

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CHUCK COLSON, FOUNDER OF PRISON FELLOWSHIP

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a convicted felon.

Earlier this month, with the revealing of Deep Throat, we were reminded of Watergate, a pivotal event in American history that also marked a major turning point in the life of then White House hatchet man Chuck Colson. Instead of returning to a career in the private sector after serving his prison sentence, Colson felt called to return to those still behind bars.

□ 1030

In 1976 he founded Prison Fellowship, the world's largest prison outreach organization.

In 2002, after nearly 30 years of leading Prison Fellowship, Colson named former Virginia Attorney General Mark Earley as the man who would take the organization into the next generation. Now, June 16, 2005, marks another crowning moment as they dedicate new headquarters in Landsdowne, Virginia.

With over two million Americans behind bars in the United States, Prison Fellowship is working to change hearts and help return inmates to society as productive citizens.

Today we may dedicate bricks and mortar, but we are truly giving thanks that Prison Fellowship is not just an organization; it is a movement of churches and volunteers in all 50 States and now 108 countries around the world.

Thank you, Chuck Colson, for saving lives by saving souls.

REPUBLICAN ABUSES OF POWER

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, how much does the majority leader underestimate the American people? For 6 months now the House Ethics Committee has been unable to meet because the Ethics Committee chairman refuses to abide by the committee's own rules. And now, this week, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) says it is the Democrats who are keeping the committee from meeting because, according to him, they want to delay his case before the Ethics Committee until an election year.

If the majority leader really wants his case heard before the Ethics Committee, he should persuade the Ethics Committee chairman to abide by the ethics rules and appoint a nonpartisan staff director. The rules of the committee are clear that the staff be assembled and retained as a professional nonpartisan staff. If the gentleman from Washington (Chairman HASTINGS)

is allowed to appoint his chief of staff, he would be breaking the committee rules by having a partisan staffer on the committee.

Democrats want the Ethics Committee to play by the rules. Please play by the rules.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2863, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 315 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 315

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2863) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORBES). The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 315.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday the Rules Committee met

and reported a rule for consideration of the House Report for H.R. 2863, the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2006.

Mr. Speaker, when the Rules Committee met, it granted an open rule, providing 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. This rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. For the purposes of amendment, the bill shall be read by paragraph. Additionally, this rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill which fail to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, and it authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the RECORD. It provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the committee believes this rule will provide ample opportunity for Members to fully debate the funding of our national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule for H.R. 2863 and the underlying bill. This important legislation takes dramatic steps to further prosecute the global war on terror, enhance our security, and improve the lives of our servicemen and women. It is a bill that fundamentally addresses many of the transformative challenges faced by our military in the future and implements many measures needed to meet those challenges.

Mr. Speaker, the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee have presented us with an excellent bill. This bill provides us with a way to meet many of the current challenges that we face by addressing the immediate requirements of our forces as well as the ongoing need to transform our military through the adoption of new technology, advanced methods of warfare, and innovative changes in military doctrine.

To fully appreciate the significance of H.R. 2863, one must understand the four long-term challenges that we seek to address in this legislation.

The first long-term challenge is a direct result of the procurement holiday that was taken by our country in the 1990s. To understand the consequences of shortchanging our military during this era, one need only to recall the ammunition accounts as they were funded, or perhaps better described as not funded, during this period. The failure to maintain adequate stocks of ammunition is a shortcoming we are only now beginning to overcome. Additionally, one can see the adverse effects that a constant surge in deployments in the 1990s had upon the maintenance levels of our hardware. This bill takes important steps to rectify that problem associated with the procurement holiday.

Mr. Speaker, the second long-term challenge we must address on a continual basis is related to the transformation of our military forces. The

famous Goldwater-Nichols legislation of 1986 altered the manner in which we organize to fight wars and committed us to transforming the nature of our forces, transformation demands an ongoing strategic, operational, and tactical review of our needs in relation to technology, procurement and the development of joint warfighting capabilities.

Each service, all our units and all our equipment must complement one another and contribute to the increased effectiveness of our forces. Transformation is not a goal in and of itself. It is a process of continuous change and adaptation that makes our forces more effective. This is an issue we must address on an ongoing basis. H.R. 2863 does just that.

Mr. Speaker, the third long-term challenge we face is related to our force structure and manpower requirements. This legislation, while meeting the request of the President's budget, also continues to fund additional forces required to prosecute the global war on terror. This is a good start. In future years, we will need to closely examine and, I believe, increase the size of our forces. There is no short-term easy solution to recruiting and maintaining the larger forces I personally believe we will need in the dangerous world in which we live. Still, H.R. 2863 is a good interim step and one which we should take and support and build on in the coming years.

The fourth long-term challenge faced by the military results from the global war on terror. This is not a conventional war. We are not fighting a nation state. We are fighting the adherents of a fanatical ideology that transcends national borders and takes root whenever and wherever it can. We are involved in a generational war against these fanatics that will last for decades. It will require a wide range of diplomatic, developmental, intelligence, communications, and civil affairs tools and activities to win.

The military component of this effort will be expensive and ever-changing. Hence, I believe we took a wise and important step when we added \$45.3 billion in bridge funding in "Emergency Wartime Appropriations" to this defense bill. It is something that indicates our understanding of the long-term nature of the challenge we face and our determination to commit the resources needed to be successful.

Today, some Members may wish to have a broad discussion on the situation in Iraq. I welcome that debate, and the open rule attached to this legislation will allow that discussion. However, in the end, this bill is not about Iraq. It is about providing the men and women who defend our country with the tools they need to prevail against those who would do harm to the United States. After the collapse of the old Soviet Union, we took our security for granted and we underfunded the military for a decade. September 11, 2001, taught us the folly of our assumptions in this regard.

Since that time, the administration and the Congress have made the tough decisions needed to rebuild our military and expand its capabilities while waging a war on terror. This bill is another step in that process. It is well crafted, essentially bipartisan, and moves us in the proper direction. Once passed, this legislation will enhance our security, enable us to fight the war on terror, and improve the quality of life for our servicemen and women.

Mr. Speaker, to that end, I urge support for the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by commending the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the Appropriations Committee chairman and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), Defense Subcommittee chairman, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the ranking member, for their continuing bipartisan work in drafting the annual defense appropriations bill.

I will not take time to detail the programs funded under this bill. However, I would like to express concern and my deep unease with a few aspects of this spending bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2863 appropriates \$408.9 billion for the Department of Defense. That is \$3.3 billion below what the administration requested. This total also includes \$45.3 billion in unrequested funds for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Total defense spending now accounts for nearly 55 percent of the entire Federal discretionary budget for fiscal year 2006.

Now, while the Committee has trimmed somewhat the administration's budget request, overall defense spending, in real terms, is currently about 20 percent greater than the average Cold War budget.

Mr. Speaker, this is spending of historic proportions.

Since the spring of 2003, Congress has appropriated approximately \$250 billion-plus for the war efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, largely through three huge supplemental appropriations bills. U.S. spending in Iraq alone will be at least 75 to 80 billion this year alone. And it could approach a \$400 billion total by 2006, making the Iraq war one of the costliest in U.S. history. Everyone in this House expects the President to ask for additional funds later this year, an expectation that I guess led the Committee to appropriate the \$45.3 billion in as-yet-unrequested funds for operations in Iraq.

This so-called "bridge fund" means, Mr. Speaker, that we are, in essence, passing two appropriations bills for Iraq and Afghanistan. One is called the Iraq supplemental, which Congress

takes up at the beginning of each year, and the other is this bridge fund. Remember we had one last year too, and it is attached to the annual defense appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is no longer breaking news that we are engaged in Iraq and Afghanistan. And it is critical for the economic and fiscal health of our Nation that the now-predictable spending for continued operations in Iraq and Afghanistan be included in the regular budget process so we can plan for it, make the necessary budgetary trade-offs, and most importantly, Mr. Speaker, so we can pay for it.

We should be paying for this war now, Mr. Speaker, not handing the cost off to our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, just this week the death toll of American troops killed in Iraq exceeded 1,700. Last month was one of the deadliest months in Iraq in the 2 years since President Bush declared the end of major combat operations. In May of 2005, 67 U.S. soldiers and Marines were killed by hostile fire, the fourth highest tally since the war began.

In a June 12 Knight-Ridder article entitled "Military Action Won't End Insurgency, Growing Number of U.S. Officers Believe," Lieutenant Colonel Frederick P. Wellman, who works with the task force overseeing the training of Iraqi security troops, said the insurgency doesn't seem to be running out of new recruits. "We can't kill them all," Wellman said. "When I kill one, I create three."

Mr. Speaker, I personally believe there is no military solution in Iraq, immediate or long term. General George Casey, the top U.S. commander in Iraq, has expressed similar sentiments. He has called the U.S. military efforts "the Pillsbury Doughboy idea," meaning that if you press the insurgency in one area, it only causes it to rise somewhere else.

Mr. Speaker, I very much regret that an amendment offered by the Democratic minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), was not made in order by the Rules Committee. This amendment is quite simple. It calls on the President to transmit to congressional leaders a report on what is our strategy for success in Iraq, one that identifies criteria to determine when it is appropriate to begin the withdrawal of our military from Iraq. The gentlewoman from California's (Ms. PELOSI) amendment is a reasonable, thoughtful approach. For the life of me, I cannot understand why the Rules Committee would not make it in order.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, we need that kind of clarity in our policy. We need a change, of course, and at the end of this debate, I will ask my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that the Pelosi amendment may be considered.

Mr. Speaker, there are some who believe that our only responsibility in

this time of war is to automatically approve appropriations bills, no questions asked. Let me remind my colleagues that we also have a responsibility to do proper oversight, to conduct thoughtful debate, and to ensure that there is a clearly defined mission, which includes when our men and women can come home. That is what the Pelosi amendment seeks to accomplish, but for some reason the Republican leadership does not want to talk about it.

To be honest, I do not think this administration has a clue about what they are doing in Iraq, and, Mr. Speaker, that is a tragedy.

Clearly the current situation is not what the administration predicted, but instead of giving us a truthful assessment, instead of candor and clarity, we are given spin. We are told that things are going great. That is simply not credible.

Mr. Speaker, it takes no courage for a politician to stand before a microphone and say, we must stay the course. It is not our lives that are on the line. We must recognize that the Members of this House have a responsibility that has for too long been neglected.

We owe our troops, indeed we owe our country, some answers. I know that this is not a comfortable topic, but I would plead with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to start worrying less about saving face and more about doing what is right.

At the end of this debate, Mr. Speaker, I will remind my colleagues I will be asking for a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule for the fiscal year 2006 Department of Defense Appropriations Act and the underlying legislation.

I would like to commend the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ranking Member OBEY), the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ranking Member MURTHA) and the staff of the Subcommittee on Defense for their tireless efforts in support of our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines who are bravely defending us at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, the bill does a remarkable job of covering a wide scope of issues that are vitally important to our armed services, both Active and Reserve components, and it clearly meets the immediate needs of the warfighter.

