

voted to go into this war. But many of them are saying to us today, if they had known then what they know now, they never would have taken that vote to send our troops into that war.

Of course, we don't have to say it, but we must remind people over and over again, there were no weapons of mass destruction. There was no reason for us to go into Iraq. We have destabilized Iraq. We are destabilizing the entire Middle East, and we cannot win with this strategy that the President has employed.

And I would simply say to my colleagues, please do everything you can to help get us out.

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

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

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

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

IRAQ

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

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker. Last night I watched the State of the Union Address in this hall for the first time as a Member of Congress. While I found the pageantry inspiring, I wish I could say the same about the speech itself.

We heard another attempt to allay with hollow rhetoric the concerns of an alarmed Nation about the war in Iraq. And rather than seizing an opportunity to level with the American people and set the new course they rightly demand, the administration, once again, chose to cling to its delusions and insist that its failing policies be enacted.

In 2003, the administration requested and received from Congress authority to invade Iraq on the basis of the claim that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction and presented an imminent threat to our national security. Senior administration officials claimed that the Iraqi Government was connected with the al Qaeda terrorists who perpetrated the attacks of September 11, 2001. And we now know that neither the

premise for the invasion and subsequent occupation of Iraq nor the claim of a connection to 9/11 was true.

After the fall of Baghdad, the administration sent in officials with little or no knowledge and understanding of Iraq, its people, its culture or its politics. Costly mistakes, including the dismantling of the army and the failure to secure weapons stockpiles, paved the way for the current situation in Iraq: More than \$450 billion spent with billions unaccounted for; an undependable Iraqi Government, unwilling or incapable of controlling warring sects in their militias; more than 3,000 American deaths, and more than 25,000 soldiers maimed or grievously wounded; hundreds of thousands of Iraqi civilians killed, wounded or driven from their homes by sectarian violence; and a profound loss of respect for our country in the region and around the world.

All in all, it constitutes an unparalleled foreign policy disaster for the United States.

The administration still has no plans for a responsible exit strategy to protect our security. And unbelievably, the administration wants to send an additional 21,000 troops to Iraq.

The proposal is a cavalier rejection of the sound views of the American people, the consensus of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group, and the counsel of wise military commanders.

In a city of some 7 million people, and without a unified government or the infrastructure to provide jobs to an ever more agitated population, an injection of 20,000 troops will not succeed. It can only stoke the flames of chaos and bloodshed in Iraq.

Our national strategic interests, Mr. Speaker, require a change of course, not an escalation. The imperative to support our troops requires a change of course, not an escalation.

Last year the Republican-controlled House declared in the defense authorization bill that 2006 would be a year of transition to Iraqi control of Iraq, and that redeployment would begin at that point. Yet here we are in 2007 with the administration calling for an escalation supported by many in this body.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the time has come and gone for this Congress to say "enough is enough." The time has come and gone for statements of concern. The time has come and gone for "trust but verify." The situation in Iraq is dire.

It is now time for this Congress to do what the American people said so clearly in November that they wanted us to do: Change the course in Iraq. We have a saying in my home State in New Hampshire, "When you're in a hole, stop digging."

Mr. Speaker, I support our valiant troops, and I oppose the administration's proposed escalation. I resolve to work with my colleagues over the coming weeks for a concrete new direction in Iraq. In the absence of an acceptable plan from the President, the American people are calling upon Congress to

lead the way. Popular demand for new direction in Iraq is, in large part, the reason I am here in Washington and the reason Democrats now hold the majority.

□ 1545

We can no longer accept empty promises from the administration or hope the administration will honestly confront the reality of its failures. The American people are looking to this Congress for leadership. They are impatient. And we must and we will respond.

CONGRESS SHOULD DUST OFF OVERSIGHT PLAN FROM 30 YEARS AGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, in December 2005, we learned that the Bush administration was using the National Security Agency, the NSA, to eavesdrop on Americans on U.S. soil without a warrant or judicial oversight, in violation of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Over a year later, Congress has yet to address this issue, and the NSA's secret surveillance program has continued unabated. Just last week the administration continued its unilateral approach, announcing that notwithstanding its protestations last year, that it could not possibly allow the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to oversee the NSA program; it would now submit to the court's jurisdiction, but not tell the Congress how the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court would oversee the program or why its policies have changed.

When Members of Congress questioned the Attorney General and the National Intelligence Director regarding this shift in policy, both officials refused to provide information regarding the nature of the administration's new policy in this area.

Indeed, we have no idea whether the administration is now seeking warrants on an individualized basis or broad programmatic approval from the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

Congressional silence in this area and others has had other repercussions. Earlier this month Congress was again caught by surprise when we learned that the President has claimed potentially sweeping new powers to open Americans' mail without a court warrant.

Again, the administration could obtain a warrant, and quickly, from a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court judge, but has chosen not to submit this effort to court supervision. Interestingly, the developments over the last year bear a striking resemblance to events that occurred some 30 years ago, when a series of troubling reports

began appearing in the press concerning domestic intelligence activities and surveillance of political activities of U.S. citizens.

These revelations and others revealed by the Watergate scandal convinced lawmakers that Congress had been too permissive and trusting, failing to carry out its oversight responsibilities over the executive branch.

In response, a U.S. Senate committee was formed to investigate intelligence activities by the government. The United States Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities, commonly referred to as the Church committee, after its Senate chairman, issued more than 50,000 pages of reports in what is considered the most comprehensive review of intelligence activities in the country.

