

have no choice except to help rebuild Iraq's oil infrastructure, but we must make clear that we have no intention of controlling the country's oil reserves. The natural resource of Iraq must be treated as the patrimony of the Iraqi people.

Point number 18: Economic assistance to Iraq should be front-loaded and generous.

War has been a constant of history, but the concept of reconstruction is relatively new. The 20th century gave us two vastly different models. At the end of World War I, the victors imposed retributive terms on Germany, which so angered German society that it turned to fascism. World War II was the result.

The allies took a different approach at the end of World War II. Generosity was the watchword. The Marshall Plan was adopted to rebuild Europe and General MacArthur directed the reform and modernization of Japan. Model democracies emerged. The world was made more secure.

The economic plan for Iraq should be two-prong, debt forgiveness coupled with institution building. A better world is more likely to emerge if the American agenda places its emphasis on construction rather than destruction.

Here a note about the other reconstruction model in American history is relevant. With his call for malice toward none in his second inaugural address, Lincoln set the most conciliatory tone in the history of war. His successor once removed, U.S. Grant, proved to be a more proficient soldier than President and countenanced carpetbagging conflicts of interest.

Our government today would be well-advised to recognize that neither history, nor the American public, approves of war or postwar profiteering. Great care has to be taken to ensure transparency and integrity in government contracts. And common sense would indicate that the more Iraqis are involved in rebuilding their own society, the more lasting such efforts are likely would be to be.

Point number 19: Terrorism effects world economics as well as politics.

Markets depend on confidence and nothing undercuts confidence more than anarchist acts. Policies designed to deter terrorism can be counterproductive. International disapproval of our actions may jeopardize our economy and diminish the credibility of our political leadership in the world. Increased terrorism could well have the dual effect of precipitating new U.S. military engagements and, ironically, strengthening isolationist sentiment which in turn could degenerate into a disastrous spiral of protectionism.

Point number 20: The measure of success in reconstruction is not the sum of accomplishments.

During the Viet Nam War, the Pentagon gave progress reports mainly in terms of body counts. One of the most liberal critics of that war, I.F. Stone,

once commented that he accepted the validity of the body counts, but thought that they did not reveal the big picture.

Suppose, Stone suggested, he was walking down a street and he bumped into a man running out of a bank, waving a gun and carrying a satchel full of money and were to ask the man, "What are you doing?" If the man responded, "I am waiting for a car," he would be telling the truth but not revealing the big picture.

Good things are being accomplished in Iraq, particularly in the north where an American General has won a measure of popularity through progressive stabilization initiatives. Yet, terrorism cannot credibly be contained in the arms-infested Iraqi environment. American civilians, as well as Armed Services personnel who have been posted to Iraq, deserve to be commended for their commitment and sacrifices, but prudence suggests that brevity of service is preferable to a long-standing presence. Otherwise, in a world where terrorism is a growth industry, even extraordinary sacrifice and significant accomplishments could be for naught.

Point number 21: We must respect Iraqi culture and work to ensure that the art and artifacts of this cradle of civilization are preserved for the Iraqi people.

There are few umbrages more long-lasting than cultural theft. Cultural looting must be stopped, and the market for stolen antiquities squelched. For our part, we should ensure that Iraqi cultural sites are protected and that our laws are upgraded. Any stolen antiquities brought to America must be returned.

Point number 22: The war in Iraq should not cause us to forget Afghanistan.

While the center of our military attention may at the moment be Bagdad, we must remember that no Iraqi was involved in hijacking the planes that struck the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on 9/11.

Few countries are more distant physically or culturally from the United States than Afghanistan; yet, it is there the plotting for the terrorist acts began. The Taliban have been removed and a new, more tolerant government has been established; but the world community has not fulfilled its commitments to raise the country out of poverty and warlordism. The U.S. cannot continue to be complacent about economic and social development in that country, where foreigners have never been welcome. Failure of the Karzai government and a return of the Taliban would be a major setback in the battle with terrorism.

Point number 23: Lastly and most importantly, U.S. policymakers should never lose sight of the fact that events in Israel and Iraq are intertwined and that no challenge is more important for regional and global security than resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian dilemma.

Extraordinarily, from a priority perspective, administration after administration in Washington seems to pay only intermittent attention to the Palestinian issue. There should be no higher priority in our foreign policy than a resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Attention in Washington should be riveted at all times on this singular problem. The current status quo is good neither for Israel nor for the Palestinians. Now, for the first time lack of progress in establishing a mutually acceptable *modus vivendi* between the parties may be even more damaging to countries not directly involved in the conflict. The need for U.S. leadership in pressing for peace has never been more urgent. It would be a tragedy if, focused as we are upon making war in one part of the Middle East, we neglected to give sufficient priority to promoting peace in another.

