

TURKEY'S EU MEMBERSHIP

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, next week the European Union will begin conducting membership negotiations with Turkey. As this process begins, it is important that the EU not allow Turkey to take any shortcuts. I am confident the European Union will insist Turkey follow all the proper steps and make the substantial changes necessary in many areas before the nation could ever be accepted.

To date, I do not believe Turkey has made substantial and meaningful progress in many of the areas that are of concern to members of the European Union. Despite making commitments for its membership negotiations, Turkey's lack of progress in adhering to essential democratic principles is of great concern. It continues to be in breach of the pace and standards set forth under initial agreements with the EU. In fact, the EU has prepared a report criticizing Turkey's reform process.

During next week's meetings, the European Union must demand answers from the Turkish government as to why the nation is not meeting benchmarks it agreed to in order to receive EU consideration. The EU must also begin to seriously explore Turkey's continued disregard for improving fundamental freedoms within its boundaries, freedoms that are commonplace throughout the European Union.

There is no question Turkey is going to be forced and should be forced to make dramatic improvements in these areas before it can ever be considered for EU membership. The EU must also consider Turkey's relations with its neighbors. I remain a vocal critic of Turkey's treatment of both Armenia and Cyprus, and believe that these issues must also be addressed during next week's discussions.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about Turkey's lack of progress in the diplomatic recognition of Armenia, the removal of its blockade against Armenia, and ending its official policy of denial of the Armenian genocide by coming to terms with it, an irrefutable historical fact affirmed by an increasing number of EU member states and European institutions.

Turkey's refusal to acknowledge the systematic killing of 1.5 million Armenians has no limits. Just last month, Turkey pulled out of a NATO exercise because the Canadian Prime Minister used the term "genocide" in reference to the massacre. Prior to that, the Turkish Ambassador to France was temporarily removed from the country as an act of protest against a French law making it illegal to deny the Armenian genocide.

This type of behavior goes on and on. Five journalists who criticized a court's decision to cancel a conference on the genocide were arrested. A lead-

ing Turkish novelist, Orhan Pamuk, was also arrested and charged with insulting Turkey's identity for referring to the Armenian genocide. Clearly, Turkey's protection of the fundamental freedoms of a democracy is simply inadequate.

Now, meanwhile, Turkey continues to illegally occupy the northern third of Cyprus. In 2001, the European Court of Human Rights rebuked the Turkish government when the court overwhelmingly found Turkey guilty of massive human rights violations in a scathing 146-page decision. The court concluded Turkey has not done enough to investigate the whereabouts of Greek-Cypriot missing persons who disappeared during life-threatening situations after the occupation.

The findings of the European Court of Human Rights should be taken very seriously by the EU, and the Turkish government should be forced to respond to these devastating charges before even being considered for membership. Turkey must also agree to once again come to the table and negotiate in good faith with Cyprus. Turkey simply cannot be admitted to the European Union if Cyprus remains divided and Turkish troops are still there.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in adding their support to a letter I am circulating with my colleague, CAROLYN MALONEY of New York. We will soon send a letter to Jose Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission, to express many of these same concerns. I also strongly urge President Bush to personally raise these concerns with President Barroso.

It is imperative Turkey's progress is measured on the basis of its complete accomplishment of all necessary criteria set forth by the European Union.

IRAQ RESOLUTION

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, it was September 26, 2002, I was sitting in the cabinet room of the White House with Condoleezza Rice, Andy Card, and President Bush, and the President explained to us that day, and I took notes and still have them, that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction; that Saddam Hussein was training terrorists on weapons of mass destruction; and that if military force was used, in President Bush's words, it would be swift. September 26, 2002.

It is now June 15, 2006, some 2,500 soldiers have died and more than 18,000 injured, many like Kevin Pannel, from Glenwood, Arkansas, who have been injured in ways that will forever change his life and so many others.

One thing we know for sure, Mr. Speaker, is that our intelligence failed us. There is not a more difficult decision that Members of Congress are asked to make than whether or not to

send our men and women in uniform into harm's way. And when we are faced with making that decision, we must know our intelligence is right.

