

The ideology behind this is that Iraq was the key to being able to move into Syria, being able to move into Iran, that this is somehow a defense of the Likud version of what is in Israel's interest. The so-called neoconservatives that are behind this ideological thrust have wanted this war for years. It is not hidden. It is not a conspiracy. It is not some kind of subterfuge. It is an announced policy and possession philosophically they have had for years.

The sad part is after Mr. Bush became President, was appointed President, they came into the forefront in terms of their appointments in the Defense Department where they were able to bring their philosophy forward. That is what is driving this. That is what the President has to face up to. This is where his difficulty is.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I know we have very limited time left. But I think before we go we should wish a happy birthday to our friend and colleague from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), because it is his 45th birthday today, is that correct?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. 29.

Mr. DELAHUNT. 29th birthday today, I think this has been a very good discussion. We really do welcome this conversation with my colleague. He knows we have respect.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I hope we have more of these.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I hope we do, too. I would issue a challenge to my friend because he and I have traveled together and it is an experience, and it is a very positive experience, but there are people that are in the custody of the executive branch, those so-called senior intelligence Iraqi agents, that continually deny any knowledge whatsoever of Iraq or meeting the gentleman that allegedly met with Mohammed Atta in Prague in the Czech Republic, is in our custody.

Let us challenge together the executive branch and my colleague, myself, and anyone else who wishes to join us, go together and exercise the oversight responsibility and function of this Congress and interview Mr. Al-Ani and make that decision ourselves and come back and report to the American people.

IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks related to this special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, let me just pick up where we left off

in this last hour. And I appreciate the discussion with my colleagues. And if we have the time, I will be happy to yield to them. It seems like we probably will have the time.

There is no question, none at all, that al-Qaeda and the Saddam Hussein regime and people connected with that have met on numerous occasions. There is no question that in May of 2002, Zarqawi, one of the top lieutenants the senior al-Qaeda with bin Laden was in Baghdad for medical treatment. And Uday Hussein provided that. There have been numerous occasions that they have been together.

Now, the question was Osama bin Laden went to Saudi Arabia and he said we have got to get rid of this guy up there, Saddam Hussein, because he does not follow the hard-core Muslim line. The fact is Winston Churchill, and I hate to go back in history, but he decided to work with Joe Stalin, a communist tyrant who killed 50 million of his own countrymen. They asked Churchill, "Why in the world are you working with Stalin?" He said, "I would go to bed with the devil in order to beat Adolph Hitler."

Osama bin Laden calls us the big devil and I believe Osama bin Laden was willing to work with Saddam Hussein, who is one of the powerhouses in the Middle East, to do everything he could to destroy Western civilization and the United States.

Now, we do not know what went on in all these meetings. But we do know that Osama bin Laden and his minions did talk to and work with Saddam Hussein's people.

Now, do you err on the side of safety or do you not? We knew that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. He killed thousands, tens of thousands of Kurds with mustard gas. We found weapons just recently that had sarin gas in them. Just recently our troops found those. He had a nuclear facility that was bombed by the Israelis in 1981. So he was trying to develop a nuclear facility.

Now, for anybody to believe that he just threw that stuff out of the window when he hates the West so much and he was negotiating and talking with Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda, I think they are just blowing smoke. Now, the President said we have got to go after the terrorists. He did not go after Saddam Hussein first, he went after the Taliban that we knew was working with Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan. And he did a pretty good job of it.

And then he said there is the threat of weapons of mass destruction, they have been used in the past. He had intelligence information that indicated there were weapons of mass destruction and he decided to go after Saddam Hussein. And all of us in this chamber when he did it said that is the right thing to do.

Now, of course, everybody is second guessing.

I think it is important to go back in history a little bit because history is

very important, very important. In the 1990s Osama bin Laden in the Sudan had 13 terrorists training camps around Khartoum. Our intelligence agencies talked about that. The President and the NSC knew about that. And at that time, we had an attack on the World Trade Center because Osama bin Laden's minions tried to bring it down. That was in 1993. In 1996, we had the attack that killed a lot of Americans in Khobar Towers. In 1998, we had the attack on the embassies in Athens, Nairobi, Kenya and Dar es Salaam and Tanzania, all of those in 1998 by al-Qaeda connections. And then in 2000, we had the attack that killed a lot of our sailors on the USS *Cole*. We knew that Saddam Hussein was behind that. We knew he was in the Sudan. We knew there were 13 terrorist training camps and the previous administration did nothing.

Now we go to September 11, 2001. And the President had an attack on the World Trade Center, against a second one. We did not do anything about the first one. We did not go after Osama bin Laden then but we waited. Then they brought down the World Trade Center, both towers.

And the President said we are going after the terrorists worldwide, no matter where they are hiding. We are going after them if they are in the Sudan. We are going after them if they are in Afghanistan. We are going after them under every rock they are hiding. And we are going to do it also in Iraq because we believe Saddam Hussein is working with al-Qaeda. He had connections with al-Qaeda. His son worked with al-Qaeda.

And they had weapons of mass destruction because we knew they had used them before and the President was told by intelligence agencies that they were there. Quite frankly, I still believe there were weapons of mass destruction. It is the size of California. And I believe that we will find more. And many of them may have been sent to Syria. Everybody is concerned about that because Syria is a very close ally and was of Saddam Hussein.

But the fact of the matter is do you err on the side of safety? Do you go after the terrorists before they attack or do you wait until they attack and say oh, we need probable cause.

When we passed the PATRIOT Act, this is a side issue, we had a lot of colleagues from the other side of the aisle say oh, my gosh, what about civil rights? What about Constitutional rights? The problem is when one is in a world war against terrorists, one cannot wait until they blow something up and kill 10 or 15,000 people or more. One tries to preempt them.

The PATRIOT Act allowed us to hold people while we investigated whether or not they were going to perpetrate a terrorist attack. If we did that, we might head it off. That is why we created Homeland Security, which my committee wrote a great deal of it, and I think the gentleman, I do not know if

he worked on that or not, but we worked on that with the Senate.

But the fact of the matter is this President did not go off half-cocked. He declared war on terrorism. He is continuing that. President Bush is doing a good job.

And I love my colleague from Massachusetts, we have a great deal of fun together. I love my friend from Hawaii.

