

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

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

#### IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening as we come to the floor again as part of what we have come to call our Iraq Watch, and I am grateful that we are joined by several colleagues this evening, Mr. BISHOP from New York, Mr. McDERMOTT from Washington State, and others that will be joining us throughout this early part of the evening.

Now, let me start, as we always have, by recognizing the valiant service of the men and women who wear the uniform. And as our leader Ms. PELOSI often says, our men and women who wear the uniform deserve a leadership that is worthy of the sacrifice that they make on a daily basis. I am proud of this Congress, inasmuch as it has been able to distinguish the warriors from the war, and so we continue to honor those brave men and women who wear the uniform of this country and who sacrifice daily on our behalf.

And yet, as events unfold around the globe, but specifically in the Middle East as it relates to Iraq, what we find is even amongst those who initially favored the war, such as pundits like Thomas Friedman, who now have come to say that we have got to come to the realization that we are no longer midwifing democracy in Iraq but, in essence, babysitting an insurgent civil war. So this evening we come here to discuss Iraq from the context of the mistakes that have been made and the need for accountability, starting with the resignation of the Secretary of Defense.

At some point, somewhere along the line, there has got to be accountability for the actions that have transpired in Iraq. We were wrong about the information that led up to going into the war. In fact, the strongest critics against us going into the war were people such as Scowcroft, Eagleburger, Kissinger and Baker, hardly left-leaning liberals, but people who understood international policy and the severe consequences that would result if we

ended up going into Iraq without the full support of the world. And so Americans everywhere kind of have to scratch their heads and say, how is it that we had the entire world with us when we invaded Afghanistan and end up virtually with no support in Iraq.

It is clear from discussions with policymakers and former generals that a series of mistakes have been made, not the least of which was going against our own national policy, the Weinberger Doctrine, which stated very clearly the United States should never go to war against another country unless its vital interests are threatened; and the Powell corollary to that, if we do go in, we should go in with overwhelming force.

In both cases, that doctrine and corollary were rejected in favor of the doctrine of preemption and unilateralism, which has left our allies looking at us as we twist slowly in the winds of Iraq, as Friedman says, babysitting an insurrection and civil war while our most precious of resources, our men and women who serve this country, are in harm's way.

We need a new direction. We ought to send a very clear signal to the world, to the people in this country that it is time for accountability; that it is time to say that mistakes were made and then move on. And we can start with Defense Secretary Rumsfeld stepping down, as he should.

The head of the 9/11 Commission has indicated to both Republicans and Democrats alike that we need to continue to adopt those resolutions and recommendations that they have found in their studies, 20 of which still aren't implemented, which is over half. And so in order to prosecute the war on terror, we have got to be able to accomplish those goals. But without a Congress that wants to hold the President accountable, that is not going to happen.

A gentleman that has been doing just that and speaking out in his district has been TIM BISHOP of New York, and at this time, I would like to yield to him.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank my friend from Connecticut for yielding, and I also thank him for his ongoing leadership on this and so many other issues of importance here in our Congress.

Let me just pick up on a few comments that were made with respect to oversight and accountability. And I find it particularly ironic, when one studies the tragic history of our involvement in Iraq, and whether it begins with the misuse of prewar intelligence or whether it begins in effect with the reasons that we were given for going to war, none of which turned out to be accurate, all of which turned out really to be more about marketing a war than about a real threat that imperiled our safety and security, that we are now being told by these very same people that have led us so far astray, that have so weakened our Nation and

so exposed us to a war on terror that we must fight much more vigilantly than we have thus far; we are now being told that these are the people that we must continue to keep in leadership positions in order to keep us free and safe. And, in fact, it is their very leadership, and I am speaking specifically about the Secretary of Defense and other civilian leaders in the Pentagon, that have led us so far astray.

When you chronicle the mistakes that were made in Iraq, we best-cased the result of our involvement in Iraq and we worst-cased the threat that was there. We invaded with too few troops. We have certainly sufficient troops to overthrow a regime that spent a fraction on defense relative to what we spend on defense, but we invaded with too few troops to secure the peace. We failed to secure the borders. We failed to secure ammo dumps. We failed to see to it that our troops were properly equipped and outfitted, and that was because the leadership of the Pentagon refused to accept the warnings that had been given by so many different experts in this area, that we weren't going to be welcomed with open arms, that we weren't going to be treated as conquering heroes and liberators, but in fact we were going to be viewed as occupiers and invaders.

But our troops arrived with insufficient body armor, with insufficiently armored vehicles because this insurgency was not recognized or anticipated. And yet we have these very same people telling us that they are the ones that are going to keep us safe.

