

every quarter this administration has to have a performance-based policy on police training, on Army training, on civil society development, on reconstruction, and on the political front so we can finally, in the President's words, stand down. But having given them free rein for nearly 2½ years and we have one battalion operationally ready to show for it, they have abused the trust of the American people.

We need to internationalize our operations in Iraq. We need to convince the world that a stable Iraq is in everyone's interests, and we need to refocus on stopping terrorism. Mr. Speaker after 2½ years and more than 2,000 American lives, it is time we adopted a different strategy, a strategy for victory that will reunite American families and provide Iraq a stable society. It is time the President stopped campaigning and began to lead on the issue of Iraq.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURGESS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### SEEKING OUT THE TRUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my focused remarks, I would like to join my colleague from Ohio, Congresswoman KAPTUR, and ask the same questions of FEMA and the Department of Homeland Security. Having just toured the region in Texas and having been in part of Louisiana in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, and now Hurricane Rita, we now are fully aware of the Department of Defense leaving behind people who are in essence homeless.

In the city of Houston, we expect that some 44,000 to 50,000 individuals now housed in hotel rooms will be subsequently evicted because of the time running out. All of these individuals have been hard-working, tax-paying Americans who are now looking not for a hand out, but a hand up. We cannot seem to get FEMA and all of the good works that many of the individual FEMA staff persons have done to recognize that we have a crisis and that we need to engage in some of the catastrophic solutions. That means finding trailers across America wherever they might be. Do not wait and tell us that you cannot find them because they are not manufactured when there are places across America housing or holding various facilities that could be moved. You cannot tell us that you cannot use some of the military bases that have been designated for closing. So I join my colleague, and we will

hopefully join in a sense of Congress that will ask FEMA and Homeland Security to move expeditiously to house the thousands of individuals who are not yet housed.

Let me now suggest that as we look to the tragedy in America that some of our citizens have fallen on hard times, might I lift again our praises and respect for the men and women on the front lines in Iraq and, of course, Afghanistan. We have always said when we have come to the floor to raise a question about the Iraq war that this is completely separate from our respect for the men and women who have offered their lives and certainly offered their service on behalf of this country. But it is important, as we have passed this enormous milestone, to be able to again remind America, and of course our colleagues, on the negative impact and negative results of this war.

For each number, a face and family. The front page of our local newspaper, we are reading the names of Jonathan David Rozier, Adolfo C. Carballo, Pedro Contreras, Andrew Houghton, Dexter Kimble, and William M. Amundson. Those are just a few names and pictures on the front page. As well, might I again cite the young man who is buried in my congressional district, Sergeant Michael Robinson.

It is important now, as the American public begins to look for some answers, both to the President and the United States Congress, that we fulfill our duty and our obligation to give them the answers. I think the action of the Senate today, led by the minority leader, Senator REID, was, in fact, a very positive step. It was a step toward telling the truth: what and how was the intelligence used, and how was it represented to the United States Congress for a decision to be made statutorily, by a vote on this floor, not a constitutional vote, to move toward Iraq.

Now, it is obviously true that the American public wants to find solutions; but as we find solutions, we must be keenly aware of finding out the truth. It is important as well to be able to go back and understand how this Congress was able to do its job effectively or not effectively because of the representations and misrepresentations that were made by the administration and others.

So I am calling upon this Congress to do the right thing. Whether we establish a bipartisan select committee to investigate the cooked intelligence to be able to find out the truth or whether or not we instruct a number of our jurisdictional committees to hold hearings, we should begin our work. Doing this work on the past, on how the representations were made and how the ultimate decisions were made does not in any way take away the responsibility that we have for a successful exit strategy for our men and women to be able to come home.

We understand that the American people are serious people. They understand as well that we have responsibil-

ities, and I know that many are concerned about any precipitous action; but we do need a deliberative approach to be able to find a way to bring our young men and women home.

My deepest sympathy to the families who have lost loved ones on the front lines of Iraq and Afghanistan. This country will be forever indebted to you. And that is why in these names we promise you that we will find out the truth so that America, as she moves forward to defend herself in years to come, will have the respect and as well the success that is deserving of the military and the people of the United States of America.

#### QUESTIONS NEEDING ANSWERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today is All Saints Day. It is a rather remarkable day. In the 18 years, 17 years I have been in the Congress, I have never seen the other body go into secret session to try and find out the truth of anything. The fact that they had a session over there where they closed the doors to try and get at the truth tells you how bad this situation is.

This morning's New York Times has an article, an editorial by Nicholas Kristof. Now, he is a neocon, certainly from the right, no question about it; but he says, his title is, "What Did Cheney Know and When Did He Know It?" He asks several questions which, I think, although many people do not have the opportunity to read the New York Times, they ought to know about it.

"Did you ask Scooter Libby to undertake his inquiries about Ambassador Joseph Wilson? Why did you independently ask the CIA for information about the Wilsons? Did you know that Mrs. Wilson was a covert officer? Did you advise Mr. Libby to leak information about Mrs. Wilson's work in the CIA to journalists? When Mr. Libby made his statements in the inquiry, allegedly committing perjury, were you aware of what he was saying?" Finally, and I think this is the question that really needs to be dealt with: "Was Mr. Libby fearful of disclosing something about your behavior in the summer of 2003?"

This goes on to suggest that if he did so, "was it a misguided attempt to try and protect you? The alleged lies shielded you," meaning Mr. CHENEY, "by indicating that the information you gave him about Mrs. Wilson instead came from reporters and not from him."

Now, this is a question that the American people deserve an answer to.

