

American people realize that they are the victims of this with the "ins," Democrats and Republicans, who are in, manipulating the system for each other's benefit.

And what do we have? We have a food fight here on the floor of the House every day. And it is not a parliamentary system. It is a representative system and one, I think, as Ben Franklin said after they got through with all the Constitution, everything, said, what have we wrought? And Ben Franklin said, a Republic, if you can keep it.

We are in, I think, grave danger with what we have done to gerrymander the country. And it is the "ins," Democrats and Republican, who are in that are doing it. And we are trying to change that, and the Blue Dog bill will do that. And I hope we can get some action. It will have to come from outside of this building, unfortunately. Thank you.

Mr. ROSS. I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) for his leadership as a founding member of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition. I want to thank him for his leadership on House Resolution 841.

We have talked tonight about House Resolution 841 to require congressional hearings when there is fraud, waste and abuse and mismanagement of Federal agencies with your tax dollars.

We have also talked tonight about another commonsense solution, and that is H.R. 5315, by one of the Blue Dog cochairs, Mr. CARDOZA of California, who has a real commonsense idea, and that is if you are a Cabinet head and your Federal agency that you oversee cannot fully account for its spending, you should have to go back to the Senate for reconfirmation.

So these are commonsense solutions that we are offering up. We are not here just to be critical of the Republican administration. We are here to say here is what is wrong and here are the things that we think we can do to fix it. Clearly, the time has come to hold this administration accountable for its reckless behavior. I believe Congress must act now to renew its constitutional responsibility to serve as a check and balance for overspending, waste, fraud and financial abuse within the executive branch of government.

Wasteful government spending has forced the national debt to its current record level of \$8,346,401,298,731, and future generations, our children and grandchildren, will be forced to pay that bill. Future generations will have to pay back with interest the money the Federal Government is borrowing from other countries due to this administration and this Republican Congress's fiscal recklessness.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker. The time has come to restore common sense and fiscal discipline to our Nation's government. The legislation that I have described to you this evening, these are two different legislative proposals put forth by the fiscally con-

servative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition that will put our Nation back on the track toward balancing the budget and restoring accountability.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. national debt, when we started this evening it was \$8,346,401,298,731. And just in the past hour, as we have been discussing this financial crisis facing America, this number, this national debt has risen \$41,666,000.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is borrowing \$1 billion a day. We are spending a half a billion a day paying interest on the debt we have already got.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to restore some common sense and fiscal discipline to our Nation's government, and once we do that, once we do that we can meet America's priorities. A half a billion dollars a day simply going to pay interest on the national debt. In my district alone, I have got \$4 billion in road needs. I need \$1.5 billion to finish I-69, Interstate 69. I need another \$1.5 billion to finish Interstate 49. I need \$200 million to finish Interstate I-530; \$300 million to four-lane 167 from Little Rock to El Dorado and beyond; about 80 to \$100 million to finish the Hot Springs Expressway; and \$200 million to four-lane U.S. Highway 82 from the east to the west side of Arkansas. These kinds of road projects can create jobs and economic opportunities for one of the poorest regions in the country, the Delta region, which I am proud to represent.

But before we can meet America's priorities and lift these folks up out of poverty and give them a helping hand by building the roads they need, we must first restore common sense and fiscal discipline to our Nation's government and pay down this national debt and stop this deficit spending.

WHY ARE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SO ANGRY?

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am going to make an attempt to answer a question: Why are the American people so angry? I have been involved in politics for over 30 years and have never seen the American people so angry. It is not unusual to sense a modest amount of outrage, but it seems the anger today is unusually intense and quite possibly worse than ever. It is not easily explained, but I have some thoughts on this matter.

Generally, anger and frustration among people are related to economic conditions, bread and butter issues. Yet, today, according to government statistics, things are going well. We have low unemployment, low inflation, more homeowners than ever before, and abundant leisure and abundant luxuries. Even the poor have cell phones, televisions, and computers.

Public school is free and anyone can get free medical care at any emergency room in the country. Almost all taxes are paid for by the top 50 percent of income earners.

□ 2115

The lower 50 percent pay essentially no income tax. Yet general dissatisfaction and anger are commonplace. The old slogan "It's the economy, stupid" just does not seem to explain things.

Some say it is the war. Yet we have lived with war throughout the 20th century. The bigger they were, the more we pulled together. And the current war, by comparison, has fewer American casualties than the rest, so it can't be just the war itself.

People complain about corruption, but what is new about government corruption? In the 19th century, we had railroad scandals. In the 20th century, we endured the Teapot Dome scandal, Watergate, Koreagate, and many others without too much anger and resentment. Yet today, it seems, anger is pervasive and worse than we have experienced in the past.

Could it be that war, vague yet persistent economic uncertainty, corruption, and the immigration problem all contribute to the anger we feel in America? Perhaps. But it is almost as though people are not exactly sure why they are so uneasy. They only know that they have had it and are not going to put up with it anymore.

High gasoline prices make a lot of people angry, though there is little understanding of how deficits, inflation, and the war in the Middle East all contribute to these higher prices.

Generally speaking, there are two controlling forces that determine the nature of government: the people's concern for their economic self-interest and the philosophy of those who hold positions of power and influence in any particular government.

Under Soviet communism, the workers believed their economic best interests would be served while a few dedicated theoreticians placed themselves in positions of power. Likewise, the intellectual leaders of the American Revolution were few but rallied the colonists who risked all to overthrow a tyrannical king.

Since there is never a perfect understanding between these two forces, the people and the philosophical leaders, and because the motivations of the intellectual leaders vary greatly, any transition from one system of government to another is unpredictable. The Communist takeover by Lenin was violent and costly. The demise of communism and the acceptance of a relatively open system in the former Soviet Union occurred in a miraculous manner. Both systems had intellectual underpinnings.