□ 1630

I will just say one other thing, and then yield back. I think this is an administration that specializes in giving us false choices. We are now being presented with the latest false choice, and that is that those of us who do not support the "stay the course" in Iraq can be accused of wanting to abandon the war on terror.

Nothing could be further from the truth. There is not a soul on our side of the aisle that would advocate abandoning the war on terror. Everyone on our side of the aisle would advocate continuing to wage that war, but to wage it with the full resources of this Nation and to wage it much more intelligently than we have thus far.

The sad truth about our involvement in Iraq is that it has stripped us of the resources that we need to wage the war on terror. It is why Osama bin Laden remains at large 5 years after September 11, and it is why al Qaeda remains as powerful as it is.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. If the gentleman will let me ask a question, knowing you are from New York and knowing specifically you are from Long Island, and, of course, with a solemn date approaching us of September 11, do most citizens in New York understand, in your estimation, the difference between the war on global terrorism and the war in Iraq and see

them as different subject matters, or, as IKE SKELTON on the Armed Services Committee has been so nobly trying to demonstrate, the difference between the insurrection and civil war in Iraq and the war on terror? Or has the administration's attempts to blur the lines confused people? What is the sense of New Yorkers?

Mr. BISHOP of New York. My sense is that New Yorkers have not been fooled. My sense is that New Yorkers, and there is hardly a New Yorker who did not lose a loved one or did not lose a friend in the Twin Towers, most New Yorkers recognize that we are fighting two separate and distinct wars, despite, as you say, the administration's efforts to blur the distinction and to cojoin them in an effort to justify something that the vast majority of Americans now recognize was a tragic mistake.

When I go around my district, one of the questions I ask people is do they feel safer today, in August of 2006, than they did on September 12, 2001, and the answer overwhelmingly is no. The answer overwhelmingly is no.

I think most people recognize in my district, and I am grateful for this, that the war in Iraq, which was purportedly to make us safe, make us more safe, has in fact imperiled us beyond where we were the day we invaded.

I think that that is an important recognition and an important distinction for those of us who recognize the distinction needs to continue to be made.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. We have been joined by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I think for a number of our listeners, really the whole idea for coming to this floor came from BILL DELAHUNT. The idea really wasn't hatched here on the floor of the House of Representatives. It was an idea that was hatched in town hall meetings in Nantucket and on the Cape that BILL DELAHUNT held. He encouraged other Members, including myself, who had them in West Hartford and Manchester, Connecticut, and from there, because our voices were muffled. Or if you spoke out against the war, you were deemed unpatriotic. But it was because of his efforts in organizing an Iraq Watch that this has persisted and the truth has been able to continue to come out with regard to our involvement.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the founder of this great movement.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think, tragically, and I mean this sincerely, tragically those of us who spoke out early against the invasion in Iraq, because we believed that there was not significant evidence which established that Iraq was a clear and present danger to the United States and our allies, we have been proven to be correct.

TIM BISHOP, our colleague from New York, used the term "abandoned." Accusations have been made that some who have criticized the competence

and the rationale of this administration regarding Iraq have "abandoned" the war on terror. That is patently false. That is untrue. There is no relationship between the war against terrorism and the war in Iraq.

Now, let me put forth a hypothesis: this administration abandoned the war against terror in a very real way when we were distracted by the neoconservative vision of invading Iraq, because the consequence of the invasion of Iraq was in a large degree the diversion of those assets and initiatives that were necessary to secure Afghanistan, where al Qaeda had been harbored, where al Qaeda thrived, and where there was an opportunity to apprehend Osama bin Laden.

But, no, we were more interested in Saddam Hussein, who was an arch-enemy of Osama bin Laden. Osama bin Laden considered Saddam Hussein an apostate, an infidel, an enemy of his version, his perverted version, of Islam. In fact, in 1994, it was Osama bin Laden who approached the Saudi royal family and suggested they combine forces and depose Saddam Hussein because he was an apostate; he was a defiler of Islam.

So what do we have today? We have a situation in Afghanistan where the headlines now read: "A Resurgence of the Taliban." That government that harbored and gave support to Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda, they are coming back. Another headline in the past 2 days, the British general who heads the NATO deployment in Afghanistan made this plea: "I need more troops or we will lose Afghanistan."

So who abandoned the war on terror? Who abandoned the war on terror? Do not confuse the war in Iraq and the war on terror. We all have an obligation to educate ourselves about the differences, the nuances, the realities on the ground. This is too important. This is about our future, and this is about the future of American generations far into the next decades.

