

“(G) \$4,222,125 for the period of October 1, 2004, through July 21, 2005.”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “\$1,360,000” and inserting “\$1,407,375”; and

(B) by striking “July 19, 2005” and inserting “July 21, 2005”.

(m) URBANIZED AREA FORMULA GRANTS.—Section 5307(b)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading by striking “July 19, 2005” and inserting “JULY 21, 2005”; and

(2) in subparagraph (A) by striking “July 19, 2005” and inserting “July 21, 2005”.

(n) OBLIGATION CEILING.—Section 3040(7) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 394; 118 Stat. 1158; 119 Stat. 333; 119 Stat. 346) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$6,166,400,000” and inserting “\$6,229,759,760”; and

(2) by striking “July 19, 2005” and inserting “July 21, 2005”.

(o) FUEL CELL BUS AND BUS FACILITIES PROGRAM.—Section 3015(b) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 361; 118 Stat. 1158; 119 Stat. 333; 119 Stat. 346) is amended—

(1) by striking “July 19, 2005” and inserting “July 21, 2005”; and

(2) by striking “\$3,880,000” and inserting “\$3,928,500”.

(p) ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PILOT PROJECT.—Section 3015(c)(2) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (49 U.S.C. 322 note; 112 Stat. 361; 118 Stat. 1158; 119 Stat. 334; 119 Stat. 346) is amended—

(1) by striking “July 19, 2005,” and inserting “July 21, 2005”; and

(2) by striking “\$4,000,000” and inserting “\$4,050,000”.

(q) PROJECTS FOR NEW FIXED GUIDEWAY SYSTEMS AND EXTENSIONS TO EXISTING SYSTEMS.—Subsections (a), (b), and (c)(1) of section 3030 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 373; 118 Stat. 1158; 119 Stat. 334; 119 Stat. 346) are amended by striking “July 19, 2005” and inserting “July 21, 2005”.

(r) NEW JERSEY URBAN CORE PROJECT.—Subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 3031(a)(3) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (105 Stat. 2122; 118 Stat. 1158; 119 Stat. 334; 119 Stat. 346) are amended by striking “July 19, 2005” and inserting “July 21, 2005”.

(s) LOCAL SHARE.—Section 3011(a) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (49 U.S.C. 5307 note; 118 Stat. 1158; 119 Stat. 334; 119 Stat. 346) is amended by striking “July 19, 2005” and inserting “July 21, 2005”.

#### SEC. 8. SPORT FISHING AND BOATING SAFETY.

(a) FUNDING FOR NATIONAL OUTREACH AND COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM.—Section 4(c)(7) of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(7) \$8,099,997 for the period of October 1, 2004, through July 21, 2005.”.

(b) CLEAN VESSEL ACT FUNDING.—Section 4(b)(4) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 777c(b)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

“(4) FIRST 42 WEEKS OF FISCAL YEAR 2005.—For the period of October 1, 2004, through July 21, 2005, of the balance of each annual appropriation remaining after making the distribution under subsection (a), an amount equal to \$66,420,000, reduced by 82.9 percent of the amount appropriated for that fiscal year from the Boat Safety Account of the Aquatic Resources Trust Fund established by section 9504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to carry out the purposes of section 13106(a) of title 46, United States Code, shall be used as follows:

“(A) \$8,100,000 shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior for 3 fiscal years for

obligation for qualified projects under section 5604(c) of the Clean Vessel Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 1322 note).

“(B) \$6,480,000 shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior for 3 fiscal years for obligation for qualified projects under section 7404(d) of the Sportfishing and Boating Safety Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 777g-1(d)).

“(C) The balance remaining after the application of subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be transferred to the Secretary of Transportation and shall be expended for State recreational boating safety programs under section 13106 of title 46, United States Code.”.

(c) BOAT SAFETY FUNDS.—Section 13106(c) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “\$4,000,000” and inserting “\$4,050,000”; and

(2) by striking “\$1,600,000” and inserting “\$1,620,003”.

#### SEC. 9. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF TRUST FUNDS FOR OBLIGATIONS UNDER TEA-21.

(a) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 9503(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) in the matter before subparagraph (A), by striking “July 20, 2005” and inserting “July 22, 2005”;

(B) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (L),

(C) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (M) and inserting “, or”,

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (M) the following new subparagraph:

“(N) authorized to be paid out of the Highway Trust Fund under the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part III.”, and

(E) in the matter after subparagraph (N), as added by this paragraph, by striking “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part II” and inserting “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part III”.

(2) MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT.—Paragraph (3) of section 9503(e) of such Code is amended—

(A) in the matter before subparagraph (A), by striking “July 20, 2005” and inserting “July 22, 2005”;

(B) in subparagraph (J), by striking “or” at the end of such subparagraph,

(C) in subparagraph (K), by inserting “or” at the end of such subparagraph,

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (K) the following new subparagraph:

“(L) the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part III.”, and

(E) in the matter after subparagraph (L), as added by this paragraph, by striking “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part II” and inserting “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part III”.

(3) EXCEPTION TO LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS.—Subparagraph (B) of section 9503(b)(6) of such Code is amended by striking “July 20, 2005” and inserting “July 22, 2005”.

(b) AQUATIC RESOURCES TRUST FUND.—

(1) SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACCOUNT.—Paragraph (2) of section 9504(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part II” each place it appears and inserting “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part III”.