In the United States over the last century, we have witnessed the coming and going of various intellectual influences by proponents of the free market, Keynesian welfarism, varieties of socialism, and supply-side economics. In

foreign policy, we have seen a transition from the Founders' vision of non-intervention in the affairs of others to internationalism, unilateral nation building, and policing the world. We now have in place a policy driven by determined neoconservatives to promote American goodness and democracy throughout the world by military force, with particular emphasis on remaking the entire Middle East.

We all know that ideas do have consequences. Bad ideas, even when supported naively by the people, will have bad results. Could it be that the people sense in a profound way that the policies of recent decades are unworkable and thus they have instinctively lost confidence in their government leaders? This certainly happened in the final years of the Soviet system. Though not fully understood, this sense of frustration may well be the source of anger we hear expressed on a daily basis by so many. No matter how noble the motivations of political leaders are, when they achieve positions of power, the power itself inevitably becomes their driving force. Government officials too often yield to the temptations and corrupting influences of power.

But there are many others who are not bashful about using government power to do good. They truly believe they can make the economy fair through a redistributive tax and spending system, make the people moral by regulating personal behavior and choices, and remake the world in our image using armies. They argue that the use of force to achieve good is legitimate and a proper function of government, always speaking of the noble goals while ignoring the inevitable failures and evils caused by coercion. Not only do they justify government force, they believe they have a moral obligation to do so.

Once we concede government has this legitimate function and can be manipulated by a majority vote, the various special interests move in quickly. They gain control to direct government largesse for their own benefit. Too often, it is corporate interests who learn how to manipulate every contract, regulation, and tax policy. Likewise, promoters of the progressive agenda, always hostile to property rights, compete for government power through safety, health, and environmental initiatives. Both groups resort to using government power and abuse this power in an effort to serve their narrow interests. In the meantime, constitutional limits on power and its mandate to protect liberty are totally forgotten.

Since the use of power to achieve political ends is accepted, pervasive, and ever expanding, popular support for various programs is achieved by creating fear. Sometimes the fear is concocted out of thin air, but usually it is created by wildly exaggerating a problem or incident that does not warrant the proposed government so-called "solution." Often government caused the problem in the first place.

The irony, of course, is that government action rarely solves any problem but rather worsens existing problems or creates altogether new ones. Fear is generated to garner popular support for the proposed government action even when some liberty has to be sacrificed. This leads to a society that is systematically driven toward fear, fear that gives the monstrous government more and more authority and control over our lives and property.

Fear is constantly generated by politicians to rally the support of the people. Environmentalists go back and forth from warning about a coming ice age to arguing the grave dangers of global warming. It is said that without an economic safety net for everyone from cradle to grave people would starve and many would become homeless. It is said that without government health care, the poor would not receive treatment, and medical care would be available only to the rich. Without government insuring pensions, all private pension funds would be threatened. Without Federal assistance, there would be no funds for public education, and the quality of our public schools would be diminished, ignoring, of course, recent history to the contrary.

It is argued that without government surveillance of every American even without search warrants, security cannot be achieved. The sacrifice of some liberty is required for security of our citizens, they claim. We are constantly told that the next terrorist attack could come at any moment. Rather than questioning why we might be attacked, this atmosphere of fear, instead, prompts giving up liberty and privacy. 9/11 has been conveniently used to generate the fear necessary to expand both our foreign intervention and domestic surveillance.

Fear of nuclear power is used to assure shortages and highly expensive energy.

In all instances where fear is generated and used to expand government control, it is safe to say the problems behind the fears were not caused by the free market economy or too much privacy or excessive liberty. It is easy to generate fear, fear that too often becomes excessive, unrealistic, and difficult to curb. This is important. It leads to even more demands for government action than the perpetrators of the fear actually anticipated. Once people look to government to alleviate their fears and make them safe, expectations exceed reality.

FEMA originally had a small role, but its current mission is to centrally manage every natural disaster that befalls us. This mission was exposed as a fraud during last year's hurricanes. Incompetence and corruption are now FEMA's legacy. This generates anger among those who have to pay the bills and among those who did not receive the handouts promised to them quickly enough.

Generating exaggerated fear to justify and promote attacks on private

property is commonplace. It serves to inflame resentment between the producers in society and the so-called victims, whose demands grow exponentially.

The economic impossibility of this system guarantees that the harder government tries to satisfy the unlimited demands, the worse the problems become. We will not be able to pay the bills forever, and eventually our ability to borrow and print new money must end. This dependency on government will guarantee anger when the money runs out. Today, we are still able to borrow and inflate, but budgets are getting tighter and people sense serious problems lurking in the future. This fear is legitimate. No easy solution to our fiscal problems is readily apparent, and this ignites anger and apprehension. Disenchantment is directed at the politicians and their false promises made in order to secure reelection and exert power that so many of them enjoy.

It is, however, in foreign affairs that governments have most abused fear to generate support for an agenda that, under normal circumstances, would have been rejected. For decades, our administrations have targeted one supposed Hitler after another to gain support for military action against a particular country. Today, we have three choices termed the axis of evil: Iran, Iraq, or North Korea.

We recently witnessed how unfounded fear was generated concerning Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction to justify our first-ever preemptive war. It is now universally known the fear was based on falsehoods, and yet the war goes on and the death and destruction continues.

This is not a new phenomenon. General Douglas MacArthur understood the political use of fear when he made this famous statement: "Always there has been some terrible evil at home or some monstrous foreign power that was going to gobble us up if we did not blindly rally behind it."

