Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to address

you, Mr. Speaker, and this House Chamber. I do rise in support, and I

wish to associate with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms.

Jackson-Lee) who brought up that Mother's Day is coming up, and we need

to honor our mothers. They are the source of a lot of the good things

about the world. They are the things that civilize us men, I would

point out.

And I certainly give my greetings to all mothers and look forward to

the day that we formally celebrate that glorious day. A source of

compassion and understanding and nurturement, all of the things I will

never be in my life are wrapped up in motherhood.

Mr. Speaker, I did come here to speak about a different subject

matter, Mr. Speaker. Before I get to the subject of Iraq and the

broader war on terror, I feel compelled to address the issue of the

National Security Administration and their data mining operations that

came to light today in a publication.

I am alarmed in the verbal messages that come around this Chamber,

alarmed that there could be that kind of an operation going on in this

country.

Before I react, though, Mr. Speaker, I think it is imperative and

incumbent upon all of us to step back, to take a good look at the

facts, and not run forward with an uninformed response. I concur with

the first instincts of the gentlemen from New Mexico and also the

gentleman from Washington that spoke on the issue of the data mining of

the National Security Administration.

I serve on the Judiciary Committee where we had at least 12 and

perhaps 13 hearings on the PATRIOT Act, renewed the PATRIOT Act. We put

some insurances in the PATRIOT Act. In a couple of the sections, we set

them up with a sunset so that we will be able to go back and review

those issues in a shorter period of time to make sure that we are

protecting the rights and the privacy of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, when I look at this issue and again, from the sense of

alarm that there would be that kind of a potential intrusion into the

private lives of Americans. And I would dig a little bit deeper and say

this data mining, with the little bit of information that we have at

this point, does not look into the details of Americans, and no one is

alleging that it does except for the remarks made here in this Chamber,

Mr. Speaker.

And it does not, according to the administration, collect any names

of anyone, it does not collect any addresses, it does not listen to any

telephone calls. None of those things, according to the

administration's response at least, and worthy of verification I would

add, takes place unless the FISA court is aware of that and unless it

happens to be a communication from a domestic call within the United

States from or to a caller in a foreign country, and even then the

interest would be in al-Qaeda, as the President made clear.

So data mining is a little bit different. It is clear that, you know,

it depends on how you define the invasion of privacy. And the

allegation was made here, Mr. Speaker, that the administration, and

through the NSA's

data mining, that the privacy was invaded. That is a direct quote from

the gentlemen from New Mexico.

Well, the definition of the privacy, I think, needs to be clearer

before America comes to the conclusion as to whether that privacy was

invaded. Now, if it has not been, if no phone calls have been listened

to, if none have been recorded, if there were no names, and if there

were no addresses that were recorded, if it were just the telephone

numbers, and if the telephone numbers were data mined and run through a

database to sort out, to see if those numbers also were the numbers

that were known phone numbers of suspected terrorists, if that was the

indicator that would cause the National Security Administration then to

go to the FISA court and ask for a warrant, to perhaps listen in on

some of these phone calls, it might have been discovered through the

data mining process. That is how I understand this to be.

This is how the administration defends their actions. This is how I

hope the facts emerge as we listen more closely to this situation. But

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker. I think it is important for Congress to

take a real close look at this. And I will be one of the people who

will be making these requests to take a close look at it.

Mr. Speaker, I am not willing to go out here and make the allegation

that there is a tremendous invasion of the privacy of millions of

Americans until I know that factually that is the case.

The administration would need, in order to get a FISA court warrant,

probable cause, as the gentlemen from New Mexico stated. And the

gathering of information beyond simply an indexing of a phone number

that might link to known al-Qaeda phone numbers or suspected al-Qaeda

phone numbers, as the administration's position on all of the fervor

they have gone with this.

So let's take a deep breath, America. Let's count to 10, America.

Let's get the facts in front of us. Let's get a sense of what is

actually going on before such time as we would leap to a conclusion.

But I want to announce that I am focused on this and I am concerned

about this. And I also would point out that in a hearing before the

Judiciary Committee, the Attorney General, General Gonzalez, was asked

the question as to whether there were any telephone conversations that

were being listened into, domestic calls within the United States

without a FISA warrant or without a warrant of any kind.

That answer that he gave that day I recall not to have been a very

concise, precise or clear answer. And I intend to look up the

Congressional Record to determine that answer that was given by

Attorney General Gonzalez and see how that comports with this story

that came out in the news today of which we will be looking more

carefully into.