□ 2115

The fact of the matter is we are trying to politicize something at this time that should not be politicized. We are fighting a war against terrorism. The President is doing the right thing; and this Nation needs to stand behind him, instead of nitpicking and going back and saying this should have been done or that should have been.

If we had this kind of nitpicking prior to the invasion of Normandy, I believe that the media and everybody would have said, oh, my gosh, that is a terrible thing to do; the waves may be too high. They would have alerted Hitler, and we may all be speaking German today.

The fact of the matter is, President Bush, in my opinion, and my colleagues may differ, I think he has been very prudent. He has done things that he thinks that are necessary to protect the American people.

I love my colleagues, I really do; and I do want some Macadamia nuts.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) very much for yielding.

All of this would be well and good except that it is not working. I know my colleague did not intend to do this hour, and I will not use his time or his colleagues' time but merely to say, and perhaps we can carry this on at greater length, maybe even tomorrow night if it is okay with the gentleman.

I do not want to interfere, but just to say on the points that he raised, if this was the right war and the right place, that would be one thing; but it is not nitpicking to say that we are doing the wrong thing in the wrong place at the wrong time and actually undermining our capacity to be able to take on terrorists, and in fact, creating more terrorists as a result of it, with fewer allies.

I do not bring that up to try and dispute my colleague tonight; but merely to say I think there is an alternative point of view that is worthy of discussion, and perhaps we could do that at another time when our colleagues do not have the time for the topic they want to discuss.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I will get together and talk with my colleagues.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I would just simply say that I think we are operating on a totally different understanding of the facts. I feel very comfortable with what we have reported here tonight and what others have said.

I think over the course of time the kind of conversations that we are having will elucidate the facts for the American people; but again, every Member in this House is concerned about what is happening to this country. We do not want to make the mistakes of the past, and I am very concerned that we are; but we will leave that for a later time, and I am sure that it will be a feisty and contentious, but friendly, conversation; and I wish my friend a most happy birthday.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friends, and I have great admiration for the silver fox from Massachusetts.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. *Hau oli la hanau*, which means happy birthday. Take my word for it, it means what my colleague thinks it does.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding, and I always find it interesting. Monday morning quarterbacks are always right in their minds because they have a chance to look back on tough decisions that have to be made; but as we know, the war on terrorism is progressing to one of those situations where the lessons of the past are important, because when Americans have been impatient, we have lost; and when we recognize that the war on terror is going to take time, al Qaeda and other terrorist elements are in 65 different countries that we know of, thousands of terrorists were trained in the camps in Afghanistan and Sudan and elsewhere, but we are making progress; and we are holding firm on the war on terror.

Clearly, the war on terror is progressing. It is a tough, hard fight; and our effort in Iraq is a key front in the war on terror.

Just less than 2 short weeks history will be made. Today, Saddam Hussein is in jail and an international coalition led by the United States and our 31-country allied coalition will hand over authority over Iraq to a sovereign Iraqi government. Let us review what is going on; and frankly, here is the bottom line.

The goal of the 31-country international coalition, which the United States is part of, has the bottom line goal that Iraq will govern its own internal affairs. The Iraqi interim government will run the day-to-day operations of Iraq's government and ministries. The Iraqi interim government will increase security and prepare the country for national democratic elections.

The President has a five-point plan that is now being implemented and has

been implemented over the last several months as we worked not only to win the war on terrorism but to put in place a stable, democratically elected government in Iraq.

The President's five-point plan calls for handing over authority to a sovereign Iraqi government that should be achieved in just 2 short weeks. We want to establish the stability and security in Iraq that democracy requires. We want to continue rebuilding Iraq's infrastructure. We want to continue to build international support beyond the 31 nations already involved, and we want to move towards free national elections that will bring forward new leaders empowered by the Iraqi people themselves.

The past few weeks have proved that the President's Iraqi plan is moving forward; it is working. The international community is coming together to help Iraqis secure their own future.

On June 8, the U.N. Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution which supports free elections and reauthorizes a multinational force to help provide security in Iraq. The international community is now on the record. The coalition will continue to help in every way possible on the economic front, the security front and the political front; and the international coalition will continue in the process of assisting the Iraqi people and taking responsibility for the future of their country.

I am pleased that as a result of the recent summit, the G-8, that we continue to build that international support. In fact, many of us had the opportunity just less than 2 weeks ago to meet with the new, free Iraqi President when he visited Washington, and it was an impressive meeting with an impressive leader.

Iraq is improving and has already taken big steps to keep Iraq on the path to national elections by January 2005, leading the way to representative government by and of the people of Iraq. That interim government is making progress.

Ninety thousand militia members are being transitioned into new occupations. All six of Haditha Dam generating units recently ran at maximum capacity for the first time since 1990. To date, over 10,000 democracy development activities, program activities, have been held in communities across Iraq involving more than 312,000 Iraqi participants. Today, there are now 55,000 Internet subscribers in Baghdad compared to only 3,000 just 2 years ago. Reconstruction of the Baghdad International Airport is expected to be completed by this August; and primary, intermediate, and secondary students are completing their final exam for the school year with minimal disruption; and I would note when we visit Iraqi schools today, we see young girls attending those schools again. That is progress.

Our international coalition has a clear goal, to see the Iraqi people in

charge of Iraq for the first time. America worked not only to defeat an enemy but to give strength, freedom and opportunity to our friends, the people of Iraq.

Freedom can and will advance and enhance the lives of those living in the greater Middle East, just as it has been successful in Latin America, Eastern Europe, Asia, South America, and Africa. Today, we are fighting a war on terror. We are making progress. It is a tough, hard fight, but al Qaeda and other terrorist groups want to defeat our effort to bring freedom to the Middle East. With our commitment, we will win.

In the next few weeks we are going to be tested by al Qaeda and other international terrorist organizations. We are going to be tested and have violence that is going to be likely. The terrorists and Hussein loyalists would rather see innocent Iraqis die than let them taste freedom. They honestly think that Americans will cut and run, because they have seen that happen in the past. We are going to be tested in this war on terror, and how we conduct ourselves today and in the weeks ahead will determine whether or not we win the war on terror, whether or not we give the people of the Mideast a taste of real freedom.