(2) BOAT SAFETY ACCOUNT.—Subsection (c) of section 9504 of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “July 20, 2005” and inserting “July 22, 2005”; and

(B) by striking “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part II” and inserting “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part III”.

(3) EXCEPTION TO LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS.—Paragraph (2) of section 9504(d) of such Code is amended by striking “July 20, 2005” and inserting “July 22, 2005”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) TEMPORARY RULE REGARDING ADJUSTMENTS.—During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2003 and ending on July 21, 2005, for purposes of making any estimate under section 9503(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 of receipts of the Highway Trust Fund, the Secretary of the Treasury shall treat—

(1) each expiring provision of paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 9503(b) of such Code which is related to appropriations or transfers to such Fund to have been extended through the end of the 24-month period referred to in section 9503(d)(1)(B) of such Code, and

(2) with respect to each tax imposed under the sections referred to in section 9503(b)(1) of such Code, the rate of such tax during the 24-month period referred to in section 9503(d)(1)(B) of such Code to be the same as the rate of such tax as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2003.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am joined here this evening by two of my colleagues, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLIE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN). In the past, since the commencement of military action in Iraq, four of us came together and created what we called the Iraq Watch, which was an effort to assess the situation in the Middle East with a particular focus on Iraq and Afghanistan, and the global implications for our national security and for the role of the United States in the world.

For some 19 months, we would convene here on the floor and have a dialogue among us. Some of our colleagues are not here this evening, but our regulars include the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), the same State that is represented by Mr. RYAN, who is a welcome new addition to the Iraq Watch. So we welcome the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

I would like to begin by just examining the current security situation in Iraq and reporting to my colleagues and to the American people.

Through July 17, 1,764 U.S. soldiers have died, and 13,483 have been wounded in Iraq since the invasion. Now, I know many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have visited our wounded military personnel in the naval hospital in Bethesda and at Walter Reed. It is, to say the least, a moving, poignant, and profoundly disturbing experience; and I know we share, all of us share the absolute best

wishes for them as they move forward in their lives. We know that they have many hurdles and many obstacles ahead of them, but that same courage and that same heroism that they displayed in the war we know will be with them as they proceed through life.

But it is our obligation here in this Congress, in this House to make sure that they have every single benefit that they deserve and that all of our programs are fully funded. I know the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) serves on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and has been a leader in that regard, and I congratulate him.

Since June 2003, 2,642 Iraqi soldiers and police have died. Estimates of Iraqi civilian deaths since the beginning of the invasion range up to 60,800. The New York Times recently cited Iraqi government figures reporting that an average of 500 Iraqis are killed each month by so-called insurgents. Over a 10-month period ending in May, that rate had escalated to some 800 a month.

So those are the statistics. Those are the cold, hard statistics.

Now, I know that my colleague, the gentleman from the State of Washington (Mr. INSLEE), has an obligation in about 20 minutes, so I am going to call on him and ask him for his observations to begin our conversation.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. An issue I would like to address tonight is perhaps one of the most important ones. Of course, we all share the gentleman's admiration for our troops. I heard of a young man from Ohio who will be going back in a month or so for his fourth tour of duty in Iraq, so not only our admiration for our personnel there, but their whole families who are contributing to this effort, and it has been very, very difficult for them as well.

But I want to talk about how we can eventually be in a position to be able to bring our sons and daughters home, and that involves fulfilling an activity that might seem obvious to anyone who has thought about this, but, unfortunately, has not been fulfilled by the administration, and that is that we need to replace American troops with Iraqis.

□ 2000

We need to get our sons and daughters home and their responsibility for the security of Iraq needs to be assumed by Iraqis who will stand up and toe the line for their countries. And until that happens, we are going to continue to see the enormous losses that are being suffered by the Iraqis and our sons and daughters now.

And the reason I want to address this, and perhaps it seems obvious when I say that, but I wanted to share tonight the abject failure of the administration to do the very obvious things that need to be done to train the Iraqi security forces. It is obvious in this country that we need larger number of

troops in the security forces now and in the future to allow the withdrawal of American troops. But we have found after doing an examination of what the civilian planners, and this is not a criticism of the military personnel because frankly it is the civilian personnel, from the Secretary of Defense up through the President, who have dropped the ball unfortunately, and what is required to train these Iraqi troops.

Four months ago an assessment showed that we had less than 40 percent of the training personnel that was anticipated to be in Iraq 6 months after the collapse of the Iraqi Army, less than half of the training personnel were there several months ago. And the result has been a spectacular failure to train and equip and stand up an Iraqi Army.

I remember the first time I ever heard the term stand up. It was from Secretary Rumsfeld. And he said we are going to stand up the Iraqi Army. This is before the war started. This army cannot get on its knees in Iraq right now.

Now, we have been told by the administration that there are 170,000 troops in Iraq. Well, there are 170,000 names on paper, and maybe there are 170,000 boots, but at most, at most, being generous, there are three battalions that can actually go out there and provide security in Iraq, less than 20,000 people. This army is a paper machet force and we, the administration, has not provided the infrastructures needed to train it.

Now why have they not done that? Why would they think immediately after the collapse of the Iraq Army, of course it did not help that the administration made what appears to be a major tactical blunder, which was to disband the Iraqi Army in the first place, without any security in Iraq to replace it, which led to this horrendous looting, if you will recall, looting that everyone predicted except the civilian leadership of the military here, knowing the history of Iraq, the violence in the ethnic groups. The fact that no security was supplied after the collapse of the Iraqi Army has put us behind the 8 ball.