In conclusion, the world is noting that we are saying and what we are doing. Many are not convinced by our words; many are appalled by our actions. Yet nothing would be worse for the world than for us to fail. We must not. The key at this point is to recognize the limits as well as magnitude of our power and emphasize the most uplifting aspects of our heritage: democracy, opportunity, freedom of thought and worship. Motives matter; so do techniques to advance our values. The lesson of the past year is clear: America does better as a mediator and multi-party peace maker than as a unilateral interventionist.

IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RENZI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am here, and I anticipate being joined by several Members, to discuss the issues that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) was discussing, the gentleman, who commands great respect in this body and one who clearly possesses a profound knowledge of international relationships, and at the same time provides a perspective and an analysis that should be instructive and informative to all Americans. I think he had 23 points. I do not know whether he has any additional points he wishes to make, but if he does, I would be happy to yield to him.

It would appear that he does not. But again, let me acknowledge his contribution to the debate.

Myself and my colleagues for some weeks now, I think, on more than 20 occasions during the course of the time that is reserved after legislative business is concluded, the so-called "special orders" time, have come to the floor and we have labeled this particular initiative, the Iraq Watch. And, hopefully, we have had among us a conversation that has been both informative for the audience, as well as educational for the Members of the House in terms of this issue that, clearly, has a huge impact on the American people, both in terms of lives and the safety of our military personnel in Iraq, but also clearly in terms of our economy.

It is ironic that it was the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) as I said, a very respected member of the Republican Party, who just left the floor, who spoke I believe so eloquently, and I daresay that I share many of the concerns and would agree with much of what he said. But having said that, recently in his home State, Iowa, there was an advertisement on behalf of the Bush Presidential Campaign; and I understand it was paid for by the Republican National Committee. It was titled "Reality" and it was a 30-second clip. There were some comments by the President, and I understand there were some snippets of speeches that the President had made regarding Iraq specifically and presumably the war on terrorists.

There was also an announcer, a voice overlay, if you will, not an individual who appeared on the ad, but someone who would comment after the snippet of the President was viewed by the audience. And what the announcer said caused me to be disturbed, because the announcer said, and I am quoting from that snippet, "Some now are attacking the President for attacking the terrorists."

The announcer then went on to say that, "Some called for us to retreat, putting our national security in the hands of others." And then the announcer instructed, "Call Congress now."

I am confused, because during the entire debate, not just regarding Iraq, not just regarding Afghanistan, but all of the debate subsequent to September 11, I never heard from a single Member on either side of the aisle that we should retreat and put our national security in the hands of others.

□ 1945

That simply was untrue. That ad was not misleading; it was an untruth.

Now, have many of us questioned the policy regarding Iraq, regarding the war on terror? Well, yes. An unequivocal yes. And as I said, ironically, we heard this earlier this evening from the preceding speaker, a well-regarded, well-respected, thoughtful member of the House Committee on International Relations who happens to be a subcommittee chair and one who voted against the resolution authorizing military intervention in Iraq. He certainly is not calling for any retreat, and neither am I, and neither is any Democrat.

But, again, I know many of us on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, are concerned about the competence and what we see as a policy that is failing, which will translate not into a retreat but a defeat in terms of the war on terror. I understand that that particular 30-second ad is no longer running. Well, that is good. The questions that are being posed to the President and to his administration are not just coming from Democrats. The displeasure, the disappointment, the criticism, the concern is not coming

from Democrats. It is a view that is shared by many.

Now, many Americans, clearly many in this Chamber, remember the former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Newt Gingrich. And clearly many Americans are familiar with the junior Senator from New York, the former First Lady, the wife of the former President, Bill Clinton. And all of us know that it would be a rare moment where they would agree on anything. Well, they happen to agree on the policy of this administration when it comes to Iraq, because yesterday it was the former House Speaker on a Sunday TV magazine program who stated that the Bush administration has gone, and I am quoting Newt Gingrich, "Off the cliff in postwar Iraq, and the White House has to get a grip on this."

These are not my words; these are the words of the former Speaker of the House, the former leader of the Republican Party in this House, Mr. Newt Gingrich, that often sat, Mr. Speaker, in the same chair that you are now sitting in presiding over this House. Well, on this particular occasion, Senator CLINTON said she agreed with Mr. Gingrich. She blamed the administration for miscalculating and inept planning in Iraq.

But those two are not alone.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield to my good friend and a member of the Iraq Watch, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, the difficulty here, as the gentleman has outlined, is that we are now engaged in what can only be described as political hate speech. This is not an unusual circumstance, I am sorry to say, in this day and age.