Just looking at calling patterns of phone numbers, I am not certain

that that does rise to the level of invasion of privacy. America will

decide that, Mr. Speaker. And we will draw some conclusions ourselves

when we get the facts together.

But I would add also, that the White House would not confirm or deny

the existence of such a program. I will not draw a conclusion either,

Mr. Speaker, as to what that might indicate. But I would point out that

perhaps the architect of this plan, the person who was in charge at NSA

during the period of time that this data mining was initiated and

developed, and certainly during the time of its activity, if indeed it

did take place, was General Michael Hayden, General Michael Hayden who

has been appointed to be the next Director of the CIA.

And we know that there is friction between the CIA and the White

House, and that there is political ideology conflicts going on between

the CIA and the White House, and that the appointment of General

Hayden, an outsider, a military officer, to come into the CIA to be the

Director of the CIA and hopefully to clean up some of the activities

within the CIA that have undermined the foreign policy of the President

of the United States of America, might just be the reason why there was

such a timely leak of this information.

Mr. Speaker, I pose that question to America as perhaps being more

important or at least a question that needs to be raised to a high

level of importance, alongside the importance of the privacy of the

American people.

We will get to the bottom of this, Mr. Speaker. And I will join

others in asking these questions and asking for the factual information

so that we can draw a conclusion here in the Congress, and that the

conclusion in this Congress by right and ought to reflect the

conclusions of the well-informed American public. That is the path that

we need to go down, Mr. Speaker.

I thank you for your indulgence. I shift then over to the subject

matter that I came here to talk about on this floor, and that is the

subject of the effort of our great, dedicated, well-trained, well-

disciplined, well-performing and well-equipped military of the United

States of America.

The effort that they are giving worldwide, globally in this global

effort on terror, this global effort that was enjoined against our will

on September 11, 2001. And the President went to Ground Zero in New

York with a bullhorn and made it clear that we were going to take on

this enemy wherever they might be.

And he said, if you are harboring terrorists, you are a terrorist, if

you are aiding and abetting terrorists, you are a terrorist. If you are

on the side of the terrorists, you are against the side of freedom, and

we will identify our enemies as such.

And within months, the Commander in Chief dispatched troops into

Afghanistan, a nation of 25 million people, a nation that had never had

a free election on that soil ever in the history of the world. A nation

that the Khyber Pass was renowned as being a place where you could

never send military through there without them being ambushed and shot

down, that no nation in the world, including the very powerful Soviet

Union, could ever invade and occupy for any period of time a nation

like Afghanistan.

And that a military, we were advised that a military effort in

Afghanistan would be a failure. And I remember the voices of the people

over on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, and they advised America

that it would be a defeated effort to presume to go into Afghanistan

since all nations throughout all of history had failed in that country

because of the rough terrain, because of the tribalism, because of a

tenacity of the people there to always reject any outsiders, no matter

what kind of good will might come to Afghanistan.

But the Taliban had taken over Afghanistan. And they had been

harboring terrorists. They had been harboring al-Qaeda, and they had

allowed al-Qaeda to get established on Afghanistan and on the border

with Pakistan.

And this al-Qaeda was the worst venom in a very venomous regime

there. The Taliban had taken over essentially all of Afghanistan. They

has been blowing up the religious symbols and statutes in Afghanistan,

trying to wipe out anything that challenged them. They rejected

Buddhism, they rejected Christianity.

Afghanistan was one of the few countries in the world, Mr. Speaker,

where the life expectancy of the women in Afghanistan was less than the

life expectancy of the men, even though the men were the ones that were

continually in combat taking on the bullets and the bombs and the

missiles and the artillery.

Still, they were so brutal with their women in Afghanistan that their

life expectancy was less than that of the men. And the children did not

fare much better, Mr. Speaker. Girls could not go to school. The lack

of freedom, the lack of an economy had devolved down into barely a

survival mode, with a Draconian Islamic cleric regime in place called

the Taliban, one of the darkest regimes ever in the history of the

world.

But our Commander in Chief saw differently. He got good advice from

his military advisers. He took the advice of the military advisers,

accepted that. In a period of within a couple of months of September

11, dispatched our troops into Afghanistan, where they joined up with

the Northern Alliance.