In any event. At that point you would think the administration would push the alarm button to say we are going to speed forward as far as we possibly can to train and equip the Iraqi Army. Boy, were we wrong. In fact, it is this bad. In this chamber, when the defense bill came to the floor here the week before last for the appropriations bill, the majority party had put in a limitation on what could be spent to train the Iraqi military force. Now, it seems to me that ought to be the place we should not be scrimping money. We should not be trying to artificially limit. That is the place we should put the pedal to the metal and train these forces to replace our sons and daughters as soon as humanly possible. Now fortunately we passed an amendment

that lifted that cap. I brought an amendment. I appreciate the Chair accepted it, and we actually got rid of that limitation. But this has been one of a long train of failures that follows from a fundamental misapprehension of the situation. And all of these mistakes that we have talked about flow from one basic misunderstanding by this administration, and that was the assumption that they made, that they could put on rose colored glasses and Baghdad would look like Paris in 1944 and the Shias and the Sunnis would break bread together and sing Kumbaya and democracy would flower without standing up an Iraqi Army, without having security, without having armored HUMVEES, without having flak jackets for our troops, without having a provision for the National Guard, which is now so extended that the governors now, you know, the governors had a meeting just this week saying how are we going to fight our fires this summer when the National Guard is not here. This has been a continuation of the rose colored glasses syndrome that has now resulted in a continued failure to stand up an Iraqi Army.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. INSLEE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I just want to kind of expound on that point a little bit. It is not like there were not people in the country saying we know you are going to go to Baghdad. We know you are going to win the war. We know you are going to defeat the enemy. A lot of us were saying then what? Then what are you going to do? And there was never any hard answer on what this administration was going to do. So, you know it is not like they went in blind. You are preparing for a war. Sit down and figure out all the options. What if they do not hand us flowers and Hershey bars? You know, then what do we do? And if that does not work and something else, then what do we do. You should have four or five plans. This is just a lack of preparation, and it was that rush to war that I think caused all the problems that I think you already stated.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I think it is interesting to go back a bit and to remember that the Department of State had worked for months on a plan, a plan that was fleshed out by bringing in experts from outside, by bringing in those with different perspectives. And yet, because there was some suspicion on the part of the Pentagon that State was not enthusiastically in support of the military invasion of Iraq, that that had to be put aside. And now we find ourselves, obviously, in a real mess.

Mr. INSLEE. I just want to say that, you know, that is history. It is important to review. But the present and the future are disconcerting now too. For instance, we now know that we have this paper machet force in Iraq, and that is all it is, to provide security.

And until it becomes real, it is going to be difficult to get our troops home.

But even today, this administration, because they are so wedded to this go it alone policy, has rejected offers from adjoining nations in the region to train these Iraqi troops. Egypt, we are told, has made a specific proposal to train Iraqi troops to expedite that process so we can replace our people and get our people home and replace them with Iraqis. And this administration, because of their go it alone attitude has rejected that offer of other people in the region to train these forces.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I would like to make an interesting observation, because during the debate tomorrow and during the debate today, and during the course of our committee hearings, we constantly hear of a profound concern by this administration and this government about Iran. If you remember, Iran was described as a charter member, if you will, of the Axis of Evil club. And there are legitimate concerns about the development of nuclear weapons by Iran.

And here we are in Iraq, we have already appropriated in excess of \$330 billion. That is \$330 billion. Estimates range that by the time we have discharged our obligation, which is difficult to quantify, we will be looking at \$1 trillion from American taxpayers.

However, while we are expressing this concern about Iran, a story appears in the Washington Post dated Tuesday, July 12, and the headline reads as follows: Iraqi official says Iran will not train troops. But there appears to be some confusion because the Iraq defense minister reached an agreement, a military agreement with Iran the previous week. And he claims it does not include any provision for the Iranian armed forces to help train Iraqi troops. But this was contradicted by his Iranian counterpart.

So here we are, America. We now have a military agreement between Iraq, where we have expended billions, hundreds of billions of dollars, and the blood of more than 1,700 Americans killed in action, and yet what do we have? We have a military agreement between Iraq and the Republic of Iran. And tomorrow, I can assure you, as we debate the reauthorization legislation in terms of the Department of State, there will be much said about Iran. There will be a pounding of fists and there will be considerable consternation about Iran.

And yet, here we are, it is publicly disclosed, the Iranians and the Iraqis have reached an accord in a military agreement. So maybe that will take care of the training of Iraqi troops so that Americans can learn. The Iranians can attract them.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Will the gentleman yield on the question of the cost associated with the points you made?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Of course I yield to my friend from Hawaii and one of the original members of Iraq Watch.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. The publication Inside Defense of July 6 reports, with regard to your estimations as to the cost, this was just prior to the advent of the meeting between the Iraqis and the Iranians. A group of advisors, I am now quoting from this July 6 article in Inside Defense. A group of advisors to Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld is preparing a report warning that the huge costs associated with prolonged bloody operations in Iraq and Afghanistan may become part of a U.S. adversary's strategy. U.S. led operations in these two countries, quote, have tapped out the ground services active and reserve components, unquote, stated June 29, briefing slides prepared for the working group of the Defense Science Board. The Defense Science Board, as my colleagues know, is the group designated to report to the Secretary of Defense on these issues. Quote, we therefore find ourselves without resources for any other campaign at this scale, a prospect not long lost on our adversaries, unquote.