I have had occasion to pick up a centennial edition, I believe is the designation, by the original publishers of George Orwell's "1984." A new introduction by Thomas Pinchon. My colleague may recall in "1984," in Orwell's conception of what was taking place, there is a whole new conception of what speech would consist of and what the language would be. Ignorance is strength, slavery is freedom, hatred is love. Everything becomes its own contradiction, its exact opposite. The confusion is there.

Let us read exactly what the advertisement said. We are now conducting political policy by virtue of advertising when issues of war and peace are concerned. Let me quote it directly: "Some are now attacking the President for attacking the terrorists." Who? Some. Who?

I suppose it is possible, if you look far enough and long enough and deep enough, you can find somebody, somewhere, not necessarily even within the boundaries of the United States, if we are talking about some, who would be attacking the President for attacking the terrorists. But I do not think that

those of us who are taking this issue seriously and trying to engage in a dialogue on this issue can find anyone of a serious bent in the House, any of our colleagues, to come down and name anyone.

Mr. DELAHUNT. From either the Republican side or the Democratic side.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. That goes without saying. Here on the floor of the House of Representatives, anyone, find anyone, who would be able to corroborate such an accusation.

In fact, if one takes into account, and I am looking here at an article in the Wall Street Journal, in an opinion article, "Politics and People," Albert Hunt, "What Might Have Been," and it concerns our good friend and my good friend and fellow Hawaiian, General Eric Shinseki, former Chief of the Army, who, as you know, was vilified by people in the administration.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And, Mr. Speaker, who happened to be a decorated hero, a military hero; someone who fought for his country with great bravery and valor. That is the kind of individual that my colleague is talking about.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I am not only talking about General Shinseki as a decorated war hero but as someone who came through the ranks to become chief of the Army, and who, in response to a congressional inquiry, gave answers, as a soldier should to those who are in charge of the country by constitution, gave answers with respect to what would be required in Iraq should an attack take place in order to avoid encouraging and in fact perhaps even seeing a situation take place in which terrorism would expand, rather than be contracted or defeated. What General Shinseki indicated was that we were not engaged in a serious "troops to task analysis."

That is what this is about. This is not about attacking the President about his opposition to terrorism; it is whether or not his political policies have resulted in military activity which is in fact not only succeeding but increasing the terrorism that exists in the world.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And, Mr. Speaker, the best evidence of that are the recent attacks both in Saudi Arabia and Turkey, one of our erstwhile allies in the region, who has been supportive of the United States in the war on terror, who has been supportive of our natural ally in the State of Israel. And what we are beginning to see is the spread of terrorism far from just Iraq, but everywhere around the world.

However, others, again from both parties, have articulated a criticism. CHUCK HAGEL, another veteran, someone who has experienced combat in Vietnam, a highly regarded, well-respected Senator, made this statement back in September, again on a national TV program. In response to the question, "Did the administration miscalculate the difficulty of this war?," this is what Senator HAGEL said: "Yes, they did miscalculate it. I think they

did a miserable job of planning for a post-Saddam Iraq. They treated most in the Congress like a nuisance when we asked questions."

Well, I think it is incumbent upon the President of the United States to respond to the questions that the people's representatives in both branches of Congress pose, because it is the people of the United States that are losing their sons and daughters in Iraq. To date we have already appropriated in excess of \$165 billion that will be paid for by future generations. And what do we see? We see a deteriorating situation.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, we are spending not \$87 billion, but as the gentleman indicated, upwards of \$160 billion just in excess appropriations, or rather in additional supplemental appropriations vis-a-vis Iraq. Yet, when we bring home troops for rest and recreation purposes, they are taken to only three cities, and then they are on their own and they pay their own bills. That has not been changed.

I believe the figure is \$55 million approximately that the Congress has put forward for transportation in the area of recreation purposes. It is not going to be enough. We are not even prepared at this stage to have orderly transitions in terms of rest and recreation periods, let alone what will now take place with the transfer of troops.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I am aware of the gentleman's expertise in terms of issues involving national security. I do not know whether the gentleman had an opportunity to read just recently the fact that we are now, for the next 6 months, under the benchmark in terms of readiness as far as our Army is concerned. And yet we have members of the administration, an Under Secretary of State and others, such as Richard Perle, who is the former chair of the Defense Policy Board, insinuating that if Syria does not get its act together, they might be the next one subject to a military intervention by the United States.