I am particularly grateful for the work the Committee on Appropriations has done to fund the FA-22 program this year. The funding for 25 planes will go a long way towards providing sta-

bility for that program and assuring that America does maintain air dominance for the foreseeable future. I also wholeheartedly agree with the committee's assessment that the Department of Defense should look into the future needs for the FA-22 fighter and consider both a multiyear contract and extending the procurement life of the program beyond fiscal year 2009.

I am especially appreciative for the hard work of the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) in restoring the multiyear contract for the procurement of C-130Js. This is an absolutely vital program, Mr. Speaker, for our military's current and future airlift capability, and I and our Nation are grateful for their strong support.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member of the committee for their hard work on this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our Democratic leader, whose amendment was not allowed to be made in order by the Committee on Rules last night.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to action taken by the Committee on Rules last night when they refused to grant a waiver for my amendment, which I will describe in a moment.

First, I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for their patriotism, for their hard work on behalf of the safety and security of our country and the well-being of our troops. I say to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) congratulations and thank you for what you have done.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) is not in the room at the moment, but I want to acknowledge his great leadership, as well as that of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our ranking member of the full committee, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the new chairman of the full committee. They have all had a strong commitment to our national defense, to our men and women in uniform, to the safety and security of our country. They help us honor our oath of office which calls for providing for the common defense.

I would have hoped that in this legislation that comes before us we would have had an opportunity to give an accounting to the American people as to the conduct of the war in Iraq.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, this Sunday is Father's Day, and many fathers, young fathers, will be away from their families. They will be in Iraq. They will be in Iraq, just as many mothers were on Mother's Day. These brave young mothers and fathers, sons and daughters, and many others are fighting a war of choice in which we sent our young people in harm's way without leveling with the American people. They were sent into a war with-

out the intelligence about what they were going to confront, without the equipment to protect them and without a plan of what would happen after the fall of Baghdad.

I, as well as many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, have visited with soldiers in Iraq and many of whom are on their second tour of duty there. I have conveyed to those brave soldiers, as I have to the wounded in military hospitals in the United States and overseas, how grateful the American people are for their valor, their patriotism and the sacrifice they are willing to make for our country. They have performed their duties with great courage and great skill, and we are all deeply in their debt.

Disagreement with the policies and the conduct of the war that sent our troops to Iraq, and which keeps them in danger today, in no way diminishes the respect and admiration that we have for our troops. Sadly, their level of sacrifice has not been met by the level of the administration's planning, and now the American people agree. This war is not making America safer.

This unnecessary, preemptive war has come at great cost. More than 1,700 of our troops have lost their lives, and thousands more have suffered wounds, many of them, many thousands of them, suffering permanent wounds. Since the war began more than 2 years ago, Congress has appropriated nearly \$200 billion for the war in Iraq, and the United States has suffered devastating damage to our reputation in the eyes of the world. The cost in lives and limbs, the cost in dollars, the cost in reputation has been enormous.

Then-Republican Senator from Ohio, Senator Robert Taft, soon to become the majority leader, the Republican leader in the Senate of the United States, had this to say about our duty in time of war. He said, "Criticism in a time of war is essential to the maintenance of any kind of democratic government." He is a Republican. That was during World War II, and what he said was right, "Criticism in a time of war is essential to the maintenance of any kind of democratic government."

Each passing day confirms that the Iraq War has been a grotesque mistake. We are here today considering a rule for a defense appropriations bill that will provide another \$45 billion for that war, in addition to the hundreds of billions of dollars already appropriated, and the end is not in sight. This money has been spent in Iraq without question by Congress, without accountability by the administration and without success.

Today we must also finally, if belatedly, heed the admonition of Senator Taft and pose questions. The questions are long overdue, about the policies by which the Iraq War is conducted. Congress did not discharge its responsibility to oversee the policies at the start of the war, and it has not done so since. The American people, particularly our troops who are serving in harm's way, deserve better.

If we defeat the previous question on this rule, this is a technicality inside a baseball process here, but if we defeat the previous question on this rule, we can consider my amendment, which says to the President: "Within 30 days of enactment of this legislation, Congress expects an accounting from you as to what the strategy for success is. What security and political measures have you established that will bring our troops home?"

Specifically, my amendment would require the President within 30 days of enactment, as I mentioned, submit to Congress a report identifying the criteria that will be used to determine when it is appropriate to begin to bring our troops home from Iraq. It does not require that the troops be brought home by a particular day. It requires only that the means for judging when they may be brought home be shared with the Congress.

This is not new language. Under the leadership of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), even more expanded, more detailed criteria were set forth in the supplemental bill, which was agreed to in a bipartisan way. I believe the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) was a party to that agreement with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

So this is just raising the profile once again of that requirement, and I commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) for his leadership, for his attention to the detail of all of this, for providing some questions for much-needed answers for the American people.

It is long time past due that the President level with the American people and tell them what the plan is for our troops to complete their work in Iraq. Before any more money is provided for this war, Congress must insist that this information be shared.

I hope that the administration will honor the request, the bipartisan request, in the supplemental. This appropriations bill, which has even more money for Iraq, is an appropriate place for us to make that request as well.

This is an enormous issue in our country. Our troops are in harm's way. Their actions there, again, have been marked by their patriotism, their skill, their love of our country and their courage, but we have to let them know what the goal is and when we have accomplished it so that they can come home.

I hope that we will have bipartisan consensus for a strategy for success in Iraq.

Regrettably, the Republican majority on the Committee on Rules refused to make my amendment in order. Therefore, opposing the previous question on the rule is the only way that we can force this issue on the defense appropriations bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on that vote and to "yes" for accountability for a safer America.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for his time.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge that this House vote "no" on the previous question for the reasons just laid out by the distinguished minority leader. I think there are some other reasons as well.

I happen to think that the Iraqi war is the dumbest war that we have engaged in since the War of 1812, but my opinion is not relevant on that point today. We are there, and the question is how do we best deal with the problem now that we are.

To me, it is irresponsible and mindless for us to be involved in a war unless we have some kind of idea how we will define success. How will we know when we have won; or conversely, how will we know if and when this effort becomes obviously counterproductive?

Right now we have no specific measuring stick. All we know is that we are in a morass, and we are likely to remain there for years. I would predict American troops are going to be there for a decade under existing policy. I do not think the American people will stand for that unless there is a clear policy and a clear set of goals and a clear set of tools to evaluate what it is we are doing. We need to know what standard of success will be held up for training Iraqi replacements. We need to know the answer to a wide variety of other questions.

□ 1100

But there is another reason why I think this is important. The bill we will debate today spends \$45 billion in a "bridge fund" for Iraq. That means that we are bumping up against the ceiling in the budget resolution. The problem is that the \$45 billion in the defense bill today only pays for 6 months of the war. How are we going to pay for the other 6 months? The answer is, we do not know. All we know is that the next time a supplemental comes up to pay for that war, we are going to have to find \$40 billion or more.

I would suggest if we have to do that, there are only two ways that are responsible: one is to require the Budget Committee to come up with another resolution which spells out how we are going to pay for that additional \$40 to \$45 billion without raising the deficit.

The second way to do it would be to have reconciliation instructions to the Ways and Means Committee to actually find ways to raise enough revenue to pay for that next \$40 or \$45 billion so that we do not increase the deficit even further. If we do not do one of those two things, then this House engaged in an elaborate sham when it passed the last budget resolution, because everybody knows it only paid for half the cost of the war this year.

Therefore, I think that what the gentlewoman from California is trying to do is infinitely reasonable; it is certainly prudent and fiscally responsible, and it produces a product that every soldier fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan today has a right to see produced. They have a right to know that they are not in an open-ended mess. They have a right to know that we know what we are doing. They have a right to know that we will have some idea of how to gauge whether what we are doing is productive or counterproductive. Right now, we are simply flying blind.

I congratulate the gentleman from Virginia for offering the original language on the supplemental. This is a follow-up to that in a simplified version, but it aims at the same thing. It says, "Mr. President, tell us how you are going to determine whether this policy is a success or not. Quit the bull gravy. Give us specifics, not generalized platitudes which the Congress has been getting on this subject for the last 2 years."

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. My main purpose here, obviously, was to focus on the bill and the rule for the bill, but I want to discuss some of the concerns that my good friends on the other side of the aisle have.

Frankly, I do not doubt their patriotism for a minute, and I welcome the discussion and debate. I think it is a very good one and a very important one for the national purpose. But I think we ought to go back and recall a little bit the situation in Iraq. We ought to remember who and what Saddam Hussein was. This was brought home to me very dramatically on my first visit to Iraq in October 2003. I have since gone back on three additional occasions, plus to Afghanistan.

I was talking with a young American soldier. At that point we, like every other intelligence service in the world and most people in the world, thought there were WMDs in significant quantities in Iraq, although I do hasten to point out the capacity to acquire and to develop those was still very much there and Mr. Hussein was still working himself out of U.N. sanctions and placing himself in a position to do that.

So I still think we were right to have acted early. But this young soldier that I was visiting with, I asked him: We've been here a considerable amount of time. We've not found the quantities of WMDs we expected. Do you think it was a wise decision to come?

He was quiet for a moment and looked at me and he said: Yes, sir, I will tell you regardless, and I still think they had the capacity, but regardless I think it was a good decision to come.

I said: Why?

And he answered my question with a question of his own. He said: Sir, have you ever been to a mass grave site?

I said: No, I haven't.

He said: I have. He said, Until you've seen hundreds of wailing women as bodies are coming out, one after another, trying to identify, is that a father, is that a son, is that a husband, is that a brother, you don't know what terror really is. He said: My question is why the whole world wasn't here 10 years ago.

That is a very interesting question to ask. Because we of all people had the ability 10 years previously to have done that. We had just won a war with Saddam Hussein, we stopped at the border, and we actually urged people on the other side to rise up, and they did. And 50,000 of them were killed by Saddam Hussein and neither we nor our coalition allies did anything to help.

So I think looking at what was going on in Iraq, looking at the 400,000 deaths, looking at the 263 identified mass grave sites and looking, frankly, at our responsibility to have done something when, indeed, for a decade we did nothing is something that we ought to think about and, frankly, something that the whole world ought to think about.

Just 2 weeks ago, or last week, actually, the New York Times ran an article on another mass grave site that had been located, was being frankly explored, if that is even the appropriate term, in preparation for Saddam Hussein's trial, and in that there were 2,500 people, almost all of them women or children, some of them as young as 3 or 4 years of age. That is the type of thing that American intervention in Iraq stopped. My friends on the other side say, Well, are there any signposts? Any hope?

I think that is a very legitimate question to raise, too, because there is no doubt this has been a rough road that we have walked down and no doubt, and I think my friends are appropriate when they raise this, that it has not gone as predicted and as planned and it has been a very, very difficult process.

