Mr. Speaker, I think the hearing that we had in the

Committee on Armed Services today makes clear that they have moved from

that position to the point that it does not matter. That is essentially

the point that Mr. Wolfowitz was taking today, the Deputy Secretary of

Defense, Mr. Paul Wolfowitz, who is one of the individuals that has

been cited here and has been involved in the decision making based on

this false intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, it is not interference at all, believe

me, because this is complementary to what has been said. I can tell the

gentleman on April 20 of this year, he is thinking about an army. Here

is what he said to the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. Wolfowitz said,

on April 20: ``There is no question it would be nice right now to have

a larger army.'' These are the same people that were claiming, and

reclaimed again today, that General Shinseki was wrong. He did not

mention General Shinseki, but he went out of his way to make sure that

everybody understood that we did not need a greater Armed Forces even

though he said so; it would be nice to have a larger Army but absent

that, after all, we can on the 200,000 security forces that he says are

now in place.

I have his testimony here before me, a written statement given today

before the Committee on Armed Services in which he indicates on Page 3

that we are going to be full partners with the Iraqis. This has to do

with the sovereignty issue, that they are going to take the lead, he

says elsewhere, that they have 200,000 Iraqis in a security force that

is a ``work in progress,'' an interesting way of looking at it, that

according to the Prime Minister, as related by Mr. Wolfowitz, they are

ready to take charge on July 1. There has been enormous progress.

So I asked him today, well, is there an end in sight? And there is no

end in sight. It is schizophrenic. I pointed that out to him today. On

the one hand, everything is fine, everything is working according to

plan, maybe a little bit behind schedule, but nonetheless working its

way right along; and on the other hand, we are going to have to be

there forever as some kind of partner. I asked partners, I understand

the word ``partner'' and the phrase ``full partner.'' What does it mean

in terms of who is in charge in relation to these young and men as well

as some older members of the Guard and Reserves who are being killed

and wounded? Who is in charge? I cannot get from General Pace, I cannot

get from Secretary Wolfowitz, who is in charge. Who makes the

decisions? They are talking about a partnership on all levels,

regional, national, and local; a unity of command; a consensus on the

way ahead. And it is supposed to be working out of what are called

joint operating centers. How these joint operating centers are supposed

to make any decisions regionally or locally or nationally is beyond me.

What is clear from the testimony today is all the discussion that has

been taking place about the reasons for going to this war have been

entirely set aside; and now apparently what the mission of the United

States is, is to act as some kind of backup force, according to them:

``U.S. forces are there to help out. They are backup.'' That is the

motto, a backup force for whatever is to take place now to achieve some

kind of nation-building. That is now what our mission is all about. It

has nothing to do with weapons of mass destruction. It has nothing to

do with anything else that was used as a reference point for why we are

going to war, an immediate threat to the United

States in terms of weapons of mass destruction, some kind of military

connection to terrorist organizations that are an immediate threat to

the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I will answer the gentleman; but

according to Mr. Wolfowitz today, terror is now being defined as the

insurgency in Iraq. If there was not anything before, we have now

created it as a result of the actions that we took based on this false

information.

So now the situation has been redefined. The war on terror has been

redefined to be the activities of what are termed killers and

terrorists and all kinds of anecdotal references as to what that means.

We have to go no further than what happened today, an assassination in

Mosul of the head of a law school and her husband being beheaded,

killed with her and beheaded; another American soldier dying; roadside

bombings, all the rest of these kinds of activities taking place so

that what was going to happen, in my judgment, on July 1 is that the

American military will be set adrift in a desert sea with no compass,

with no direction, with nothing except to provide backup under this

full partnership in these so-called joint operating centers to make

decisions about what we are going to do with the military in Iraq. I

was unable to determine today from Mr. Wolfowitz exactly what the role

of the Guard and Reserve forces and what the deployment schedule are

going to be.

I asked, is there an end in sight? I got Korea, 50 years. I got

Germany as an answer. I got Bosnia as an answer. I said, if that is the

case, if you are going to cite Bosnia, which he does over and over

again, in Bosnia there has been a steady drawdown of troops. Times and

schedules are announced. Troops have been drawn down. If we are talking

about Korea or Germany, none of the conditions prevail in South Korea

or Germany that prevail in Iraq today. So, the analogies are at best

totally inaccurate and have nothing to do with what is taking place

today in Iraq.

The question remains, if the reasons for going to war have now proven

to be at best inadequate, and, at worst, false and misleading, and

deliberately so in order to fulfill whatever ideological agenda was

then in place in the Bush administration, the fact is now that the

mission of the United States military is to somehow provide a backdrop,

a foundation or background to this increasingly apparent civil war that

is now underway in Iraq.

Because the question arose in several contexts,

including questions and observations made by the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. Weldon) and others on the Republican side of the

committee. We try very hard in that committee to work together as

Americans to try to come to these conclusions. The gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. Weldon) raised the issue of Iran. Other issues were

raised with regard to Iran and Syria with the border police.

The best that I can discern out of all of this is that somehow this

war was to prevent this from taking place, that is to say, the

increased terrorist activities to the degree it can be associated with

reference to Syria or Iran, but I was unable to get out of his answers

anything that would indicate how could we deal with it.

I do not have trouble understanding him.

If the gentleman will yield, I will tell you exactly

what Mr. Wolfowitz thinks on that subject. In the New York Times

Magazine, interviewed by Bill Keller in September of 2002, a year after

the 9/11 activity, I will tell you exactly what he said.

``There is an awful lot we don't know, an awful lot we may never

know, and we have got to think differently about standards of proof

here. In fact, there is no way you can prove that something is going to

happen 3 years from now or 6 years from now. But these people have made

absolutely clear what their intentions are, and we know a lot about

their capabilities. Intentions and capabilities are the way you think

about warfare. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is the way you think

about law enforcement. And I think we are much closer to being in a

state of war than being in a judicial proceeding.''

That should give you a very brief summary of the answer that would be

forthcoming to the questions you just raised, namely, it does not

matter.

Can the gentleman yield, so I can tell him what Mr.

Wolfowitz would respond, or how he responded today to the questions the

gentleman is raising, and particularly what Mr. Inslee has cited in

detail. I quote from page 8 of his written statement given to the

Committee on Armed Services today.

``Although the reconstruction plans first envisioned in the summer of

2002 and submitted by the Coalition Provisional Authority to Congress

last July have undergone substantial changes, it has been the

coalition's ability to adapt to rapidly changing circumstances that has

brought us now to the transfer of sovereignty and the beginning of

representative government in Iraq.''

The commitment is upwards of $150 billion. That does

not include the taxes that are now being imposed, and I use that with

quotation marks around it because that is how it is characterized,

within the military itself.

The existing military budget is being taxed, money extracted from it

for operational purposes. The capacity to expend construction funds of

$18 billion-plus are committed, but are not necessarily expended just

yet. The plain fact is we are talking between $150 billion and $200

billion.