But having said that, I just want to go again back so that those who are listening are aware that that attacking Congress, and presumably Democrats, is just simply untrue.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If the gentleman will yield for a moment on his latter point, I was looking through my notes for a moment, and the gentleman indicated Mr. Perle. Would this be the same Mr. Perle, quoting from the Financial Times of December 4, that "the Boeing Corporation has taken a \$20 million stake in an investment fund run by Richard Perle, a top Pentagon adviser, underlining the close links it has built to Washington's defense establishment. Boeing said it made the investment in Trireme Partners last year as part of a broad strategy to invest in companies with promising defense-related technologies." The Financial Times adds, "Boeing said it

had no knowledge that Mr. Perle had advised the company on a controversial \$18 billion deal to lease refueling aircraft tankers to the U.S. Air Force or other Pentagon related matters."

Mr. DELAHUNT. This is the same Richard Perle, my friend, who was the former chair but then resigned because of concerns about conflict of interest.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. As a defense adviser to the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Who, in many respects, was the single most ardent supporter of a leading member of the Iraqi Governing Council, whose name is Ahmed Chalabi. And I do not know how this happened, but he was appointed by the administration to the Iraqi Governing Council without any consultation with another of our allies in the region, the Government of Jordan.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the gentleman is aware of this, but I dare say many who might be watching this are unaware of it, but Mr. Chalabi was convicted in Jordan for embezzlement in the amount of hundreds of millions of dollars.

□ 2000

He was sentenced in absentia, and received a sentence of 22 years. He is a convicted felon. Again, I do not want to get into issues that I think we both agree do not really go to the heart of our policy but reflect the failures of the management of the so-called war against terror.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the reason this has relevance is because these are the people who are formulating the policy. These are the people who are making the case for the foundations of the political policy that we find our troops having to bear the brunt of. That is the whole point here. The question is not whether we are against terror, the question is not whether there is support for the troops, the question is do we have a political policy that is worthy of their sacrifice.

Mr. DELAHUNT. The question is, I dare say, who is in charge? For me, it was an interesting Sunday morning when I listened to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, RICHARD LUGAR, again another highly-respected Republican with considerable experience in terms of foreign relations, along with the senior Democrat on the committee, Senator JOE BIDEN. When Senator BIDEN made the statement that the President should take charge, and Tim Russet, who happened to be the moderator, asked whether that was good and necessary advice, Senator LUGAR, the Republican Senator from the State of Indiana who chairs the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said yes, it is, it is very necessary. I concur with my colleague, the President has to be the President, that means the President over the Vice President and other Secretaries. LUGAR had just had enough of the administration's divided voices, especially the Vice President's which he described,

when referring to the Vice President, "very, very tough and strident."

To put out an ad in Iowa during a Presidential Campaign suggesting it was either the Democrats or Congress that wanted to retreat on the war on terror, no, that is not the case. None of us want to retreat, we want to win, we do not want to lose, and we are looking at defeat right now.

Many that are watching here tonight clearly are familiar with Senator MCCAIN who served this country heroically and courageously in Vietnam as a pilot, who served for many years as a prisoner of war, and he criticized, as reported in USA Today, just about a month ago, MCCAIN criticized the Bush Administration conduct of the Iraq war yesterday, saying the U.S. should send at least 15,000 more troops, or risk the most significant global defeat on the world stage since Vietnam. MCCAIN said Bush must be more involved in Iraqi decisionmaking and not be influenced by the upcoming Presidential campaign. MCCAIN also challenged the Rumsfeld assertion that the 132,000 American troops in Iraq can defeat the insurgency in the country. This is again Senator MCCAIN's words, "The simple truth is we do not have sufficient forces in Iraq to meet our military objectives."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RENZI). The Chair would remind all Members to refrain from quoting the Senate, including quotations of individual Senators.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, clearly this advertisement to which we are referring in which the phrase "some are now attacking the President for attacking the terrorists," is meant to reestablish a link between Iraq, the attack in Iraq and 9/11. That is to say, there has been a constant drum-beat attempt by those who advocated this war in Iraq that this was somehow an extension or expansion or movement toward a more direct attack on terrorism, whereas no link has been established between the attack on the Trade Towers and the plane crashing in Pennsylvania, no link has been established between that and this attack on Iraq.

To the contrary, there is more than ample evidence to indicate that there were policymakers around the President who wanted to have this attack on Iraq well before 9/11, and 9/11 became the excuse for them to bring this back up, move it into the forefront and, in fact, displace the war on terror, the response to the attack on terror.

That is, in fact, not just what was implied in this ad, but this is clearly an attempt on a political basis to try to reestablish that in the minds of Americans across the Nation so that this becomes a defense of this failed policy in Iraq.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, let us remember for a moment this it was practically a unanimous vote with one exception, over 400 Members of this House voted to support, the gentleman

and I included, to support the intervention in Afghanistan because, clearly, there was a haven for the terrorists there. There were al Qaeda camps there. There was al Qaeda training there. But now let us stop for a moment and examine what has happened in Afghanistan. What has happened in Afghanistan, if this administration is really serious about the war on terror, we are facing a crisis in Afghanistan. They have the responsibility.