But I think we ought to stop and look at the Iraqis on the ground and see what they are doing, the fact that a constitutional government has been established or is being established, the fact that 8 million people came out to vote under the most difficult of circumstances, the fact that we have elections scheduled for October and again for December of this year, an extraordinary achievement by very brave Iraqis under very difficult circumstances to set up what we most need in that part of the world, which is a functioning democracy.

That would not be possible without the sacrifice and the service of the brave men and women of the United States military. That is one of the things they are accomplishing. Their first accomplishment, of course, is to make us more secure. I think it is always legitimate to ask, are we more secure or less secure as a result of the war in Iraq? I would argue we are more

secure. I would argue that anybody that believes somebody like Zakawi would not be busy trying to kill Americans someplace in the region or in the world probably is missing the point. Our troops are engaged there and are engaging an enemy that, left otherwise free to operate, would be busy trying to kill other Americans as they demonstrated pretty dramatically on 9/11.

I would also argue that over time the best way to transform the region is exactly the one that the President suggests, that is, to establish a functioning democracy. I have a lot of faith in the Iraqi people. I have met the political leaders there. I saw the courage of people going out. I talked to a young soldier on the way back just after the elections actually in March of this year who had been wounded at Mosul.

I asked him: Were you there for the elections?

He said: Yes, sir, I was. It was the proudest moment in my 15 years of service to my country. I was never so proud of my unit, my Army or my country for what we accomplished. And, frankly, I was enormously proud and impressed with the Iraqi people who came out and demonstrated their determination with our help to establish a free society.

So I think we should have this discussion. I think it is a good discussion for us to have. But I think we should remember the horror that was there before the Americans intervened, the process that is under way that will not only improve the lives of the people in Iraq but is essentially the manner in which we hope someday to be able to leave a self-governing and free country.

It is not going to be an easy task. It is not going to be a simple task, but it is a noble task and it is one I think that the men and women engaged in it that wear the uniform of the United States can be extraordinarily proud of and, frankly, something that all of us can be grateful to them for accomplishing and running such great risks to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just respond to the gentleman briefly by saying that I do not believe that we are more secure today. We were not told the truth about this war in Iraq. We were not told the truth about WMDs or Iraq's tie to al Qaeda. The justification for this war was based on false or falsified information. Things are getting worse. And this administration does not have a clue.

I was in Iraq as well. I saw firsthand what is going on over there. What the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is trying to do is to get some clarity, to get the administration to come out and explain to us what their strategy is, if they have one, and if they do not, to try to get them to come up with one. This is a very serious matter. Those men and women who are serving our country so bravely over

there deserve more from us than they have gotten.

That is the reason why I hope people will vote "no" on the previous question, to give us an opportunity to force this administration to do what it should have done a long time ago and that is define what this mission is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I thank my friend and colleague from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the debate that just took place. I cannot help but be mindful of the fact that we are still debating today the advisability of going to war in Vietnam which concluded 30 years ago and we may continue this debate on the Iraq war for another generation.

But the comments that the gentleman makes are really not particularly relevant to this amendment that we are focusing on in the rule. I did not feel we should go into the Iraq war without an adequate exit strategy and without more reliable information connecting Saddam Hussein to the 9/11 attacks, but I was in the minority. The Congress gave the President the authority to go to war in Iraq. We accept that. But we did not give the President the authority to spend an unlimited amount of money. We did not give the President the authority to take an unlimited amount of time in completing the mission in Iraq. We certainly did not give the President the authority to expend an unlimited number of Americans' lives in pursuing that mission. We have to retain our oversight responsibility.

In the newspaper today, in The Washington Post, maybe some of my colleagues were struck at the juxtaposition of headlines, one headline says, "Bush Is Expected to Address Specifics on Iraq." And on the page facing it, it says: "Exit Strategy on Social Security Is Sought." Interesting juxtaposition. But in the story on Iraq, the White House spokesperson says, the President takes seriously his responsibility as Commander in Chief to continue to educate the American people about our strategy for victory.

That is all this amendment was about. That is all we are asking for, some reasonable information that is critical for assessing how well we are doing, how much in the way of resources are necessary. We put that language into the conference on the Iraq supplemental. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and I had it put into report language. The minority leader asked that that language become bill language as part of the defense appropriations bill.

I do not think it is inconsistent with what the White House acknowledges is their responsibility to provide us with measurable criteria for success in Iraq. What level of military capability is necessary for the Iraq forces, what level of economic viability is necessary

for the Iraq economy, what level of political stability is necessary for the Iraq Government.

That is what we are asking. More importantly, that is what our constituents are asking. If we had a child in that war, would that not be the first thing we would want to know? What does it take to accomplish the mission so they can get back home to their loved ones?

The Government Accountability Office, the GAO, just gave us a report that states that "U.S. Government agencies do not report reliable data on the extent to which Iraqi security forces are trained and equipped. The reported number of Iraqi police is unreliable because the Ministry of Interior does not receive consistent and accurate reporting from the police forces around the country."

Further, the Departments of State and Defense no longer report on the extent to which Iraqi security forces are equipped with their required weapons, vehicles, communications equipment, and body armor. Without reliable reporting data, a more capable Iraqi force, and stronger Iraqi leadership, the Department of Defense faces difficulties in implementing its strategy to draw down U.S. forces from Iraq."

I quoted all those words. That is our GAO. We are not fighting the issue of the war. We are trying to exercise our oversight responsibility. What number of Iraqi military forces are going to be necessary, adequately trained, sufficiently equipped so that we can turn over some of the military responsibility? What number of Iraqi police forces are necessary to restore law and order in that country?

□ 1115

How much more in the way of American dollars are going to be necessary to reconstruct the infrastructure of the Iraqi economy so that it will be economically viable? And how much more in the way of political stability will be necessary so that they could start to govern themselves? Until we get those questions answered, we do not know where we are going. And if we do not know where we are going, we are never going to get there.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me this time, but primarily for the outstanding statement he has made during the discussion of this rule.

I also want to thank the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), because the bill that we will be working on after this rule is adopted is a bipartisan bill, as any wartime bill should be.

But I think most of the debate on the rule has not been about the bill that

the rule provides for. Most of the debate has been at a different level on the issue of the so-called war in Iraq. I may get in a little trouble here, but I do not think we should call this the Iraqi war or the war in Iraq. This is a global war against terrorism, against terrorists, who hide and strike from cover. That is what this war is about. The Iraqi part of the war, because of the tremendous military capability that we have, that war was over quickly. Saddam Hussein's villainous regime was toppled quickly and effectively. Saddam's military was either defeated or ran for cover. That part of the war was over early, and the President said, "Mission accomplished." That was accomplished. Saddam was gone. His bad guys were gone.

What we are dealing with today is a war on terror, a war against terror. The battleground today happens to be Iraq. The battleground today is in Iraq. On September 11 of 2001, the battleground was in New York City when terrorists attacked the World Trade Center, killing several thousand of our people. That was the battleground then. The battleground was at the Pentagon just across the river from the Capitol on September 11. That was the battleground then. Today it is in Iraq.

On February 26 of 1993, the battleground again was at the World Trade Center where terrorists attacked. Six lives were lost in that attack. The battleground again was on June 25 of 1996, at the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia, the home of our Air Force personnel who were working there at the airbase. Nineteen lives were lost. That was the battleground in this global war on terror. On August 7 of 1998, the United States Embassies, our sovereign property in Kenya and Tanzania, were bombed. Two hundred and fifty-nine lives were lost, including 11 Americans. That was the battleground then. On October 12 of 2000, USS *Cole*, off the shore of Yemen was attacked by terrorists. Seventeen sailors lost their lives, and many, many more were wounded seriously. That was the battleground in this global war on terrorists then.

The battleground today is in Iraq and Afghanistan, but it is not the Iraqi war. That just happens to be the battleground today. We are trying to prevent any further battlegrounds in the United States or anywhere else in the civilized world.

If I were going to make a criticism today, I would criticize many of our friends in the civilized world because we now have an established government in Iraq, elected by large numbers of Iraqi people. We are seeing that government attacked because the major loss of life since that government was established has been of the Iraqis themselves. Where is the rest of the civilized world in fighting this war on terror? They have already been subject to terror in many parts of the world, and they will continue to be as long as the terrorists reign free and roam the globe free.

This is not an Iraqi war. Iraq just happens to be the battleground today. It is an expensive war, and it is an expensive war in the lives of our personnel. And we want to conclude this war against terror as quickly as we can, as effectively as we can. And the civilized world has a responsibility that they are not meeting to help the United States in this effort to allow this established government in Iraq to take a strong hold and to be able to provide for their own security as we battle against the forces of terrorism wherever they might be.

Let us pass the previous question, let us pass the rule, and let us pass this very good bipartisan defense appropriations bill and get on with our work.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just say to the very distinguished gentleman from Florida, whom that I have a great deal of respect for, that all these terrible terrorist acts that he has cited were committed by al Qaeda. And, unfortunately, most of those masterminds are still at large because our forces have been diverted into this war in Iraq, and they are not focused in on where they should be, on bringing to justice those members of al Qaeda who are the masterminds of these crimes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Our strategy to win the peace in Iraq is failing. We have been killing or eliminating 1,000 to 3,000 Iraqi insurgents a month for 17 months, and in that same period of time, the insurgency has quadrupled. If we talk to people in the theater in Iraq today, they would tell us that that insurgency is anywhere from 150- to 200,000 people.

So what do we want to do? The gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI) wants to have an amendment asking the President to come up with a success strategy. We do that to support our men and women in uniform and to support the administration's coming up with an exit strategy, because it has been 25 months and 1,700 American fatalities since the President declared "mission accomplished" in Iraq. For over 2 years we have stayed the course, and it has brought us only casualties and less stability.

After returning to the United States from Iraq, I suggested 5 months ago that we needed to think of an exit strategy. Five months later the case for an exit strategy has only grown stronger. And having an exit strategy does not mean cut and run. It means having a blueprint for achieving our goal of leaving the Iraqi people sovereign and truly independent. And it is not a novel idea. All we are asking is for this President to have the same principle he had when he was Governor of Texas, when he said, "Victory means exit strategy." It is important for the

President to explain to us what that exit strategy is, and that is what Governor George W. Bush said relative to our campaign in Kosovo, and it is more relevant today in Iraq than it was even then.

Any successful strategy in Iraq has to address the fundamental factors that are continuing to fuel the insurgency. One of those factors, Mr. Speaker, is the suspicion that the United States is going to occupy Iraq indefinitely. And until we lay out a framework with the Iraqi Government to bring our troops home, the Iraqi people will never feel that they have control of their own destiny.