This has been a war that has touched most families, and mine is no different. My brother-in-law spent Christmas in the Middle East supporting a mission to refuel Air Force aircraft over Afghanistan. My first cousin was in Iraq serving our country when his wife gave birth to their first child.

We all have a story like that. We all know someone who has been there. I escorted a young woman and her two children to the White House this morning for a tour of the White House. They are in Washington, D.C. with her mom and dad on vacation. Her husband was in Iraq when she gave birth to their second child, and he is in Iraq today on his third mission in 4½ years.

I want you to know that our men and women in uniform and their service to our country is much greater, much greater than that of any Member of Congress or any President could ever be, and tonight I honor them.

There has been a lot of talk about this resolution that we will be voting on tomorrow. I have read it three times. It says that we support our troops, and I do. It says that we are against terrorists, and I am. It says that we are against a date certain for withdrawal from Iraq, and I agree with that, and so I plan to vote for this resolution tomorrow. But here is where I disagree with this President.

This President is spending \$279 million of your tax money in Iraq every 24 hours. And yet if you ask him to be accountable for it, if you ask him how he is spending that \$279 million of your tax money in Iraq every day, he will tell you that you are unpatriotic. I disagree with that. I believe in accountability. I believe that this President, this administration and this Republican Congress, must be held accountable for the \$279 million of your tax money that they are spending in Iraq every 24 hours.

I also believe that this President lacks a plan. This resolution is full of saying things like, we support our troops, and I certainly do. It is full of things like saying, we are against terrorists, and I would hope we all are. But there is nothing in the resolution about how we are going to win, how we are going to win, and it is time for this President to give us a plan on how we can win in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Iraq. We had some 3,000 Arkansas National Guard troops there August 11, 2004, and I went to let them know we support them and to make sure some of this money was being spent on them and the equipment they need to get the job done. I visited with young soldiers from my hometown, soldiers I had taught in Sunday school, soldiers I had duck hunted with.

And so I said to them, what do we need to be doing differently? They said we need to be hiring Iraqis to rebuild

their nation's infrastructure. The insurgents are hiring them and they are accepting the money and lobbying cheap bombs at us. Why? Because they need to feed their family. And they also told me we need to be training a lot more Iraqis to take control of their military and police force. August 11, 2004.

February 2006, as a member of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly I was in Brussels visiting the Ambassador to NATO, the U.S. Ambassador to NATO, at his home. I visited with the Iraqi Ambassador there, and I asked him the same question. And you know what? Some 2 years later, he gave me the same answer.

It is time for this President, this Congress, to give us a plan to establish a democracy, to win the peace, a plan that will eventually allow us to bring our men and women in uniform home.

IRAQ RESOLUTION

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I am going to take the full 5 minutes, but I have been in this House Chamber almost all day and I hear these arguments that we don't have a plan to end the war in Iraq and succeed, and that is just simply not true. It is not true at all.

The fact is the plan was wrong in the sense that there was the anticipation that it would happen more easily. But the plan is very clear. It is not simple. It requires that the Iraqis have their own police, their own border patrol, and their own army in order to secure themselves. And since we did not allow for their police to be restood, we had to start from scratch and train them.

And it is simply not possible to train a police and border patrol, an army, in 1 year or 2 or 3. There are 26 million Iraqis in a country the size of California. But every day we train more and more of them, so that now they control about 42 percent of the land that includes 42 percent of the population.

So as we continue with our plan, as we continue to train more and more Iraqis, we are able to move our troops out and move their troops in. We are able to move their police in and our troops out. We are able to move their border patrol in and our troops out.

Now, it is clear that they do not have the logistics, so we will still have to be there later, but not in the numbers that we have now. That is all part of the plan; to train their troops, train their border patrol, train their army, and allow them to take our place.

What we object to is leaving prematurely. And if you ask an Iraqi what their biggest fear is, and having been there 12 times I have spoken to a lot of them, it is basically the same thing, it is that you will leave us; that you will leave us before we can take hold of democracy and before we can defend our-

selves. That is their biggest fear. Some of them even say, like you did in Vietnam. And some of them will make reference to what they hear on CNN or what they hear about elected officials who say we need to get out, we need to have some kind of artificial timetable.