I do not know if the gentleman is aware, but after the overwhelming victory by the military in Afghanistan, in the 2003 budget the dollars that were appropriated or recommended by the administration for reconstruction and support for Afghanistan amounted to nothing, not a single dollar.

Fortunately, this House and this Senate appropriated some \$800 million. But stop for a moment and realize that those that attacked the United States on 9/11, al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden, those terrorists that were clearly posing an imminent and direct threat to Americans everywhere, and still do, are multiplying like fishes and loaves, were headquartered in Afghanistan and protected by the Taliban regime. It has been 2 years, and what is happening in Afghanistan?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I think we see in the dialogue that has taken place between Secretary Powell and our NATO allies, the answer to that question. The NATO allies are not going to increase to the degree they have any troops there at all, and they do have some in insignificant numbers. The Italians, for example, have police officers, and so on, but insignificant numbers. They are reluctant at best, if not outright hostile, toward the idea of increasing their presence in Iraq for a simple reason, it is the NATO forces in Afghanistan that are bearing the brunt of trying to deal with the continuing battle that is going on there against terrorism. That war on terror was not won in Afghanistan, it is ongoing. It is ongoing as we speak. We do not have sufficient forces, let alone intelligence there, right now.

The gentleman may know we now have to deal with the horrifying consequences and stories that will be going around based on what happened in Afghanistan within the last 36 hours where nine children were killed in an attempt to try to take a presumed militant, whatever the word is these days that is attached to anybody that we can presume to be an enemy.

We do not have sufficient forces, we do not have sufficient assets, we do not have sufficient concentration of intelligence efforts in Afghanistan right now because we are diverted in Iraq.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And the American people should know that the Taliban and al Qaeda are experiencing a resurgence in the border area of Afghanistan with Pakistan. They are coming back. We are on the verge of losing the war against terror. We are not retreating,

but we are finding ourselves on the verge of losing.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, this is precisely the point that we are trying to make, and have been trying to make here in Iraq Watch, over and over again. By engaging as we are in Iraq right now, we are actually undermining our capacity to confront terror, whether in its most physically manifest form in Afghanistan or in the recruitment and the propaganda that is now sweeping the Islamic world with regard to whether or not America is now an enemy that must be fought at all costs. We are increasing the number of people who can succumb to that kind of message because of what we are doing in Iraq and what we are not doing in Afghanistan.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And yet months ago the White House was attempting to call Afghanistan a success story; but they failed to commit the necessary resources, and now we have a chaotic and increasingly dangerous country where violence is the norm, where the Taliban is returning, and one can only see that we are on the verge of repeating the same mistake in Iraq. Can Members just imagine in terms of the prestige and the influence of the United States, not just in that region but all over the Muslim world, as well as the entire globe, what would happen in terms of the erosion of our stature.

There was a very good analytical piece done by a columnist by the name of Jake Kaplan, and I want to quote what he said 4 or 5 months ago. "As we reconsider reconstruction plans in Iraq and the administration promises to democratize the country, it is worth taking a look at our liberalization of Afghanistan. A year later, many of the atrocities we thought would stop still continue, and even Bush's allies in the Senate on Afghanistan think we have undercommitted to efforts that could truly change that country for the better. 'Afghanistan's experience does not bode very well for the upcoming one,' said Steven Burke of the Center for International Conflict Resolution, who just returned from 16 days in Afghanistan in early March. It is a country that needs attention and commitment, but there is an inclination to withdraw."

And there is an ad that says that Congress is retreating? Who are these people that are retreating from the war on terror? And yet no dollars in the 2003 budget submitted by the administration were incorporated into that budget for Afghanistan, and that ad runs? That is more than an untruth.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, we may not be financing what is necessary for either troop movements or political stability in Afghanistan, but I can assure the gentleman, I am sorry to say that financing is nonetheless taking place in Afghanistan except it is going to be for terror.