A fundamental problem with our failed strategy has been the failure to counter the suspicion among the Iraqis that the United States intends permanent occupation. We are pouring concrete all over that country, and in order to build credibility for the new government and make clear that our forces in Iraq are only temporary peacekeepers, we need to renounce any intention of a long-term presence in Iraq. There are difficult and fundamental questions about Iraq's future, the structure of government, the degree of influence and religious and political minorities. All of these things have to be worked out. But this process must be fully inclusive. It is our obligation to press the process and pulling Iraqis out of the insurgency, pulling them into the political process. A clear exit strategy would help splinter insurgent groups and help them set aside their own differences. The only reason they have united is to unite against us in our occupation. We should support this strategy.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have great respect, Mr. Speaker, for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their passion and their commitment, but I think they are make a fundamental mistake in their argument about Iraq. I think what they want is a timetable, not a strategy.

We have a strategy. It is called getting an elected government up and operational that can defend itself. We have made important steps along the way in succeeding in that strategy. We have turned over power to the Iraqis. The Iraqis have had an election. They have an elected government that, as we debate here, is debating there about the constitution that they want to have, that they want to live under, that they want to put in front of their people to approve of in October, followed by scheduled elections in December for a government.

I remind my friends that while they call for an exit strategy and a date certain, our friends in Iraq want exactly the opposite of a date certain. Repeatedly, the elected leaders, the elected leaders in Iraq, the people who have the voice, the mandate of the people behind them, have said, Our biggest fear about the United States is that

they will not stay the course, that they will quit and run.

I tell the Members that some of the most surprised people that I met when I was in Iraq came in two categories when I was there in March after the elections. First, I met with a group of the newly formed United Iraqi Alliance, basically a group of Shia and other people who are now the majority. And we were visiting about the political process there, and one of the individuals I was visiting with, now a leader in the government, made the point that, We were not sure that you would actually allow free elections to occur, and you did, and we are astonished and pleased and committed to staying the course. So our next question is, will you stay here and help us against the people that want to take us back to the era of Saddam Hussein, back to that regime, because we are going to need your help in this transition process?

That is a very legitimate question. Do we have the political will to stay while the people that are elected put together the government that they need to succeed? So we are going to see that in the course of the coming time. But I think we should be more understanding that there is a strategy and that there is a process under way that is producing good results for the Iraqi people, that is giving them actually a government for the first time that they choose.

I also met with a group of Sunnis who were dissidents, who were not particularly supportive of the process, and in the course of our discussion, a number of them made the point, We made a big mistake. We should have participated in the last elections. The situation in the country would be different. We would be at the political table. We would be in a position to affect what is happening. But we also did not have faith that the United States was serious about democracy. But we look at the outcome of the election, and we understand that indeed you were, and we intend to participate as we move forward.

I think the gentleman from Florida made a very good point. We need to recognize that most people in Iraq are on the same side we are. Most people in Iraq want a democracy, and most people believe that our presence there is important in ensuring that that process take root and actually succeed. I think if we stay the course, frankly, in time we will be very pleased with the result, but, more importantly, we will have restored faith.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say people question our intention about staying long term. I can tell them from my personal experience it is exactly the opposite. They doubt our willingness to stay. I would suggest that setting dates certain would sound more like a surrender strategy than an exit strategy, more like we can count on at this particular point that the Americans will not be here anymore. That is a nice thing to know if one hap-

pens to be in the insurgency. It is also a pretty worrisome thing if one happens to be part of the forces of democracy. At that point whether we have succeeded or not, whether or not the government is able to deal with the insurgency on its own, the Americans are saying, sayonara, we are out of here, good-bye. That is a catastrophic mistake. That, in my opinion, would undermine the sacrifice, the effort, and the service so far.

So, again, I welcome the debate. And I hope at some point in the discussion on the rule we can get back to this excellent piece of legislation, which I think really is important, and where, frankly, there is bipartisan unity in terms of the things we need to do to move our military forward.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

If the gentleman from Oklahoma has a strategy on Iraq or knows that the Bush administration has written down such a strategy, would he please share with us a copy because I have yet to see one?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

□ 1130

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the aftermath of the war in Iraq has been marred by miscalculations and mistakes, made up for in many cases by our troops, who have filled the breach brilliantly by improvising, often doing duty for which they were never trained. You cannot go to Iraq and talk to our troops in the field and come home without saying to yourself, thank God there are such Americans.

But their valiant efforts would have been more effective if the Pentagon had not ignored General Shinseki and deployed too few troops initially to secure the country and capitalize on our victory in battle.

Their efforts would have been more effective if the Pentagon had not ignored General Garner and cashed the entire Iraqi Army.

Their efforts would have been more effective if we had moved much sooner to set up a representative government and stand up Iraqi security forces to whom we can ultimately and must ultimately hand over the responsibility for securing their own country.

Before we disengage from Iraq, we have to do both of the above. I firmly believe that. We have to stand up security forces, and by that I mean police and border guards and the army, adequate to stabilize the country; and we have to steer the Iraqis through the shoals towards the adoption of a constitution and the election of a government under that constitution.

We cannot leave any sooner without risking the collapse of Iraq into a fractious and bloody civil war which could very well require us to return. I believe that.

But to be sure that we are moving systematically in the right direction, the minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), is asking for a yardstick, milestones, by which to measure our progress. This is not a plan of withdrawal. If it were, I would not vote for it. This is a strategy for success.

Let me give you one reason from a budget perspective why we need it. Basically, the budgets in the out years beyond 2006 contain no estimation of what the deployments in Iraq, Afghanistan, and North American Air Defense are costing us. Even though the cost is \$80 billion to \$100 billion a year, it is not included in the budget.

CBO undertook to estimate, to model, what our likely deployment in Iraq may cost, because otherwise there is a gaping hole, an unrealistic aspect, to the budget. Their estimate was that if we drew down to 20,000 troops in theater by the end of 2006 and 20,000 troops in Afghanistan by the end of 2006, and then taper that force off over the rest of the remaining 10-year period, the cost over 10 years would be \$384 billion. That is a significant item.

If that is what is in the cards, if that is what is likely, given the strategy for success, we need to know it, we need to plan for it, we need to be expecting it.

Given what is at stake, given the lives that have been lost, given the billions that have been spent, what we are asking is a modest request to make of the Pentagon; and, Mr. Speaker, it involves the sort of planning that I would hope they would be doing anyway and should be sharing with us if they are doing it.

I would therefore urge a "no" vote on the previous question and a vote for the leader's amendment.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this very misguided \$409 billion defense appropriations rule and bill. As the proud daughter of a veteran of two wars, I believe that our Nation is best defended by funding priorities that truly make our Nation and world safer. This bill, I am sorry to say, does not do that.

What does it say about our priorities when Congress appropriates \$45 billion more for the unnecessary war in Iraq, without any accountability, direction, or exit strategy or even a plan to end this permanent occupation? Does the President plan to have permanent bases in Iraq?

We are in an impossible situation. Taken to war under false pretenses, our troops have become the very rallying points for the insurgency they are trying to contain.

This administration continues to stonewall what is a very simple ques-

tion: What is the plan to bring our troops home? The purpose of this funding bill is to provide for our national defense. Yet in the same way that this war has made us less safe, the funding priorities in this bill are for weapons systems and military contractors, and billions of additional funds are unaccounted for in waste, fraud, and abuse. This only undermines our national interest.

Mr. Speaker, we must get our funding priorities right. And the American people need to know what the President's plan is. What is his strategy? What does he consider success? The information that the Pelosi amendment is requesting is absolutely necessary to begin what the American people are demanding, and that is the withdrawal of the United States Armed Forces from Iraq.

It is incredible to me that we are sacrificing our funding needs for our critical efforts here in America, such as for housing and health care and education. Once again, we must get our funding priorities correct. We must get them straight. We must know what the President's plan is. We must know what he intends to do. The Pelosi amendment gets that information. I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to differ with an underlying assumption that has been made by a number of my friends on the other side of the aisle, which is that we are somehow paying an extraordinary amount of our national wealth for defense. I would actually argue quite the opposite.

In 1959 and 1960, at the height of the Cold War, this country spent 50 percent, 50 percent, of the entire Federal budget on defense, almost 9 percent of the gross national product, an enormous sum of money.

1980, fast forward, Ronald Reagan, we are spending about 6 percent of the Gross National Product and about one-third of the Federal budget on defense.

1990, 4.8 percent of the gross national product and a significantly lower percentage of the Federal budget.

Today, about 3.7 percent of the national wealth and about 18 to 19 percent of the total Federal budget.

I could make a pretty good argument that either, one, we are very efficient because we are actually defending the country for considerably less of its national wealth than we have done at any period in the postwar period; or we need to be doing more. I would argue toward the latter, actually. I think we should be doing more, and I think this bill is a step in that direction.

The second assumption that I want to disagree with is that we are somehow less safe today because of the Iraqi war. That is asserted, never demonstrated.

The reality is, I think, if you asked most Americans on September 12, 2001,

did they expect other incidents inside the domestic confines of the United States, they would have said yes, and they would have expected them in rather short order. It is a little short of miraculous that we have not had that horrific incident occur again. It could occur at any moment. As the President has said repeatedly in recent months, America is safer; America is certainly not safe.

But I would argue, again, the engagement of the enemy a far distance away from the United States and in a method that keeps them tied down has actually contributed to the security of our country. This excellent piece of legislation will enable our military to continue to do the outstanding job it is doing. Again, on that piece of legislation, at least, I am delighted there is bipartisan unity.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge a "no" vote on this rule. A little over 2 years ago, the President announced on that aircraft carrier off San Diego, "mission accomplished" in Iraq. Today, we must ask what really has been accomplished with the hundreds of billions of dollars that the United States has spent and will spend.

Iraq is in chaos. 1,714 U.S. servicemen have been killed and 12,855 wounded. In the first half of this month alone, 431 Iraqi citizens have died randomly at the hands of insurgents and terrorists. Multiple car bombings have become a daily occurrence in Baghdad and throughout Iraq. The elected government is struggling to gain control and cannot provide security for its citizens.

Just 2 weeks ago, the New York Times and international news organizations reported our Marines' discovery of an enormous underground bunker near the city of Fallujah that was used by insurgents as a hideout and weapons cache. This bunker is the size of four football fields and sports dormitories, with full kitchen, showers, and sanitation facilities. This is just the largest example of the weapons caches patrols find every week. How can we call the mission a success when insurgents can operate so freely as to still utilize bunkers of this size?

All of this simply underscores how spectacularly and tragically wrong our civilian leadership, from Secretary Rumsfeld right up through President, was when they rejected military commanders' advice that at least 300,000 troops would be needed on the ground to occupy and pacify Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, as we discuss this bill, I urge my colleagues to think about whether our huge commitment, the thousands of young lives lost and the hundreds of billions of dollars spent, is being deployed effectively and wisely.

It is very late in this Iraq tragedy. Congress needs to force the development of a workable strategy to achieve

stability in Iraq and then bring our young men and women home. That was the subject of the distinguished minority leader's amendment which this rule denies.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

As we debate the 2006 Defense Appropriations Act, I rise to commend the actions of Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and Brigadier General Casey McClain. Their swift effort to implement a tough policy against sexual assaults in the military is praiseworthy.

