

yea or nay. If I wished to offer an amendment giving voice to my desire and that of the majority of my constituents to redeploy our troops from Iraq, I could not. You heard me correctly, the rules of this debate that we had today precluded me from taking any substantive action.

I believe that one of the fundamental functions of the Congress is to act as a check and a balance to the executive branch. Yet here we are in the people's House, the people's House, unable to do the people's will.

Mr. Speaker, America is the lone superpower in an increasingly interconnected and interdependent world. Along with that awesome and unprecedented power comes responsibilities to humankind and the planet itself.

America's reasons for maintaining her superpower status must be to export the best of our democratic system of governance and the hope of the American dream to the rest of the world. But these cherished ideals cannot be exported through force. We must teach and lead by example. Leading by example means modeling the behaviors that we want others to emulate. We must respect the rule of law. We must respect civil rights and liberties. We must stand firmly for human rights, renouncing in all circumstances the use of torture, assassinations, kidnappings as political tools, illegal detention, and cruel and unusual punishment.

Mr. Speaker, we must renounce the preemption doctrine. President Kennedy had this to say about the use of America's military force: "The United States, as the world knows, will never start a war. We do not want war. We shall be prepared if others wish it. We shall be alert and try to stop it, but we shall always do our part to build a world of peace where the weak are safe and the strong are just."

Mr. Speaker, I voted against authorizing use of force in Iraq. I believed then, as I do today, that Iraq posed no threat to America's security. I agree with the 9/11 Commission members that there was no credible link between Iraq and the 9/11 terrorists. I feared that war in Iraq would divert our attention from anti-terrorism efforts and serve to make us less safe and secure.

I called upon the President to tell Congress and the American people what circumstances would be required in order to bring home our troops from Iraq. My letter demanding articulable milestones and an exit strategy was sent to the President before the war even started, and to this day that letter remains unanswered.

Mr. Speaker, since that time I have participated in fearful troop sendoffs and joyous homecomings. I have nothing but respect for our brave soldiers. During the past 4 years, I have embraced and stood and prayed with Wisconsin families as they said their last good-byes to brave sons, fathers and brothers.

As of yesterday over 2,500 young men and women of our military have given

their lives in Iraq. During the past 4 years, I have also heard from parents who clearly see that it is their children and grandchildren who will pay the \$320 billion that this war has cost to date.

Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus and a proud cosponsor of Mr. MURTHA's resolution, H.J. Res. 73, to redeploy our troops. I only wish it was that resolution that we had debated over the past 2 days.

□ 1200

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

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

THE WAR IN IRAQ

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to speak out of order and assume the time of Mr. BURTON.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I requested this Special Order to read a statement that I earlier placed in the RECORD during the debate on the Iraq war resolution.

I did not request time during the debate because it was obvious that the chairmen controlling the time, all good friends of mine, wanted only speakers who support the war, and I did not want to place them in an uncomfortable position.

I did not request time from the Democrats because many of my colleagues in the minority were using this debate in a bitterly partisan way. Surely, war should be the last thing that should become partisan.

Yet 80 percent of the House Republicans, including me, voted against the bombings in Bosnia and Kosovo when President Clinton was in the White House. I believe 80 percent of Republicans would have opposed the war in Iraq if it had been started by President Clinton or Gore, and probably almost all the Democrats would have then been supporting it, as they did the bombings in Bosnia and Kosovo.

Much of the resolution that was just passed by this House contains language that everyone supports, especially the praise for our troops. Our troops do a great job everywhere they are sent. And it is certainly no criticism of them to criticize this war.

In August of 2002, 2 months before Congress voted for the war in Iraq, Dick Armey, then our Republican majority leader, in a speech in Iowa said, "I don't believe America will justifiably make an unprovoked attack on another nation. It would not be con-

sistent with what we have been as a Nation."