□ 2015

We now have more poppies being grown, more heroin being processed,

and more trading in heroin than ever before in the history of Afghanistan, than ever before in the history of any nation on the face of the Earth. I should say any region on the face of the Earth, because clearly Afghanistan does not rate the name of nation now in terms of commerce and stability and political equilibrium that we associate with the term. The only thing that is stable, the only thing that is growing, the only thing that is expanding, the only thing that is a sure thing in Afghanistan is there is more heroin being traded for more money that is going to find its way into the pockets of those who are financing terrorism.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And come to the streets and the communities and the neighborhoods in this country. There is one statistic the gentleman might be interested in. Since our intervention 2 years ago in Afghanistan, opium production has increased 19-fold and become the major source of the world's heroin. Who is retreating? I want to win, and I know you want to win. That opium production will fuel terrorism. By the way, President Karzai, whom I believe is a man of great courage, it is well known among all the international observers and participants in the efforts to assist Afghanistan that he cannot leave Kabul for fear of being assassinated. His brother, who represents the government in southern Kandahar, which is a province in Afghanistan, was very blunt to a reporter. He said recently, "It's like I am seeing the same movie twice and no one is trying to fix the problem. What was promised to Afghans with the collapse of the Taliban was a new life of hope and change. But what was delivered? Nothing. There have been no significant changes for the people." Hamid Karzai says he does not know what to say to people anymore. And who is retreating? Who is allowing terrorism to experience a renaissance, if you will, in Afghanistan, after the promises were made by this administration?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If the gentleman will yield, I think the answer is very, very clear. All of our assets, human and otherwise, are being concentrated in Iraq, or that area of the world which purports to be Iraq. As the gentleman knows, Iraq is a construct of the post-World War I colonial powers, particularly Great Britain and France. And so even the idea that there is a political construct there that can be referred to for elections or anything else is little more than fiction to begin with. The plain fact of the matter is that we cannot move forward in Afghanistan because the assets that are needed there, particularly financial, are being wasted right now in Iraq.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Again, I do not want those that might be watching us this evening having this conversation to think that simply because you and I are Democrats that there are not concerns that have been expressed by Members in the majority party. There

was an article that appeared in a magazine that circulates here in Washington particularly among Members and those that work on Capitol Hill. This is back several weeks ago in Roll Call. The article is entitled, "As Supplemental Heads to Conference, Members Warn of Cautionary Tale in Afghanistan." Members are using the war-torn nation as an example of what not to do in Iraq. "Remember, Afghanistan was the haven for Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda," I am quoting now from Representative JIM KOLBE, chair of the Appropriations Committee in this body on foreign relations. He said there has been some neglect of it. He was referring to the 2-year U.S. effort to rebuild Afghanistan after toppling its repressive and terrorist-shielding Taliban government.

Representative LEWIS, our colleague from California who chairs the appropriations subcommittee on defense, said, "One really does need to understand the challenges we face in Iraq. We should not leave vacuums like we did in Afghanistan. A failed state there could be an incubator for terrorism again but the resources have not always followed the policy." Again, there is Senator LUGAR.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If the gentleman will yield, I will tell you where we do have a visible presence, where we do meet the criteria that is stated and enunciated by Representative LEWIS and the good Senator. We now have barbed wire villages. Those images are going all around the world as we speak. We are now creating our own areas of concentration camps and villages complete with identification cards that have to be shown to American soldiers so that people, and I say people, I am talking women, children, men, entire villages now are being processed through barbed wire into their own villages.

Mr. DELAHUNT. It is called winning the hearts and minds of the people, I presume.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. The parallel, and I am not one to draw analogies to Vietnam because I think most of those kinds of comparisons tend to be inexact and then you end up in useless kinds of arguments as to exactitude, but the parallels are there. You may recall the rather infamous phrase associated with our pacification policy in Vietnam. We had to destroy the village in order to save it. Now in order to stabilize Iraq, we have to take barbed wire and surround whole villages with it. So I think the question here is, at this stage, what is to be done? How are we to regard the war on terror and what the relationship of the attack on Baghdad and the subsequent war which followed it, how is that to be handled? How is that to be addressed by the United States?

We are told, and again these cliches and bromides come fast and furious, that we should not cut and run. I am going to have to presume, I guess, that I know what cutting and running

means. It means that you stop doing what you are doing and you leave. I do not know whether anybody noticed it or not, I certainly noticed, about November 15, that is precisely what Mr. Bush and Mr. Bremer concluded, that the United States was going to cut and run. That is what we are doing right now. The problem is that we are not admitting that that is what we are doing and we are sacrificing the Reserves and the Guard and the active duty military that is there now and that which will be going there to this continued failed policy without admitting what we are doing.

We are turning over supposedly conveniently, just before the election in 2004, turning over, supposedly, the present occupation to a government in Iraq. If that is not cutting and running, I do not know what is. Are we going to turn over control, such as it might be, to some governing entity in Iraq, or are we not? And if we are, what constitutes that governing entity, this farce of an advisory group that we have there? Shiite clerics? The ill-equipped and untrained police forces that we have cobbled together? Or perhaps we are going to turn it over to this new paramilitary army made up of armed members of various political parties in Iraq. A paramilitary force.