I became aware of the troublesome issue in the military when the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues held a hearing last spring to give voice to military women who were victims of sexual assault.

In this time of conflict, when brave young men and women are willing to put their lives at risk, it is essential that those soldiers do not fear the actions of their comrades in arms. The act of sexual assault is condemned in civilian society. It is especially unforgivable when one soldier sexually assaults another. The bonds of trust and respect unite soldiers on the battlefield. It therefore is imperative that this trust not be eroded because of insufficient policies addressing sexual assault among our troops.

After the hearing, Congress acted last year to include language in the Defense Authorization Act that required DOD to develop a definition of sexual assault that is uniform for all of the Armed Forces. That was part of the problem before. It was no small task, yet the Joint Task Force on Sexual Assault Prevention and Response led by Brigadier General McClain carried out this charge with the utmost professionalism and timeliness.

As a result of their efforts, I am pleased to report that the new policy on confidential reporting went into effect just earlier this week. The new policy provides for a confidential means for soldiers to report assaults and ensures that victims feel safe and that they are encouraged not to hide, but rather to report this violation.

It is clear that the Department of Defense places a high priority on the prevention of and response to sexual assault within the military. I commend their actions, but I remind them that this Congress will continue to exercise authority over them to ensure that this policy is continued.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking Members to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule so we can consider the Pelosi amendment that was offered in the Committee on Rules Tuesday night, but rejected on a straight party-line vote.

Mr. Speaker, the Pelosi amendment would require the President to submit to Congress within 30 days a report on a strategy for success in Iraq. That is it.

Mr. Speaker, whatever one's position is on the war in Iraq, I think most of us realize that it is past time for the administration to assess the situation in Iraq and to address the matter of an eventual withdrawal from that country. I hope Members will agree to at least consider this amendment today.

The House has a responsibility to ask tough questions and to demand straight answers. I am tired of the spin, as so many other Members are. It is time for candor. The people of this country deserve that.

A "no" vote will not prevent us from considering the defense appropriations bill under an open rule, but a "no" vote will allow Members to vote on the Pelosi amendment. However, a "yes" vote will block the House from considering and voting on the need for a success strategy in the war in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we need a strategy, not just slogans.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I will enter into the RECORD two articles cited in my opening statement. I also had a very moving meeting yesterday with members of the Gold Star Families for Peace who have lost sons and daughters in the war in Iraq. These families have experienced the tragedy of this war firsthand, and they believe we should set a very different course. I will enter into the RECORD the personal statements by these family members regarding the continuing U.S. presence in Iraq.

[From Knight Ridder Newspapers, June 12, 2005.]

MILITARY ACTION WON'T END INSURGENCY,
GROWING NUMBER OF U.S. OFFICERS BELIEVE
(By Tom Lasseter)

BAGHDAD, IRAQ.—A growing number of senior American military officers in Iraq have concluded that there is no long-term military solution to an insurgency that has killed thousands of Iraqis and more than 1,300 U.S. troops during the past two years.

Instead, officers say, the only way to end the guerilla war is through Iraqi politics—an arena that so far has been crippled by divisions between Shiite Muslims, whose coalition dominated the January elections, and Sunni Muslims, who are a minority in Iraq but form the base of support for the insurgency.

"I think the more accurate way to approach this right now is to concede that . . . this insurgency is not going to be settled, the terrorists and the terrorism in Iraq is not going to be settled, through military options or military operations," Brig. Gen. Donald Alston, the chief U.S. military spokesman in Iraq, said last week, in a comment that echoes what other senior officers say. "It's going to be settled in the political process."

Gen. George W. Casey, the top U.S. commander in Iraq, expressed similar sentiments, calling the military's efforts "the Pillsbury Doughboy idea"—pressing the insurgency in one area only causes it to rise elsewhere.

"Like in Baghdad," Casey said during an interview with two newspaper reporters, in-

cluding one from Knight Ridder, last week. "We push in Baghdad—they're down to about less than a car bomb a day in Baghdad over the last week—but in north-center (Iraq) . . . they've gone up," he said. "The political process will be the decisive element."

The recognition that a military solution is not in the offing has led U.S. and Iraqi officials to signal they are willing to negotiate with insurgent groups, or their intermediaries.

"It has evolved in the course of normal business," said a senior U.S. diplomatic official in Baghdad, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of U.S. policy to defer to the Iraqi government on Iraqi political matters. "We have now encountered people who at least claim to have some form of a relationship with the insurgency."

The message is markedly different from previous statements by U.S. officials who spoke of quashing the insurgency by rounding up or killing "dead enders" loyal to former dictator Saddam Hussein. As recently as two weeks ago, in a Memorial Day interview on CNN's "Larry King Live," Vice President Dick Cheney said he believed the insurgency was in its "last throes."

But the violence has continued unabated, even though 44 of the 55 Iraqis portrayed in the military's famous "deck of cards" have been killed or captured, including Saddam.

Lt. Col. Frederick P. Wellman, who works with the task force overseeing the training of Iraqi security troops, said the insurgency doesn't seem to be running out of new recruits, a dynamic fueled by tribal members seeking revenge for relatives killed in fighting.

"We can't kill them all," Wellman said. "When I kill one I create three."

Last month was one of the deadliest since President Bush declared the end of major combat operations in May 2003, a month that saw six American troops killed by hostile fire. In May 2005, 67 U.S. soldiers and Marines were killed by hostile fire, the fourth-highest tally since the war began, according to Iraq Coalition Casualty Count, an Internet site that uses official casualty reports to organize deaths by a variety of criteria.

At least 26 troops have been killed by insurgents so far in June, bringing to 1,311 the number of U.S. soldiers killed by hostile action. Another 391 service members have died as a result of accidents or illness.

The Iraqi interior minister said last week that the insurgency has killed 12,000 Iraqis during the past two years. He did not say how he arrived at the figure.

American officials had hoped that January's national elections would blunt the insurgency by giving the population hope for their political future. But so far, the political process has not in any meaningful way included Iraq's Sunni Muslim population.

Most of Iraq's Sunnis Muslims, motivated either by fear or boycott, did not vote, and they hold a scant 17 seats in the 275-member parliament.

There was a post-election lull in bloodshed, a period that saw daily attack figures dip into the 30s. But with the seating of the interim government on April 28, attacks spiked back to 70 a day. More than 700 Iraqis have been killed since then.

The former Iraqi minister of electricity, Ayham al-Samarie, has said he's consulted with U.S. diplomatic officials about his negotiations with two major insurgent groups to form a political front of sorts. There has been similar talk in the past—notably by former Prime Minister Ayad Allawi's administration, which spoke of inclusion through amnesty—but nothing has come of it.

At the heart of the problem is the continued failure of U.S. and Iraqi officials to bring the nation's Sunni minority, with more than

five million people, to the political table. Sunnis now find themselves in a country ruled by the Shiite and Kurdish political parties once brutally oppressed by Saddam, a Sunni.

With Shiites and Kurds stocking the nation's security forces with members of their militias, Sunnis have been marginalized and, according to some analysts in Iraq, have become more willing to join armed groups.

Since September of last year, some 85 percent of the violence in Iraq has taken place in just four of Iraq's 18 provinces: the Sunni heartland of al Anbar, Baghdad, Ninevah and Salah al Din.

U.S. officials prefer not to talk about the situation along religious lines, but they acknowledge that one of the key obstacles to resolving Iraq's problems is the difference between Sunni and Shiite religious institutions.

Shiites are organized around their marja'ia, a council of clerics—led in Iraq by Grand Ayatollah Ali al Sistani—that issues religious edicts that Shiite faithful follow as law. Sunnis, on the other hand, have no such unifying structure.

The difference was made clear in January when one list formed under the guidance of Sistani was the choice of almost all Shiites voting. Those Sunnis who did go to the polls split their votes among a myriad of organizations including those backed by a presumptive monarch, a group of communists and a religious group that mayor may not have been boycotting the election.

Sunni Muslims near downtown Baghdad have only to drive down the street to see how precarious their position in Iraqi politics and society is these days. On roads near the party headquarters for the Shiite Supreme Council for Islamic Revolution in Iraq, which is in large part shaping the policy of the nation, Kurdish militia members patrol the streets.

The troops are ostensibly part of the nation's army, but they still wear militia uniforms and, as is the case with some in Kurdistan, many either can't or won't speak Arabic. One of the roads they patrol has been named Badr Street, for the armed wing of the Supreme Council. There is a large billboard with the looming face of Abdul Aziz al Hakim, the Supreme Council's leader.

Unless Sunnis develop confidence that the government will represent them, few here see the insurgency fading.

Asked about the success in suppressing the insurgency in Baghdad recently—the result of a series of large-scale raids that in targeted primarily Sunni neighborhoods—Brig. Gen. Alston said that he expects the violence to return.

"We have taken down factories, major cells, we have made good progress in (stopping) the production of (car bombs) in Baghdad," Alston said. "Now, do I think that there will be more (bombs) in Baghdad? Yes, I do."

[From the Washington Post, June 8, 2005.]

PENTAGON WASTED SUPPLIES, GAO FINDS (By Griff Witte)

The Defense Department spent at least \$400 million in recent years buying boots, tents, bandages and other goods at the same time it was getting rid of identical items it had paid for but never used, government investigators told House members yesterday.

That finding came as part of a broader inquiry by the Government Accountability Office that uncovered deep flaws in the Pentagon's system for determining when it needs to buy new supplies and how it disposes of supposedly excess inventory.

Investigators discovered that out of \$33 billion of goods the Defense Department marked as excess from 2002 through 2004, \$4

billion was in excellent condition. Only about 12 percent of that was reused by the department. The other \$3.5 billion "includes significant waste and inefficiency," the GAO said, because new or good-as-new items were "transferred and donated outside of DOD, sold for pennies on the dollar, or destroyed."

Investigators brought some of that equipment with them to the hearing of a House Government Reform Committee subcommittee yesterday. Among the items on display were unused military uniforms and medals that GAO had purchased off of a publicly available Web site intended for disposing of unwanted government property. The GAO also obtained the power-supply system for a component of a nuclear submarine that was on the Pentagon's "critical shortage" list at the time.

"We're not sure why DOD would be letting GAO have that. We don't have any nuclear submarines at GAO," said Gregory D. Kutz, the GAO's managing director for special investigations.

Subcommittee members reacted angrily to the findings.

"Waste on this scale affects our ability to meet the immediate needs of men and women in uniform," said Rep. Christopher Shays (R-Conn.), who chaired the hearing. "The \$400 million spent on unneeded equipment could have bought body armor, medical supplies or more than 1,700 fully armed Humvees to protect coalition forces against deadly improvised explosive devices."

Rep. Henry A. Waxman (D-Calif.) said the only beneficiaries of the Pentagon's mismanagement are the companies that sell equipment to the government. "Federal contractors are reaping a bonanza while taxpayers are being gouged," Waxman said.