We should be ever vigilant when we hear the fear mongers preparing us for the next military conflict our young men and women will be expected to fight. We are being told of the great danger posed by Ahmadinejad in Iran and Kim Jong-il in North Korea. Even Russia and China bashing is in vogue again, and we are still not able to trade with or travel to Cuba. A constant enemy is required to expand the state. We are hearing more and more news stories blaming Iran for the bad results in Iraq. Does this mean Iran is next on the hit list?

The world is much too dangerous, we are told, and therefore we must be prepared to fight at a moment's notice, regardless of the cost. If the public could not be manipulated by the politicians' efforts to instill needless fear, fewer wars would be fought and far fewer lives would be lost.

Though the American people are fed up for a lot of legitimate reasons, almost all polls show the mess in Iraq

leads the list of why the anger is so intense. Short wars with well-defined victories are tolerated by the American people even when they are misled as to the reasons for the war. Wars entered into without a proper declaration tend to be politically motivated and not for national security reasons. These wars by their very nature are prolonged, costly, and usually require a new administration to finally end them. This certainly was true with the Korean and the Vietnam Wars. The lack of a quick military victory, the loss of life and limb, and the huge economic costs of lengthy wars precipitate anger. This is overwhelmingly true when the war propaganda that stirred up the illegitimate fears is exposed as a fraud. Most soon come to realize the promise of guns and butter is an illusion. They come to understand that inflation, a weak economy, and a prolonged war without real success are the reality.

The anger over the Iraq War is multifaceted. Some are angry believing they were lied to in order to gain their support at the beginning. Others are angry that the \$40 billion we spend every year on intelligence gathering fail to provide good information. Proponents of the war too often are unable to admit the truth. They become frustrated with the progress of the war and then turn on those wanting to change course, angrily denouncing them as unpatriotic and unAmerican.

□ 2130

Those accused are quick to respond to the insulting charges made by those who want to fight on forever without regard to casualties. Proponents of the war do not hesitate to challenge the manhood of war critics, accusing them of wanting to cut and run. Some war supporters duck military service themselves while others fought and died, only adding to the anger of those who have seen battle up close and now question our campaign in Iraq.

When people see a \$600 million embassy being built in Baghdad while funding for services here in the United States is hard to obtain, they become angry. They can't understand why the money is being spent, especially when they are told by our government that we have no intention of remaining permanently in Iraq.

The bickering and anger will not soon subside since victory in Iraq is not on the horizon and a change in policy is not likely to occur.

The neoconservative instigators of war are angry at everyone, at the people who want to get out of Iraq and especially at those prosecuting the war for not bombing more aggressively, sending in more troops and expanding the war into Iran. As our country becomes poorer due to the cost of the war, anger surely will escalate. Much of it will be justified.

It seems bizarre that it is so unthinkable to change course if the current policy is failing. Our leaders are like a physician who makes a wrong diag-

nosis and prescribes the wrong medicine, but because of his ego can't tell the patient he has made a mistake. Instead, he hopes the patient will get better on his own. But instead of improving, the patient gets worse from the medication wrongly prescribed. This would be abhorrent behavior in medicine, but tragically it is commonplace in politics.

If the truth is admitted, it would appear that the lives lost and the money spent have been in vain. Instead, more casualties must be sustained to prove a false premise. What a tragedy. If the truth is admitted, imagine the anger of all the families that already have suffered such a burden. That burden is softened when the families and the wounded are told their great sacrifice was worthy and required to preserve our freedoms and our Constitution.

But no one is allowed to ask the obvious: How have the 2,500 plus deaths and the 18,500 wounded made us more free? What in the world does Iraq have to do with protecting our civil liberties here at home? What national security threat prompted America's first preemptive war? How does our unilateral enforcement of U.N. resolutions enhance our freedoms?

These questions aren't permitted. They are not politically correct. I agree that the truth hurts and these questions are terribly hurtful to the families that have suffered so much. What a horrible thought it would be to find out the cause for which we fight is not quite so noble. I don't believe those who hide from the truth and refuse to face the reality of the war do so deliberately. The pain is too great. Deep down psychologically many are incapable of admitting such a costly and emotionally damaging error. They instead become even greater and more determined supporters of the failed policy.

I would concede that there are some, though, especially the diehard neoconservatives who believe it is our moral duty to spread American goodness through force and remake the Middle East who neither suffer regrets nor are bothered by the casualties. They continue to argue for more war without remorse as long as they themselves do not have to fight. Criticism is reserved for the wimps who want to "cut and run."

Due to the psychological need to persist with the failed policy, the war proponents must remain in denial of many facts staring them in the face. They refuse to accept that the real reason for our invasion and occupation of Iraq was not related to terrorism. They deny that our military is weaker as a consequence of this war. They won't admit that our invasion has served the interests of Osama bin Laden.

They continue to blame our image problems around the world on a few bad apples. They won't admit that our invasion has served the interests of Iran's radical regime. The cost in lives lost and dollars spent is glossed over and the deficit spirals up without con-

cern. They ridicule those who point out that our relationship with our allies have been significantly damaged.

We have provided a tremendous incentive for Russia and China and others like Iran to organize through the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. They entertain future challenges to our plans to dominate Southeast Asia and the Middle East and all its oil. Radicalizing the Middle East will in the long term jeopardize Israel's security and increase the odds of this war spreading.

War supporters cannot see that for every Iraqi killed, another family turns on us, regardless of who did the killing. We are and will continue to be blamed for every wrong done in Iraq, all deaths, illness, water problems, food shortages and electricity outages. As long as our political leaders persist in these denials, the war won't end. The problem is that this is the source of the anger, because the American people are not in denial and want a change in policy.

