

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### BUSH ADMINISTRATION SHOULD REEVALUATE SPENDING PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, tonight, several Members on the Republican side of the aisle gave 5-minute Special Orders on government waste, while today's New York Times talks about the war in Iraq and the difficulty that the Bush administration is facing in managing that war and in restoring Iraq's economy. Now, I do not think most Americans thought when we went into Iraq that we were supposed to restore the economy, but there has been a great deal of mission creep, obviously, and with no stability there and, with no security, investment does not happen. Of course, it is not a free-enterprise economy, and a lot of their former businesses and State-owned companies are in trouble.

This particular article talks about a shoe company that would fashion leather and finish shoes. Thousands of people there are without work as a result of the war and the bad conditions. So the Bush administration is taking cash and paying over 2,000 workers in just that company; imagine how many companies there are in Iraq, just to kind of "buy the peace" so that there is not more unrest.

Meanwhile, here in Congress, about a week ago, we tried to get a bill passed that would give \$1,500 to each of our soldiers' families who are in combat in Iraq and Afghanistan. Guess what? The very same Republican party that is handing out \$100 bills in Iraq forced the defeat of that measure offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) here in the House. Very interesting pri-

orities, in my opinion, and absolutely wrong.

Now, last Friday, President Bush came to Ohio, our State, and I thought he might be coming to stop the loss of jobs, because that particular day there had been an announcement of another 525 jobs, this time Federal jobs, that had to do with the Department of Defense that were being taken out of Cleveland, Ohio. The President did not say anything about those jobs when he came. He probably did not want to because his own Department of Defense made a big mistake. They took these Federal jobs that had been with the Defense Finance Accounting Service at the Department of Defense through the Cleveland office, and they decided they were going to move them to Texas. They said, we are going to contract these jobs out. Now, did they provide the workers in Cleveland with the same kind of money they are providing to the workers in Iraq? No.

What they did was they moved the jobs to Dallas, Texas because they contracted out the jobs to a company, and I want to get the name of the private company correctly here; oh, Dallas-based Affiliated Computer Services. The President said he was going to save money by contracting out these Federal jobs. But do my colleagues know what? They made a big mistake, because the government workers actually saved the taxpayers \$20 million. The subcontractors that the President hired in Texas and, gee, is that a coincidence, is going to cost the taxpayers of our country 20 million more dollars, not less dollars. It is funny that it was in Texas. While the President was in Ohio, while our jobs were leaving for Texas and costing the taxpayers of our country \$20 million more, the President took down a cool \$1.2 billion in Columbus, Ohio for his campaign. He bagged a cool million in Ohio, a little bit over \$1 million. Then he went to Texas and took \$1.4 million down there in a big fund-raiser. Very interesting.

Now, he was in California, I think it was yesterday, and he stood in front of people's homes that have had their properties burned to the ground. Unlike Iraq, he did not hand out any money; he just sympathized, empathized with the people and said they would get FEMA loans. Give them loans in California. And then he proceeded, while these people have just lost everything and they are getting loans from FEMA, to talk about Iraq and the \$87 billion that he is going to spend in Iraq.

What I really want to know from President Bush is, how are we going to know, as the American people, when we have won in Iraq?

Now, back in May, I think the President got on a ship and it said, "mission accomplished." So the American people thought things were winding down. Well, they were just beginning. We have now lost more troops in Iraq than before the President stood in front of the sign that said "mission accom-

plished," and I want to know how will we know when we have won? When we have trained 200,000 Iraqi police to keep the security in the country? At what level will we have to have their force in order to know that we have to leave? Will we have won when we finally find Saddam Hussein? Will we have won when Iraq holds their own elections next year? Will we have won when we assure ourselves that there are no weapons of mass destruction? The President already said when Hurricane Isabel hit the East Coast here and captured all the headlines, there was a story that was buried in the paper where he said: Well, there were not any weapons of mass destruction. But that is why we went in.

So I would like to ask the President, please, tell us what the exit strategy is. How will we know when we win in Iraq, and how much is it going to cost us?

#### \$87 BILLION BETTER SPENT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Senate on a voice vote yesterday, kind of pathetic, voted to borrow \$87 billion from the American people for the conflict in Iraq. A substantial portion of that is to go to rebuild, or build, not rebuild, build the infrastructure of Iraq. As the gentlewoman from Ohio said, some of it is going to pay Iraqis for make-work or no-show jobs when we cannot get unemployment benefits for Americans here. If we took that money and we divided it up, there are 435 of us here in the House of Representatives, and we divided it up among our congressional districts, that would be \$220 million per congressional district.

Now, my district has just about the highest rate of unemployment in the United States. My State has the highest rate of unemployment, my district and the gentleman from Oregon's (Mr. WALDEN) are unfortunately right up there in the State. Mr. Speaker, \$22 million could mean a lot for us. It could put a lot of people to work.

Albany, Oregon, under Federal mandate, is going to borrow money to build a new water system. Of course, we are going to give \$50 million to Iraq to build a new water system for one city. Sweet Home, Oregon, same thing. Federal mandate. They can borrow some money, but we are going to give money to Iraq to build them new water systems.

My port of Port Orifice sewage system, fell into the ocean after a big storm. Problem. The Federal Government says this depressed little coastal community, they will lend them some money to help them do that project; lend them some money. But, in Iraq, we are going to give them new sewer systems. The American people are borrowing money to build these projects