They will not succeed and the forces of good, the forces of freedom and the international coalition, which is growing, will win if we remain firm and hang together, because, again, we are being tested. My hope is we will hang tough and continue to fight the war on terror because we would all rather fight the terrorists on the streets of Baghdad than here in Washington and in communities in the south suburbs of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I am confident through the will of the Iraqi people and the international community President Bush's plan will be implemented successfully. Iraq will have a free and representative government. The terrorist regimes of the past will be defeated and silenced, and we will prevail. That is because I believe, like I know so many other Americans do, the Iraqi people deserve and know better.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) and appreciate that very much.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I watched the debate, discussion that took place in the last hour, as many Americans did; and I could not help but note that lots of questions were raised by our friends on the other side of the aisle. I think the American public needs to be reminded that the vast majority of Members in this body on both sides of the aisle supported the resolution authorizing the

use of force. The vast majority of Members on both sides of the aisle supported the supplemental appropriation that continues to support the operations in Iraq, and I think the public needs to ask itself whether debates like the one they just saw are really a serious discussion of policies and principles or whether or not they are more about election-year politics.

Debate is a good thing. We should debate. We should debate often, but I think we also have to remember that the world is watching and our soldiers are watching, and there should be no doubt whatsoever about this Nation's resolve to continue to fight on and to prevail in the war against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important time; and even though it is an important time, I think it is useful for us to slow things down a little bit because I think sometimes we can only appreciate the significance of events perhaps after the fact. Sometimes we are too close to events to fully understand how they fit into the larger context, and I think we need to step back for a moment and take a look at where we are right now in Iraq.

I believe that in the months and years ahead, as we take a look at these very important weeks and months that surround the handover of sovereignty to Iraq, I believe that we will look at these as great months and years for this nation. With each passing day, leaders for a new, free Iraq are taking steps forward, just as the terrorists try with their terrible attacks to force these same Iraqi leaders to take steps backward, but I believe that the clarity of hindsight will show us all in the years ahead that the violence and the bloodshed and the senseless destruction that we have seen far too often in that country, that our national media focuses on to the exclusion of all else, it seems is happening not because the coalition efforts are failing or falling short, but instead, because they are succeeding.

They are the result of a growing fear in the terrorist world that decency and democracy will succeed, that they will take hold, that the success will not only inspire more and more Iraqis to embrace self-rule and to invest of themselves in the future of Iraq, but that it will serve as an inspiration to many oppressed peoples in many troubled lands all throughout that region.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to take time to talk about what is going on in Iraq because so much of it is really outside the narrow view of the camera lens. It is important for our soldiers that we tell their story because so many of our brave young men and women have put themselves on the line, have shed sweat, have shed blood for a mission that they believe in, a mission that I also believe in.

Young men and women from all over America have traveled thousands of miles for this cause. One of the units from my own district, the 432nd Civil Affairs Battalion, has as its motto "Order Out of Chaos."

□ 2130

Well, that is just what they, the 432nd and the members of the 395th out of Appleton, and countless other units and soldiers from Wisconsin, and all over America, that is just what they are accomplishing. Some of it I saw myself firsthand when I was in Iraq late last year.

The most recent good news, the good news that you may not have seen, is that President Bush has outlined a clear 5-step plan for Iraqi sovereignty and its implementation is already underway. On June 8, the U.N. Security Council unanimously, unanimously, adopted a resolution supporting free elections in Iraq and reauthorizing the multinational security force. This will provide greater security for Iraqis and for Americans in that country. Already the G-8 has responded favorably, and its members are making new commitments for the long-term rebuilding process.

In Iraq itself, there are key signs that the government and the economy is beginning to mobilize and the economic and civic redevelopment process is underway, the rebuilding is marching on. For example, as my colleague, the previous speaker, has noted, the number of telephone subscribers in Iraq is 45 percent above prewar levels. There are now 55,000 Internet subscribers in Baghdad alone. Less than 2 years ago there were 37,000. Eighty-five percent of Iraqi children have now been immunized. Two hundred forty Iraqi hospitals and 1,200 preventive health care clinics are now operating. Twenty-five hundred schools have been rehabilitated, with another 1,200 to be rehabilitated by year's end. Hundreds of free, local government units have been launched and are up and running.

Now, I cite these numbers, Mr. Speaker, not to gloss over the challenges but, instead, because I am afraid too many of us are guilty of glossing over the successes. These successes have been paid for with the lives of too many Americans. They have been paid for with the lives of countless Iraqis, people who believe in the future, people who are willing to put themselves on the line.

Now, June 30th is not a switch we can simply turn on and have security and prosperity and perfect democracy, but it marks one more step down a clear path from which, for Iraqis, the future will be much brighter. Mr. Speaker, there are challenging times ahead of us, there are dangerous and dark days that we will see all too often. But, clearly, clearly there are good things happening in Iraq. Clearly, many people believe in the future. They have put themselves on the line. And that future is happening quickly and more brightly, I think, than many people expected could possibly occur.

So, Mr. Speaker, debate is a good thing. We should talk about what is going on in Iraq, and we should question our leaders. That is important. But I think we must not let that crowd

out what is going on, what is positive, the bright future that lies ahead, the hope that so many of us have. And, more importantly, the clear plan that we are following and that we are proceeding along each and every day; a plan that will bring democracy and decency to that country, a plan that will bring a brighter future to that entire region, a plan that so many Americans have fought for, a plan that all of us can be very, very proud of.

I yield back to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) for his very eloquent statement.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my good friend, one of the senior members of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the leadership he is providing on this very important, I would say, issue, but it is not an issue, it is the question of the day, the question of our time. Will the people of the United States stand tall in this time of crisis? Will we meet our responsibility? Will we overcome those who hate our way of life? Will we remain the last best hope for all of humankind for a better world.

Let us look back and make sure we understand it. The American people have a heavy responsibility, because we do represent every race and every religion. We are a mixture of all the people of the world who have come here to live in freedom and show the world that there is a better way.

That is why groups like the Nazis and the Japanese Imperialists back in the last century knew they had to deal with us. We were attacked at Pearl Harbor because the Japanese knew that we were the only thing that stood in their way to the domination of Asia. The Nazis knew we were the only thing that was going to thwart them from creating a black evil empire over Europe, and much of Asia. Americans of that day stood tall and strong and did what was necessary to make sure that we saved the world from that evil threat.