Policy changes in wartime are difficult, for it is almost impossible for the administration to change course since so much emotional energy has been invested in the effort. That is why Eisenhower ended the Korean War, not Truman. That is why Nixon ended the Vietnam War, not LBJ. Even in the case of Vietnam, the end was too slow and costly as more than 30,000 military deaths came after Nixon's election in 1968.

It makes a lot more sense to avoid unnecessary wars than to overcome the politics involved in stopping them once they have started. I personally am convinced that many of our wars could be prevented by paying stricter attention to the method whereby our troops are committed to battle. I also am convinced that when Congress does not declare war, victory is unlikely. The most important thing Congress can do to prevent needless and foolish wars is for every Member to take seriously his or her oath to obey the Constitution. Wars should be entered into only after great deliberation and caution. Wars that are declared by Congress should reflect the support of the people and the goal should be a quick and successful resolution.

Our undeclared wars of the past 65 years have dragged on without precise victories. We fight to spread American values, to enforce U.N. resolutions, and to slay supposed Hitlers. We forget that once we spread American values by persuasion and setting an example, not by bombs and preemptive invasions. Nowhere in the Constitution are we permitted to go to war on behalf of the United Nations at the sacrifice of our national sovereignty. We repeatedly use military force against former allies, thugs we helped empower, like Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden, even when they pose no danger to us.

The 2002 resolution allowing the President to decide when and if to invade Iraq is an embarrassment. The

Constitution authorizes only Congress to declare war. Our refusal to declare war transferred power to the President illegally, without a constitutional amendment. Congress did this with a simple resolution, passed by majority vote. This means Congress reneged on its responsibility as a separate branch of government and should be held accountable for the bad policy in Iraq that the majority of Americans are now upset about. Congress is every bit as much at fault as the President.

Constitutional questions aside, the American people should have demanded more answers from their government before they supported the invasion and occupation of a foreign country. Some of the strongest supporters of the war declare that we are a Christian Nation, yet use their religious beliefs to justify the war. They claim it is our Christian duty to remake the Middle East and attack the Muslim infidels. Evidently I have been reading from a different Bible. I remember something about "blessed are the peacemakers."

My beliefs aside, Christian teaching of nearly a thousand years reinforces the concept of the "Just War Theory." This Christian theory emphasizes six criteria needed to justify Christian participation in war. Briefly, the six points are as follows:

War should be fought only in self-defense.

War should be undertaken only as a last resort.

A decision to enter war should be made only by a legitimate authority.

All military responses must be proportional to the threat.

There must be a reasonable chance of success.

And a public declaration notifying all parties concerned is required.

The war in Iraq fails to meet almost all of these requirements. This discrepancy has generated anger and division within the Christian community. Some are angry because the war is being fought out of Christian duty, yet does not have uniform support from all Christians. Others are angry because they see Christianity as a religion of peace and forgiveness, not war and annihilation of enemies. Constitutional and moral restraints on wars should be strictly followed. It is understandable when kings, dictators and tyrants take their people into war since it serves their selfish interest and those sent to fight have no say in the matter. It is more difficult to understand why democracies and democratic legislative bodies, which have a say over the issue of war, so readily submit to the executive branch of government. The determined effort of the authors of our Constitution to firmly place the power to declare war in the legislative branch has been ignored in the decades following World War II.

Many Members have confided in me that they are quite comfortable with this arrangement. They flatly do not expect in this modern age to formally

declare war ever again. Yet no one predicts there will be fewer wars fought. It is instead assumed that they will be ordered by the executive branch or the United Nations, a rather sad commentary.

What about the practical arguments against war, since no one seems interested in exerting constitutional or moral restraints? Why do we continue to fight prolonged, political wars when the practical results are so bad? Our undeclared wars since 1945 have been very costly, to put it mildly. We have suffered over 100,000 military deaths and even more serious casualties. Tens of thousands have suffered from serious war-related illnesses. Sadly, we as a nation express essentially no concern for the millions of civilian casualties in the countries where we fought.

The cost of war since 1945 and our military presence in over 100 countries since exceeds \$2 trillion in today's dollars. The cost in higher taxes, debt and persistent inflation is immeasurable. Likewise, the economic opportunities lost by diverting trillions of dollars into war is impossible to measure, but it is huge. Yet our Presidents persist in picking fights with countries that pose no threat to us, refusing to participate in true diplomacy to resolve differences. Congress over the decades has never resisted the political pressures to send our troops abroad on missions that defy imagination.

When the people object to a new adventure, the propaganda machine goes into action to make sure critics are seen as unpatriotic Americans or even traitors. The military-industrial complex we were warned about has been transformed into a military-media-industrial-government complex that is capable of silencing the dissenters and cheerleading for the war. It is only after years of failure that people are able to overcome the propaganda for war and pressure their representatives in Congress to stop the needless killing. Many times the economic costs of war stir people to demand an end.

This time around, the war might be brought to a halt by our actual inability to pay the bills due to a dollar crisis. A dollar crisis will make borrowing \$2.5 billion per day from foreign powers like China and Japan virtually impossible, at least at affordable interest rates. That is when we will be forced to reassess the spending spree, both at home and abroad.

The solution to this mess is not complicated, but the changes needed are nearly impossible for political reasons. Sound free market economics, sound money and a sensible foreign policy would all result from a strict adherence to the Constitution. If the people desired it, and the Congress was filled with responsible Members, a smooth although challenging transition could be achieved. Since this is unlikely, we can only hope that the rule of law and the goal of liberty can be reestablished without chaos. We must move quickly toward a more traditional American

foreign policy of peace, friendship and trade with all nations, entangling alliances with none. We must reject the notion that we can or should make the world safe for democracy.