Rep. John J. Duncan Jr. (R-Tenn.) said the GAO's findings involved the waste of "an unbelievably staggering amount of money."

"Anybody who's not horrified by this does not deserve to be called a conservative," he said.

Pentagon officials testified that they generally agreed with the GAO's findings, saying new items had been accidentally labeled in some cases as excess inventory. The officials said they have made improvements, however, and plan to have a computer system up and running by January that would prevent Pentagon officials from buying new equipment that is already available internally.

"We do have a fix on the horizon," said Maj. Gen. Daniel G. Mongeon, director of logistics operations at the Defense Logistics Agency.

Yesterday's report followed GAO inquiries that uncovered evidence the Defense Department was selling unused biological and chemical-weapons-resistant suits for \$3 each. At the same time it was buying hundreds of thousands more for \$200 apiece.

Investigators found that example typified a broader problem. For instance, they paid \$2,898 for \$79,649 worth of tires, badges, circuit cards and medical supplies. In some cases, the goods had been marked as junk but were delivered in their original packaging. At the same time, the Pentagon continued to order more of the same items from its suppliers.

The GAO concluded that the Pentagon could have saved \$400 million in fiscal 2002 and 2003 had it used what it already owned, rather than buying more.

GAO investigators also found that at contractor-operated facilities where excess equipment was supposed to be liquidated, items were left exposed to rain and wind. Much of it ended up damaged beyond repair.

In addition, the Defense Department said that between 2002 and 2004, \$466 million of equipment marked as excess—including sen-

sitive equipment such as missile warheads—had been lost, stolen or damaged. Kutz, who said he believes the total of unaccounted-for equipment could be far higher, said the GAO will continue to investigate where those items ended up.

STATEMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF GOLD STAR FAMILIES FOR PEACE

Iraq has been the tragic Lie of Historic Proportions of Washington, DC since before the first gulf war. For years, Saddam was one of our government's propped up and militarily supported puppets. Many people have seen the famous footage of Donald Rumsfeld shaking hands with Saddam. I suppose the two are smiling so big for the cameras because they are kindred spirits. After all of the hand-shaking and weapon brokering, when did Saddam become such a bad guy to Bush, Cheney, Halliburton and Co.? (Insert your favorite reason here). During the Clinton regime the US-UN led sanctions against Iraq and the weekly bombing raids killed tens of thousands of innocent people in Iraq. Many of them were children, but since one of her children didn't have to be sacrificed to the homicidal war machine, Madeline Albright, thinks the slaughter during the "halcyon" Clinton years was "worth it." More lies.

Anyone with even a rudimentary understanding of current events understands that this invasion/occupation of Iraq was not about Saddam being a "bad guy." If that logic is used, then how many innocent Iraqi people have to die before the citizens of America wake up and know that our government is a "bad guy?" We also know that Iraq was not about WMD's. They weren't there and they weren't going to be there for at least a decade, by all reports. Another reason, so wispy and more difficult to disprove, is that America invaded Iraq to bring freedom and democracy to the Iraqi people. When one tries to dispute this particular deception, one is accused of being unpatriotic or hating freedom. Even though correct, the statement "Freedom isn't Free" is very insulting to me. False freedom is very expensive. Fake freedom costs over one billion of our tax dollars a week; phony freedom has cost the Iraqi people tens of thousands of innocent lives; fanciful freedom has meant the destruction of a country and its infrastructure. Tragically, this fabricated notion of freedom and democracy cost me far more than I was willing to pay: the life of my son, Casey. The Lie of Historic Proportions also cost me my peace of mind, I do not feel free and I do not feel like I live in a democracy.

One of the other great deceptions that is being perpetuated on the American public and the world is that this occupation is to fight terrorism: If we don't fight terrorism in Iraq then we will have to fight it "on our streets." In fact, terrorist attacks have skyrocketed in Iraq and all over the world. So much so, that the State Department has stopped compiling the statistics and quit issuing the yearly terrorism report. I guess if one doesn't write a report, then terrorism doesn't exist? All of Casey's commendations say that he was killed in the "GWOT" the Global War on Terrorism. I agree with most of GWOT, except that Casey was killed in the Global War Of Terrorism waged on the world and its own citizens by the biggest terrorist outfit in the world: George and his destructive Neo-con cabal.

The evidence is overwhelming, compelling, and alarming that George and his indecent bandits traitorously had intelligence fabricated to fit their goal of invading Iraq. The criminals foisted a Lie of Historic Proportions on the world. It was clear to many of us more aware people that George, Condi, Rummy, the two Dicks: Cheney and Perle,

Wolfie, and most effectively and treacherously, Colin Powell, lied their brains out before the invasion. The world was even shown where the WMD's were on the map. We were told that the "smoking gun" could come at any time in the form of a "mushroom cloud" or a cloud of toxic biological or chemical weapons. Does anyone remember duct tape and plastic sheeting?

Finally, the side of peace, truth and justice has our own smoking gun and it is burning our hands. It is the so-called Downing Street Memo dated 23, July 2002, (almost 8 months before the invasion) that states that military action (against Iraq) is now seen as "inevitable." The memo further states that: "Bush wanted to remove Saddam through military action", justified by the conjunction of "terrorism and WMD's." The most damning thing to George in the memo is where the British intelligence officer who wrote the memo claims that the intelligence to base Great Britain and the U.S. staging a devastating invasion on Iraq was being "fixed around the policy." Now, after over three years of relentless propaganda, it is difficult to distinguish the proven lies from the new "truth:" that this occupation is bringing freedom and democracy to the people of Iraq.

Casey took an oath to protect the U.S. from all enemies "foreign and domestic." He was sent to occupy and die in a foreign country that was no threat to the USA. However, the biggest threat to our safety, humanity, and our way of life in America are George and his cronies. Congress made a Mistake of Historic Proportions and waived its Constitutional responsibility to declare war. It is time for the House to make up for that mistake and introduce Articles of Impeachment against the murderous thugs who have caused so much mindless mayhem. It is time for Congress to revalidate itself by holding a hearing about the Downing Street Memo. The reader can help by going onto www.AfterDowningStreet.org and signing a petition to Rep. John Conyers so he will know that the American people are behind him to convene an investigation in the House Judiciary Committee. You can also write your Congressional Representative to help push the inquiry.

It is time to put partisan politics behind us to do what is correct for once and reclaim America's humanity. It is time for Congress and the American people to work together in peace and justice to rid our country of the stench of greed, hypocrisy, and unnecessary suffering that permeates our White House and our halls of Congress. It is time to hold someone accountable for the carnage and devastation that has been caused. As a matter of fact, it is past time, but it is not too late—Cindy Sheehan, mother of Casey Sheehan, KIA Apr. 4, 2004.

My son Sherwood Baker, only 30 years old, a fine man, father, husband, social worker, musician, entertainer, friend, protector, patriot, national guard soldier lost his precious life on April 26, 2004 in Baghdad.

He had been in Iraq for six weeks. He was assigned to protect the Iraq Survey Group the very people looking for the weapons of mass destruction. He was guarding that group as they entered a munitions factory, it exploded, something hit my son in his head as he raised himself from his humvee. He died two hours later, half a World away from all of us who love him so much.

Two years before this happened, people in the Administration of George Bush had decided they wanted a war with Iraq. They were determined to have one, though the facts about any real dangers were "thin", though so many disagreed, though the American people rejected a capricious war. So these people who took their oath before God

to be honorable leaders, betrayed the public trust and committed themselves and our Country to finding a way to have a war.

Some of us suspected all this then, many of us know it now, the Downing Street memo and other revealing documents bring the light of truth everyday to these horrendous betrayals.

Now it is the duty of congress to stand up and face these truths, investigate the documents, follow them where ever they lead. Hold those accountable who betrayed my son, my family and this Country I love.

If we are ever to reach Peace in Iraq we must confront the lies and deceptions that got us there, just as we could not wage a war successfully on lies, there can be no Peace based on lies.

It is very simple in some ways, 1706 Americans have given up their lives, they stand just beyond us now, tied forever by grief and longing to those who loved them. Tied to the history of this Country, tied to its honor, now they wait on us to honor the fallen and honor the truth.

I pray YOU will support the Downing Street memo hearings—and stand with honor for the truth—Celeste Zappala, mother of Sgt Sherwood Baker, KIA Apr. 26, 2004.

SILENCE IN THE FACE OF TRUTH: THE DOWNING STREET MEMO

(By Dante Zappala)

For the first 30 years of my brother Sherwood Baker's life, his mission was to be a responsible citizen. He made oaths and he honored those oaths. This made him a loving father and husband. This also made him a noble and committed soldier. He courageously deployed with his National Guard unit to Iraq in 2004.

For the last six weeks of his life, Sherwood's mission was to provide convoy security for the Iraq Survey Group. He was killed in action, providing site security for the group that was looking for weapons of mass destruction. Mounting evidence indicates that the weapons' non-existence wasn't a mistake. It was a ruse.

The clouds surrounding Sherwood's death became even darker recently when I read the contents of a memo from the upper echelons of the British government. The memo reiterates the fact that our administration had every intention of invading Iraq in the summer of 2002. The White House needed only to sell the idea to the American people.

Prior to Congressional approval, prior to saying, "War is the last resort," the decision had been made to go to war regardless of legal justification or the problems associated with the aftermath of an invasion. The most telling quote in this memo reads, "The intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy." Read the memo: <http://www.downingstreetmemo.com/memo.html>.

My brother died scouring the Iraqi countryside not to protect his country, but to satisfy the Bush administration's public relations agenda.

The leaders of our country politicized intelligence to satisfy an ideology. My brother and more than 1,650 other soldiers have been killed as a result. Yet I have to sift through the papers and the news channels to find even a pulse of concern. In the wake of such disturbing revelations, a majority of our press and populace resoundingly choose to be silent.

Overwhelmingly, Americans have ceased to care about how and why we went war. Apathy, in the face of our soldiers' sacrifice, seems more convenient.

We cannot allow our government to simply replace the motivations for war mainstream and expect an entire nation and all its allies to succumb to selective memory. Yet that is exactly what has happened.

The poet Archibald MacLish, who also lost a brother in war, wrote:

They say
We leave you our deaths
Give them their meaning.

If we are to give meaning to the deaths in Iraq, we must be willing to engage in truthful dialogue about the pretenses of war. Acquiescing to the lure of silence and ignorance is an affront to the families and memories of all who have fallen. It is a prescription for unending violence and suffering.

Are we so ashamed of what our soldiers have and continue to do in Iraq that we can't even talk about how they got there? Or, are we simply ashamed of ourselves for letting it happen?

We must each confront ourselves over the failures in Iraq. For that failure is not simply the fault of our leaders misusing suspect intelligence. Our course as a country, ultimately, stems from the individual conclusion of all of us to be either complicit or resistant to war.