In a matter of months they swept through Afghanistan, wiped out the

Taliban and enabled a free government to be established there. And free

elections were held on that soil for the first time ever in the history

of the world. That provided the 25 million Afghanis the gratitude of

the coalition forces and the United States military. No small feat.

And as that fantastic feat unfolded, the critics from the other side

of this aisle, and the liberals throughout America, slowly were muzzled

by the success of the operations in Afghanistan. Slowly muzzled, Mr.

Speaker, because they came to the realization that it was such a

resounding success in all facets of it, from the military perspective,

from the security perspective, from establishing a free government

having successful elections, and establishing an economy that is now

starting to grow and become stable in Afghanistan, from building

infrastructure, sewer, water, wells, roads, schools, girls going to

school, women voting. The freedom that you see in the eyes of people

that are looking out through a burka that had never had the chance to

do that before, was an astonishing success that again had not taken

place on that place in the globe ever in the history of the world,

thanks to the bravery and the courage of our Commander in Chief.

His vision, his courage, his ability to discern the advice that came

from his Secretary of Defense, from his military staff, from the Joint

Chiefs of Staff, to be able to discern that advice, select the best

advice and then act upon that and send an appropriate number of troops

with appropriate tactical support with appropriate equipment to be able

to initiate and carry out and complete a successful operation in

Afghanistan.

And I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that his critics have been

muzzled on that issue, even though logistically, population-wise, the

degree of difficulty in Afghanistan is greater than the degree the

difficulty in Iraq from a military perspective.

The critics have been muzzled because of the resounding success.

Slowly their voices have been squelched one after another after

another. I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the logistics and the

population in Iraq, substantially easier from the military's

perspective than the war in Afghanistan, the critics said the same

things before the beginning of the operation.

They have not quite been muzzled yet, but one of the people that is

helping in that cause is here to join us this evening. That is the

gentlewoman from Tennessee who stands up for freedom and free

enterprise and our American military, and is there every time they need

her and many times comes without even bothering to call, stands up for

America on the floor and in committee, and in every facet of her life.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to share some time here on the floor. I am

proud to yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. Blackburn).

I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her

presentation here, Mr. Speaker. It is always with great gratitude that

I have the privilege to share some floor time and address this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, picking up on the remarks made by the gentlewoman from

Tennessee (Mrs. Blackburn), several things pop to mind as I listened to

her discussion. One of them is passing the DOD authorization bill here

a little more than an hour ago. It is encouraging to see that we come

together with that kind of unity in supporting our military here. A few

dissenters I would say, but the core of this Chamber does support our

military, and that was evident today.

I would also like to compliment Chairman Hunter, who did an excellent

job of putting the bill together. He brought into play a number of

interests and was able to work this out in a fashion that I think

demonstrates the unity of the American people as voiced through the

United States Congress.

One of the elements in that bill that we did not discuss is a

directive in the bill that will ensure that the military chaplains can

pray reflective of their faith, reflective of their consciences; and

that they will not be told by the ACLU or any other anti-faith group

out there that may want to interfere with their relationship between

God and our soldiers as reflected between them by our chaplains.

When this bill gets to the President's desk, our chaplains will be

protected to operate and to pray consistent with their faith,

consistent with their consciences, consistent with their duty as they

always have until this more enlightened era, as some might call it,

when they began to interfere with the faith relationships. We put our

soldiers on the battlefield and we ask them to put their lives on the

line for us. The least we can do is let them worship in the fashion

that they would prefer.

That is one of those constitutional guarantees. We can go overboard

in trying to make sure we sanitize our religion to the point where no

one is offended. In fact, I think that is a major mistake in the

approach to many of the issues that we have, the idea that somehow we

can move through this society and make progress without offending

anyone. No, there are people who are grievance experts in America and

around the world who will be offended no matter what you do. And if you

keep backing up and backing up, they just bring their line of offense

to follow you back to some point where you get your back against the

wall when you cannot retreat anymore and they will still be offended

when you cannot back up anymore.

Then what do you do? It is pretty difficult to step back and plant

your foot and fight, Mr. Speaker. I submit that we have to draw a line

consistent with our moral values, our religious values, our

constitutional values and stand up for those principles that we hold

dear, but also stand up for the principles that have made the United

States of America a great Nation.