Jack Kemp wrote before the war, "What is the evidence that should cause us to fear Iraq more than Pakistan or Iran? Do we reserve the right to launch a preemptive war exclusively for ourselves, or might other nations such as India, Pakistan or China be justified in taking similar action on the basis of fears of other nations?"

Mr. Kemp said, based on the evidence he had seen, there was not "a compelling case for the invasion and occupation of Iraq."

William F. Buckley wrote that if he had known in 2002 what he knew then in 2004, he would have been against the war. Last year he wrote another column against the war, saying, "A point is reached when tenacity conveys not steadfastness of purpose, but misapplication of pride."

The very popular conservative columnist, Charley Reese, wrote that this war was "against a country that was not attacking us, did not have the means to attack us, and had never expressed any intention of attacking us. And for whatever real reason we attacked Iraq, it was not to save America from any danger, imminent or otherwise."

Many years ago, Senator Robert Taft expressed a traditional conservative position: "No foreign policy can be justified except a policy devoted to the protection of the American people, with war only as the last resort and only to preserve that liberty."

Millions of conservatives across this Nation believe this war was unconstitutional, unaffordable and worst of all, unnecessary. It was waged against an evil man, but one who had a total military budget only two-tenths of 1 percent of ours.

We are not going to be able to pay all our military pensions, civil service pensions, Social Security, Medicare and all the other things we have promised if we are going to turn the Department of Defense into the Department of Foreign Aid and attempt to be the policeman of the world.

This is contrary to every traditional conservative position on defense and on huge deficit spending. The conservative columnist Georgie Ann Geyer wrote, "Critics of the war against Iraq have said since the beginning of the conflict that Americans, still strangely complacent about overseas wars being waged by a minority in their name will inevitably come to a point where they will see they have to have a government that provides services at home, or one that seeks empire across the globe."

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I found out that a rating service called voteview.com which studies all of our votes from the last Congress, 472 votes I think it was, from last year, in this Congress, rated me as the sixth most conservative Member of this body. And yet I am steadfastly opposed to this war and I have been since the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, we need to start putting our own people first once again and bring our troops home, the sooner the better. And when somebody says we can't cut and run, I surely hope they don't mean that we should stay there forever.

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

THE WAR IN IRAQ

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask to address the House out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I follow the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. I thank him for his honesty, and I thank him for his eloquence. And I too, Mr. DUNCAN, wish that we could do this in a nonpartisan manner, and I would have hoped that we would have had every voice to have been able to be heard on this question. This is not a Democratic or Republican issue about the forces in Iraq, the freedom of this Nation, the right to defend our Nation, the right to tell the American people the truth that Saddam Hussein had nothing to do with the tragedy, the horrific, heinous act of 9/11.

If you looked at the 19 terrorists, you might think that we need to be engaged in war with Saudi Arabia. But we are not. That is why this debate had such insignificance because all of us believe in our troops. More importantly, we believe in the families and the wounded that have come home.

But I stand here today, Mr. Speaker, as someone who has just returned from Iraq, been to Iraq three times and Afghanistan; been to the border between Pakistan and Afghanistan where we truly believe Osama bin Laden hides. Do we remember that name? Someone that we allegedly have been in pursuit of for a number of years, a pursuit that has been stymied by the intrusion of the Iraq war. Rather than the global war on terror, we have misdirected and misconstrued the truth.

I am reminded of the somber presentation that Secretary Powell made before the United Nations; all the world was in awe, all the world's eyes were turned to America, America with the high moral compass. Yes, if America said it, it must be true. And now we can't get more than one or two countries to follow our lead. It cries out for a change in direction.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I hold up for the world to see and for America to see that these are the ones that we should be concerned about, those who have

lost their lives in battle, 2,500 and growing, and the 19,000 casualties that are facing America. Are these the soldiers that we are going to say are cutting and running because we want a new direction that makes sense?

Well, I believe in the Declaration of Independence when brave patriots said we all are created equal, with certain unalienable rights of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. And our soldiers deserve the right to pursue happiness. And America deserves the right of the right investment of its tax dollars. The global war on terror is where we should be confronting the evilness of the Osama bin Ladens and the others who are mounting efforts around the world to fight against us.