After the war, after that war, when our fathers and mothers, my father in particular, and I know the fathers of many of the people here in Congress today, fought so hard and risked so much, and saw their loved ones lose their lives, they thought they deserved a break. Instead, what we saw was the rise of another menace, another evil force that would have conquered the world, would have turned the world into a Marxist-Leninist dictatorship, the proletariat. They would have imposed on all of humankind their dream, their proletarian dictatorship, and they would have snuffed out the freedom our people had just fought so hard to maintain.

Yet, during those days of the Cold War, Americans stood firm. And it was

difficult to stand firm during the Cold War. In Vietnam and in Korea, we lost well over 100,000 people, together in those two conflicts, not to mention hundreds of thousands who were wounded, but it was also a matter of hundreds of small conflicts that were going on. Yet our people stood firm. It was difficult, but we had the leadership that we needed there at the end.

We just heard last week how Ronald Reagan saved the world from communism. But do not think that that was done without a great cost to him personally. There was no bipartisanship that I saw that helped end the Cold War. Ronald Reagan was ridiculed, he was undermined, he was back-bitten, and there was partisan politics played throughout his administration. Because no one predicted that the Cold War would be over and that our enemy would collapse. But Ronald Reagan stuck to his guns. He was tenacious, he was unrelenting, he was strong, he stood for principle, and he reached out to those other people in the world and put them on our side of the battles against communism.

Well, today, we know that communism, yes, collapsed and we thought we were due for a break. There will never be a break for those people who are the champions of liberty and freedom and justice, because there will be evil forces in the future. We face another one today. It is not terror. People say the war on terror. They are trying to be a little bit diplomatic. It is a war with radical Islam which has declared war on the American way of life.

Radical Islam believes that we are a sinful group of people because we permit people the freedom to make decisions on their own lives. Radical Islam would make chattel out of our women, out of women everywhere. Radical Islam does not believe in those things that we hold dear in terms of personal freedom. And radical Islam has declared war on us. And let us not make a mistake about it, 3,000 of our people are dead today in those towers in New York and here in the Pentagon because we did not recognize that they were at war with us.

Well, we have recognized that, and there is no escaping it. Today, we have the same challenge as our forefathers and mothers did in the war against the Nazis and the Japanese Imperialists, and as we did in the Cold War against the Communists. We have to win this fight or it will be a far worse world. It will be a dark world of chaos and despotism and fanaticism if we do not. Nowhere is that battle more important today than what is going on in Iraq.

I say, thank God that we have a President who was willing to take this stand. What we are seeing in Iraq is an historic strategic move to outflank the radical Islamists. We are turning a dictatorship in the Muslim world into a democracy. And we are, thus, pointing to this so that the young people of the Muslim world will have an alternative to radical Islam. We are doing what

Ronald Reagan did. We are cutting our enemy off from its source of strength. If we do what is right and we stick to this, our enemy will collapse, just as communism collapsed, just as that other evil force collapsed.

Again, we are having to go through the pangs of partisan politics, the back-biting, the nitpicking, the let us cut and run. The people who ask, why should we risk anything; why are we losing these lives, they know if we would leave Iraq as it is today and the radical Islamists, especially the Iranians, then become a dominant force in Iraq, it would be a disaster for the future, not only of that region but for the people of the United States. We would have a future filled with fear, a future of knowing that the radical Islamic creed would have been gathering strength because we had demonstrated weakness.

No, we have a President who is just as unrelenting as Ronald Reagan. We have a President who is a visionary, who is taking a positive approach, trying to establish a positive alternative to radical Islam. We have a President who has courage and is moving forward, but we also have a generation of young people who understand that strength and courage and commitment is the way to a better world.

Those people who are giving their lives for us in Iraq know they are doing it to build a better world. They deserve solid support from this Congress. We support them because they are risking their lives for us. They are building a better world, just like those people who stormed ashore on D-Day over a half century ago. And just like those young men and women throughout the Cold War, who gave their lives, these are the heroes of our age.

We have a President every bit as important to the future of mankind as was FDR when he provided the political leadership necessary to win the Second World War; and Ronald Reagan, who provided the leadership to help us win the struggle against communist tyranny. And now, with President Bush, he is a man who will not retreat, will not cower, will not turn his back and run. We have a man who has drawn the line in the sand and said we are going to win because the whole world depends on us.

This is what is happening in Iraq. There is no option in terms of defeat. Defeat is not an option. If we walk away, it will only mean further bloodshed and further aggression, and not only terrorism here, but attacks on our friends throughout the world if we would retreat from Iraq today. We should never dream of emboldening our worst enemies. We should, instead, stand tall.

That is what this is about tonight. That is what many of us are committed to here in the House. I hope the American people listen and take a look at the long run, take a look at what happened in the past, take a look at what will happen in the long run unless we

have that same sense of purpose and courage that those who came before us had in these same type of challenges.

We are building the world of tomorrow and it will be a world where we will be friends with the people of the Muslim faith because we will have helped them defeat the radical Muslims who hate our way of life. We will have a world that does have peace between the religions, whether they are Christians, Jews or Muslims, because we will have a world in which we have not permitted the fanatics of one faith, the Islamic faith, to superimpose their will on the rest of the world by force.

We will not be cowards. We will do our duty. And God bless President Bush for the stand that he has made, and God bless the United States of America and those who defend it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

I will now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, being from Detroit, I am often able to watch CBC, and last night I was privileged to watch Albert Finney's performance as Winston Churchill in a movie called "The Gathering Storm." And perhaps it was his finest hour, the former prime minister's. When Hitler was rearming, he stood in front of the House of Commons and warned his own conservative party's government, led by Stanley Baldwin, that Hitler was indeed more than prepared for war; that he was arming to instigate a new one.

Churchill was thought insane at the time, because no one, coming off the horror of the millions killed in World War I, could believe that a European leader would seek to rekindle that tinderbox, certainly not a corporal of the German army who had been blinded by mustard gas in combat. Yet Churchill was proven right.

And when we apply these lessons to our own time, one of the first things we can realize is that sometimes the forest is so menacing, we choose to stare at the tree which shields us, until it is too late.