Some of those principles of course are on the line right now around

the globe. They are on the line in Afghanistan where the President

committed troops in the fall of 2001, and successfully I might add. The

critics have been muzzled. And yet before Mrs. Blackburn took to the

floor I had taken this, Mr. Speaker, up to the point where we made the

decision in this Congress to endorse the President's authority to go

into military operations in Iraq, and I point out the similarities

between Iraq and Afghanistan: 25 million people in each of those two

countries; both of them being Arab countries, Muslim countries. And

some might argue about the Arab-ness about the Afghanis, but Muslim

countries certainly. Those similarities. Fair amounts of desert in

each. Far more mountains in Afghanistan than there are in Iraq, but

similar-size countries, countries without large economies, countries

that had not made a lot of progress in the last 35 or more years.

One country was ruled by the Taliban and the other was ruled by

Saddam Hussein. Who is to say which is worse. The Taliban did random

violence and intimidation and pushed that country back into the Stone

Age, sometimes one person at a time, small groups at a time. They

turned their soccer fields into execution fields where they executed

women in front of a crowd.

It is a brutal thing going on in Afghanistan, but the brutality in

Iraq was not quite so obvious. It was not submitted to us so much on

the media because those things took place behind the scenes, but Saddam

Hussein, the tyrant that he was and tyrant that he is, was committing

atrocities against his own people.

The rate of those atrocities can be calculated a number of different

ways. The lowest number that I come up with is that he was killing his

own people at a rate of something just less than 100 a day. The highest

number that I come up with is that he was killing his own people

something over 200 per day, but however it is calculated, and if you

want to figure the lowest average versus the highest average, and these

are numbers that come off the Web pages designed to show how many

Iraqis have suffered, it is not a pro-administration Web page by any

means, but it is the only numbers we really have about the levels of

Iraqi civilians that have died since the liberation of Iraq that began

in March of 2003.

By any measure, Mr. Speaker, when one measures the loss of American

life, plus the loss of Iraqi troops who are on our side fighting for

their freedom, plus the loss of civilian Iraqis, however one measures

those fatalities, those killed in action, those casualties that

resulted in death, and then one calculates the loss of Iraqi lives

under Saddam, that loss of Iraqi life under Saddam was far greater than

the loss in lives during any operation or any period of time that one

wants to select as broader than a few minutes during the whole period

of the operation during 3 years in Iraq.

Saddam's killing of his own people, add up all of those numbers and

subtract the lives that have been sacrificed in Iraq that have gotten

them to this point of freedom, and there are still, by any measure, at

least 100,000 Iraqis who are alive today because of coalition forces,

because of our American military, because of the effort of the Iraqi

people to step up and defend themselves.

This effort that is ongoing in Iraq is more than the function of our

daily casualties, more than the function of the daily casualties of

Iraqi military and Iraqi civilians. What we see are bombing in the

street. We see the news media that is there. It is as if Al Jazeera

gets called whenever there is going to be a bomb detonated and they can

be there to turn on their movie cameras and record the videos of what

is going on for the level of violence in Iraq.

Now, I think it is too high, and I pray that we can get this violence

reduced and get Americans out of the line of fire so they are not

taking on the casualties. I also pray that the Iraqis who are taking

more casualties than Americans are and other coalition forces will be

able to quell this violence, but however we measure this, the loss of

American lives, plus the loss of Iraqi military, lives of people that

are allied with us, plus the loss of innocent civilian lives that we

see on television every day as the bombs detonate, still result in a

massive net saving of Iraqi lives because Saddam Hussein was so brutal

to his own people.

There are not mass graves that are now filling with bodies in Iraq

like they were during the Saddam regime. Those things have stopped. The

level of violence that is there in Iraq and Iraqi civilians are taking

this violence and

those killed are far greater than Iraqi military who are taking more

casualties than the American soldiers who are taking more casualties

than the balance of the coalition forces. That is how that rank order

of loss goes, tragic as it is.

But if we look at the real circumstances in Iraq, and we ask the

question, how can anybody live in that country with daily constant

bombings and people being killed every day in the course of going to

the barber or going to the store or walking down the street or driving

through the intersection or going to school or getting on a bus or

lining up to volunteer for the police force or for the Iraqi military

or even for the rarest of occasions, I am allowing even going to vote,

how can they tolerate that level of violence in their country?

Well, what is the level of violence in Iraq? And so I looked up those

numbers, and it turns out that the annual fatalities due to that kind

of violence, due to violent deaths in Iraq, the same way we measure

violent death in the United States, by a form of murder, first and

second degree murder and manslaughter, that kind of violence in Iraq is

a rate of just a little over 27 per 100,000 people. So you can multiply

that across the 25 plus million people that are there and come up with

that number, now 27 for 100,000 people.