I know my colleague from Maryland who has joined us, CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, has a specific interest in Afghanistan. What is happening today in Afghanistan is a disgraceful example of the incompetence and the legacy of this administration's policy by going into Iraq.

And what have we achieved? We have achieved a resurgence of the Taliban and other terrorist elements in Afghanistan. By the way, what else we have achieved is we have created a new superpower in the region, Iran. Because while we are standing here discussing among ourselves this region in the world, let it be very clear to the American people that there is an emerging warm relationship between Iran and the new government in Iraq. Do your homework, and you will discover that there is a bilateral military cooperation agreement that exists today between Iraq and Iran.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I would like to ask the gentleman a question: What you are telling me and you are

telling our viewing audience this evening, you voted, and I believe the vote was near unanimous in the House of Representatives and the Senate, to invade Afghanistan in Operation Enduring Freedom; is that correct?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I voted, and, again, with one exception out of 435 Members, there was a unanimous vote here in this Chamber, bipartisan, Republicans and Democrats and Independent, to go to Afghanistan and destroy al Qaeda and find Osama bin Laden and apprehend him.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Was not the rest of the world united in that effort with the United States?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I have this vivid memory of the day after 9/11, a headline that appeared in the paper of record in France that said: "We Are All Americans Today." We had support in every corner of the world for what we were doing. We would have succeeded in the war on terror by now. But, no. But, no. We invaded Iraq, and clearly that has created implications for our national security.

If I may just for one moment, and I am not alone when I say this, it is interesting, today in the Wall Street Journal a former Republican Speaker of the House of Representatives, Newt Gingrich of Georgia, who succeeded in securing a majority for the Republican Party in this House in 1994, was quoted. Remember, this is a Republican, a leader. The speculation is that he is considering running for the Presidency in 2008.

This is what Newt Gingrich had to say. Just consider the following: "Osama bin Laden is still at large." I agree. "Afghanistan is still insecure." I would suggest that it is unraveling. "Iraq is still violent." 3,000 deaths a month. "North Korea and Iran are still building nuclear weapons and missiles. Terrorist recruiting is still occurring in the United States, Canada, Great Britain and across the planet."

Those are Newt Gingrich's words, today, in the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. So how is it then, given all that you have said, that with the world behind us in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, that we would, if you will excuse the phrase, why did we "cut and run" in Afghanistan and then focus on Iraq?

As the gentleman from New York pointed out, people are able to distinguish between the enemy who actually knocked down the Twin Towers in New York, struck the Pentagon, and, as Tim Roemer pointed out yesterday, were it not for those brave souls on Flight 93, would have hit this Capitol. How did we go from the whole world being behind us, abandoning what has become, as Mr. VAN HOLLEN often points out, the forgotten front in Afghanistan, take our eye off the prize and expend the amount of money, and, most importantly, our most precious resource, our men and women who serve this country in Iraq?

□ 1645

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, if one reviews the memoir of Paul O'Neill, former Republican Secretary of the Treasury, who served in this Bush administration for 2 years, and in that capacity was a member of the National Security Council, you will discover that he was as surprised as anyone when 10 days after this President was inaugurated at a National Security Council meeting, there was a discussion about Iraq and the need to remove Saddam Hussein who, about 6 weeks later on February 22 of 2001, months before 9/11, there was a meeting when Secretary Rumsfeld had a map of the oil fields in Iraq spread out on a table.

The discussion, it was prepared by the Defense Intelligence Agency, and there was a discussion about how those oil fields would be divided up between nations and various big oil companies.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. DELAHUNT, and thank you, Mr. LARSON, and others who are gathered here to talk about these very important national security questions. As you pointed out, Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. LARSON, we have taken our eye off the ball here. As we approach the terrible fifth anniversary of the tragic attacks of 2001, September 11, it is important to remember that the attacks upon our homeland were launched by al Qaeda from Afghanistan and had nothing to do with Iraq, nothing to do with Iraq.

Yet here, as we gather 5 years later, we have not finished the job in Afghanistan. We have not finished the job against al Qaeda. Indeed, the situation is now getting worse today than it was a year ago and even a year before that.

Now, the President has said in the last 10 days that he wants to have a national conversation about Iraq and national security, and he has delivered a number of speeches. But when you listen to what he has had to say, it is clear that unfortunately once again he is not interested in the national conversation. Conversation implies a give and take, a dialogue, an exchange of views.

But when you listen to the President, on the one hand he lays out his idea of what he wants to go forward and then engages in finger-pointing and name calling of anybody who disagrees with him. Secretary Rumsfeld and Vice President CHENEY have gone around this country engaging in name calling and finger-pointing against anyone who disagrees with them.