□ 2315

Thank goodness George Washington didn't have Congress telling him he had to have a timetable to beat the Brits. Thank goodness when all the generals criticized Abraham Lincoln, we didn't say, well, the generals are against Abraham Lincoln, he doesn't have a plan, we better just fold our tent. Thank goodness that didn't happen.

The bottom line for me is very clear. We may have been wrong about weapons of mass destruction, and for that the President loses credibility, and people like me do, and people on the other side of the aisle who voted for going into Iraq, and now pretend like they didn't, we all lose our credibility there. But we don't lose our credibility with this: Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. He used these weapons on his own people and neighbors. He didn't abide by the agreement that stopped us from going into Baghdad. He has now been removed. Thank God.

The Iraqi people have a democracy that is flourishing and is extraordinarily impressive. Three elections have allowed the Iraqis to form a government that created a Constitution, adopt a Constitution, and then elect a government under that Constitution.

All the Iraqis are asking from this Congress is you came in, you removed our security people, you have given us a taste of democracy, let us live that democracy and let us have the capability to protect ourselves before you leave. That's our plan.

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IRAQ WAR

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I come before you tonight after listening to the presentations that have been taking place all day, not only as a Member of this body but as a parent who has lost a child. My son, B.J., who passed away a little more than 6 years ago, would have turned 24 tomorrow. Every time I learn about loss of life in Iraq, another son or daughter, mother or father, brother or sister, I can't help but think about my son B.J. and the profound pain and loss that will remain with us for the rest of our lives.

That intense pain that we feel over the loss of B.J. is being felt every day by those families here in America who have suffered a loss in Iraq, and that is one of the reasons why I oppose this

war and one of the reasons why I plan to oppose this resolution.

But one of the other reasons I oppose this resolution deals with honesty and truth. Boake Carter is credited with saying that "in time of war, the first casualty is truth."

Mr. Carter's statement is applicable to the resolution before us today. Like the one-sided resolution presented to the House last December, the Republican majority has refused to allow a true debate on the war on Iraq. The truth is 2,500 servicemen and -women have died in Iraq. The truth is the so-called coalition countries, including Great Britain, are drawing down their troops in Iraq. The truth is the Republican majority in its resolution today wants to blur the truth, that the cause and purpose of the war in Iraq is the same as the war in Afghanistan.

The truth is the Republican majority in its resolution today wants to blur the truth that the cause and purpose of the war in Iraq is justified by the terrorist attacks of September 11.

The truth is the Republican majority in its resolution today wants to blur the truth saying that we who oppose this war in Iraq are not as patriotic as those who support the war.

The truth is the Republican majority in its resolution today wants to blur the truth saying that those who do not support Resolution 861 do not support our troops in Iraq.

Resolution 861 continues the open-ended commitment of U.S. troops in Iraq and embodies President Bush's latest attempt to justify the U.S. involvement in Iraq.

Last December the President and his congressional allies claimed the Iraqi parliamentary elections were a "crucial victory" in establishing a democracy in Iraq. Thus, through this election, "victory" was inevitable in Iraq. Even Vice President CHENEY declared the insurgency was "in their final throes."

America has heard this type of reasoning before from President Johnson during the Vietnam War. In 1967, the South Vietnamese freely elected their government. President Johnson then declared the Vietnamese election had established a democracy supported by the Vietnamese people. Even our Vietnam military leaders declared the war would be over soon as there was "light at the end of the tunnel."

After this Vietnamese election, and the light at the end of the tunnel, 3,800 more Americans would die in Southeast Asia.

Since May 1, 2003, when the President declared "mission accomplished" in Iraq, over 2,300 troops have died in Iraq. What is the victory that the President and his congressional supporters envision in Iraq for the U.S.? What is the strategy for the Iraqi war mission to be accomplished?

This is not a war like our grandparents fought. This is an insurgency. There is no country to hoist a white flag of surrender. There is no recognized political entity that America can