□ 2145

Our Nation is in a war on terror. In this war on terror, Iraq is a theatre. It is not a war unto itself, any more than FDR's much-maligned, at the time, strike into north Africa was a diversion from the war against Hitler.

What we have seen in our time is the preemption doctrine applied, and what I have not heard anyone say is that the pillar upon which this administration entered into the Iraqi theatre in the war on terror did not achieve its result. Saddam Hussein desired weapons of mass destruction. Saddam Hussein had contacts without apparent collaboration, but contacts nonetheless, with terrorist groups and was, in fact, shielding terrorists like Abu Nidal in Baghdad.

Since the United States engaged in hostilities against Iraq, we can be sure

of two things, the Saddam Hussein regime will never have weapons of mass destruction that can be used against the United States or its troops in the field, and the Saddam Hussein regime will never again have any contacts with any terrorist groups.

In some polls that are cited, we hear about people believing the link between al Qaeda and September 11; but one of the polls that I saw that was interesting was that about 70 percent of the American people realized that Saddam Hussein was a terrorist, and in the war on terror the states which sponsor terrorism are as much our enemies by enabling the terrorists, as the terrorists are our enemies themselves, for terrorist cells cannot exist without state sponsorship, without state support.

Now, put yourself in President Bush's position at the time post-September 11. You have seen reports from the past administration up through his present administration detailing contacts, "shadowy with terrorists," including bin Laden. You know that Saddam Hussein wants to engage a weapons of mass destruction program for their acquisition, and you say to yourself, what am I going to do?

The President of the United States in applying the preemption doctrine made sure, again, that two things would not happen: the Saddam Hussein regime would not have weapons of mass destruction, ever, and that they would no longer be able to even be considered for support as a terrorist haven.

Now, there were some important points brought up in the earlier debate, and I would be more than happy to come back tomorrow or at any time to assist to talk about some of those points with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle; but I find it fascinating some of the points.

Now, we are splitting hairs when we say that the contact between Iraq and al Qaeda in hindsight may not have appeared to have formed a collaboration. Yet, we cannot say whether they would or not. Now, to try to destroy that link or denigrate that link, we will hear that these contacts were meetings, but Iraq never responded.

Now, all of us here in the U.S. House have to get elected. Now, as politicians, put yourselves in an interesting position. Consider this: you are sitting around getting ready to run for re-election. An opponent you have defeated in the past is having coffee on a regular basis with the opponent running against you now. Do you say to yourself, well, I am sure they are just having pleasantries and this has absolutely nothing to do with me, and that while they be having contact, there is apparently no collaboration that they are out to get me? I highly doubt many of the people in this room would ascribe to the latter theory. If Saddam Hussein could, he would do anything to hurt the United States.

Now, why would bin Laden and his associates that are in captivity deny

any link with al Qaeda? Al Qaeda's premise, on a perverted facade of Islam, is to work with the secular Ba'athist regime under Saddam Hussein, but undermine its very credibility as it goes after Saudi Arabia and other regimes in that region.

Now, the ones in captivity like al-Anni that were referenced before, I would just caution everyone, do not take a terrorist at their word unless they say they are going to kill you, because whether in captivity or not, there is no incentive to prove any member of the United States' present administration was correct, and there is certainly no impetus for these people to undermine the very position, belie the very myth of al Qaeda as an Islamic group trying to liberate its people and lead them to a greater life in Islam. So I would caution against that.

I also would like to just reiterate something that I think is very troubling to me, that we hear many people saying that our ability to preemptively deal with the situation in Iraq has somehow hurt us internationally. I suppose there will always be those people who believe that when the United States has to defend itself that we will be hurting ourselves. This is mistaken.

In fact, many of these same people never credit the good will of the acts of the United States in the immunization of Iraqi children or the education of Iraqi children or the free speech and association that is occurring in Iraq today. I would argue that over the long term, these benefits to the United States are going to outweigh any short-term anger that the terrorist organizations may feel, because we are striking a blow at them in the heart of the terrorist network.

I also have not heard about how the regime change and reconstruction nexus that has been applied in Iraq has also led to the regime conversion and potential rehabilitation of the Libyan regime, which also not only in that regard shows what strength and resolve have done in Iraq.

I think that one of the things that has been missed when Qadhafi admitted he has a weapons program, he invited weapons inspectors in, who were then led to the labs or testing facilities of the Libyan Government. Some of the inspectors pointed out that they would never have found these unless they were shown. Dr. Kay, who I have much respect for, when I met with him in Baghdad did not say that we had weapons of mass destruction, to his credit. But he did say that Saddam Hussein and his regime were actively engaging in re-energizing to try to acquire them, especially chemical and biological, which could have been generated in 2 weeks to 2 months.

If we had trouble finding extant technologies for weapons production in Libya, even with the Libyans' assistance, it should come as no surprise that in Iraq we are having extreme difficulty finding not only the weapons of mass destruction, if they exist themselves, but the labs or the scientists

who were trying to accumulate them, because, as Dr. Kay pointed out, the trouble we have in Iraq is that many of the scientists whom we would go to to try to find this information are being killed or are frightened.

I eagerly await to see what the fruits of security once it is firmly established in Iraq will yield to us in terms of intelligence regarding the weapons program and its state; and if there were any weapons, where did they go once the scientists and others in the community that participated in these programs feel that they are free of the threat of assassination or other reprisals to themselves or their family for sharing this information with the United States of America.

In conclusion, I would like to add just one personal point. I will not condemn the Clinton administration for what it did not do prior to September 11, but I would hope that others would be slow to condemn the Bush administration for what it has done since September 11 in defending the interests of the United States. In many ways, I do understand what occurred under the Clinton administration. While I was not one who was swayed at the time, when we defeated European Communism, we saw books from left and right proclaiming to the United States that the end of history was here, that we had peace dividends, that our future was bright, that we could go on to the task of perfecting the American experiment in democracy by addressing internal problems, such as education, race relations, poverty, hunger, injustice; and on September 11 that was taken from us.

What was foisted upon us was an unsought struggle against extremists perverting the tenets of Islam. Our generation and all the generations have to face the fact that once again we are called to our historic duty to defend freedom and civilization from every would-be tyrant bent upon world domination. On September 11, we went from sorrow to anger. But it is fair for us to also feel frustration that a country as great as ours, that has offered the world so much, could be so lowly stricken and have to deal with this type of aggressor yet again. It is unfair, but it is here.