The government's failure in Iraq becomes our own failure when we substitute political rhetoric or blanket ideology for reason. It becomes our fault when we are recklessly arrogant and willfully deaf.

Our responsibility as citizens is to acknowledge and embrace the whole truth about the Iraq War. We must look past partisanship and hold ourselves and our leaders to the high standards of integrity that citizenship demands. When we fail to honor that responsibility, we fail to honor the sacrifices of our soldiers.

The world as I knew it ended when Neil was killed. Many years ago someone gave us a beautiful vase and somehow I knocked it over and it broke into two pieces. I glued it together, it still holds water, but it lost its beauty. We are like that vase. For a while I lost my ability to pray. That has come back, thank God and all those who prayed for us. Many people go to work with coffee or tea in their cupholder. I go with tissues in my cupholder, because I cry to and from work. I am able to function at work because I work with children. Daily activities are no longer the same. I can speak to a large group of people, yet I have trouble going into stores. I cannot be in crowded stores. One of my dearest friends just retired and I did not go to her retirement party, because I was worried that I would start sobbing. I love the theater, but do not go. My son was an honorable man killed by the actions of dishonorable men—Dianne Santoriello, mother of 1st Lt. Neil Anthony Santoriello, KIA Aug. 13, 2004.

My son, Sgt. Mike Mitchell, was killed in Sadr City on April 4, 2004, the first day of the Shiite uprising. He had been in Iraq for 11 months, had turned in all of his equipment on April 3, as he was headed to Kuwait the next week then back to Germany and his fiancée and wedding—Bill Mitchell, father of Sgt. Mike Mitchell, KIA Apr. 4, 2004.

Jeff was sent to Kuwait on a 6 month rotation tour with his Battery, C/1-39 FA (MLRS) in August 2002. He was due back to the states in February 2003, until orders to returned were halted in December 2002 because of the build-up. He was caught in this melee of horror with no other recourse to be a true soldier and fight for the cause. You can imagine my horror listening to the propaganda and lies our government leaderships so vehemently declared to the nation as the truth. It was out of my control to tell my baby he was in the wrong place at the wrong time. I felt absolutely helpless. He died 4 weeks into the invasion. He was just commissioned as a second lieutenant, he married the love of his life, he acquired his mustang muscle car, and he was living on his own in Ft. Stewart, Georgia. He had the world ahead of him and

eager to be part of life. He didn't expect to lose his life. He died from a shrapnel metal that pierced his right eye and traveled through his brain knocking out all the vital parts to sustain life. He was a victim to an explosion a football field away. Back then, his unit (FA) was not equipped with protective gear nor properly trained to handle infantry, engineers, and explosive specialist jobs. Jeff was 24 yrs old when he died and my only son. He was the love of my life and such a cuddly baby to raise. He always had kisses for me even into his adult life. I miss him so! This war shouldn't happen and I want the truth. I want someone to gather all the casualty families and tell them the truth—why it was necessary to fabricate intelligence information to make a case for war. We have the right to know even if its classified—Roxanne Kaylor, mother of LT. Jeff Kaylor, KIA Apr. 7, 2003.

The Department of Defense announced today the death of two soldiers who were supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom. They died April 19 in Baghdad, Iraq, when a vehicle-borne improvised explosive device detonated near their dismounted patrol. Both Soldiers were assigned 3rd Battalion, 7th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Infantry Division, and Fort Stewart, Ga. The soldiers are: Spc. Jacob M. Pfister, 27, of Buffalo, N.Y., Spc. Kevin S.K. Wessel, 20, of Newport, Ore.—Lori Wessel, mother of Spc Kevin S.K. Wessel, KIA Apr. 19, 2005.

Let me tell you why I think, no demand that Congress investigate Bush's Iraq War lies. It starts with a conversation that I remember as if it were yesterday. It was a conversation between my son and me. He had called me from Ft. Lewis, Wa.; his duty station. He was assuring me that there was no way that we were going to invade Iraq. I replied that I wasn't so sure; after all I kept hearing those war drums. He told me with all confidence that there were two reasons. First Saddam was not a threat to the U.S., that we had him contained. Second, even though Saddam was a bad guy he was OUR bad guy and if we removed him we would be creating a political vacuum in Iraq that we would not be able to control. How very confident he was. Needless to say, that when we did invade he was more than a little disillusioned. Of course his two reasons have both proved to be true. Unfortunately, his Commander and Chief had decided on this war possibly even before 9/11. In my son's name I demand that Congress investigate. I demand it in my son's name because he is unable to demand it himself. Cpl. Jonathan Castro, my only child, was killed December 21, 2004, when a suicide bomber was allowed into a military base mess tent in Mosul. I also demand the investigation in the name of all those still serving. Many of them would demand it themselves if they didn't fear military retribution—Vickie Castro, mother of Spc. Jonathan Castro, KIA Dec. 21, 2004.

As you meet today and discuss the additional evidence of the lies that were used to launch this illegal, immoral invasion and occupation of a recognized, sovereign nation, I would humbly like to put before you yet a few more numbers, reasons to stay the course and continue to reveal these crimes and bring the perpetrators to justice.

That number is 538. My nephew, PFC William Ramirez, was American soldier number 538 to die in this horrific travesty committed on the people of Iraq in the name of the Congress of the United States, our citizens and our allies. Think then of the 537 who came before and the 1100+ who have died since. Think also of the 100,000 innocent Iraqi civilians whose lives have been lost and blown to rubble by American munitions and their aftermath.

Here's another number—19. That is how many years William spent on this earth. Two

of those in the U.S. Army. He was anxious to serve and defend. He was promised a chance to learn architecture or engineering, to create and build. Instead, he was sent to destroy, kill and die. And for what? How many of you, knowing what you know about this war, would willingly allow a child, a grandchild, a nephew or niece or even your dog to be sacrificed for it? Can you wrap your minds around the suffering, pain and grief that lies behind each number in the newspaper, in your briefings, on the TV? Multiply those numbers 10 times or so and envision the lives shattered by injury, physical and mental, and the military families who must support those victims.

It is horrible and wrong for a life to be cut off violently and short. The greater horror is the senselessness of it, in knowing that William's death was in vain. There is no comfort in thinking the world is a better place because of it. His heroism was squandered by liars, cheats and profiteers. His courage was used to attack a nation that was not a threat. His youth and inexperience was stolen by conniving draft dodgers waving flags of patriotism and fear who never answered the call to serve. His life was manipulated to achieve the ends chosen by a handful of people and his death means nothing to them.

Congress was lied to, but Congress is still culpable. Our entire country will continue to pay for this. It is your job and duty now to investigate without stopping until truth and justice are rooted out. Number 538 is just one in a sea of numbers that don't look like much on a piece of paper. It really isn't that large of a number relative to so many others in the news. To our family, however it is a fatal number. It is the difference between a hope-filled future for a loving, intelligent boy and a silent headstone in a military cemetery. How many more families will receive a number like that? How many more?

William may have wanted to defend our country and its democracy, but the truth is that battle must be waged on these shores, in these very buildings. And you are the soldiers. Yes, you have position, influence, money and power at stake and you might feel that you have much to lose on the front lines of this conflict. The United States has much to lose if you do not fight. Please be inspired by our heroic and selfless troops and by the memory of our fallen. Take up their cause and restore our nation to one they would be proud of, to the one they thought they suffered and died for. You can give meaning to their deaths if only you will—Annette Pritchard, aunt of PFC William Ramirez, KIA Feb. 11, 2004.

My son, Spc. Joseph Blickenstaff, lost his life in the line of duty for our country. Yes, we were and are proud of him as a man and thrilled at his accomplishments. Today is the 18-month anniversary of his death. One day, at the age of 20, Joe came to see me and was very excited. He had enlisted in the Army. I was not happy. He convinced me it was something he really wanted to do and thought he would be good at it. I finally agreed it might be good for him.

He left for Basic Training May 1, 2001. He arrived home from Basic on September 6, 2001. The party to celebrate this achievement was September 9, 2001. You know what happened next. All the rules changed. He married his Sweetheart, Angela, shortly after Basic Training. They moved to Washington near the Base. Joe continued to prepare in the Stryker Brigade at Fort Lewis, Washington for the next 25 months. He achieved the Expert Infantryman designation, which few managed to do. He told me he wanted to be the "one" to bring down Osama Bin Laden. He was full of the righteous anger that flowed through most Americans after 9-11. He did not, however, believe we had the

right to invade Iraq. He decided he wanted to go to Iraq to protect his comrades. He was a gunner. He wanted to take good care of them. He also wanted to see what he could do to help the Iraqi people. He hated bullies and spent his life looking out for the underdogs. He literally would walk down the street and give his money and his clothes away. As parents, we thought that maybe the experience of mastering the many skills and participating in helping other people would turn out to be Joe's reward for all the hard work he put in as we watched him become a proud and capable soldier. So, we met him for dinner and kissed him goodbye in the parking lot of the restaurant on November 13, 2003. He assured us he would be home in a few months in order to be discharged on time. The last words I heard him speak were on my answering machine about 2 weeks later; "Mom, they're keeping me for the year, they're not letting me out." My heart broke for him. He had signed a contract with the United States Government that said he would serve 3 years. This was to be his last disillusionment with the Army.

In the early hours of December 9, 2003, we got that most-dreaded knock on our door. When four uniformed Army officers face you at 1:30 a.m., there is little to ask except "How did it happen?"

As everyone will acknowledge, there are no words to describe the pain of losing a child. In our case, we held each other and assured one another that he died doing what he believed was right. We proudly displayed his Casket Flag and Bronze Star. We went through the motions of living, though we felt detached from ourselves.

We did not even know who would answer all the questions we had. The ticking clock seemed like a relentless tyrant as it clicked away all the time he would be gone from us.

We had an invitation to meet President Bush at Fort Lewis. We went to that meeting. I wanted and needed for our Commander-in-Chief to look into my eyes and tell me he was sorry for this terrible loss. I was sure I would know if he was sincere. We had pictures taken with President Bush looking at the picture of me pinning on Joe's boutonniere at his wedding. The President asked me if he could keep the words to the last song Joe wrote while in Iraq. The song "Worthy", expressed Joe's deep conviction that he was loved by his Lord.

In the year since that meeting I have been very disturbed to learn how many things were wrong with our decision to declare war on Iraq. I say "our decision" because I supported it in the beginning. I tried to rationalize that mistakes happen and that "Freedom Isn't Free" and on and on. Nothing really helped us except to keep saying to each other that Joe died doing something he believed in. Joe died knowing we all loved him and that he was a precious child of his Creator. Joe died among friends who had watched him overcome so many obstacles as the unsure boy, Joe, became the capable and assured man and soldier, Joe.

But now, to learn how many ways the American people were deceived into believing our leaders had our best interest at heart, after believing we had the kind of responsible leadership that would only put our bravest young people in danger if absolutely necessary, after believing that we could trust them with our very lives—it's just a horror beyond the thinkable. Surely this misuse and loss of our precious young people constitutes murder.