Ironically, the reports included sections on mail opening as well as the National Security Agency and fourth amendment rights. In rebuffing recent congressional requests for information on the current NSA program, the administration has made the argument that the NSA surveillance program is too sensitive to be shared with Congress, even to Members in the classified setting.

When these same concerns were weighed by the Church committee in 1975, the opposite result was reached, with the committee refusing to neglect its oversight responsibility merely because their work would be harder. In fact, the extensive oversight and the substantial record generated by the Church committee inspired the creation of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

Both have worked effectively to ensure that the President has the tools necessary to thwart attacks while ensuring respect for the civil liberties of Americans and the adherence to the rule of law. FISA, as it is called, has provided a measure of oversight over foreign intelligence activities on U.S. soil, and with it the confidence of the American people.

This administration, however, has undermined that trust by circumventing FISA. Congress should follow the example of the Church committee, by vigorously examining the NSA surveillance program and determining what legislative action is necessary. The administration should cooperate and work with Congress as we engage in our oversight responsibilities, and make the case for statutory change if revisions are required to meet new challenges in the war on terror.

If, however, the administration rejects congressional oversight in this area and continues to defy requests for information, Congress should seek other means of redress. I have introduced bipartisan legislation with Representative JEFF FLAKE that can serve as a basis for examining these issues and restoring the rule of law.

The NSA Oversight Act, H.R. 11, would reiterate existing law requiring

court approval for the surveillance of Americans on American soil, and would provide greater oversight of NSA's surveillance activity. Our legislation also makes some key changes to FISA in order to streamline and expedite the process in response to the administration's argument that the current framework was too cumbersome.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to fully examine this issue, step up its oversight responsibility, and take legislative action if necessary.

RECOGNIZING THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE D.C. PRESERVATION LEAGUE

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

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Mr. TURNER of Ohio and I are the co-chairs of the Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus. I am proud to rise today, as cochair of that caucus, to recognize the 35th anniversary of the District of Columbia Preservation League.

In 1971 the old post office on Pennsylvania Avenue was slated for demolition to allow completion of an addition to the Federal Triangle Building. In part, to save that Washington landmark, the DCPL, which is also known as Don't Tear it Down, was founded. And since then, the DCPL has worked tirelessly to preserve Washington's historic treasures and save many of the unique features of this great city, the features that really define our Nation's capital.

Washington's history and character are among Washington's greatest assets, and are vital to the local economic development efforts.

Advocacy and education have been at the forefront of the DCPL's mission. The League has produced educational programs, including tours, lectures, newsletters and guides of historic districts here in Washington, and since 1996 has annually published a list of Washington's most endangered places.

For the last 35 years, the DCPL has prepared, sponsored, or cosponsored more than 120 individual District of Columbia landmark nominations and many historic district nominations throughout the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a sampling of the efforts that the DCPL puts into protecting the history of the District of Columbia. I am sure the League will continue to make invaluable contributions to this city, and every member of the League, every member, every citizen of the District of Columbia, has every right to feel proud of the history of the work, the legacy of the DCPL.

I urge all of the citizens of Washington and supporters of historic preservation around the country to join me in commending the DCPL for its dedication and commitment to preserving and protecting the history and environment of this city through the work of advocacy and education.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to submit for the RECORD a resolution, a proclamation by the Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus, recognizing Thursday, January 25, 2007 as the DCPL's 35th anniversary.

Whereas, the DC Preservation League was founded by dedicated volunteers in 1971 as Don't Tear It Down, to save the Old Post Office on Pennsylvania Avenue and other notable downtown buildings from Federal Government-sponsored demolition,

Whereas, Don't Tear It Down worked to provide protection for historic landmarks and historic districts in the Nation's Capital through the establishment of the Historic Landmark and Historic District Protection Act (D.C. Law 2-144) in 1978,

Whereas, over the last 35 years the DC Preservation League has prepared, sponsored or co-sponsored more than 120 individual DC Landmark nominations and numerous historic district nominations throughout the Nation's Capital,

Whereas, to carry out its mission of preservation advocacy and education, the DC Preservation League has produced educational programs including tours, lectures, citywide conferences, candidates' forums, publications including newsletters, information brochures and guides to historic districts, and since 1996 has annually publicized a list of Washington's Most Endangered Places,

Whereas, the DC Preservation League works with the government of the United States, its federal agency representatives, committees appointed by the President, and organizations chartered by Congress to advocate for the preservation of historic resources as a vital component of the economic and cultural life of our Nation's Capital,

Whereas, the DC Preservation League is supported by members, contributors and volunteers from across the Washington, DC region who are dedicated to the promotion of the history of the Nation's Capital for visitors and residents alike,

Whereas, the DC Preservation League will celebrate 35 years of preservation activism as Washington, DC's only citywide non-profit historic preservation organization at the historic Willard InterContinental Hotel on Thursday, January 25, 2007,

As co-chairs of the Congressional Historic Preservation Caucus, we would like to recognize January 25, 2007 as the DC Preservation League's 35th Anniversary.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is an honor to come before the House once again. We have finished our work for the week, and a lot has happened, a lot has been said. As you know, the 30-Something Working Group, Mr. MURPHY, and I are here today, my good friend from Connecticut. We are going to talk about some of the issues that have been discussed over the last 24 hours on the floor, some of the votes that we have taken, even as it relates to last week, some of the challenges that are facing the country.

I know there will be other Members of the 30-Something Working Group