As I said at the beginning, it is a menacing forest; but the trees will not shield us from the truth any longer, and we must accept the fate that we now share and succeed and continue with our resolve in the overarching war on terror to do one thing: it is to kill the terrorists before they kill us, to kill the terrorists before they kill our children; and it is to win the war on terror in our lifetimes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding. I will also extend happy birthday to the gentleman from Indiana and thank him for putting together this hour this

evening. I think this is extremely helpful.

I, too, listened to the first hour of the debate from the other side, and I will not repeat everything that has been said here so eloquently tonight by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER); but I want to go to one word that was spoken on the other side and that word was "misrepresentation," and it was used in the context of the Kay report.

This is an unclassified document. In fact, it is Mr. Kay's testimony before the Senate select committee last October. In that report, Mr. Kay says that Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs spanned more than 2 decades, involved thousands of people, billions of dollars, and were elaborately shielded by security and deception operations that continued even beyond the end of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Mr. Kay went on to say, we have discovered dozens of weapons-related program activities and significant amounts of equipment that Iraq has concealed from the United Nations during inspections. A list of these included a clandestine network of laboratories and safe houses within the Iraqi Intelligence Service that contained equipment subject to U.N. monitoring and suitable for conducting chemical and biological weapons research; a prison laboratory complex used in human testing of biological agents; reference strains of biological organisms concealed in a scientist's home, one of which can be used to produce biological weapons; new research on biological weapon applicable agents, Brucella and Congo Crimean Hemorrhagic Fever.

This is a viral illness that is very similar to the e-bola virus. We heard a lot of discussion last year about the smallpox virus, and truly smallpox is a frightening chemical agent because it is so infective. This organism is not only infective but its early detection can be easily confused with other illnesses such as the flu. People put into our midst who are suffering from smallpox would actually quickly become apparent because they look sick and they are covered with sores. Individuals with Congo Crimean Hemorrhagic Fever would look for all the world like someone suffering from a summer cold and could work a good deal of mischief in this country by infecting individuals going about their business.

In addition, they found documents and equipment hidden in scientists' homes that would have been useful in resuming uranium enrichment by centrifuge and electromagnetic isotope separation and a line of unmanned aerial vehicles not fully declared at an undeclared production facility.

Most people do not consider a missile a weapon of mass destruction, but when that missile has a range of 1,000 kilometers, and Iraq was expressly prohibited from having missiles beyond 150

kilometers, depending upon what you put in the warhead of that missile, that, Mr. Speaker, is a weapon of mass destruction and found by the Kay Iraqi survey group.

Finally, I will just sum up, as Dr. Kay himself did, deception and concealment were the watchwords of the Iraqi Government. You do not have those as your national priorities unless you have something to hide. Saddam, at least as judged by those scientists and other insiders who worked in his military-industrial programs, had not given up his aspirations and intentions to continue to acquire weapons of mass destruction.

Another term that we heard over on the other side was whether or not Saddam was involved in September 11. I do not know the answer to that question; but so much was stated as fact from the 9/11 Commission, the commission that is studying the events around 9/11. In today's Washington Times, and anyone is free to pick this up, it only costs a quarter, and read it for themselves: "Iraqi Officer an Al Qaeda Operative, Papers Show."

"There is at least one officer of Saddam's Fedayeen, a lieutenant colonel, who was a very prominent member of al Qaeda," said September 11 commission member and former Navy Secretary John Lehman. Although he stressed that the intelligence "still has to be confirmed," Mr. Lehman told NBC's "Meet the Press" on Sunday that the information came from "captured documents" shown to the panel after the September 11 Commission's staff report had been written.

What we heard quoted tonight was from that staff report; so I would just tell the American people, Mr. Speaker, that the final word has not been written from the 9/11 Commission, and I would caution people about coming to conclusions based on data that is incomplete.

Mr. Speaker, I know that time is somewhat at a premium, so I will wrap up; but President Clinton said in 1998 that Saddam had weapons of mass destruction, he had used them in the past and someday, some way, if you don't take them away from him, I guarantee you he will use them again.

□ 2200

Mr. Speaker, I have been to Iraq a couple of times, and this is not a picture that I took, but this picture was taken by a member of the Corps of Engineers down in my district, Mr. Doug Cox, who was in the town of Kirkuk, Iraq right after Operation Iraqi Freedom started, and actually he was with one of the forward groups. And this picture was on the wall of the airport there in Kirkuk, the military training base, and this picture was in a room where apparently there was some sort of training facility. There were a lot of pictures on the wall, and we one might relate it to some type of training facility we might have seen in this country, but these pictures were obviously used

for a purpose in training Iraqi military individuals.

If people cannot see it well on C-SPAN, let me just describe it. It shows an individual here, who has a tank and an airplane and a couple of missiles at his disposal, and he is aiming them at a country, the United States of America, or the USA, as is abbreviated there, and we see an individual standing there in a cowboy hat or a Pilgrim hat, and we see the crosshairs on this individual's chest. It does not take a great deal of imagination to guess what was being taught in that training exercise in this military installation in Kirkuk, Iraq.

And, finally, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) did such an eloquent job of talking about the times in the past that Saddam Hussein had used chemical weapons against his own people, and this was the true threat of Saddam Hussein. Yes, there are other countries that had perhaps helped terrorists in the past. Saddam Hussein was the only world leader who had ever used weapons of mass destruction in an offensive fashion, and that is what made him so dangerous. We have the proof from, as the gentleman pointed out, northern Iraq.

We also have the proof from our poor individuals, our poor soldiers in the first Gulf War who suffered from Gulf War Syndrome, and Gulf War Syndrome was a result of neurologic chemical agents. Individuals who were susceptible, who had a specific enzyme defect, who were exposed to low levels of those neurologic agents, then became susceptible to Gulf War Syndrome.

So it is not a point for discussion that Saddam had weapons of mass destruction. He clearly did. He used them offensively, and he clearly had designs on using them again.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas for that very comprehensive talk.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding to me.