The panel was part of the larger Defense Science Board which is doing a study for the Defense Department on transformation. Further quotation, the requirements U.S. forces face in the global war on terrorism to not only prevail in the traditional combat phase of the military operation and restore stability afterwards, but also to establishing a functioning free economy and robust democracy are significant and expensive. Quote, these new goals, that is to say, establishing the economy and the democracy, these new goals dwarf the complexity cost and scope of achieving victory on the battlefield, unquote.

Now, last summer the incremental additional estimated cost for stabilization and reconstruction in Iraq was estimated at \$72 billion according to the Defense Science Board Panel. That was the previous estimation.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And what is it now?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Now these costs are likely to be at least \$500 billion and perhaps close to \$1 trillion, unquote. Total military spending on operations in Afghanistan and Iraq from 2001 through this September 2005 is \$252 billion according to Steve Kosiak with the Center For Strategic and Budgetary Assessments. Spending on non military aid in these missions at the same time period is \$27 billion in addition to the \$252 billion.

The Congressional Budget Office in January estimated that between the fiscal year 2006 and 2015, the costs of supporting these operations could total \$393 billion.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Those numbers are mind boggling. And before I yield to my friend from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), I have a question. And I need someone to at least assist me in trying to understand how Iran, again, and a charter member of the axis of evil, is now a military ally of Iraq. And we are promoting democracy in Iraq.

□ 2015

It also should be noted again, according to this Washington Post story, that while the Minister of Defense in the interim government claims that, no, the Iranians are not going to train troops, but he did acknowledge that Iran has pledged \$1 billion in reconstruction aid to the Iraqi government, some of which would be to the defense ministry. Is this Allie in Wonderland? Is up down and down is up? The Iranians and the Iraqis are engaged in a military accord?

This is the kind of information that we tried to bring out during the course of our conversations once a week. We have just begun them again after a hiatus of some 6 months. But that to me is inexplicable because that will give Iran, Iran, that many on the floor tomorrow will say is a potential enemy and something has got to be done. What is happening?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I am stumped as well. I have no good answer for the gentleman. What I would like to do is the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) was throwing out some pretty large numbers to the tune of \$1 trillion, if not more. In Ohio alone only \$240 million is being spent on homeland security and \$700 million on No Child Left Behind which is underfunded by \$1.5 billion. We are talking trillions. And I think it speaks to the fact that we are not meeting the needs here at home while we are spending a tremendous amount of money abroad.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I never said, of course, that we are going to get any value received for this money. We are going to spend the money, but as the gentleman well knows and I think the record shows that what we are getting for the money is corruption, thievery, failure to significantly alter the infrastructure of Iraq in any significant way.

It does not surprise me in the least that there would be an accord or an attempt at an accord being undertaken between Iraq and Iran. After all, they live in the same neighborhood. We do not. What we are engaged in right now is another one of these false premises that somehow a military in an inherently insurgent situation is going to be able to provide political answers through military activity and subsequently having the military take on the task of helping to provide a civil infrastructure. It cannot be done. It will not be done.

The only victims of that will be the Guard and Reserve and active duty military forces of the United States so that the numbers of wounded, grievously wounded and dead will continue to rise.

Mr. DELAHUNT. The burden is being carried almost exclusively by the American military and the American taxpayer. And we have been joined by 2 colleagues, our friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), and, again, one of the original members of the Iraq Watch, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

I yield, since he is one of the originals I have to yield first of course, to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) and welcome him.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. It is good to be with my colleagues as we talk about this important issue.

I would like to share with my colleagues an experience I had over the weekend involving a real person, a real American. Representative John Bocerri, a young State representative from my State of Ohio, serves in the State legislature. He is also in the Air Reserves, and he has previously been to 3 deployments in Iraq. He flies these big C-130 transport planes.

John has a wonderful wife and 2 young daughters, and just about 4 days ago his third child was born. A little guy named Matthew Bocerri. They brought him home the day before yesterday, and I was there as this wonderful family gathered around this newborn, sisters holding him for the first time.

John Bocerri is leaving Thursday of this week for his fourth deployment to the war zone. A young father with a child recently home from the hospital for the fourth time is being sent by this country to the war zone to fly transport in and out of Iraq from Qatar.

When you talk with someone like John Bocerri, when you see his little daughters and his newborn child and you talk to his wife you understand what this war is doing to Americans, to families, to community. The President has some explaining to do to all of us.

I have here an e-mail from a Marine Corps Civil Affairs officer who is currently in Ramadi, Iraq. This Marine has received his master's degree in international policy from Stanford University. He is a bright guy obviously. And I would just like to read briefly from his e-mail and then I will be happy to hear from the rest of my colleagues.

This young Marine writes, "As an Iraq War veteran, I disagree with how President Bush has assessed the war and how we should be conducting it. The President has mischaracterized the debate as a simplistic black and white challenge. Is the sacrifice worth it? That is the question. But this mischaracterization clouds the debate and avoids 2 essential questions: What are the real conditions on the ground and what must be done to win this war?"

He continues, "Unfortunately," he says, "the President obscures the truth of the current conditions in Iraq. My personal experiences in Iraq confirm statements made by numerous officers there, including General John Abizaid, Commander of the U.S. Central Command, that the insurgency shows no signs of weakening and its numbers continue to grow. The Bush administration must first recognize this serious problem in order to rectify it."

