let them do that are "rarer than red sulfur."

Now, I have been to a lot of places in that country, and I looked all over for red sulfur and I did not see any, and I asked some of those pilots that flew helicopters if they have seen any red sulfur, and they said no. No one I know has been able to identify that; so I am going to tell you that is pretty rare. I do not think there are very many Iraqis that are willing to let Zarqawi operate. In fact, there are a lot less of Zarqawi's allies. We do not hear these numbers, Mr. Speaker.

We see the American casualties, the coalition casualties, and we see the Iraqi civilian casualties; but the numbers come down to how many of the enemy are being taken off the streets out of the operation, how many per day, per week, per month? And per month I can tell the Members, Mr. Speaker, that number, and the number was last brought to me in August of this year, I will say very close to 3,000 of our enemy are taken off the streets both in those killed and those captured, 3,000.

The Iraqi people are losing about 600 a month. We are losing about 73 a month on average. A painful loss for all of us, but the enemy is losing more by far than we are, Mr. Speaker. And it is wrong on the part of Howard Dean. We are a long ways away from losing this war. Where he says that we are going to lose it is just plain wrong, that is just undermining the President, that is undermining our foreign policy, and it is undermining our military. And he identified it with Vietnam. I laid out the difference.

He suggests that we redeploy our troops to Afghanistan because that is where we are welcome. Now, when in history has it been important to deploy troops to a place where the troops are welcome? It is nice to have them there for security reasons, but a strategic redeployment of troops because that is a place where they are welcome? And he suggests we ought to pull our troops all out of Iraq and take them to a friendly Middle Eastern country where they can have a strategic redeployment and they can be someplace where there is support for our troops there, Mr. Speaker.

Another point that was made on this floor by the gentleman that was the purpose of our debate, he, Mr. Dean, both say that 80 percent of Iraqis want us to leave. Mr. Speaker, it is not 80 percent of the Iraqis that want us to leave. I do not know where that number comes from. I asked that question over and over again. We have had surveys over there that come a little bit different, but it depends on how they ask the question. Now, if we would ask the Iraqis someday sometime when they get full control of their country and they have safety and security and their freedom is established and the economy is flowing and they are not worried about enemies from without and enemies from within, they would like to have the last American soldier pull out of Iraq, maybe 80 percent would say yes, I think that would be a good idea.

I think the responsible people in Iraq do not look forward to the day that American troops pull out anytime soon because they know that their future and their freedom is contingent upon American and coalition troops being there to guarantee it for now, as the 2,010 Iraqi numbers grow and increase and their training increases and their commitment increases, and, in fact, their courage has been increasing substantially too, and they do have the courage to fight for their country. I am hearing that from our generals over there now too.

But I asked the question of the Iraqi people, if there is a referendum today, the same referendum that was on the floor of this House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, that only found three Members of this 435-Member body that would vote to move our troops out immediately, if that referendum were laid out before the Iraqi people, the Iraqis that I talked to say that 90 to 95 percent would say stay, please stay, we

are so grateful for our freedom. When we come home, we expect our family to be there instead of wondering if Saddam has taken and spirited them away.

I met with a Kurdish young lady who is here now on a scholarship, that has been here several months. She said up in that region around Kirkuk, every household that has boys has a crawl space for the boys to hide in when Saddam's henchmen came to conscript them into the military. She grew up with brothers and could not admit to the neighborhood that she had brothers because they would be conscripted into the military. The list goes on and on.

The testimony that is taking place now in the trial of Saddam and his fellow henchmen that are there are bringing out atrocity after atrocity, Mr. Speaker. We will hear more about these atrocities as this trial unfolds. And when this trial is over and a new one begins and the history of Saddam's regime is written into the court records of those courageous jurists that put their lives on the line to provide a fair trial for a person whom I believe is a murdering tyrant, they need to be honored. They need to be respected. They need to put that in the history, and the American people need to watch it, Mr. Speaker. We need to all understand this, and we need to understand that when we speak up and we speak out and when we undermine our American troops, meanwhile posturing that we support them but not their mission, what happens is people like Muqtada Al-Sadr say on Aljazeera TV, "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."

Never again, Mr. Speaker. This is where that stops. This is where the bright line in history gets drawn. This is where the legacy of the freedom that emanates from America is established in the Middle East and where the lone star of Iraq inspires the rest of the Arab world and eliminates the habitat that breeds terror.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the Members in the Chamber this evening.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LARSEN of Washington (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MEEHAN, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURGESS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and December 7 and 8.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today and December 7 and 8.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and December 7 and 8.

Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, December 7 and 8.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, December 7.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today and December 7.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today and December 7.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, December 7.

Mr. CHABOT, for 5 minutes, December 7.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today and December 7 and 8.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

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

S. 584. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to allow the continued occupancy and use of certain land and improvements within Rocky Mountain National Park, to the Committee on Resources.

ENROLLED BILLS 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. 4133. An act to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for carrying out the national flood insurance program.

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 680. An act to direct the Secretary of Interior to convey certain land held in trust for the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah to the City of Richfield, Utah, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2062. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located

at 57 West Street in Newville, Pennsylvania as the "Randall D. Shughart Post Office Building."

H.R. 2183. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 567 Tompkins Avenue in Staten Island, New York, as the "Vincent Palladino Post Office."

H.R. 2528. An act making appropriations for military quality of life functions of the Department of Defense, military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3058. An act making appropriations for the Department 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.

H.R. 3853. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 208 South Main Street in Parkdale, Arkansas, as the "Willie Vaughn Post Office."

H.R. 4145. An act to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to obtain a statue of Rosa Parks and to place the statue in the United States Capitol in National Statuary Hall, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on November 21, 2005, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 4133. National Flood Insurance Program Further Enhanced Borrowing Authority Act of 2005

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House also reports that on November 28, 2005, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 126. To amend Public Law 89-366 to allow for an adjustment in the number of free roaming horses permitted in Cape Lookout National Seashore.

H.R. 539. Caribbean National Forest Act of 2005.

H.R. 584. Department of the Interior Volunteer Recruitment Act of 2005.

H.R. 606. Angel Island Immigration Station Restoration and Preservation Act.

H.R. 680. To direct the Secretary of Interior to convey certain land held in trust for the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah to the City of Richfield, Utah, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1101. To revoke a Public Land Order with respect to certain lands erroneously included in the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge, California.

H.R. 1972. Franklin National Battlefield Study Act.

H.R. 1973. Water for the Poor Act of 2005.

H.R. 2062. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 57 West Street in Newville, Pennsylvania, as the "Randall D. Shughart Post Office Building".

H.R. 2183. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 567 Tompkins Avenue in Staten Island, New York, as the "Vincent Palladino Post Office".

H.R. 2528. Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2006.

H.R. 3058. Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006.