There are some, both at home and abroad, who would have us believe that Abu Ghraib is the true face of this war, that the acts of a few troubled individuals represent our cause. I believe there is a dramatically different face, and I would like to describe it to the Members.

In a recent news story, Lt. Riley Sharon, an Army emergency room charge nurse from St. Cloud, Minnesota, a city I am proud to represent, and a fellow alumnus from St. John's University, tells of incidents at the Abu Ghraib prison when it came under attack from mortars fired by insurgents, killing scores of prisoners and wounding hundreds of detainees.

In one 4-hour period, insurgents killed 22 detainees and Lt. Sharbonno's group treated over 100 enemy detainee patients. At the time Sharbonno and his fellow soldiers were fighting to save

the lives of those who might have gladly taken theirs, they were under such heavy fire, they had to wear a Kevlar helmet and a bullet-proof vest.

As Lt. Sharbonno said, "I am unaware of any military in the history of war that has built an entire hospital for the exclusive treatment of enemy detainees or POWs. I don't understand the media's insistence on ignoring the atrocities committed by anti-coalition forces or the amazing things that the military has accomplished over here."

The brave work of the likes of Lt. Sharbonno is the real face of this war. This is the courage, compassion, and humanity of the American soldiers who fight for us all in this war on terror. Too little attention has been paid to their noble work and sacrifices. Too little attention has also been paid to recent successes in moving Iraq towards a democratic form of government.

The Iraqi Governing Council has shown some real initiative recently. They selected a president America supposedly did not want and a prime minister the UN did not want. But by showing independence, they now have more credibility amongst Iraqis and the international community. The Security Council approved of a new government by a unanimous 15-to-nothing vote. The new interim government got to work early, integrated the many independent militias so that they are now part of the solution, not a potential problem, and reorganized Iraqi security forces. Al Sadr is now trying to be a political force rather than a leader of a rebellious militia.

There is no doubt that there will be further bumps in the road on the way to an elected government, but there can also be no doubt that significant progress has been made.

And then we look at the actions of our enemies. If there is any remaining doubt that this is truly a war between good and evil, it should be gone. One can have no doubt at the depths of the enemies will or hatred when we are forced to confront the atrocities committed against Nick Berg and Paul Johnson.

The insurgents attack oil pipelines, a source of hope for the Iraqi people. What is the point in this? Since the liberation of Iraq, the wealth of her natural resources is hers again. An Iraqi-led Oil Ministry controls the pipeline with revenues going to the Iraqi treasury. Iraqi officials disburse the profits for the benefit of Iraqis.

With the fall of the dictator's regime, the money no longer goes to encourage hopeless and desperate Palestinian use to kill themselves while they murder innocent. The revenues no longer subsidize a megalomaniac's architectural fantasies in the form of grandiose palaces. It no longer subsidizes the sadistic whims of the dictator's sons.

The revenue from Iraqi oil are a chance for the Iraqi people to use their own natural resources to educate Iraqi children, to build an Iraqi health care

system, an infrastructure, and a strong Iraqi economy.

Mr. Speaker, the important question we should ask ourselves is why are the terrorists so desperate? Why are they willing to commit so many inhumane acts not just against Americans, but against the Iraqi people as well? The terrorist leader Zarqawi's memo to Al Qaeda's leader, Osama bin Laden, in that we find the explanation for their desperation.

When pleading for bin Laden's assistance in the Iraqi insurgency, Zarqawi makes clear that his insurgency has failed to engender support within the country. Zarqawi also acknowledges that they have been unable to scare Americans into leaving, having been disabused of the idea that he had earlier professed that Americans were "the biggest cowards that God has created." We have certainly proved him wrong. He believes that the insurgents might be able to win if they are able to kill enough Shiites so that the Shiites will attack the Sunni minority, that by creating such turmoil, there will be a civil war. They clearly understand what is at stake, the terrorists do. I hope we do.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that eloquent statement.

Let me say that the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) will be going into detail in just a few minutes about the reasons why 9-11 occurred.

And let me say one more thing, Mr. Speaker, and that is if we had had foresight that Winston Churchill had prior to World War II, we would have saved 50 million lives. President Bush has that foresight, and he is doing the right thing right now.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 30th, Iraq will assume control of its own destiny. Iraq will enter the post-Saddam era with the hope of the world resting upon them. No longer will the Iraqi people be subjected to a climate of fear and desperation. Saddam's murderous, thieving cronies have been removed. Uday and Qusay's henchmen likewise, will no longer be free to roam the streets, terrorizing their people.

The challenge now for the Iraqi people and their new government is to set their future on a course for open thought, popular choice of their leaders, and freedom of action in which to conduct their lives and their futures.

The Iraqi people must understand that, with this new-found freedom comes responsibility—a responsibility to remember the interests of all Iraqis. Each and every Iraqi has a stake in that nation's future and now with our transfer of sovereignty to them, that stake can be fully realized.

We are thrilled to have played a role in empowering the Iraqi people and supporting them in their efforts to rebuild their country, after decades of corruption and oppression. They have the opportunity to make their nation a shining light for all to see, not only in the Middle East, but around the world. A nation filled with talent beyond imagination, Iraq can create a climate of freedom and opportunity for others to emulate.

Problems have arisen. Yet, we must all acknowledge that this opportunity could not have

happened without the brave men and women of the United States military. Through their courage, commitment and sacrifice, we have managed to free an enslaved people. We have brought down a tyrant who killed as many as one million of his own people.

And thus, history will record that the United States brought a beacon of light and hope to a people who had only known misery, suffering, and brutality under Saddam Hussein. The future will judge us to have done right for the Iraqi people and for our nation.

We are, however, not naive about the challenges that lie ahead. Freedom and democracy take time and hard work. They take vigilance and dedication to truth and a commitment to justice. These are things that come with patience. The terrorists want to deprive the Iraqi people of their future. But Iraq can and will prevail.

Iraq's chance is now. Let us stand by the Iraqi people as they struggle to enjoy those rights and liberties that they denied for so long. Let us be motivated by the knowledge that we have helped make the world a better place for the Iraqi people and for all.