Several years ago we sat in this body and listened to a State of the Union address, and the Vice President of the United States sat right up here on the

dais, behind the President of the United States, knowing that what the President was saying was not factual. He knew that. How can the President of the United States explain to the American people how he sent people out to find out all this information, found it out, and still was allowed to come before the American people and the Congress and the diplomatic corps and the Supreme Court and the whole administration and tell them something that was not true.

Now, what this event does, and they may try and brush this off as a minor technicality, or it is just perjury; well, we impeached or tried to impeach President Clinton over just perjury, and that was about a sex act. No one died. Two thousand people have died, our people, untold numbers of Iraqis have died, and 10,000 of our people have come home badly, badly wounded. It has cost us \$240 billion, money that we did not use to fix the levees in New Orleans or other places in this country where there are problems today.

□ 2000

The question that comes up again and again: Is there no limit in this administration to what will be said or done to promote this war and to protect it? Will they say anything? Is there any limit on what they will bring here as evidence?

The fact is that we hear there is a terror alert. If you look at those terror alerts, they always follow some disaster someplace to get people's mind off it. What has happened this week since the President was made aware of the fact that we had an indictment of the Chief of Staff to the Vice President of the United States? That man works in the White House or in the Executive Office Building right next to it.

What do we have? Well, we certainly have a lot of things here. We today had a big exposé about a flu epidemic. Now, did that just happen yesterday? That has been going on for a long time. The President said he had a flu shot. That flu shot had nothing to do with the avian bird flu from Asia. That is this year's strain of virus. We get them every year. Everybody gets a flu shot every year. They have nothing to do with this pandemic we are talking about. Yet the President makes a big exposé in the White House. And the fact is that this kind of thing to divert people's attention will continually be done to keep them from focusing on the disaster of this morally bankrupt war we are in in the Middle East.

It is time for us to call an end to this. The President has no plan to get out of it. We have no plans. There are no benchmarks for anything. They are going to stay there, and they intend to stay there. As long as there is chaos, they will be able to justify staying there, and that is what they want. They have wanted chaos.

Why did they disband the army? Why did they disband civil service? Why did they not prepare? Because they were

intending to have things be in turmoil. Because in turmoil they can keep justifying their existence in Iraq. They should come home. The Vice President, as Mr. Christoff said, should either tell us what was going on or resign.

#### PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, my fellow colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and our constituents who may be listening to this hour this evening, we are going to talk about something that is well known to the general public, and that is the subject of eminent domain. It is well known, maybe not particularly liked by the general public, but certainly it is well known that, under the power, the government has the power under the Constitution and the fifth amendment to take private property for public use. This is something that has been recognized for 200 years.

An example, the obvious example, of course, of public use would be for a school in a community that is growing rapidly, and youngsters need a place to get that public education. That is a public use of the power of eminent domain, that ability for a government entity, the Federal Government, the State government, a county government or municipal city government to literally take a person's private property for public use purposes and, of course, with just, fair market value compensation. That is something that we all recognize.

As I said, when it is the individual who may have that little tract of land that they have owned for their lifetime and it was willed to them by their parents and willed to their parents by their grandparents, and maybe it is 50 acres, maybe it started out as farmland and ended up as just a homestead and a paid-for residence and a front porch with rocking chairs and a great view and clean air and clean environment and a place for the children and the grandchildren to come and play on the weekends. It is pretty painful indeed when John Q. Public comes knocking on the door. It may be the local school board, good, dedicated men and women who are trying to provide education for the children in the community; and that 30 acres is the last remaining plot of land in the whole county where a new high school is desperately needed because of development, economic development, new subdivisions, new roads.

And people, of course, are powerless in the face of that authority of eminent domain. The only recourse they have, of course, is a plea and an appeal for fair market value of the land that they do not want to sell, they are

forced to sell under this constitutional right of eminent domain.

Maybe there is some negotiation. Maybe they are not happy with what is the public entity that is doing the taking, has set the price; and the homeowner, the property owner, small business owner, feels that that is not fair. Then certainly they have the right to appeal in our court system and our judicial system to the superior court of the judicial area in which they happen to lie.

My colleagues, I think you all know that the Supreme Court on June 23 of this year, 2005, made a decision, a narrowly split decision, as this court has done in so many other cases, particularly regarding our traditional values. That is not the purpose of this debate and this discussion, Mr. Speaker, tonight on the floor of this House.

But this 5 to 4 decision all of a sudden expanded this power of eminent domain to include the taking of a person's home, small business for economic development, that is now being interpreted by this split decision of the Supreme Court to qualify under the fifth amendment, under the Constitution, the right to take someone's property by eminent domain for economic purposes, redefining, completely and totally redefining this definition of public use that probably a sixth grader would answer correctly if you asked them: Well, give us an example of public use. They would say a road or a bridge or possibly a public library, certainly a school, maybe even a sewer line easement, a natural gas line easement.

But to suggest to them that, oh, no, now we are talking about taking somebody's property for the purpose of increasing the tax revenue. Let me just kind of set the scenario for my colleagues just as a perfect example.

Under this ruling, June 23, 2005, this atrocious, we think, and of course on the floor of this body of this House with overwhelming bipartisan support, not unanimous but overwhelming bipartisan support, we expressed our outrage over this, the sense of the House, a concurrent resolution expressing our absolute outrage over this decision.

What it basically says and what prompted and predicated this Supreme Court decision was a case in the State of Connecticut, the City of New London, and New London in this case being the defendant, the plaintiff was the property owner, Kelo. Their property was being taken for the purpose of nothing other than increasing the tax base, the tax revenue of that particular section of town where their property happened to be.

The justification for it from the standpoint of the City of New London, that local jurisdiction, was, well, if we are able to take this property, which in our opinion, Mr. Speaker, I think everybody knows I am not a lawyer nor am I a real estate expert, I am just a little old meat and potatoes OB/GYN physician. But what they were going to