We must forget about being the world's policeman. We should disengage from the unworkable and unforfeiting task of nation building. We must reject the notion that our military should be used to protect natural resources, private investments, or serve the interests of any foreign government or the United Nations. Our military should be designed for one purpose, defending our national security. It is time to come home now, before financial conditions or military weakness dictates it.

The major obstacle to a sensible foreign policy is the fiction about what patriotism means. Today, patriotism has come to mean blind support for the government and its policies. In earlier times, patriotism meant having the willingness and courage to challenge government policies regardless of popular perceptions. Today, we constantly hear innuendoes and direct insults aimed at those who dare to challenge current foreign policy, no matter how flawed that policy may be. I would suggest it takes more courage to admit the truth, to admit mistakes, than to attack others as unpatriotic for disagreeing with the war in Iraq.

□ 2145

Remember the original American patriots challenged the abuses of King George and wrote and carried out the Declaration of Independence. Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of anger in this country. Much of it is justified, some of it is totally unnecessary and misdirected. The only thing that can lessen this anger is an informed public.

A better understanding of economic principles, a rejection of foreign intervention, and a strict adherence to the Constitutional rule of law. This will be difficult to achieve. But it is not impossible and well worth the effort.

Mr. Speaker, I now would like to defer to one of our colleagues who has arrived on the floor and is going to participate in this special order, that is the gentleman from North Carolina. I alluded to the fact that looking for the truth was very important. And there is nobody in the Congress that surpasses this gentleman's effort to pursue the truth, and his willingness to take personal responsibility for what he has said, voted for in the past.

And this to me is so important, because his pursuit of truth I think is key. And the efforts that he has made here in the last couple of years I think is just critical, because he has been concerned specifically about information that we in the Congress were given in order to make our decision to deliver this authority to the President.

It is this pursuit of truth that I think is so critical, and I have such high regards for gentleman for doing this. At this time I would like to yield to the

gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you and the gentleman from Texas. I would like to say about the gentleman from Texas that he has been on the floor so many times talking about the economic future of this country and also taking about unjust wars.

I would like to tonight, in the few minutes I have, I would like to quote from Rudyard Kipling. It is called the Epitaphs of the War, 1914 to 1918.

Mr. Kipling at one time was a proponent of aggressive actions, but once his son was killed he seemed to change his thought, which is understandable. And I quote very quickly before I make my brief comments. "If any question why we died, tell them because our fathers lied".

I will leave it at that, Mr. Speaker. I think that speaks for itself. And that again was Rudyard Kipling, not me, Congressman WALTER JONES from North Carolina.

Along with my friend from Texas, I can tell you that I seek the truth. I came to this floor 3½ years ago, I cast my votes to give the President the authority to commit troops to Iraq.

I came to this floor. I was not sure that I was doing the right thing, but I hoped and prayed that I was. But since that time, because I do seek the truth, as my friend from Texas said, that I want to mention to you tonight just a few facts that I have uncovered.

Let me base some of this comment tonight on people I have met with in my office person to person, such as — Carl Ford, former CIA, Paul Pillar, former CIA for 31 years, Larry Wilkerson, Chief of Staff to Colin Powell, General Anthony Zinni, CENTCOM Commander for 3 years, General Gregory Newbold, General John Batiste, former Colonel Karen Kwiatowski, Ray McGovern, CIA, and former Colonel Sam Gardiner, Jim Bamford, author of Pretext for War, and John Landay and Warren Strobel, writers for Knight Ridder.

Tonight I want to start my brief comments with an article written by Gregory Newbold. General Newbold is a Marine General. He was part of J-3 at the Department of Defense prior to our going into war in Iraq. General Newbold is a very impressive man. He was a 2-star Marine General on the way to being a 3-star.

But I would like, with unanimous consent, to submit the whole article, it is a 3-page article in Time Magazine written by General Newbold, not by a writer at Time.

This is what he said in this article. "I was a witness and therefore a party to the actions that led to the invasion of Iraq, an unnecessary war. Inside the military family I made no secret of my view that the zealots rationale for war made no sense. I think I was outspoken enough to make those senior to me uncomfortable.

But I now regret that I did not do more, openly challenge those who were

determined to invade a country whose actions were peripheral to the real threat, al-Qaeda. I retired from the military 4 months before the invasion, in part because of my opposition to those who had used 9/11's tragedy to hijack our security policy. Until now I have resisted speaking out in public. I have been silent long enough".

Mr. Speaker, I could quote more from General Newbold's article, but the RECORD will show this. I do not need to read more.

It is so sad to me that so many in our military and also our CIA saw what was happening in those who wanted to go to war in Iraq, but truthfully did not have the credibility or could prove what they were saying was a fact.

Just today, as a matter of fact, my good friend and Mr. PAUL's good friend from Missouri, IKE SKELTON is on the floor. I assume he will speak when we finish. We held hearings today on the Armed Services Committee. He is the ranking member.

This was to, if you will, to rally about the fact that we found 500 weapons known as munitions that Senator SANTORUM and Representative HOEKSTRA were saying, oh, this shows us that there was weapons of mass destruction. It just was not true. I do not mean to discredit them, but it was not true.

These weapons, according to the experts were probably in existence from 1984 to 1991. And as a matter of fact, today at our hearing, we had a former UN inspector, David Kay, Dr. David Kay. And I quoted this during the hearing today. Mr. Kay has said, when this announcement was made 2 weeks ago, and nobody at the administration was excited about it, and said, oh, this is the secret. This is what happened. This is why we went to war.

None of that was said. And certainly I have not heard a peep, if you will from Secretary Rumsfeld. But Dr. Kay said, well, I questioned this as far as being the weapons of mass destruction. And this is what he said, and I brought this out today, later on this afternoon.