They got all the answers, they tell us. You know what? For years and years they have gotten away with that by the majority in this Congress. The Republican majority in this Congress has essentially said, yes, you two have all the answers, and we are going to write you a blank check, and we are not going to ask you the hard questions.

Well, I am glad the President wants to have a big national conversation. Let's make this a real conversation on national security. I say, let's have it,

because I think when the American people look at the facts on the ground, and the fact that this administration has made our world and our country a much more dangerous place than it otherwise had to be, that people will ask questions about whose judgment is best in these matters.

Let us just think back to May 2003 aboard the aircraft carrier USS *Lincoln*. The President gave a speech with a big banner behind him, "mission accomplished," mission accomplished. That was May 2003, more than 3 years ago. We haven't finished the mission in Afghanistan, and we have got a mess on our hands in Iraq.

Let us just think back to more than a year ago. Vice President CHENEY said that the insurgency in Iraq was in its, quote, final throes, the last gasp.

Well, we just had a Pentagon report come out a few days ago. Here is what they had to say about that. In addition to a budding civil war or a civil war, they say the Sunni-based insurgency remains, quote, potent and viable.

For years now Secretary Rumsfeld has been giving us these sorts of rosy scenarios about what would happen in Iraq, and he has been proven wrong again and again and again.

So when the President and his people say to the American people, we have got all the answers, I think the American people get it now that they don't have all the answers. We need to have this debate and this discussion.

Let me just quickly go back to the issue of Afghanistan, because the world was with us. We were united as a Nation, we were united as a NATO alliance, and we were united as an international community. The United Nations unanimously passed a resolution saying they were with the United States in its war on terror and its war on al Qaeda.

Yet, today, al Qaeda is still active, they are still plotting, they are still trying to do harm to Americans and others around the world. Yet, if you look at what is happening in Afghanistan right now, we have got to be concerned. The United States is not doing all that it should in Afghanistan. The major resurgence has occurred in the southern part of Afghanistan. That has been the stronghold for the Taliban. Yet we have reduced, reduced, the number of U.S. forces in southern Afghanistan.

Second, we, the Bush administration, disbanded the only unit within the CIA whose specific mission was to go after al Qaeda. They said, we don't need it anymore. That's what they said about a month ago. That was before the President again quoted Osama bin Laden a few days ago in one of his speeches for why we still need to be concerned. Well, we should be concerned. That is why what we are doing in Afghanistan has not made sense.

Third, we just learned the other day that the opium production in Afghanistan is at an all-time record, all-time record. We know that the funds from

those sales of those drugs are being used to fuel al Qaeda and the Taliban.

Finally, finally, we just learned yesterday of this agreement now between the Government of Pakistan, General Musharraf, has entered into this agreement with the pro-Taliban militia, and the agreement says we, the Pakistan military, will now take a hands-off posture along the northwest frontier, that was the Waziristan part of Pakistan where the Taliban have regrouped and where al Qaeda has regrouped and what they have used to launch attacks into Afghanistan.

Now Musharraf is saying, no, that is not what he meant. But it is very clear he has essentially said Pakistan military isn't coming after you anymore, you Taliban who are in that part of Pakistan. We have a hands-off policy. That is simply a signal to them that they can now more freely operate to try to step up their attacks in Afghanistan, that they can continue to collaborate with al Qaeda.

So here we are, here we are coming up on the fifth anniversary of those tragic attacks launched from Afghanistan by al Qaeda because they were given safe haven by the Taliban, and we haven't finished the job, and we have reduced the amount of resources that we are committing to completing the mission. Mission accomplished, nowhere near it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and Vice President.

The gentleman from Connecticut may resume.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The President has asked to engage, and the gentleman made several good points and one of them was about a new dialogue, long overdue, and I think welcomed by the American people. But as the gentleman from Maryland points out, a one-way street.

Certainly no one knows better than the gentleman from Washington State. No one was vilified more, both on this floor and in public, because of love of country and speaking out, than JIM MCDERMOTT.

I recognize the gentleman from Washington State.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Thank you very much. As I sit here and I listen to this today, I think about the Katrina event. You saw the President go down and throw his arm around the guy who was fixing Katrina. He said, Good job, Brownie. I mean, that has become a laughingstock.

Well, this President has done the same thing with Rumsfeld. Beginning in 2004, when Abu Ghraib came out, the President showed up and said the Secretary is doing a great job, right? This will not change as long as the President keeps Rumsfeld in that job, because Rumsfeld is the controlling power behind it all.