"Denial," says this young Marine, "is not the path to success. As a Marine

Corps Civil Affairs officer serving for 7 months in Ramadi, a hotbed of the Iraqi insurgency, my job was to cultivate economic, governmental and civil society development. This work was part of a strategy to inculcate Iraqis with the desire and capacity to defeat the insurgents themselves, allowing America's withdrawal."

Then he concludes his e-mail with this sentence. "The gap between President Bush's rhetoric and the reality that I saw on the ground is enormous." It is time for some truth telling from this President and this administration. The American people can deal with the truth. But I say to my friend from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), the American people are sick and tired of exaggerations, of distortions, of mischaracterizations, of twisted and distorted intelligence.

The American people and young Americans like John Bocerri that I just talked about earlier deserve to hear the truth from this President.

I thank the gentleman for allowing me to join him for these moments. It is good to be back with my fellow colleagues as we talk about these important issues.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). The Chair will remind Members to refrain from personally offensive references toward the President.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, as a parliamentary inquiry, does that mean that I cannot make characterizations about actions that are taken by this administration?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. References to the President suggesting he obscured the truth are out of order.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. STRICKLAND. May I say that the President mischaracterized the intelligence?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mischaracterizations, without an intent to deceive, are not necessarily out of order.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I thank the Speaker.

I would clarify my statement by saying that I believe the President has mischaracterized the intelligence and that, in fact, has led us into a war that in my judgment has not been justified.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) for yielding to me and I especially thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) for his very poignant remarks.

It is clear that the administration has had a very difficult time in leveling with the American public, and it is also very clear that it has been the Iraq Watch that has been able on a regular basis, and I am so proud to see that you once again have taken to the floor to inform the American public the way you have with regard to what

is happening to our troops in the field and what is taking place here on the floor of the Congress.

More often than not in traveling home to my district and conducting forums, people will routinely say, why are people not speaking out in the United States Congress? And several have commented that it seems like the only voice they have heard has been the Iraq Watch.

So I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), and of course the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) who was here earlier.

It is rather interesting in listening to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) speak that Bush the elder warned us very succinctly about what would happen if we chose this policy of unilateralism and preemption. He said essentially that if we were to invade Iraq that we would end up being not liberators but occupiers, and we would immediately lose our allied support around the globe and turn Arab nations against us.

As Ambassador Jordan said to us on a trip over to Saudi Arabia, in essence, we would accomplish what Osama bin Laden failed to do. There would be a united Islamic jihad against the United States. And so what we have witnessed in the very cavalier statement of saying that "we are fighting them over there so we do not have to fight them here," oversimplifies the problem that we have created for ourselves. In fact, it has intensified the insurrection that has taken place within Iraq.

I believe and I am grateful to the Iraq Watch for you constantly bringing forth these issues that the United States has to be both safe, secure and strategic with regard to our troops that are in the field. It is in everyone's best interest to make sure that they have a safe and secure and strategic return home.

I especially applaud the efforts of the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations with respect to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) in making sure that they have categorized a strategy for success, a strategy that embraces a common-sense approach in a region where we desperately need leadership that starts with the President's ability to level with the American people. And most importantly as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) points out, the need for us to level with our National Guard and Reservists in terms of their deployment, in terms of their commitment to this great Nation of ours and to the American public, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) so eloquently puts forward about the enormous cost that we are incurring that is unpaid for and is only debt that we are heaping on the backs of our children.

□ 2030

Also, with respect to tough love with our allies in the region, let us be honest about this. In the Gulf War, the United States expended \$10 billion. As the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) said earlier, we are already over \$330 billion and growing. Ten billion dollars because we had the support of the entire world with us. Because Bush, the elder, made sure that we had that kind of support instead of going off with this new policy of unilateralism and preemption that has turned the rest of the globe against us.

Many of us stood in this Chamber and voted because we felt strongly about our commitment to fight terrorism in Afghanistan, and the whole world joined us only to find we were abandoned in Iraq because of policies that made little sense and that now, as we learn almost daily about the concocted reasons by which we went into war with Iraq. Yet, if the gentleman will allow me, we find we also desperately need policies in this region that hold the Arab League, Pakistan, India, China, and Russia accountable for making sure that we bring stability to this region.

We also need an energy policy here at home, that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) has so eloquently spoken about, that embraces alternative fuels, fuel cell technology, and gets us off of this ensnared position that we find ourselves in, this awful entanglement and dependency on foreign oil, when we know we could extricate ourselves from it if we just embraced the very technology that we can develop here in our own country, here in both my State of Connecticut and across this country, that will embrace the hydrogen economy and the bounty of fuel cell technology that exists out there.

We must also embrace religions around the globe. There should be a call on the President's part, and also on the part of religious leaders, to talk about the perversion of terrorism and turning these young men into terrorists by perverting the great teachings of the book. It is so important that we embrace these things conceptually and comprehensively in a manner that will draw the world together in an understanding about what we have to accomplish in that region.

General Zinni said it very clearly. We need more troops in this area, but not American troops. We need to take the American face off the occupation here and get the Arab League, get the United Nations, NATO, Russia, China, India and all involved in bringing stability to this region. It is a world responsibility. Our men and women in the services have done their job and done it extraordinarily well. This country simply cannot continue to afford both the human capital and the enormous capital that we are expending, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) points out, over \$330 billion.