And we have the gall to turn to the American people and say, "Well, they are preparing to defend themselves." They are preparing to cut each other's throats. They are preparing to fight one another, not just politically but with guns and bullets. The fact of the matter is that there is utter and complete political chaos in Iraq that is not being addressed by existing military policy of the United States.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And they made the same, and continue to make the same, mistake in Afghanistan. After more than 18 months now, only about 7,000 troops have completed training under British and French and American officers. That program has been delayed by desertions and political interference from Afghan warlords. At this point in time, it was estimated there would be 50 or 60,000 in the Afghan police and in the Afghan military. And they expect that they are going to have in June a national election. If they have a national election, one can only imagine the magnitude of violence that will occur.

We are losing the war on terror, Mr. President. We are not retreating. What we are imploring you to do is to consult with Congress. Do not consider Congress as a nuisance. Listen to the Jim Leaches, to the Chuck Hagels, to the John McCains, and to others that have valuable insights in terms of what war is truly about and, most importantly, how to make peace and protect the Americans and our national security interests, and tell the RNC to take that ad off, because it is a lie. It is not just an untruth.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If the gentleman will yield, I will tell you what

we are going to have to do in the meantime, then, to try and protect those troops that are already there and to try and find an exit strategy worthy of the name that can allow us the opportunity to turn over some kind of political capacity in Iraq. There is a bill going forward that hopefully will be signed on a bipartisan basis to increase the end strength of the armed services, the Army and Marines in particular, and I am afraid now we are going to have to include the Air Force. At one point I think if we had handled this, we would not have had to add the Air Force. Since 1995, I for one and others on the Committee on Armed Services and other interested parties have been urging, so this goes beyond the present administration.

We are not trying to draw distinctions there. Since 1995, some of us have been urging an increase in the end strength. That is an inside baseball term in the Committee on Armed Services for increasing the number of troops in the Army and in the Marine Corps, because we could see the kinds of deployments that were taking place, whether it was in Kosovo, whether it was in Bosnia, in other words, in Eastern Europe, whether it was in the Philippines. No matter where it was and no matter what the reasons may have been, no matter how one felt about it one way or the other, the plain fact of the matter is that there was sufficient support to warrant these deployments, and we did not have the troop strength available to do it. We do not yet have a reinstatement of the draft.

When people talk about the war on terrorism, most people are watching it on television. We are depending on a volunteer force to do that. What sacrifices have we made? Some inconvenience in an airport? Somebody running, as they did for me yesterday when I flew here, running their wands over your shoes? Having you hold your arms out so that they can check your watch? Examining your baggage? What kind of sacrifice is that? At most it is an inconvenience.

The only sacrifice that we have made as a population since 9/11 is we postponed the Super Bowl one week. An inconvenience. That is the only sacrifice that has been made. This is being watched on television. This is being observed. We get the little tear in the eye and we get the flag being waved around those who are in Walter Reed or in Bethesda Hospital right now with grievous wounds. The sacrifice of the troops is not the point here. It is the sacrifice of those troops on a battlefield of corrupt political policy unworthy of the troops that are out there. And I tell you this, we cannot sustain with the existing Guard and Reserves that we have in this country the continual deployment into Iraq and still meet the necessities that we have outlined with respect to Afghanistan. That does not even begin to include questions about North Korea or any other place that United States troops may or may not

be needed in the future as a result of some activity, other kinds of terrorist activity in other places around the world. We are not prepared. We are not able to engage in deployments with respect to terror in the rest of the world because of the failure of our policies in Iraq and our failure to understand the true nature of what was necessary in Afghanistan.

□ 2030

Mr. DELAHUNT. What is refreshing is within the past 2 or 3 weeks there has been some candor on the part of representatives of the administration. In a recent story in the Washington Post back on November 19, the new U.S. Ambassador to Afghanistan made this acknowledgment: He gave the administration's bleakest assessment yet of security conditions in Afghanistan, saying that a regrouping of the Taliban and al Qaeda, increased drug trafficking, and even common criminals are hampering Karsai in the transition to democracy. Taliban rebels have dramatically stepped up operations in recent months, and Khalilzad, who is our Ambassador, said, "Common criminals and al Qaeda followers are increasingly active."

Just be honest with the American people. Do not talk about Congress not supporting the war on terror or Democrats not supporting the war on terror or selected Republicans not supporting the war on terror. Every American has an interest in defeating those that would attack this country. Do not question motives. Do not question people's patriotism. Do not question the effort to create a policy. Many of us including myself and the gentleman from Hawaii opposed American intervention in Iraq, and I stand by that decision proudly. But now that we are there, do not politicize the efforts that are being made to deal with these egregious conditions in Iraq and in Afghanistan when this administration has made promises to those people and to the American people and are not living up to them.