The insurgency in Iraq, the foreign terrorists are a mere 10 percent or less. It is a civil war in Iraq between Sunnis and Shiia. And Mr. MURTHA is right: there is no mission. The mission is complete. Our soldiers are victorious. Saddam Hussein is gone. We are not broom sweepers. We don't go around cleaning up IEDs. That is what their mission is. That is not a mission of freedom.

And so Democrats today joined with more than one-third of this Congress to ask for a new direction. And I would venture to say that we would have more if there had not been the hard hand of the Republicans to scare their Members into not going against the tide.

The war in Iraq has increased the burden on taxpayers. We are paying \$300 million a day, a day, for this war. And yet we do not have monies for our enlisted personnel. Our soldiers' families are on food stamps, and veterans health care has been cut when soldiers are coming with catastrophic injuries, brain injuries that they have yet not diagnosed of how long they will be impacted by what we call closed-brain injuries.

We asked the administration to tell the truth. We asked them to recognize the young soldiers that were kind enough to sign this scarf. Yes, they are true and the brave, and this is not a question of challenging the soldiers' bravery and duty. This is a burden on the policymakers like Secretary McNamara, who indicated that he was wrong in the Vietnam War. But, oh, what a price we paid: 50,000 dead in Vietnam and broken hearts and broken families and yet someone 20-some years later was willing to admit they were wrong.

Well, I voted against this resolution and I voted because I never want it to be said that any war to which we send young soldiers into battle, the military into battle does not have the truth and the strength to withhold the understanding that America's freedom is at risk.

I close, Mr. Speaker, by saying when I went to Iraq and visited many bases, one sailor took this off of his chest. It is a badge of honor I wear.

We are not cutting and running. We are holding up the Constitution and

the Declaration of Independence. We want our soldiers to be able to pursue happiness, and we want a sovereign Iraq to protect its own nation.

NEWS FROM THE FRONT

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, news from the front: the war on the border continues. More disturbing news, this time from the forgotten front.

We have just voted to finish successfully the war on the first front, Iraq and Afghanistan. Our second front is the fight against armed illegals, human smugglers, drug runners and possible terrorists not just wanting to penetrate our homeland border with Mexico and Canada, but the forgotten front, Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, here I have a map of the Caribbean islands. Puerto Rico is a part of the United States, the location: in the Caribbean islands next to the Dominican Republic, southeast of Cuba, east of Jamaica. It has earned a reputation among border patrol agents as America's biggest threat.

This is not a photo, the second one here, of Americans storming the beach at Iwo Jima or Normandy. Mr. Speaker, this is a photograph of 100 illegal immigrants with landing craft storming the American beaches in a yola, a homemade wooden boat. The boat is from the Caribbean islands. Its cargo, Dominicans, Middle Easterners and others from the islands. The Border Patrol says when people storm the American beaches here in Puerto Rico, they capture maybe one out of 10. And here we have a Blackhawk helicopter, at this particular time, having to view this firsthand.

One U.S. Border Patrol agent says he interviews the survivors of these ill fated trips, and they say they are coming to America for that free amnesty. Once they get to Puerto Rico, they can go anywhere in the United States with only a birth certificate or an easily forgeable photographic ID, if the one Border Patrol agent at the San Juan airport happens to ask for that identification.

We must remember that one of the 9/11 hijackers made his way into the United States through the Virgin Islands. Then he took flight lessons at San Juan, Puerto Rico. More than 2,600 illegals have been found entering the country just this way in Puerto Rico the past year. How many more weren't caught at all? And just where are they going and what are they taking with them?

Most of them, we must remember, are not from south of the border or north of the border; but they come from all over the world. Since we don't require passports to legally enter the United States from Mexico, Canada or the Caribbean islands, people can easily get to Puerto Rico pretending to be