I will quote this. He said, "They probably would have been intended for chemical attacks during the Iran-Iraq war", said Dr. Kay who headed the U.S. weapons hunting team in Iraq from 2003 until 2004.

He said, "experts on Iraq's chemical weapons are in almost 100 percent agreement that Sarin nerve agents produced from the 1980s would no longer be dangerous".

And I quote, and a quote Dr. David Kay, and I asked him about this today. And he said, yes, sir, this is what I said. "It is less toxic than most things that Americans have under their kitchen sink at this point". That is what he said.

And yet we have got those in the Congress who are just beating the drums of, this is what we are saying, this is the reason we went to war. We should never, under any circumstances, send American boys to die for this

country unless we know the intelligence has been verified, verified, verified.

And I regret, and I said this Monday. I was invited by Senator DORGAN to sit on the Democratic Policy Committee's investigation of the Iraq war where they had three or four CIA agents there to testify.

And the Senator very kindly allowed me to sit at the dais. And I apologized that I did not ask the questions before we went into Iraq. I know knew better, but I did not at the time. I am not smarter, Mr. Speaker, but I am wiser, much wiser.

But I said today, as Frank Gaffney who was on the panel with Dr. Taylor, former UN inspector, and also Dr. David Kay. And Mr. Gaffney was saying, well, you know what we need to do is we need to get the President to speak more about the potential threat and this and that.

And I said, well, the problem is trust. The American people have to trust the Congress. They have to trust the administration, be it Democrat or Republican. I said to Mr. Gaffney, I said, I assume that an article in the London Times and the New York Times must be accurate, because I have heard no one dispute it, because if it is true, I would want to demand that I get 8 o'clock national TV to say this is not right, I will not accept it.

But this is what was said, just two quick points. This is by David Manning, who was Mr. Blair's chief foreign policy advisor at the time. Mr. Blair and Mr. Bush were meeting. This is about 6 months before we went into Iraq. And this is what Mr. Manning says, "our diplomatic strategy had to be arranged around the military planning".

He further stated, "that at one point during this discussion between Mr. Blair and Mr. Bush, that it was said that Mr. Bush suggested that the U.S. might be able to have a U-2 reconnaissance aircraft, colored in the UN colors, followed by American fighters and fly it over Iraq and maybe Saddam Hussein would shoot it down. And if Saddam Hussein fired on them it would be a breach".

He further stated that, "maybe it would be possible to get someone to come in and testify that, yes, he has got weapons of mass destruction".

Mr. Speaker, I bring this forward, I do not delight in challenging the administration. But I will tell you that when I go to Walter Reed, like many of my colleagues, both sides, and I never will forget a soldier 4 weeks ago, I was there with WAYNE GILCHREST, Mr. GILCHREST, a Member of Congress, was a Vietnam veteran. And he was wounded in Vietnam and spent 4 months at Walter Reed.

And we went to Walter Reed, and it was kind of nice to me, I am not a veteran, and for me to be able to say to the wounded, this is a Member of Congress, who like yourself spent 4 months in Walter Reed. He was wounded in

Vietnam fighting for his country. He is a Marine.

But I never will forget the fellow, Luke, and then I will yield back to the gentleman from Texas before we close. We were standing there and Luke's mom, Luke is from Florida, I do not have permission to use his last name so I will not use it.

Luke's mom and dad were there. We met them and shook hands. And Luke's mom never stopped crying. And she would not—it was just tears. It was not boo-hoo. But tears. So we talked to Luke. And Luke said, when we got ready to finish, and his girlfriend by the way, he is engaged now with a ring on her hand, he introduced us.

We got ready to leave. He said, Congressman, can I ask you a question? And we said certainly. He said, who is responsible for the stop loss program, where our men and women in uniform who have served their time in Iraq and Afghanistan are extended because of the fact that we are really short on replacements, to be honest about it.

And we said, the Department of Defense. They have the authority. He said, will you do me a favor when you go back to Congress? He said, I am just a sergeant. He said, tell them two or three things for me. We said, certainly. He said, first of all, my very best friend was killed 3 months after he was extended.

He said I was on my third tour of duty. He pulled the sheets down. His legs are gone, both legs are gone. He said, Congressman, my humble opinion is whether you are there 10 days or 10 years, you are not going to change the people of Iraq. It is a different culture. It is a different country.

Whether Luke will be right on that or wrong, I do not know. But why I am here tonight with my friend from Texas is that I have always regretted, since I voted for the resolution, because I should have asked more questions. I should have been more inquisitive. But I was not.

And I do have a pain. I have signed over 8,000 pieces of paper to families in this country. There have been over 2,500 killed. And when you factor in their extended families, we have signed over 8,000 pages. It requires, it is a two-page letter. It requires my signature on one page and the second page also.

I have done that because my heart aches, the fact that I did not question. And yet, I want this Congress, both Democrat and Republican, as my friend from Texas said just a few minutes ago, we have an oversight responsibility to say how and why were we given information that was not credible?

Why were we given intelligence that had not been verified three times before we sent American kids to give their life and their limbs for this country.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I want to yield back to the gentleman from Texas and thank him for giving me a few minutes to share my thoughts with the American people, and to say that I

will continue, Congressman PAUL, to seek the truth. Because this democracy will not survive unless the American people know the truth. Whether it is good or bad, we must know the truth. Thank you, sir.

[From Time Magazine, Apr. 9, 2006]

WHY IRAQ WAS A MISTAKE

(By Lieut. General Greg Newbold (Ret.))