I yield to the gentleman and I apologize for going on.

Mr. DELAHUNT. No, the gentleman's remarks are excellent, and, Mr. Speaker, they are on point. The tragic reality is that this is an American war, with some help from the British. This is becoming every day almost an exclusive American venture, both militarily and in terms of the reconstruction phase.

A recent report indicated that Italy is prepared to withdraw its 3,000 troops come this fall. This fall is 2 months away. The coalition of the willing is "getting out of Dodge." That is the tragic reality here. Because they are hearing from the people in their societies who are saying we do not want to participate.

We find ourselves in a real conundrum. And my colleague was absolutely right, in the aftermath of 9/11 every single one of us stood here and voted in favor of going after al-Qaeda, in Afghanistan, along with the Taliban, and we prevailed. But then, then we became distracted and we took resources from Afghanistan. What is happening in Afghanistan? It has become a narco state. President Karzai has a terrible situation on his hands.

And I know we all remember here that the day after 9/11 the entire world was with us. The French, their leading newspaper *Le Monde*, summed it up when it said "Today We Are All Americans." We had that good will. And now? And now what do we see because of these policies? Well, I will tell you what we see. According to the independent nonpartisan Government Accountability Office, and the American people should know that that is an arm of the U.S. Congress, this is what they had to say just this past April:

"Recent polling data show that anti-Americanism is spreading and deepening around the world. Such anti-American sentiments can increase foreign public support for terrorism directed against Americans. It impacts the cost and effectiveness of military operations, thereby escalating the cost of supporting our troops in the multiple venues that they presently patrol, and it weakens the United States' ability to align with other nations in pursuit of common policy objectives and dampen foreign publics' enthusiasm for U.S. business services and products."

This has huge implications for the American people. It is absolutely stunning to see some of this polling that has currently become available. When posed this question, "Please tell me if you think each of the following are having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world," and they single out the United States, in Great Britain, our most staunch ally, 44 percent say it is mainly positive, with fifty percent saying it is mostly negative. That is Great Britain.

In Australia, 40 percent say it is mostly positive and 52 percent say American influence in the world today is mostly negative. Our neighbors to

the north, in Canada, 34 percent say American influence in terms of the international order is mostly positive, 34 percent, and 60 percent say it is mostly negative. Germany, 27 percent positive, 64 percent negative. Japan, 24 percent positive, 31 percent negative. Mexico, our neighbors to the south, 11 percent mostly positive in terms of American influence in the international community, and 57 percent mostly negative.

I could go on and on and on.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say as well that I mentioned I conduct forums all the time, and I am most proud to say that at a forum recently in West Hartford, where over 400 people attended, that one of the questions that came forward from one of my constituents was in praise of one of our colleagues, one of our Members, and that is the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), who I truly believe, as important and as critical as I think the Iraq Watch has been, if there is a profiles in courage award that should be given, it should be for this humble man of conscience.

When residents of the State of Connecticut recognize Members of Congress, like yourself who have come here, but especially in the case of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), who has gone against the grain and is merely speaking from his heart and from his conscience and speaking directly to the American people about his feelings, about his discussions that he has had with his constituents about this war that we are involved in, a war that he voted for but has come to the principled conclusion, and in a safe, secure and strategic manner, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) has outlined on the Committee on Armed Services, and as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has called for in terms of very severe and tough guidelines and deadlines that the President and this administration must meet, all with an eye in mind of a strategy for success, yet my constituents say this all the time, where was Congress during all of this?

Shakespeare said, "Would Caesar be a wolf if the Senate was not a sheep?" And that is so true, but not for the Iraq watch, speaking out consistently. And not for people like the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), who was able to come down to this floor and talk from his heart and from his head about what he truly feels and believes.

That is what makes us the great Nation that we are, and that is what I think gives the American public hope; that people like yourself, who have been at this for some time and who continue to come down here and speak in the words not only of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) but of the reservist who is going back to Iraq for the fourth time.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield on that point, my intention is not to take up time

necessarily on Iraq Watch on the question of H.J. Res. 55, the joint resolution number 55, but that is the tangible substance of the commitment of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and others at this point, including myself, to try to put legislation forward that will respond precisely to the commentary that the gentleman from Connecticut found in his West Hartford meeting.

The resolution asks the President to develop and implement a plan for the withdrawal of the United States Armed Forces from Iraq. It makes a reference, the short version of it, joint resolution 55, as Homeward Bound. The principal point here, rather than going over it point by point, the principal point in the context established tonight, and I am referring to one of two findings here, is that the United States has in place a timetable for training, equipping and employing Iraqi security forces to take over the counterinsurgency mission from coalition forces. That is a statement of fact.

Speaking as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I can say to you in all candor and openness that we do have timetables. We do have timetables. We do have benchmarks. We do have indications and timelines for those indications of what constitutes success, what constitutes a capacity for the counterinsurgency mission to be taken from coalition forces by Iraqi forces of all kinds; from border police to interior ministry, to defense personnel police and armed forces.

In order to explicate that clearly to the American people, this House passed, in overwhelming numbers, an emergency supplemental appropriations for defense, the emergency supplemental appropriations act for defense on the global war on terror and tsunami relief. Public Law 109-13. In that, a joint explanatory statement accompanied the conference report, which required the Secretary of Defense to report not later than July 10.