How does that compare then being an average civilian Iraqi compared

to other places in the world where a civilian has a risk of dying a

violent death on any given day? I looked up the statistics for

Washington, D.C. I live here part time and part time in Iowa. My wife

lives here part time and part time in Iowa. It turns out the risk to

me, more important than to me, the risk to my wife Marilyn for being on

the streets in Washington, D.C., is almost twice as high here as a

civilian in Washington, D.C., as it is to be an average civilian in

Iraq. Twenty-seven times per 100,000 in Iraq as civilians due to

violent death, and the number here in Washington, D.C., is 45 per

100,000 here, not quite twice as high but significantly higher than

Iraq.

So what would it be in some other places around the country? Well,

let us see. Detroit, not one of the safer cities but a little safer

than Washington, D.C. That number is 41 per 100,000 compared to 27 per

100,000 in Iraq. So it is significantly safer to be an average citizen

in Iraq than it is is to be an average citizen in Detroit, Michigan.

If we took a look at where would be the most dangerous place in

America, that would be down in New Orleans before Katrina. Before

Katrina in New Orleans, the violent loss of life there was 54 per

100,000, and I will say that is statistically twice as dangerous to be

a citizen in New Orleans as far as taking the risk of violent death,

murder, manslaughter, than it is to be hit by a bomb or a murderer over

in Iraq itself.

So that puts it into perspective for us on how dangerous it is in

Iraq. I have been both places within the last few months, and I think

it is important for us to take a look statistically because what we do

not have is the news media sensationalizing the violence in New Orleans

or the violence in Washington, D.C., or the violence in Detroit. That

is the difference, Mr. Speaker. We do not have the news media

sensationalizing. So America gets this sense that it is an intolerable

level of violence in Iraq and that it cannot be quelled.

Some Members of this Congress declare, as the junior senator declared

from Iowa, that there is a civil war going on in Iraq, and I would

submit that if there is a civil war going on in Iraq, if that were to

happen, we would know it. It is not what is going on there today. A

civil war would be defined as when the uniformed military of Iraq, the

254,000 strong now that are in the field taking the fight to the

insurgents and to the enemy, when they choose up sides and start to

shoot at each other, Mr. Speaker, there will be a message that there

might be a war that has begun in Iraq. Until that happens, they are not

choosing up sides.

We have Sunni and Shi'as and Kurds all wearing the same uniform, all

defending the same flag, all defending the new free Iraq, all defending

the new government that has been established there, the new government

that has now finally been formed and been put in place with a cabinet

that soon will be approved perhaps by the parliament, and they will be

launched upon the political solution of this.

But the violence in Iraq is nowhere near the level that the news

media would have us believe, but it is very much sensationalized.

And how does it compare, the violence of an average citizen in Iraq,

to maybe a Nation like Colombia or Honduras? Well, it is significantly

more dangerous to go to either one of those two countries than it is to

go to Iraq. The murder level in Honduras is nine times that of the

United States. So it is significantly safer to be a regular citizen in

Iraq, again, than it would to be a regular citizen in places like

Colombia or Honduras or let alone Swaziland where that country has the

highest murder rate in the world at 88 per 100,000 people. So to go

visit Swaziland and walk around on the streets in a country like that,

you can divide 27 into 88 about as well as I can, Mr. Speaker. It is

not quite four times as dangerous, but 3.5, 3.6 times more dangerous to

go visit Swaziland. Reading the news media, you could do a Google

search and have difficulty finding such a statistic.

I would submit also, Mr. Speaker, that we had some choices. The

President had some choices, and engaging in the liberation of

Afghanistan was an excellent choice because it took the habitat that

bred the Taliban and supported al Qaeda, that habitat that bred terror,

erased that habitat, cleaned it up and established a new habitat there.

If you want to think about this from an environmentalist perspective,

there was an environment that bred the kind of terror that came to

visit us on September 11 and had attacked us for 20 years and attacked

many of the countries around the world and continues to do so at a far

lesser scale than it would be otherwise.

The habitat that was there bred terror. The habitat that replaces it

breeds freedom. That is the Bush doctrine. That is the vision that was

put in place within 2 months of September 11 when our military was

ordered into Afghanistan, when the people over on this side said it

cannot be done, that our troops would be bogged down, but it has been a

resounding success.