My Sweet Joe, my brave and independent Joe, my kind and loving and giving Joe was taken from us through a series of lies and deception. My heart is breaking—for us, for this country, for this world. I know there are hundreds of thousands of people who have

paid the ultimate price and each one of those people leaves a family as stricken and changed as my own.

I think the only thing this Nation can do now to save any honor we might have had in the eyes of the World would be to lay bare the lies and do whatever we need in order to restore the things we took from the Iraqi people when we decided to "shock and awe" them over 2 years ago. America has not lost nearly as many people as the Iraqis over this insane approach to "helping" these people, but we have had tens of thousands of families changed, crippled, and denied their rights as we are told over and over that our loved ones offered themselves up to a higher cause.

My son would never have offered himself for the kind of abuse of power that now exists because of this evilly-conceived war. And the abuses aren't just happening in Iraq, as we read daily now. Besides all of the prisoner abuse, the American people have been abused, our society has been abused, our financial future has been abused. Every man, woman and child without food and medical care right here in America has been abused.

It took an incredible amount of "fixing" to make sure this war happened as planned.

We will never regain our own dignity until we stop this insanity and become responsible members of our Global Community. We can do it! Let's start now—Georgia Shilz, proud mother of Spc. Joseph Michael Blickenstaff, KIA, Dec. 8, 2003.

They just drove away. Your new world is black and white; it's upside down and inside out. You scream and do not recognize the pain coming from a place you never knew existed. You scream again and the sound is your soul leaving your body.

You might not have even heard the words, "I regret to inform you", because all you needed was to see who was at your door and you knew. Every nightmare you had about your loved one being killed in Iraq has just come true. Every prayer for their safety on this earth will never be answered. Every deal you made was off.

You cannot possibly know, but you are not alone. 1699 other hearts broke again as we saw the number tick one more to 1700 and then 1701 and 1702. We know your pain, we know the hellish journey that you have just begun and there is nothing to say except "I'm sorry". We have hugs to offer and maybe some advice, but as the moon rises, you will be alone, knowing that your son or daughter, your husband or wife, your nephew or niece, your best friend is never coming home.

The sun will come up in the morning and you may be grateful that you survived another night of your new life, not knowing how. You may be angry that you survived another night without your loved one and wonder why you live and they don't. If only you could trade places.

Some sleep easily, some with medication, some not at all. You want to sleep to fend off exhaustion, but know if you do the nightmares might enter the quiet place that once meant solace. The exhaustion just finds a deeper place inside you, another place unfamiliar to you.

If you cry, and some cannot or will not, you will wonder if the crying will ever stop. You don't ever want to stop crying—how will you ever, ever, ever get your arms around this new life? You will never want to cry again; it's just so excruciating. You will wonder how one body can cry so many tears and for so many hours, days and months.

There will be phone calls, cards, flowers and food. But all you want is your old life back, knowing that your loved one will be coming home alive and well.

There will be prayers and religious services. Prayers for you, prayers for your loved

one, prayers for peace, prayers for strength. Some will seek comfort in their faith, some will be interminably angry at God.

You never imagined signing a document called "Disposition of Remains" but there it is, your loved one's name, in black and white. That name doesn't belong there. It belongs on a letter with love from Iraq, it belongs on an email, but it doesn't belong there. You will see their name again in headlines, on TV, on letters of condolence and on other legal documents and it never feels right. His or her name doesn't belong there!

There will be questions, there will be details. You want to know all the details; you want to know none—at the same time. You have questions—so many questions and so do they. How could this be happening? What kind of funeral service, cremation or burial? Who will speak? When is the body coming home? Why is the body coming home? My son or daughter is supposed to be coming home—not their body!

The flags will fly at half staff, an indication that one young friend described as "someone is sad". The flag will cover the coffin, soon to be handed to you, with the words "On behalf of a grateful nation . . ." Flags will arrive in the mail having flown over the state capitol or the nation's capitol. They all mean the same thing—your loved one is never coming home and someone is very, very sad.

Maybe you never heard the phrase "Pain shared is divided". We share your pain; we live and breathe your pain every single day. While you may have never imagined you would be a part of this group, please know that you are not alone—Karen Meredith, mother of 1LT Kenneth Ballard, KIA May 30, 2004.

□ 1145

Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment immediately prior to the vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORBES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, again, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can have an opportunity to vote on the Pelosi amendment. It is our responsibility as Members of Congress to ask tough questions, to demand answers, to do the oversight, to make sure that we are getting this right. We have not been doing that. This is an opportunity for us to demand that the administration give us answers.

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

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

We have had an excellent and interesting discussion here this morning on the issue of Iraq, and we will continue to have those discussions undoubtedly as we move forward.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to again draw the attention of Members to the strength of this piece of legislation. Unfortunately, it was not discussed very much during the course of our exchange.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2863 takes many important steps forward in reforming the procurement and acquisition systems of the United States military, and

increasing its end strength, and providing \$45.3 billion in supplemental "bridge funding" for the war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, it must also be noted that this legislation would not have been possible without much hard work on the part of the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), and the members of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and the members of the full committee. As evidenced by their hard work, this is a bipartisan bill that the vast majority of the House will undoubtedly agree is a good product.

Mr. Speaker, no legislation is perfect, and, as I said in my opening statement, the defense appropriation bill takes important steps in an ongoing process that does not end; that is, the defense of our country. However frustrated some may be with particular aspects of H.R. 2863, it undoubtedly moves our military in the direction it needs to evolve and enhances the security of our country and the well-being of our men and women in uniform.

Therefore, I, once again, urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying concurrent resolution.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule for the FY06 Defense Appropriations Bill. This rule, unfortunately, does not allow consideration of the Pelosi Amendment—an amendment critical to our current and future efforts in Iraq.

We consider the situation in Iraq this week in the midst of growing public concern over the way this administration has, and continues, to execute the war. For the first time since the war in Iraq began, more than half of the public believes that our campaign there has not made the United States safer. Nearly three-quarters of Americans say the number of casualties in Iraq is unacceptable and two-thirds say the U.S. military is "bogged down." Nearly six in ten say the war is not worth fighting.

To date, the lives of nearly 1,700 men and women in uniform have been lost, and another 12,000 have been injured. Close to 200 billion in taxpayer dollars have been spent without a clear plan for success. And today, we are no closer to true success in Iraq than we were since the days of "Shock and Awe."

The Democratic Leader's amendment is simple—it asks that this administration report to Congress within 30 days with their "Strategy for Success" in Iraq. The Pelosi amendment requires the President to explain how he will ensure that there are well-trained Iraqi military, border and police forces that can ensure the security of Iraq and that there is political stability in the country.

This amendment isn't about setting a hard date for withdrawal, or leaving Iraq before we finish what we started. This amendment, rather, simply ensures that Congress—and the American people—know what milestones and criteria by which our Nation will judge success in Iraq. Without such a guide, we will continue to be left with an open-ended military commitment with no end in sight.

Our men and women in uniform deserve nothing less than clear milestones that lead us to the day when we can bring them home. To get to that day, we need to know how we are

going to assess the capabilities and readiness of Iraqi security forces and when we can expect them to take over vital security missions in their country. We need to know the number of U.S. and coalition advisors needed to support Iraqi security forces. And, finally, we need to know the benchmarks by which we will measure the political stability of Iraq.

The fog of war is thick in Iraq, and this administration has only added to it by sticking to their vague notions of success and stability. But the President can cut through the fog by providing clear and demonstrable criteria by which we can judge our progress and, hopefully, success in Iraq.

Since the start of this war, I and many of my colleagues have implored the President to level with the American people and our troops over the true cost and end strategy for the war. It is time for the administration and Congress to be honest with us about a path forward in Iraq—a path towards a success that brings our men and women home and restores our credibility at home and abroad.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule, and allow consideration of a critical amendment that will give our Nation a clear path forward in Iraq.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION ON H. RES. 315—RULE FOR H.R. 2863 FY06 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

“SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 3 shall be in order without intervention of any point of order and before any other amendment if offered by Representative PELOSI of California or a designee. The amendment is not subject to amendment except for pro forma amendments or to a demand for a division of the question in the committee of the whole or in the House.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. ____, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI OF CALIFORNIA
(Defense Appropriations, 2006)

At the end of title VIII (page ____, after line ____), insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. (a) Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives and the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate a report on a strategy for success in Iraq that identifies criteria to be used by the Government of the United States to determine when it is appropriate to begin the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Iraq.

(b) The report shall include a detailed description of each of the following:

(1) The criteria for assessing the capabilities and readiness of Iraqi security forces, goals for achieving appropriate capability and readiness levels for such forces, as well as for recruiting, training, and equipping such forces, and the milestones and timetable for achieving such goals.

(2) The estimated total number of Iraqi personnel trained at the levels identified in paragraph (1) that are needed for Iraqi security forces to perform duties currently being undertaken by United States and coalition forces, including defending Iraq's borders and providing adequate levels of law and order throughout Iraq.

(3) The number of United States and coalition advisors needed to support Iraqi security forces and associated ministries.

(4) The measures of political stability for Iraq, including the important political milestones to be achieved over the next several years.

(c) The report shall be transmitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2862, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 314 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2862.

□ 1149

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 15, 2005, the amendment by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 108, line 7.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. PAUL:
Page 108, after line 7, insert the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay any United States contribution to the United Nations or any affiliated agency of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 14, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have is very simple, and it tells us exactly what it does, so I am just going to read it. It says, “None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay any United States contribution to the United Nations or any affiliated agency of the United Nations.”

So, very simply, a vote for my amendment would be a vote to defund the United Nations, and it would be a policy statement, obviously. We have had some debate already on the United Nations, and we will be having another debate either later today or tomorrow dealing with reform of the United Nations. Yesterday we had a vote dealing with removing half of the funding from the United Nations. This would be in the same direction, but it would remove all of the funding.

The United Nations has been under serious attack, and most Americans know there is a big problem with the United Nations. There is corruption involved with the oil-for-food scandal, as well as the abuse of human rights. There are a lot of people who believe that we can reform the United Nations and make it much more responsive to our principles. I do not happen to share that belief.

I have been a longtime opponent of the United Nations not so much because of the goals they seek, but because of their failure to reach these goals, as well as the attack on our national sovereignty. For me, it is a sovereignty issue, and that is the reason that I believe that it does not serve our interests to be in the United Nations, and we should make a statement for the many Americans who share that particular view.

But I would like to take a little bit of this time right now to relate my position on the United Nations with the bill that is coming up later today or tomorrow, and that is the reform bill. The reform bill is very controversial. We already have former Republican and Democrat ambassadors, Secretaries of State who are in opposition to this, and our own President has expressed opposition to this. It is not for the same reasons that I am opposed to that reform bill, but they are opposed to it because there is a threat of cutting some funding.