As we speak, it is now approximately 8:45 p.m. on the East Coast on July 19, some 9 days past the deadline established by the Congress of the United States, passed by Democrats and Republicans in overwhelming numbers. Not with this Member's vote, to be sure. But nonetheless, my position as enunciated then in opposition to it, to the bill, because I felt we were not carrying forward on what we said we were doing, nonetheless the overwhelming majority gave the Secretary of Defense the opportunity to report to us no later than July 10 and every 90 days thereafter on measures for security, political, and economic progress in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from the Secretary of Defense yesterday indicating they were working hard on this report. I have no doubt. But we are already 9 days late. We are already 9 days of more killings, more murders, more terrorism, more grievous wounding, more terrorism worldwide, and yet we do not have this report from the Secretary of Defense.

□ 2045

My plea is that other Members and the audience that may be listening to us tonight take a look at House Joint Resolution 55 that has been developed on a bipartisan basis with one of the leading advocates being the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and other Members of the Republican Party and Democratic Party as well. This is not an ideological construct, this is not a resolution made to embarrass the President. On the contrary, House Joint Resolution 55 in some respects has been characterized by some as saying what are you doing helping President Bush? We should be in opposition to President Bush, but I feel the politics will take care of itself in time to come. There is no question about that. We can make that point later. This resolution is about backing up our troops now on the mission they have accomplished, and to get the political side, the economic side, the civilian side of this moving forward the way we say it should be.

So we set in this resolution the opportunity for the President to enunciate a plan commensurate with the time tables he has set for the establishment of a government in December, and to move forward with the troops that the Secretary of Defense himself has said are being trained so we can begin to withdraw, bring homeward bound our troops.

So when people inquire of you what is it Congress is doing, we can look at H.J. Res. 55. It is not perfect. It is a legislative project. The only perfect set of rules, the only perfect legislation was the Ten Commandments, and I understand Moses took 40 days to do them. And as he came down the mountain he said, Well, I got them down to 10. That is what the legislative process is. You talk things over.

So House Joint Resolution 55 is not a perfect vehicle, but it is a legislative vehicle to join with the President and make an offer to the President to join with us in the Congress in setting a timetable and plan for the withdrawal of these troops commensurate with the mission as enunciated by everyone.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And hopefully that will also staunch that rising virulent, anti-Americanism that does such harm to our national security, that breeds terrorists and directs their anger toward the United States.

We saw what happened in London. Again, we hear from those in the Islamic world that by virtue of what we are doing in our policy, why we speak of democracy and our rhetoric is comprised of the most noble of word, we are not seen that way because our actions belie them.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, we do no service to the support of our troops by continuing to have them engage in military activity which undercuts that which they have accomplished to this point.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If I may go to that issue of anti-Americanism once more,

it was interesting during the course of the debate today on the reauthorization of the Department of State when during consideration of the rule an amendment put forth by myself and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) was not made in order because I would suggest that the seeds of that anti-Americanism is a perception that the United States operates on two different standards, and that is interpreted by many in this world to be rank hypocrisy.

It was the President that said during his inaugural address that the United States "will persistently clarify the choice for every ruler and every Nation: The moral choice between oppression, which is always wrong, and freedom which is eternally right. America will not pretend that any human being aspires to live at the mercy of bullies. We will encourage reform in other governments by making it clear that success in our relations will require the decent treatment of their own people."

Noble words, a noble cause, and we all of course embrace that. Yet when we put forth this amendment which would have admonished and required a certification by the President that the thug, the bully, if you will, that rules Uzbekistan would change his ways, it was not made in order. One of our partners in this coalition of the willing is the thug, and I will take a moment here and put his picture up so Members and the viewing audience can see. This is Islam Karimov. This victim here was boiled alive in water, scalding water. This is a member of the coalition of the willing.

According to our own State Department, Karimov heads a regime that does not allow freedom of speech or religion, that makes a mockery of elections, that holds thousands of political prisoners, and where security forces routinely use torture. This is the product of the thug Karimov's security forces utilization of torture, torture that goes back to the medieval times.

And then 2 months ago his troops massacred hundreds of civilians who were simply protesting for justice and for liberty. And yet we continue to give him military assistance, some \$400 million to date. The amendment that was offered by myself and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) would have terminated that aid unless Karimov changed his behavior.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, looking at this picture, it almost makes me nauseated. What you are telling me is that Americans work hard, pay their taxes, and this administration, knowing that this kind of terrible torture and human rights abuses are occurring, still continues to give our tax dollars to this leader simply because he is willing to say he is our partner in the war in Iraq?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Exactly.

Mr. STRICKLAND. That is terribly, terribly disturbing, and I think it does point out what you said earlier, a hypocrisy that discredits us in the eyes of much of the world.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, just think of the message that this sends to the rest of the world. When crowds were demonstrating in the Ukraine, we were cheering. We approved. We welcomed the so-called Orange Revolution. And we speak about bringing the fire of freedom to dark corners of the world, and yet here is one dark corner of the world where there is no light, there is no hope, and we do not bring the fire of freedom. And we wonder why polling data indicates that country after country, our traditional allies, look at us as having a mainly negative influence in the world, all because of the war in Iraq. That was the genesis.

Mr. Speaker, it will have implications for us.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to the television audience.

#### PEAK OIL

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, if you go to your computer this evening and do a Google search for peak oil, you will find there a large assortment of articles and comments. Like every issue, you will find a few people who are on the extreme, but there will be a lot of mainstream observations there.