That same approach, with that same philosophy, the Bush doctrine of

erasing the habitat that breeds terror and replacing it with a habitat

that is a free habitat that grows freedom was brought to bear in Iraq,

and I will point out that many of the same advisers that had advised

President Bush in Afghanistan advised President Bush in Iraq. Some of

the same tactics that were used in Afghanistan were used in Iraq, but

the same thought process, the same evaluation, the same willingness to

take risk, measure risk, make sure that we had the resources that were

necessary to complete the operation was all considered.

To argue that the President did not listen to the right people in

Iraq, none of the people that argued against the President's decision-

making are willing to endorse that he listened to the right people for

going into Afghanistan. They simply do not talk about that operation,

as if the global war on terror only has one front, only has one

battlefield, and only had one conclusion or one way to conclude it and

one way to do so, and that in retrospect for them would be send a half

a million troops in there, not 150,000 or 167,000 or 168,000 troops in

there to do this operation.

The President sent enough troops to do the job that was in front of

them. He used the best information he had at the time. He knew who to

listen to before he went into Afghanistan. He listened to a lot of the

same people going into Iraq. Tommy Franks has not stepped forward and

said, oops, I wish I had another 350,000 troops. I would submit, Mr.

Speaker, that another 350,000 troops in Iraq would have taken so long

to mobilize, and the cost of mobilization and the difficulty of doing

such a thing would also put more of our troops in harm's way.

I would point out that if one looks back statistically, that if you

are going to stand up a military, when you put young men and women in

the same place where you have machines that move fast and are heavy and

instruments that are designed to deal death and destruction, as our

military is designed to do, there will be accidents and you will lose

people due to accident that are not combat fatalities.

In fact, one out of every five fatalities in Iraq has been a

noncombat fatality, the result of an accident, but those accidents take

place whether it is a civilian on the streets of America or whether it

is a military wearing the uniform on a base somewhere where we never

hear about that accident. If we add up the loss of American lives as a

price to be ready, because those accidents that take place in training

they take place on the base, the in-uniform accidents, if we add them

up for the period of time between Desert Storm and Operation Iraqi

Freedom, there were 5,000 Americans who gave their life to this country

for our freedom as a price to be ready to take on the enemy. We mourn

them as well as we mourn the soldiers who we lost in combat. They all

paid the price for freedom, and we need to take advantage of this

freedom and exercise this freedom and defend this freedom here the same

way they defended it overseas for us.

But those loss of lives are still hard when it is a family that gives

up a son or a daughter due to a price to be ready as opposed to the

price to be engaged in combat. All need to be honored, all need to be

respected, and of course, we add an extra level of honor to those who

went into the line of fire for our freedom.

But the price remains as a price paid to be readied. There has been a

price paid due to accidents in Iraq, as well as loss of life due to

combat, but there is freedom there in Iraq. They held three elections

in the year 2005, all successful, and they said it could not be done.

They said that the violence would be so great that we could not open

the polling booths and allow Iraqis to come to the polls and vote, but

they did, Mr. Speaker, and each election the number of Iraqis went up,

not down.

The smiling Iraqis with the purple fingers coming out of polling

places, those numbers got greater and greater. As that happened, we

were transitioning from the military security phase of Operation Iraqi

Freedom to the political phase. And now we are into this political

phase full blown, full bore. The Iraqi people have established their

prime minister, their president and their speaker of their new

parliament along with names that have been presented to their cabinet.

That cabinet is endorsed by a majority of the parliament. They will be

up and running.

When they are seated at the United Nations, they will be the most

sovereign and most representative Arab nation in the world, the Nation

that reflects the will of their own people far greater than any others.

We often think of the United Nations as an organization that is the

democracy for the world. It is a voice of all of these nations, and the

ambassadors from the countries represent the voices of the citizens of

the country that they come from. That is not the truth. The truth is

that there are some democratic countries that come to the United

Nations, that appoint an ambassador to go to the United Nations to

speak the will of the people. That is some of the countries.

Then there are the other countries that are significantly different.