Two senior military officers are known to have challenged Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld on the planning of the Iraq war. Army General Eric Shinseki publicly dissented and found himself marginalized. Marine Lieut. General Greg Newbold, the Pentagon's top operations officer, voiced his objections internally and then retired, in part out of opposition to the war. Here, for the first time, Newbold goes public with a full-throated critique:

In 1971, the rock group The Who released the antiwar anthem "Won't Get Fooled Again." To most in my generation, the song conveyed a sense of betrayal by the nation's leaders, who had led our country into a costly and unnecessary war in Vietnam. To those of us who were truly counterculture—who became career members of the military during those rough times—the song conveyed a very different message. To us, its lyrics evoked a feeling that we must never again stand by quietly while those ignorant of and casual about war lead us into another one and then mismanage the conduct of it. Never again, we thought, would our military's senior leaders remain silent as American troops were marched off to an ill-considered engagement. It's 35 years later, and the judgment is in: the Who had it wrong. We have been fooled again.

From 2000 until October 2002, I was a Marine Corps lieutenant general and director of operations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. After 9/11, I was a witness and therefore a party to the actions that led us to the invasion of Iraq—an unnecessary war. Inside the military family, I made no secret of my view that the zealots' rationale for war made no sense. And I think I was outspoken enough to make those senior to me uncomfortable. But I now regret that I did not more openly challenge those who were determined to invade a country whose actions were peripheral to the real threat—al-Qaeda. I retired from the military four months before the invasion, in part because of my opposition to those who had used 9/11's tragedy to hijack our security policy. Until now, I have resisted speaking out in public. I've been silent long enough.

I am driven to action now by the missteps and misjudgments of the White House and the Pentagon, and by my many painful visits to our military hospitals. In those places, I have been both inspired and shaken by the broken bodies but unbroken spirits of soldiers, Marines and corpsmen returning from this war. The cost of flawed leadership continues to be paid in blood. The willingness of our forces to shoulder such a load should make it a sacred obligation for civilian and military leaders to get our defense policy right. They must be absolutely sure that the commitment is for a cause as honorable as the sacrifice.

With the encouragement of some still in positions of military leadership, I offer a challenge to those still in uniform: a leader's responsibility is to give voice to those who can't—or don't—have the opportunity to speak. Enlisted members of the armed forces wear their oath to those appointed over them; an officer swears an oath not to a person but to the Constitution. The distinction is important.

Before the antiwar banners start to unfurl, however, let me make clear—I am not op-

posed to war. I would gladly have traded my general's stars for a captain's bars to lead our troops into Afghanistan to destroy the Taliban and al-Qaeda. And while I don't accept the stated rationale for invading Iraq, my view—at the moment—is that a precipitous withdrawal would be a mistake. It would send a signal, heard around the world, that would reinforce the jihadists' message that America can be defeated, and thus increase the chances of future conflicts. If, however, the Iraqis prove unable to govern, and there is open civil war, then I am prepared to change my position.

I will admit my own prejudice: my deep affection and respect are for those who volunteer to serve our nation and therefore shoulder, in those thin ranks, the nation's most sacred obligation of citizenship. To those of you who don't know, our country has never been served by a more competent and professional military. For that reason, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice's recent statement that "we" made the "right strategic decisions" but made thousands of "tactical errors" is an outrage. It reflects an effort to obscure gross errors in strategy by shifting the blame for failure to those who have been resolute in fighting. The truth is, our forces are successful in spite of the strategic guidance they receive, not because of it.

What we are living with now is the consequences of successive policy failures. Some of the missteps include: the distortion of intelligence in the buildup to the war, McNamara-like micromanagement that kept our forces from having enough resources to do the job, the failure to retain and reconstitute the Iraqi military in time to help quell civil disorder, the initial denial that an insurgency was the heart of the opposition to occupation, alienation of allies who could have helped in a more robust way to rebuild Iraq, and the continuing failure of the other agencies of our government to commit assets to the same degree as the Defense Department. My sincere view is that the commitment of our forces to this fight was done with a casualness and swagger that are the special province of those who have never had to execute these missions—or bury the results.

Flaws in our civilians are one thing; the failure of the Pentagon's military leaders is quite another. Those are men who know the hard consequences of war but, with few exceptions, acted timidly when their voices urgently needed to be heard. When they knew the plan was flawed, saw intelligence distorted to justify a rationale for war, or witnessed arrogant micromanagement that at times crippled the military's effectiveness, many leaders who wore the uniform chose inaction. A few of the most senior officers actually supported the logic for war. Others were simply intimidated, while still others must have believed that the principle of obedience does not allow for respectful dissent. The consequence of the military's quiescence was that a fundamentally flawed plan was executed for an invented war, while pursuing the real enemy, al-Qaeda, became a secondary effort.

There have been exceptions, albeit uncommon, to the rule of silence among military leaders. Former Army Chief of Staff General Shinseki, when challenged to offer his professional opinion during prewar congressional testimony, suggested that more troops might be needed for the invasion's aftermath. The Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense castigated him in public and marginalized him in his remaining months in his post. Army GEN John Abizaid, head of Central Command, has been forceful in his views with appointed officials on strategy and micromanagement of the fight in

Iraq—often with success. Marine Commandant GEN Mike Hagee steadfastly challenged plans to underfund, understaff and underequip his service as the Corps has struggled to sustain its fighting capability.

To be sure, the Bush Administration and senior military officials are not alone in their culpability. Members of Congress—from both parties—defaulted in fulfilling their constitutional responsibility for oversight. Many in the media saw the warning signs and heard cautionary tales before the invasion from wise observers like former Central Command chiefs Joe Hoar and Tony Zinni but gave insufficient weight to their views. These are the same news organizations that now downplay both the heroic and the constructive in Iraq.