As long as the President puts him out there and let's him run, you are going

to continue to have this stuff. Rumsfeld went to Iraq in July while we were on vacation, right at the end, and they found the bodies of 20 kidnapped and murdered bus drivers the day he arrived. A bomber blew himself up and killed seven people. The Secretary of Defense made what I consider to be an interesting statement in response to that. He said, each time I come to Iraq, I see progress.

Now, no one who has any kind of realistic view of this could say that kind of thing. You could not be watching what is going on, when it is to our troops who are dying, or the wounded who are coming home, or the thousands of Iraqis who are being killed and say, I see progress. There is simply, you have got your military people talking about the fact that it is coming apart, you had Rumsfeld this week say to some National Guardsmen from California, no, you can't go home, I know your enlistment is up, but you have got to stay here for another 120 days.

We are going to send you into Baghdad to calm things down. It is a mess, and it has been a mess from the start because Rumsfeld would never listen. Like the President, he wouldn't listen. General Shinseki came in and said, you are going to need 300,000 troops. Rumsfeld said, you don't know what you are saying, you are out of here. Here is your retirement. Get out of here.

That is the response to anybody who comes into this administration and talks. Unless the President will dump Rumsfeld, you are not going to get any change in the policy. What is the alternative to the people of this country? The only alternative they have is on election day to take the gavel away from the Republican majority so that we can have hearings run by Democrats where some questions will be asked, where there will be some accountability so that things will begin to come up into the public view.

We have never found out what Halliburton's contracts are all about. We haven't found out who is responsible for Abu Ghraib. No, there isn't a soldier or a sailor or a marine or anyone near the military.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Is the gentleman suggesting that the more than \$9 billion that is unaccounted for, that this Congress actually ought to go and find out what happened with those no-bid contracts, \$9 billion?

Mr. McDERMOTT. Only if you care about taxpayer money. I mean, the examples are so bald and so bad that it is almost laughable if it wasn't what was going on today and it was taking us down the wrong trail.

What has been said here today is, I was reading the Middle Eastern papers today, everybody says that half of Afghanistan is now under control of the Taliban. That is universal in the press.

The British general there is saying we are losing this thing; he is worried. We will not get a change unless we get some hard questions asked. We are

never going to get them from the Republicans because they are going to rubber-stamp what Mr. Bush and Mr. Rumsfeld and all the rest of that bunch put together. I personally think this election is the most important election we have had in my lifetime.

□ 1700

You say to yourself maybe I am getting old or something, but I went through Vietnam, and I went through a whole bunch of things. But this one, if we have 2 more years of "stay the course," God knows where we are going to be economically and militarily and politically and diplomatically in the world. We have got to get some change, and Rumsfeld would be a start. There are some other people that should go, but if the President can't see that Rumsfeld cannot handle it; he threw out Paul O'Neill as the Secretary of the Treasury, and he threw out some other people, Colin Powell and some others went down the road, but he keeps the guy who got us in the mess because it means he would have to admit that he made a huge mistake, and he can't do it. He can't do it, and that is the biggest problem he has.

As politicians, sometimes you have to say, "I was wrong. I made a mistake."

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. The gentleman from Maine who has been to the floor several times to talk about this very subject recently traveled to New Orleans also where he traveled with the Army Corps of Engineers where he saw firsthand what was going on there. As the gentleman from Washington states, one of the many salient points he made is the lack of accountability and the corollary between what has happened here domestically with Hurricane Katrina and Iraq.

I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank you all for the opportunity to be here and discuss some of these important issues that we don't get to do during any debate on resolutions or legislation. These are among the most important issues we deal with.

I was down in New Orleans and in the gulf coast of Mississippi where the incompetence of this administration was on display for everyone to see. The same incompetence is on display with respect to the problems we have created in Iraq. And I say "created" because I do believe that in many ways this administration has created more problems in the Middle East than they have solved.

I agree with the gentleman from Washington that a good part of this has to do with the inadequate leadership at the Department of Defense, but we should never forget that this policy is driven by the President and the Vice President and there is a unanimity of thinking in this administration about the Middle East, the conviction that we could simply force our will on several hundred million people and bend

them to become something that we want them to become, regardless of their own intentions.

But I wanted to speak for a minute tonight about how Congress, this Republican Congress, has aided and abetted the administration by giving up its constitutional role of exercising oversight over the executive branch. It is absolutely stunning to me how both the House and the Senate have done everything that they could to rubber stamp administration policies in Iraq and cover up for them.