As our beloved former President, Ronald Wilson Reagan, would say: "You and I have a rendezvous with destiny . . . If we fail, at least let our children and our children's children say of us we justified our brief moment here. We did all that could be done."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, ten days from today, on Wednesday, June 30, 2004, a historic day will occur in the cradle of civilization: the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) will formally transfer power and sovereignty to an Iraqi Interim Government (IIG). We are ten days to sovereignty.

This step will be the most dramatic to date in a series of planned moves towards more democratic and representative government in Iraq. Since the elimination of the brutal Hussein regime, which terrorized and abused the Iraqi people for decades, significant changes have taken place, helping to put the country on a path to democracy, respect for human rights and economic prosperity.

About 33,000 secondary school teachers and 3,000 supervisors have been trained as part of an effort to upgrade the quality of education and level of learning in Iraq. Nearly 2,000 schools have been rehabilitated and an additional 1,200 schools are expected to be completed by the end of the year. New textbooks are also being developed and utilized. No more government mandates for indoctrinating, inciting hatred or demonizing Americans, the West, or Jewish people through the use of school books.

Last month, the first of several planned sewer treatment plants came online, ushering in a new era of sanitation and public health in an area rife with disease. On the technology side, the total number of telephone subscribers in Iraq is now over 1.2 million, which includes 429,000 cell phone subscribers—representing a 45% improvement above pre-war levels.

And, Iraqis want to be the business leaders in their new country. Already, 2,500 micro-credit clients have applied and received small business loans to help them build a free economy with robust industry. It is important to note that inflation is dropping, and the New Iraqi Dinar has been stable for the three months since its introduction.

This progress has not come without great cost and sacrifice. Thousands of American

families have lost irreplaceable time with their loved ones as they serve the cause of freedom in Iraq. Some American heroes have not and will not return home. We mourn their loss. For those who served, a grateful Nation must ensure those returning get world class healthcare and the compensation to which they are entitled.

After June 30th, other milestones will be marked. Democratically held elections will be conducted in January 2005 to create a National Assembly. This representative body will craft a permanent constitution to strengthen and replace the transitional administrative law (TAL). The Iraqi people will then vote up or down in a national referendum for or against their own constitution. By the end of 2005, if all goes according to plan, the first democratically elected Iraqi government in history will take office.

President Bush put it very succinctly during his speech before the Army War College, when he said: "The rise of a free and self-governing Iraq will deny terrorists a base of operation, discredit their narrow ideology, and give momentum to reformers across the region. This will be a decisive blow to terrorism at the heart of its power, and a victory for the security of America and the civilized world."

The people in Iraq—like people everywhere—want to live free. And among the many reasons why democracy has a chance to succeed in Iraq—although success is not assured—is because the United States is not in Iraq as an imperial power. We do not seek to permanently occupy Iraq. Far from it. Our mission is clear: to liberate Iraq from tyranny. Thus, it is absolutely at the heart of America's interests to see Iraq's new sovereign government succeed in establishing law and order in a just and democratic manner.

Iraqis are a justifiably proud people with an ancient and rich history and culture. Like many other people, they are patriotic and do not like to see their country occupied by any foreign power, no matter how ostensibly helpful they try to be. The Germans and Japanese were undoubtedly relieved when the Allies formally returned sovereignty to their people.

Although U.S. troops remained in each country in large numbers for decades, the former Axis nations truly thrived only after it became clear to the great majority of people that they faced a choice: they could either roll up their sleeves and get to work rebuilding their war-torn nation, or they could look backwards and remain in a miserable state.

Today, Iraqis essentially face the same choice. If they keep focused on the task at hand—rebuilding their shattered country's infrastructure and creating jobs—they too can create an economic boom similar to that experienced by Japan and Germany.

We must not forget that rebuilding Germany, Japan, Italy after World War II was not easy. Democratic traditions take time to set roots. Italy's political system was not stable throughout almost the entirety of the Cold War. Japan essentially had one-party rule until recently. All three nations faced many upheavals and set backs along the way. But like the three defeated Axis powers, Iraq will also have the benefit of extensive international economic and financial assistance in rebuilding.

Unlike an imperial power, when a nation is militarily liberated by the United States, we are willing to put our resources, technologies and willpower to work for democracy.

Our enemies are well aware that the return of real and meaningful sovereignty to Iraqis will undercut one of their chief recruiting justifications—the occupation. That is why we have seen a decrease in terrorist attacks against U.S. and Coalition troops, and more of a focus against foreign contractor personnel and Iraqis involved in their new government.

The terrorists are increasingly targeting new regime officials, police recruiting stations, and personnel involved in development programs. The terrorists and insurgents understand—perhaps better than the U.S. news media—that if the new Interim Iraqi Government headed by Prime Minister Ayad Allawi and President Sheikh Ghazi Al-Yawar succeeds, the terrorists will be defeated.

If Iraqis establish enough basic security to allow for the systematic rebuilding of Iraq's destroyed infrastructure, and commerce and prosperity return to Iraq, the moral swamps from which disaffected young Iraqi men are recruited by insurgents, will dry up. And as democratic traditions and tolerance begin to take root, and the social and economic status of women are uplifted, the appeal of radical misinterpretations of Islam will also diminish.

It is not an accident that Wahabbism and other forms of militant Islam flourish in conditions of chaos, in failed states, in places of misery and suffering, and in communities where women are seen as less than second class citizens. Our task in Iraq is to make sure these conditions never return, and are instead replaced by prosperity, freedom, and tolerance.

When, over time, democracy takes hold in Iraq, other Muslims throughout the region will be able to use the experience of Iraq to refute the arguments of repressive regimes in the Muslim world who justify their corrupt and brutal regimes by saying that there is no other way.

But there is another way. A better way. We need to stick by the side of those brave Iraqis who want to create a free, open and democratic society in Iraq and are willing to risk their lives in order to do it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE MIDDLE-CLASS SQUEEZE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 55 minutes, which is half the time that remains from now to midnight.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to use all the time, but I did want to spend my time this evening talking about what has been referred to in recent weeks as "the middle-class squeeze," basically an effort to point out how Republican policies, both at the presidential level and the congressional level, have made it more and more difficult for the middle class in the United States to get through the day or get through the year, despite Republican claims that the economy is getting better, that jobs are being created. The reality is that more and more people find it difficult to make ends meet.

Mr. Speaker, when President Bush took office, he inherited a \$236 billion