So what is to be done? We need fresh ideas and fresh faces. That means, as a first step, replacing Rumsfeld and many others unwilling to fundamentally change their approach. The troops in the Middle East have performed their duty. Now we need people in Washington who can construct a unified strategy worthy of them. It is time to send a signal to our Nation, our forces and the world that we are uncompromising on our security but are prepared to rethink how we achieve it. It is time for senior military leaders to discard caution in expressing their views and ensure that the President hears them clearly. And that we won't be fooled again.

□ 2200

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman, and I certainly appreciate your contribution. And I certainly appreciate your character, because you have been willing to admit something and change your position, which is sometimes very, very difficult for most people.

I have, of course, great concern, as I expressed earlier, about the war that is going on. But war in general is so dangerous to the cause of liberty, because it is in time of war that people are more willing to sacrifice their liberties. Today, we are told constantly that we have to do such-and-such here in this country because we are at war. Yet, we haven't declared a war. The war has not been declared.

We went to war without a declaration. And instead of being precise on just who the enemy is, we have a war against terrorism, yet terrorism is nothing more than a technique. There are all kinds of terror, terrorist acts, and all kinds of different people. So you really can't have a war against terrorism. So we should be much more precise.

But why I have, for as long as I can remember, been preaching the doctrine of the Founding Fathers on foreign policy is because I think it would be so much better for us. We would fight fewer wars, we would be a lot wealthier, there would be a lot less killing, and it would be so much better for us, and that is simply a policy of non-intervention. And as I stated in my prepared remarks, this is a good moral position, it is a good constitutional position, and it is a good practical position.

Wars that are fought indiscriminately and without declaration and without everybody being together and fighting for a quick victory, they lin-

ger and they just never have good resolve. And that is essentially what has happened since World War II. So I will continue to talk about nonintervention. I believe my allies, the Founding Fathers of this country, and the Constitution, should be enough reason for everybody to at least give consideration to nonintervention.

And I am convinced that our liberties would be better protected, our financial circumstances would be so much better off, and certainly we wouldn't have the burden and the heavy heart that Mr. JONES certainly bears about seeing so many young people needlessly losing their legs and dying in a battle that is so difficult to understand and has not come to resolve.

MORTGAGING THE FUTURE OF THE MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the Speaker for recognizing me this evening.

I wish to speak tonight about the United States military. I have the privilege of serving as the ranking member on the Armed Services Committee here in the House of Representatives. I wish to speak about mortgaging the future of our military.

In particular, I want to talk about the Army, the United States Army. That wonderful institution that has contributed so much to American freedom, has meant so much to us historically, and yet I feel that I must discuss and tell my colleagues this evening about the future of our military and how it is being strained in so many respects.

I want to talk about two of the elements of military. In particular, I want to talk about the Army. This is true also of the Marine Corps, but I will discuss mostly the Army.

The continuous deployment in Iraq hurts our military personnel and their families by straining the recruiting and retention; it damages our readiness for our mission skills outside those required for Iraq. As we all know, we have lost some 2,529 servicemembers killed in Iraq. We have over 18,000 wounded, with near 8,500 of those unable to return to duty.

Regarding the active duty of the United States Army, over 14 percent of the Army active duty force is currently deployed in Iraq. The quality of recruits has fallen in the United States Army, as greater numbers of high school dropouts and other category IV recruits, the lowest level of recruit, have been increasing. Additionally, the number of soldiers who score below the 50th percentile in the Armed Forces Qualification Test has been increasing.

For the past several years, the Army has reduced the minimum time-in-grade requirements for promotion to captain from 24 months to 18 months.

It takes 38 months for a lieutenant to become a captain compared to 42 months just 2 years ago.

One hundred percent of the Army's available active duty combat brigades have served at least a 12-month tour in Iraq or Afghanistan. At least 50 percent of those combat brigades have completed their second tour in Iraq or Afghanistan.

Regarding the Selected Reserves, more than 20 percent of those currently deployed in Iraq are members of the Selected Reserves. That is the Guard and the Reserves. Over 39 percent of the Selected Reserves have been mobilized since September 11. Nearly 20 percent of those mobilized have been deployed two or more times. In fact, 13,800 members of the Selected Reserves have had three deployments, and 10,400 have been deployed more than three times.

Currently, 45 percent of the Selected Reserves mobilized are deployed. Ninety-seven percent of the National Guard's combat and special operation battalions have been mobilized since September 11. The average tour of duty for National Guard members is 342 days.

Regarding recruiting and retention, by 2007, the Army projects that it will be short 3,500 active duty officers, primarily captains and majors. The percentage of officers leaving the Army has been increasing since 2004. Approximately 3,500 airmen are currently performing Army missions, and the Navy is also being asked to assume greater responsibilities in the Iraq theatre.

While the majority of the service components are currently meeting their recruitment goals, last year five components failed to meet their enlistment accession goals. The Army began the fiscal year 2006 with a delayed entry program of 12 percent, which is a 5 percent reduction from fiscal year 2005, and it is significantly below the 46 percent that was at the beginning of fiscal year 2003.

The cost of recruiting has increased tremendously in fiscal year 2005. Active and Reserve components spent \$3 billion on recruiting programs. The cost of retention has increased as well in fiscal year 2005. Active and Reserve components spent \$1.5 billion on retention bonuses, this compared to \$885 million spent in fiscal year 2004.

Next, let us discuss the equipment issues. Equipment readiness is falling, and Iraq seems to be a black hole for all available equipment. Forty percent of the Army and Marine Corps ground equipment is deployed to Iraq. Equipment in Iraq is wearing out two to nine times the peacetime rate. Some equipment has added as much as 27 years' worth of wear and tear in the last 3 years.

A Humvee designed for 14 years of operation needs overhaul or replacement in just 3 years. Additional armor added to protect troops is causing accelerated aging and has increased the number of rollover accidents. The Army has lost