A few examples, going back to when Democrats controlled the Congress in the 1980s, there was an Oversight Subcommittee on Armed Services, and that oversight subcommittee discovered those \$500 hammers and \$6,000 toilet seats and put an end to much of that kind of overcharging. But when Republicans took over, they eliminated the Oversight Subcommittee on Armed Services and billions of questionable Halliburton contracts have gone unexamined, unexamined by either Armed Services or by the Intelligence Committee or the Committee on Government Reform.

The minority staff on the Committee on Government Reform has identified over 200 specific misleading statements made by the administration in the run-up to the Iraq war. Over on the Senate side, remember they had Phase II, the Senate Intelligence Committee was going to do a Phase II investigation. What they meant by that was instead of beating up on the intelligence agencies like the CIA themselves, they were going to look at the misuse of intelligence by the administration. That was Phase II of their study.

It hasn't happened. Years have gone by, and the chairman of the committee has said several times, "We are going to get to that later." But they are clearly not going to do it before any election.

In 2005, House Republicans voted down a resolution demanding an investigation of Iraq intelligence. When you look at the House and you look at the Senate, there is no question what this Republican Congress has been doing. Rather than gather information, evidence, that could clarify what has happened in the past and guide us to a better policy in the future, it is all politics all the time and that means protecting the President from being exposed, protecting the Vice President from being exposed, protecting Donald Rumsfeld from being exposed for having not spoken the truth.

So this entire Congress is complicit. The Senate held a few hearings after Abu Ghraib, but no Senate committee has conducted a comprehensive public probe of the alleged abuses at Guantanamo Bay, Abu Ghraib, Bagram or the secret CIA facilities that the President just acknowledged yesterday.

In the House, the majorities on three House committees voted down resolutions seeking documents about detainee abuse. Democrats have been saying we need the information in order to

do a better job in the future, and Republicans have circled the wagons around the administration and refused to basically allow oversight.

On Iraq reconstruction, you go back to 2003, Donald Rumsfeld's Pentagon awarded a \$7 billion sole-source contract to Halliburton for reconstruction. And 3 years later, auditors identified more than \$1 billion in questionable and unsupported costs under that contract. A billion dollars in Washington is still real money. If Congress was simply doing its constitutionally mandated function, we would be holding hearings on that. But no, the Republicans are not prepared to investigate Halliburton. Vice President CHENEY was once the CEO of Halliburton, and this is ground we dare not go into, apparently, and yet we have to, to fulfill our constitutional responsibility.

That is what we are basically saying here. This Republican Congress has failed the country. The administration has failed the country. And when Democrats control this chamber again, whether you have a Republican President or a Democratic President, we are going to make sure that this Congress acts like the Congress contemplated in the Constitution and do our jobs.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. The gentleman from New York started and began this conversation by talking about what has transpired, and the gentleman from Maryland talked about the President and his calling over the last several days, both he and the Secretary of Defense and the Vice President have been out there, along with the Secretary of State, talking about this new agenda, and I believe the gentleman from New York has some thoughts on that.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. It seems like we are being treated to a late summer/early fall offensive, I would say smoke screen on the part of this administration to convince the American people that we need to stay the course in order to be safe.

Basically what they are doing is they are engaged in defending the indefensible. The only way they can defend a war that the American people have clearly turned against is to present it in a context that makes it appear to be reasonable or defensible, but in fact quite the opposite is the case.

I think all of us as elected officials, we have no more solemn responsibility than to provide for the safety and security of those who have elected us to represent them. But I think a fair-minded person has to look at the record of where this administration has taken this Nation and where this Congress, complicit in the strategies and objectives of this administration, have taken this country.

Every single place you look, it reeks with failure. The 9/11 Commission presented to us 41 carefully crafted bipartisan recommendations. This Congress has only acted on 20 or 21 of them. The 9/11 Commission, again a bipartisan group, has given this administration

and this Congress 14 Ds, 5 Fs and 2 incompletes on those recommendations.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. What is the Congress's report card again?

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Fourteen Ds, five Fs and two incompletes; and this is a leadership that is going to keep us safe and secure?

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. And we are approaching the fifth anniversary.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. We are approaching the fifth anniversary, and we have outstanding work on the part of this commission, bipartisan work which is what we ought to be striving for. We ought to be approaching the safety and security of this Nation in a bipartisan way.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Are any of those issues going to be brought to the floor? Those recommendations, those outstanding recommendations, will any of them be brought to the floor before we adjourn for elections?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am not aware of anything on the calendar.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. If I can just go back to a point made by Tom Allen. The lack of accountability, the abrogation, if you will, of this body's constitutional responsibility to conduct oversight.