One of the articles that you will find there was written by Matt Savinar. Matt Savinar is not a technical person. He is a lawyer, a good one, and he does what lawyers do. He goes to the sources and builds his case.

I remember in another life I was involved in morphing some of my knowledge of human physiology into the practical world, and I was awarded 20 patents. For every one of those I had a lawyer. I knew that he knew absolutely nothing about the subject that he was helping me on before he came to work with me. By the way, Mr. Speaker, the 20 patents I had, 19 were military patents so these were military lawyers. I was really impressed with how quickly they caught on and knew what was going on and were able to contribute.

I think that Matt Savinar has done that, and I wanted to begin this discussion this evening with a quote from Matt Savinar because it kind of grabs your attention and makes you either want to put down his article with the statement that gee, this guy cannot be for real, or you want to finish it to see the basis for his statement because he begins his article by saying, "Dear Reader, Civilization as we know it is coming to an end soon."

When my wife read that she had the first reaction that I mentioned, Gee,

this guy is a nut. I am not going to read any further.

I said, Please read on and reserve judgment until you have finished reading his thesis.

She read on and at the end was genuinely frightened by what she read. I do not believe Matt Savinar has to be correct, but he could be correct. I am going to spend a few minutes this evening talking about the subject that caused Matt Savinar to make his prediction: "Dear Reader, Civilization as we know it is coming to an end soon."

I have on the first chart here a trend that I think everybody in America is familiar with. This shows the inflation rate, and we have done a pretty good job since 1995 in the last 10 years of taming inflation. It has gone up only slightly. But the zigzag magenta here is the price of fuel, of gasoline. This is a month or so old because you see it stops at \$55 a barrel, and fuel oil from which we get gasoline is now up to around \$60 a barrel. It has fallen off just a little now. It was over \$60.

This is a trend that we are all familiar with and you see in the last 4 years from 2001 to 2005, if you draw a best fit line through those points, it would be a pretty steep slope. This gave rise to a letter that was written by about 30 prominent people in our country, McFarland, James Woolsey, Frank Gaffney, and a number of retired admirals and generals.

The next chart shows the subject of their letter to the President. They noted that we have only 2 percent of the world's oil reserves, and that is a generally agreed upon figure. You will not find much contention with that statement. Some will say closer to 3 percent. They point out that we use 25 percent of the world's oil, and we are importing about two-thirds of what we use. That is up from about one-third that we imported as of the Arab oil embargo.

□ 2100

The other points here are significant ones, I think. This 25 percent of the oil used in the world is less than 5 percent of the world's population. If we divide the 280 million people in our country into the world's population, just short of 7 billion, we get about 22. So we are one person out of 22 in the world, and we use a fourth of all the world's energy.

These first two bullets here are really interesting ones. We have really only 2 percent of the world's oil reserves, but from that we are producing 8 percent of the world's oil. We are pretty good at pumping oil. What this says is that we are pumping our oil four times faster than the average well in the world. We do a good job of pumping oil.

Their letter to the President pointed out that this was an unacceptable national security risk. And the President himself, Mr. Speaker, has noted that much of this two thirds of imported oil that we get comes from countries, in

his words, that do not even like us very much. They are unstable, unpredictable. And these 30 prominent Americans wrote to the President, saying: Mr. President, we think this is an unacceptable national security risk and our country needs to mount an aggressive program to free us from our dependence on foreign oil.

The next chart shows us how we got here. And we have to go back several decades, like 6 decades, to see where this story started, and it started with a Shell Oil Company geologist, a scientist, who was studying the exploitation and exhaustion of oil fields. And he noticed that for each typical oil field that production increased until it reached a peak, and, then after holding that peak for a little while, it started down the other side, and it is perfectly reasonable that the last oil that they get out of the well is probably going to be harder to get than the first oil that they get out of the well; so it should come more slowly. His name was M. King Hubbert, and he theorized that if he knew the totality of the oil fields in the United States and that they all behaved the way that several fields that he had studied behaved that he ought to then be able to predict when the United States would peak in oil production. And so he did that. He added up all of the fields that he knew of in the country. He made a reasonable estimate of how many more fields the country was likely to discover because this discovery trend followed a similar curve. That was a lot earlier on, and we generally are discovering the oil something like 30 or 40 years before we are using oil. And he then created a curve, a bell-shaped curve, which we call bell shaped because it rises to this peak and then falls off. That is a very typical curve that is familiar to scientists and statisticians. And he theorized that if he added up all the little bell curves in the country, he would get a big bell curve for the country. And he predicted in 1956, from his studies in the 1940s and 1950s, that the United States would peak in oil production about 1970. As it turned out, it was precisely 1970 that we peaked in oil production.

When he came up with that prediction, his employers told him, Please do not publish that; people will think you are silly. He published it anyhow, and when he finally was proven to be a prophet who had predicted correctly, he became something of an institution in his own time.

The smooth green curve here is the curve that he predicted, and he made this prediction in 1956. We were up that curve, and he predicted it would peak about 1970 and then fall off. And the more ragged, heavier green symbols, those are the actual production. And we now are well down on that curve. This is called Hubbert's Peak. And, Mr. Speaker, if one is doing this Google search, they can do one for Hubbert's Peak too, and they will find a lot of articles there, pretty much many of the same articles that one will find when they do a search for "peak oil."