These are the ones that come from the dictators and tyrants who do not

allow their own people to have a voice, but they send their ambassador

to the United Nations and they have a voice there, a voice equally

weighted to the voice of the ambassadors who actually represent a free

people.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the Iraqi ambassador soon to be

named to the United Nations will be a voice of a free Arab people, and

that is a significant improvement, a significant change from the way it

was in the past 3\1/2\ years ago. And, in fact, that ambassador will

stand out in the United Nations hopefully as a beacon of freedom to the

Arab people. And hopefully this freedom that is emerging in Iraq as we

speak will be the freedom that becomes contagious and emanates across

the borders to the other countries of the Middle East in such a fashion

that they will stand up and say I want my freedom, too. I will

celebrate when that day comes, but that would be the next phase of the

Bush doctrine. That phase where the President understands that the

clarion call of freedom calls all people, and that freedom is the right

of every person and the future of every nation.

It may not be in this year or this decade or in this generation. It

may not be in my lifetime, but it is inevitable that the yearning for

freedom will bring every country to a level of freedom over time. I

believe, as they say in the Arab world, it is God's will that we arrive

at that point.

The alternative that the President had, given the challenges in front

of him after September 11 was we could have looked at this from a law

enforcement perspective, as did the previous administration. But the

President chose to take the battle to the enemy in Afghanistan with a

model for that country almost a mirror image of Iraq. If an approach to

Afghanistan was wise, and the same approach to Iraq was not wise, I

wish the people on the other side of the aisle and the critics of that

effort would stand and tell me those distinctions. I can give

distinctions, but it is Monday morning quarterbacking now. We must

complete this task.

If we should pull out of Iraq, if that should happen, the effects on

the future of the United States of America and the free world and the

global war on terror would be catastrophic in their magnitude. The

message that would be sent to the rest of the world would be that the

United States does not stick with its commitment to go in and liberate.

The message that came from Muqtada al-Sadr, when I was there on one of

my visits a couple of years ago when he said if we keep attacking

Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the

same way that they left Mogadishu and the same way that they left

Lebanon. That is what I heard in live real-time out of the voice of

Muqtada al-Sadr.

In fact, I took the trouble to put it in a poster, Mr. Speaker. I

would point out that I heard this as I was visiting in Kuwait City

watching Al Jazeera TV. He made the statement that if we keep attacking

Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the

same way they left Lebanon, and the same way they left Mogadishu.

That message gets through to our enemy. They understand that the

United States, if we do not stick to a mission, a subsequent military

and American civilians will pay the price for not sticking to that

mission for a generation or more after the fact.

There are those who add to this argument and who add fuel to this

fire. Here would be an example. This is the senior Senator from

Massachusetts who said that this was a war made up in Texas, this whole

thing was a fraud, and Iraq is George Bush's Vietnam, which is really

my point.

This message out of the mouth of this senior Senator from

Massachusetts went through the satellite versions of television and

within seconds, in fact at the speed of light, can emerge on the other

end in the Middle East directly into the ears of Muqtada al-Sadr and

Zawahiri and Zarqawi and Osama bin Laden, and you name the leaders over

there who are committed to killing people who are not like them. They

believe that is the path to their salvation. They are encouraged by

these kinds of messages. It cost the lives of American soldiers.

We must stand together and complete this task. If we fail to do so,

our only alternative will be to retreat back to the shores of the

United States of America, fortify everything that we have that we want

to protect, that we hold dear, guard every bus stop, guard every school

and hospital, and guard every restaurant. They do that in Israel. If

you go down the streets of Israel, the military are required when they

are out on the street to carry their gun. They guard everything, and

still their women and children, their families are blown to bits by

terrorists who are committed to killing them for some religious reason

I will never understand. That is our alternative here in America if we

do not complete this task in Iraq.

Some of the things that we have done to provide stability in Iraq are

demonstrated on this poster. The yellow spots here and the green dots,

those are initiated and I believe they are completed operations of

construction projects. Yes, the green is completed operations. The

yellow are projects that are in progress.

As I traveled around, I was down in Basra in the south and on up to

Kirkuk

in the north, and I have been around the Mosul area as well, these

projects are all things that American taxpayer dollars have invested to

upgrade the infrastructure that is there. That includes water, sewers,

hospitals, roads, all kind of structure that are designed to add some

stability to the country of Iraq that in the last 38 years, aside from

coalition forces and the dollars that have been committed into the

country since the liberation, had not made significant progress.

Now there is progress being made in the country. There is more

progress that needs to be made before our troops can come home

victorious, to quote the gentlewoman from Tennessee some moments ago.

