

officials, including President Bashir? Why isn't the international community working together to make sure peace-keeping missions are fully equipped and deployed to eastern Chad and the Central African Republic? Why haven't we lived up to our word to stop the genocide in Darfur?

Mr. Speaker, words are not enough. It is action that is needed. And while we remain silent, while we refrain from taking action and fulfilling our promises, women and children are raped. Homes are being looted. Villages are being burned to the ground. People are dying of hunger and exposure.

Darfur is returning to hell.

#### KEEPING OUR PROMISES TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend David Walker for his years of service as U.S. Comptroller General, heading up the Government Accountability Office. Mr. Walker is a highly respected CPA from Atlanta and for the last few years has been trying to be a Paul Revere about the horrible financial condition of the Federal Government. He has appeared before many Congressional committees and on television and has traveled around the country trying to sound the alarm about our \$9 trillion national debt, and, even worse, our \$53 trillion in unfunded future pension liabilities.

Two days ago in the Washington Times he was quoted from testimony he gave about Iraqi oil revenues. "The Iraqis have a budget surplus," Mr. Walker said. "We have a huge budget deficit. One of the questions is who should be paying."

Stewart Bowen, Inspector General for Iraq reconstruction, said increased production, along with the highest oil prices in history, "coalesce into an enormous windfall for the Iraqi government." Mr. Bowen said Iraqi oil revenue is now around \$60 billion, and probably headed higher.

Most estimates are that we have been spending approximately \$12 billion a month on the war in Iraq, a really astounding figure if you stop to think about it. However, even worse, the request for this fiscal year is \$189 billion, or \$15.75 billion a month. This comes out to \$500 million a day.

There is certainly nothing fiscally conservative about the war in Iraq. William F. Buckley, Jr., was an inspiring figure to almost every conservative Republican. In the current issue of the New Republic, John Judis begins an article about Mr. Buckley in this way: "In the last years of his life, William F. Buckley, Jr., who died on February 27 at the age of 82, broke with many of his fellow conservatives by pronouncing the Iraq war a failure. He even expressed doubt about as to whether George W. Bush is really a conserv-

ative, and he asked the same about neoconservatives."

Mr. Buckley wrote in 2004 that if he had known in 2002 what he then knew, he would have opposed the war in Iraq.

More significantly, in June of 2005, he wrote, "A respect for the power of the United States is engendered by our success in engagements in which we take part. A point is reached when tenacity conveys not steadfastness of purpose, but misapplication of pride." Mr. Buckley continued, "It can't reasonably be disputed that if in the year ahead the situation in Iraq continues as bad as it has done in the past year, we will have suffered more than another 500 soldiers killed. Where there had been skepticism about our venture, there will then be contempt."

The major difference is that instead of just 500 more soldiers killed, we have had more than 2,000 killed since Mr. Buckley wrote that. Earlier in 2005 he had written that the time had come to get out.

There is nothing traditionally conservative about the war in Iraq. It is huge deficit spending. It is massive foreign aid. It is placing really the entire burden of enforcing U.N. resolutions on our taxpayers and our military, when conservatives have traditionally been the biggest critics of the U.N. This war has gone against every traditional conservative position.

In addition, our Constitution does not give us the authority to govern Iraq, which is what in reality we have been doing. All this against an enemy whose military budget was only a little over two-tenths of one percent of ours, most of which was used by Saddam Hussein to build castles and protect himself and his family. Iraq was no threat to us whatsoever.

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

Similarly, nationally-syndicated columnist Georgie Ann Guyer wrote a few months after the war started, "Critics of the war against Iraq have said since the beginning of the conflict that Americans, still strangely complacent about overseas wars being waged by minorities in their name, will inevitably come to a point where they will see they have to have a government that provides services at home or one that seeks empires across the globe."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we have to choose. Do we keep spending mind-boggling amounts of money in Iraq, or do we keep our promises to our own people? We cannot afford to do both.

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

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

□ 1445

#### A CONSTITUTION THAT ALWAYS LIVES AND NEVER DIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I applaud your leadership, and I am delighted to have the opportunity to address the day's and the week's events, because many times, as we discuss these matters on the floor of the House, many of our constituents and Americans sometimes wonder the order of our words.

This afternoon we did an important and major leap towards securing this Nation and providing it with the protection of civil liberties. Although in the course of the discussion there may have been accusations, the FISA bill, the amendments to the Senate bill, was the right approach and the right direction to take.

You know, we had an opportunity last evening for a secret session, and I was on the floor questioning the validity of such, because I always believe what we do in America should be in the eyes of America, although we recognize in this time of terrorism there is a necessity for classified documents or top secret documents, but there is never a time to close the door on America's knowledge.

I would not want this debate that many of you may have heard to be characterized as one of a coverup that we are doing something that does not provide the absolute safety and wise direction that America should take. I wanted to simply add to my statements that will be put into the RECORD the idea that this bill provides the opportunity to secure foreign-to-foreign surveillance, but it also avoids the targeting of Americans without the intervention of the court so that if you were, by chance, talking to a relative in a foreign land that might, without your knowledge, be targeted or through some way, might be connected, that would draw surveillance, you can be assured that as an American, unlike the occurrence with Martin Luther King and some Americans during the Vietnam War, that you have the intervention of a court established first in 1978 under President Carter.

We have streamlined that. The language called "reverse targeting" was an amendment that I submitted into the Judiciary Committee that would avoid targeting an American without the intervention of a court, not a court for 6 days or 6 weeks, but an automatic intervention that is given to you within hours.

We have a system where the Attorney General now must, along with the Director of Intelligence, put in guidelines to be able to oversee what happens when an American is targeted. I