What I found fascinating was a secret memo, a secret memorandum, that was authored by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Rumsfeld, who was widely known or at least widely believed to be an ardent hawk about military intervention; who, along with the Vice President and Under Secretary Wolfowitz, told the American people that our military personnel would be greeted with flowers and bands and welcomed as liberators. But now the reality has set in. And in a secret memorandum, Secretary Rumsfeld is expressing concerns about whether we are winning the war on terrorism, and he posed two interesting questions in this secret memorandum that was leaked so the American people could find out what was going on in terms of the administration's honest assessment. "Are we winning or losing the global war on terror?" was one of the questions. And "Is our current situation such that the harder we work, the behinder we get?"

It is indeed unfortunate that politics would be allowed to play a role in decisions where not just America tax dollars of a magnitude that will clearly at a point in our future become a drag on our economy because we are borrowing those dollars, remember, and the grant we gave them, we are not going to get it back. But even more importantly, our men and women find themselves at risk in terms of their personal safety every day. This is not a place for politics. This is not a place for attack ads. And I dare say that if that is the strategy that is being designed by the President's political advisor, it will backfire, because the American people, they get it. They really get it.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ACKERMAN. The acting Secretary of the Army I am afraid has not gotten that particular message because in relation to right in my own district out in Hawaii, the movement of troops out of the 25th up at Schofield Barracks, out into Asia and into Iraq, the movement of Guard and Reserve troops, indicated that this was justified on the basis that if we did not fight them, presumably whoever these people are, terrorists and opposition, military opposition, fight them over there, wherever "there" is, that we would be fighting them here, that is to say, in the United States. The clear link there obviously is that had we not attacked Iraq, Iraq would somehow be attacking the United States, that somehow we would be the victims of an assault by Iraq or the forces of Iraq and presumably by that meaning Saddam Hussein.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, they still cannot find the weapons of mass destruction. And, by the way, I do not know if the American people are aware of this, but it has cost and will cost the American taxpayer simply to look, to secure the experts, secure the expertise, to look for these weapons of mass destruction, which by now there is an overwhelming consensus that they do not exist and that they never existed. It is costing the American taxpayers \$1 billion. Just think of what \$1 billion could do for Hawaii or for Massachusetts. I mean, I guess, that is a subject for another night.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, precisely my point is that it serves little good both to a sensible and reasonable and rational dialogue as to what steps we should take now with regard to our occupation in Iraq and the continuing military operations in Afghanistan, it does little good for us to engage in a dialogue in which these kinds of accusations are made or these kinds of observations such as I have just outlined: If we do not fight them there, we will have to fight them here. This is hardly worthy of the Secretary of the Army let alone any high official of the government. It is hardly worthy of anybody to say some are attacking the

President for attacking terrorists. I mean it is stupid on its face to say something like that, and it is clearly meant to be provocative and political without forming any kind of an enlightenment with respect to the issues at hand. What needs to be done, and I think that the Iraq Watch that we have been engaged in these past weeks is indicative of this, that what needs to be done is to have this kind of dialogue. We do not have the hearings. We do not have the dialogue during the regular course of the day.

We are getting ready to recess. The Congress is going out of business in the midst of this winter. There will be no recess in the wars. There will be no recess in the killing. There will be no recess in the wounding. There will be no recess in the political implications. I can assure the Members of that. We are reaping a whirlwind of hatred and distrust across the world such as we have not faced certainly in my memory. The United States has always represented a beacon of hope to people. In our worst excesses and in times when there has been the most argument, even within the borders of the United States as to what our policy should be or should not be, it has always at least had as our fundamental base that we were trying to do the right thing by way of our cooperation with others, by way of our respect for other people; and yet today our whole policy is we are going to do as we please. We are going to take up the issues as we see fit, and whether anybody else wants to involve themselves with us, that is tough. We do not care. That is not a foreign policy. That way lies blindness and defeat for this country.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

THE REPUBLICAN MEDICARE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RENZI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take to the floor this evening to discuss the Medicare legislation that the President signed today. And needless to say, I am very critical of the legislation which was essentially and primarily sponsored by the Republican leadership, and, obviously, supported by the President of the United States. And I know that the President signed the bill with great fanfare today, but certainly from the reaction that I have been getting in my district and throughout the State, because I was in various locations around the State of New Jersey over the last 2 weeks when we had our Thanksgiving recess, the reaction amongst New Jerseyans has been overwhelmingly against the bill. And I have to say that the concerns that I am hearing from senior citizens in New Jersey, and I am sure this is echoed throughout the country, are