I will submit that we have to stick with this task. We do not have an

alternative except to succeed, and we are on the path of success. It is

a long, hard slog, as the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Rumsfeld, has

pointed out. He has been realistic and upfront and candid in his

positions that he has taken. I think he has taken on a yeoman's task to

reorganize our military at the same time we are involved in a conflict

overseas. But the alternative is not acceptable, and that would be not

to reorganize our military at a time when we need to be lighter,

quicker, faster and still stronger than we were before.

I have met with the Secretary of the Army who has laid out this plan

for me, and I am impressed with the level of organization and level of

discipline that they have provided. And I am impressed that Secretary

Rumsfeld has gone down this path and has seen the vision and directed

that it take place in the reorganization of our military.

I am not surprised though, Mr. Speaker, that some of the generals who

were steeped in the old way of thinking and who maybe have a little

different approach might be a little disgruntled. We have about six

generals that have spoken up. That means there are some 9,000 who have

not spoken against the Secretary of Defense. I think it was untimely of

them to do so. It did not help this cause for them. I think that if

they had stepped back and taken a look at it from the perspective of

the long-term best interest of America, they might not have taken these

issues to the public because their voice echoes across through

satellite TV, picked up by Al Jazeera, spread through the ears of al

Qaeda and Osama bin Laden and Zarqawi and Zawahiri and al-Sadr who is

maybe on the side of the government of Iraq and doing business there.

It does not help to send the message of dissent.

If you have a message of dissent, take it to the White House. They

will close the door on the Roosevelt Room or perhaps in the Oval Office

and you can have your say and it will be considered. But to have your

say and say it to our enemy at the same time you might convey that

disagreement to the President of the United States through the media is

not a constructive way to fight a war. If this goes on, it will be one

of the reasons why democracies have a difficult time in succeeding.

I point out that the country I live in is a constitutional republic,

and I am glad it is. I look forward to the day our military comes home

victorious. I do not know how soon that might be. But I would point out

that the previous administration sent troops to Kosovo and gave a time

frame at which time they would be deployed back to the United States,

and that time frame was 1 year. It has been well over 10 years since

those troops were deployed to Kosovo, and we still have troops there.

I am not raising an issue about that except to say we cannot give a

drop-dead deadline for our troops to leave Iraq. That empowers the

enemy and allows the enemy to prepare for the day when they can emerge

from their holes in the ground, having accumulated their military

supplies, and then descend upon the less-equipped people that are there

defending the country.

That idea that has taken place in a resolution over in the other

body, joined in by the junior Senator from Iowa, is the wrong idea at

the wrong place at the wrong time. The right idea and the right message

is we will be there, Iraq, as long as you need us. We are going to

encourage you to get out of the nest and fly. You are doing a good job

so far under difficult circumstances and your fighting spirit is there.

The judicial branch is there. Saddam Hussein needs to be tried. You

need to get done with the trial. You need to accumulate a record for

the Iraqi people so they understand the history that is going on within

the country of Iraq. The era of Saddam Hussein must be recorded. When

it is recorded, it will be fine with me if justice is served and an

appropriate punishment should he be found guilty is made consistent

with Iraqi law. And I am advised that there is only one penalty that is

provided for an individual who might be found guilty of crimes against

humanity and that punishment is death. I believe that is too gentle a

penalty for someone who may have committed crimes of that magnitude,

but it is the one that they have and it is all that we would have in

this country as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to stand with our military, to stand

with their mission, make the point that you cannot be for our military

and against their mission. We cannot ask people to put their lives on

the line and say you should not be doing this, I am against your

mission, but I support you. I will send you some warm socks and an MRE

and something cold to drink. I am for you, troops, but you shouldn't be

there. That is wrong.

If you are not for the mission, you are not for the troops. You

cannot ask them to put their lives on the line for you and be opposed

to their mission. They are one and the same. You support the troops and

you support their mission all together, not separately. You do not get

to choose one or the other. It is a fallacy in the argument.

I stand with the troops and the mission. I am committed to seeing

this thing through to the end. We owe that to our brave soldiers and

Marines who have given their lives for the freedom of the Iraqi people,

for the safety and security of the American people, that have taken the

fight to the enemy globally overseas, who all of them volunteered to go

over there. All of them volunteered to face the enemy. They knew they

were taking a risk. God bless them for it, Mr. Speaker, and God bless

our soldiers and our Marines in their effort, and God bless the United

States of America.