We serve on different committees. I happen to be the senior Democrat, the ranking member, on a subcommittee of International Relations that is entitled Oversight and Investigations. We have not held one serious hearing relative to Iraq in the past 2 years. And I know that, prior to that, for the past 5 years, Iraq has been off the chart in terms of the committee's considerations. You don't talk about it unless there is good news.

What I wanted to do was to bring before the committee, not Secretary Rumsfeld because we have heard enough from him. He is an F. He flunked. But I wanted to bring before the committee the men that lead our military and have served in the course of their service to this country in roles implicating Iraq, in some cases very directly in Iraq.

Not one of these men have ever been invited to any committee in the Congress so that we would have an opportunity to hear what they had to say.

So one by one, they felt compelled to speak out themselves and educate us and the American people as to the truth and the reality of Iraq and the incompetence of this administration and most specifically Donald Rumsfeld.

Let me just review a few.

Lieutenant General Greg Newbold, he is the top operations officer for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He was involved in the planning. He is Commanding General, First Marine Division, with Legion of Merit, Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medals. He is a highly decorated, well-respected general. He did not seek a promotion because he felt compelled to leave. Here is what he had to say.

"What we are living with now are the consequences of successive policy failures." He said that this year.

Major General Paul Eaton, who was given the responsibility but not the resources to train Iraqi security forces, and we know what a joke that has been, here is what he had to say, "Two and a half more years of that leadership," he was referring to Donald Rumsfeld and the civilian leadership, "two and a half more years of that leadership was too long for my Nation, for my Army, and for my family." What an indictment. What an indictment.

Lieutenant General John Riggs, "They only need the military advice when it satisfies their agenda." When it satisfies their agenda, that is when they would call in a general and say, This is our agenda, what do you think, General?

And then General Wesley Clark, "They pressed for open warfare before the diplomacy was finished. It was a tragic mistake. It was a strategic blunder."

□ 1715

Mr. McDERMOTT. We could go on with this for a long time, but we have got Major General John Batiste. He was the commander of the 1st Division in Iraq, and he said: "Rumsfeld and his team have turned what should have been a deliberate victory in Iraq into a prolonged challenge." I mean, that is a guy who was on the ground, who was there when the war was going on.

General Zinni, who was the central command of the whole forces, he served in every level of command, and he said: "We are paying the price for a lack of credible planning, or the lack of a plan." Ten years' worth of planning was thrown away. That is why we are in the mess we are. Because Rumsfeld said we don't need these guys like Zinni, who is my number one guy in the U.S. Central Command. That means he headed everything in the whole area of the Middle East.

Major General Swannack said: "I do not believe Secretary Rumsfeld is the right person to fight that war based on his absolute failures in managing the war against Saddam in Iraq." Now, he was commander of the 82nd Airborne. We all know about the Airborne. We know these are real soldiers. These are people who follow the leader. They do not speak out until they cannot stand it any longer.

And, finally, Lieutenant General Paul Ripper said: "If I was President, I would have relieved him 3 years ago." And he said that in 2006.

Now, this man was wounded in action in Vietnam. He won the Silver Star medal with a gold star, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star. This man has been wounded, has stood up in the worst kind of war. And, remember, Rumsfeld never served. Bush never served. Cheney never served. Wolfowitz never served. You cannot find anybody who has ever been in a war. And the

guys who know, who have done it, who sent people out to die and been right out there with them say things like, If I was President, I would have relieved him 3 years ago. That is 2003. That is when it started, when they started ill prepared without the battle armor, without the vehicle armor, without sufficient supplies. We are going to just run in and do it, and we are going to be out in 6 months. Remember when they told that lie? And all of us stood around and said, 6 months? Really? This is going to be a cakewalk.

They didn't tell the truth to the American people or to their own troops. And that is why guys like this say get them out of there if we are going to have any change.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen from Maine, New York, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Washington State for coming down here this evening.

We come down here out of love of country and the desire to fulfill our constitutional responsibility. There is no doubt in my mind that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle love their country as much as we do.

I cannot understand why an administration continues to attack those who, out of love of country, speak out and dare to speak truth to power, that are willing to ask the unimagined questions and perhaps give unwelcomed answers to the administration. But that is the work that is required of elected Members of the United States Congress under our Constitution. That is our sworn obligation to the people of this great country of ours and will continue to be our obligation.

It is our sincere hope that we can move this Nation in a new direction. And with a Democratic-controlled Congress, we believe that is the best hope for our colleagues on the other side to join with us in creating what is in the best interest of our troops, our families, and the very security of this Nation.

Thank you, gentlemen, each of you, for joining us this evening.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY AND ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, among many priorities that the country and the Congress face, our national security is probably preeminent today in the minds of many people and in the Congress and in our administration. And today I would like to talk about one aspect of national security that will probably be unknown to a great many Americans, and to those few who know about and have studied it, this will remind them of the potential for this threat to our country, indeed, to our whole society.

Our first glimpse of the possibility of this threat occurred in 1961. It was in the Pacific and we were then doing a series of nuclear tests, and this was our first and last high altitude test. It was over Johnston Island, and the weapon was detonated above the atmosphere the first time that we had done that. No one knew what was going to happen as a result of that test, and the consequences were unexpected and really quite striking.

Hawaii was about 800 miles away. If you think back to 1961, we did not have all of the electronics that we have today. We were more in an electrical infrastructure than than we were in an electronic infrastructure, and the electrical infrastructures are very much more robust than an electronic infrastructure because you are dealing with big structures and heavy wires and so forth. Even so, the effects of this detonation above the atmosphere resulted in the shutdown of electrical circuits. There were many disruptions in electrical and certainly in electronic equipment such as existed those days in Hawaii 800 miles away. The Soviets were also doing testing simultaneously with ours and they had more experience with this phenomenon. We now have a name for this phenomenon. We call it electromagnetic pulse, or EMP.

And here I have a chart which shows very schematically what is happening. We detonate the weapon above the atmosphere, and there is an immediate distribution of gamma rays that travel at the speed of light that will strike every object within line of sight. And when these gamma rays reach our atmosphere, they produce what is called Compton electrons, all of this essentially at the speed of light, and these Compton electrons then become a force which is very much like a nuclear storm magnified many, many times. And if you think, Mr. Speaker, of the disruptions that a robust solar storm can produce to our communications here, you can get some idea as to the potential impact of an EMP. It is sometimes called high altitude or HEMP.

We since have learned a great deal more about that than we knew then, but the feature that we learned then was that wide areas are affected. You can have very high field strengths, and here it says 50 kilovolts per meter. We have since learned, as reported by the Russian generals, and I will come to that report in a few moments, that the Soviets purportedly designed and built electromagnetic weapons that would produce 200 kilovolts per meter; so that is four times larger than the number which is given here in this chart. This was May of 1986. That was 20-some years after the explosion, but a long time before these Russian generals were interviewed. There is a very broad frequency band running from very, very short wavelengths to very long wavelengths. The pulse lasts more than 2 minutes, but it comes on with such abruptness that our surge protectors for your computer and other devices

are useless because the pulse is through the surge protector before it sees it. So there is now nothing out there the equivalent of EMP.

The next chart shows on the right that just about everything is affected by EMP. It has a missile which is taking off there. We are not even sure that we can launch through a robust EMP laydown. What I am told is that we tested our missiles and we found some deficiencies and we corrected that and we have done that several times, and the last time we corrected the deficiencies, we intentionally did not test again, hoping that we had fixed all the deficiencies. But knowing that if we tested and found deficiencies that that intelligence would probably get out to our enemies and they would know that we were vulnerable, and rather than run that risk, we believe that we had corrected all the deficiencies; so we have not tested, and, hopefully, a potential enemy will also believe that we have corrected all the deficiencies. But that is not a certainty. We do not yet know for certain that we could launch our ballistic missiles through an EMP laydown. It shows effects on automobiles.

By the way, if you have a car or truck that has a coil and a distributor, you are probably immune to EMP. But all modern cars, as you know when you take your car for service, has a lot of computers. Indeed, a computer is required for servicing your car. So all of the new vehicles are vulnerable to EMP. Airplanes, only a few of our military airplanes are EMP hardened. All of the other planes are vulnerable to EMP effects.

Here on the left it shows the coverage with the height of blast 60 miles and how large an area. That is line of sight, with the simple geometry of the Earth and the height. If you are 200 miles up, you cover a bigger area. And if you are 300 miles high up with the center of that in Iowa, Nebraska, about in that area, it covers our whole country; or the margins of our country in south Florida, northwest Washington State, and Maine, all are covered with a blast of about 300 miles high above Nebraska or Iowa.

The next chart is a little more detailed presentation of the blast area. And it shows that it is not simple concentric rings because of the dynamics of the detonation of a nuclear weapon. You have a distribution of intensities; but generally speaking, out at the margins of the country with 480 kilometers, about 300 miles, with a detonation of that blast, you see from the purple here that you have got about 50 percent of maximum at the margins of our country.

The level to which we tested is classified, but if the Russian generals are correct that they developed weapons at 200 kilovolts per meter, that would mean 100 kilovolts per meter at the margins of our country. And there is concern that even when we test and harden that we may not have hardened it to an adequate level.