

Civilization has brought to the world, including, among others, the idea that society should be based upon laws and not upon men; that individuals matter more than the collective? These are uniquely Western thoughts, and we can be proud of them, and we should be proud of them. We have all kinds of warts, I know it is true. There are plenty of things we have done wrong. But to only emphasize the worst in America, the worst things that have happened, and even rewrite history to make events even more problematic for us is despicable; and it makes us wonder, it makes children wonder, it makes Americans wonder who they really are and whether this is all really worth it, it seems to me; who are we, where are we going, and how are we going to get there.

Now, if we have a hard time trying to transfer this knowledge to the children that are coming out of our public schools, think how hard it is to transfer that knowledge also to the people who are coming here as immigrants, many of whom are not coming for the purpose of being an American. Many of them are coming simply for the purpose of getting a better job. The whole concept of integration and assimilation goes out the window when it clashes with or comes in contact with, because it is really not a clash, but comes in contact with this cult of multiculturalism, and that is why it matters. That is why immigration policy fits into this discussion.

We need to rethink the way we teach our children and we need to rethink what we tell immigrants. Instead of telling immigrants that there is no reason for them to integrate into our society, that we want them to stay separate, we want them to keep a separate language in the schools, we want them even to keep their own political associations of the countries from which they came, which now we have almost 10 million people in the country living here with dual citizenship.

I had an interesting conversation with a bishop in Denver, Bishop Gomez, who was arguing with me about this issue, and he said to me at one point, "I don't know why you are worried about the Mexicans who are coming into this country." By the way, I am not worried about "the Mexicans"; I am worried about massive immigration. He says, "But I don't know why you are worried about the Mexicans coming into this country." He said, "They don't want to be Americans." Those were his exact words: "They don't want to be Americans."

They are coming here for a job. They love Mexico. They want to keep their Mexican heritage, their Mexican citizenship. Of course, today it is a lot easier to do so than it was when my parents came from Italy, a land very far away, very difficult to get back and forth. Now, of course, all over the world it is a short hop to wherever it was we may have come from. The world has gotten much smaller, and it is a

heck of a lot easier to retain those ties than it was before. He says, "They don't want to be Americans."

I said, "Well, Bishop, of course, that is the problem. To the extent that you are right, to the extent that what you said is true," it is certainly not true for everyone coming, "but to the extent you are right, that is the problem."

That is what is fearful, and that is why we need to think about what we teach children and what we say to immigrants, and that is why we need to get a handle on immigration, reduce even the amount of legal immigrants, and certainly stop the flow of illegal immigrants into the country, until we can in fact get a handle on this problem.

I have a Web site. On our Web site, WWW.House.Gov/Tancredo, you can go there and see a little pop up thing that says "Our Heritage, Our Hope." If you go on that you will see these things that I pulled out of the textbooks, and you will see a resolution that I am going to introduce on the 3rd of March.

□ 2300

I hope that maybe 8 or 10, maybe more, of my colleagues will join me, however many have the guts to do so, and it will be a very simple resolution. It will say that the Congress of the United States wants to encourage all schools in this Nation to produce children who will be able to articulate an appreciation for Western civilization.

Now, one may not think that that should start anything, but I guarantee my colleagues that it will. I guarantee my colleagues it will. I really and truly look with enthusiasm and exhilaration, a certain amount of exhilaration, to that debate; to hearing somebody explain to me why we should not teach children to appreciate Western civilization. Appreciate. I did not say that they had to disparage any other civilization; I just say that they should be able to articulate an appreciation of Western civilization. Do we think that they can do it today? How many do we think could do that today? Do we think that they should be able to? Do we think any child should be able to do that graduating from a public school in the United States, or any school, actually? What would be wrong with having that as a goal? I would love to have this debate. Well, we are going to.

And then I am going to ask State legislatures all over the country; we have now I do not know how many signed up already, but quite a few State legislatures, and simultaneously they are going to introduce a State resolution in their legislatures saying the same thing. Then we are going to ask parents to go to school districts and bring that resolution to their school district and ask the school district to do exactly the same thing. You can go on line, go to Our Heritage, Our Hope page on our Website, and you can get all the information you want, and you can sign up to help us in this endeavor, and

I hope you will. I hope everybody will, because I need your help. But this will be a great, great battle for us to enjoy. It is about time we did so.

Mr. Speaker, there is a reason. There is something of value in Western civilization and the Judeo-Christian heritage, and this place we call the United States, which is the greatest example of that heritage. And as I say, I know that there are warts, and I do not mean to ignore them. I am not asking children to be told that there are only wonderful things about Western civilization or about America, I am just asking that they be told the truth, both the bad side and the good side, because today, they will always, I guarantee my colleagues, children will be able to articulate a problem with Western civilization, but I wonder how many can actually stand up today, a high school senior, and be able to effectively say what is good about Western civilization and the country in which they live and be able to defend it. I certainly want that to happen before we get more people here as immigrants, legal or illegal, who are not coming because they do not want to be Americans.

IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) is recognized for half the remaining time, approximately 27 minutes, as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be back on the House floor with my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) and the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), and I think others will join us, for another installment of Iraq Watch. We have been coming to the floor one evening a week since, I believe, last May to talk about our policies in Iraq, to raise questions about the policies when we do not understand those policies, to suggest alternatives, to try to get information before the Members of the Congress and the members of the general public about what is happening in Iraq.

Before turning to my colleagues for this week's installment of Iraq Watch, let me review a little bit what has been happening, and the last few weeks have been tough weeks for President Bush regarding his policies in Iraq. We know that the chief CIA weapons inspector, Dr. David Kay, returned from Iraq and said that stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction do not exist. He could not find weapons of mass destruction themselves. He doubts that such stockpiles existed before we went to war. He doubts they existed in 2002 or 2003. This, of course, is completely contrary to the White House assertions in the fall of 2002 and in the spring of 2003 that these weapons of mass destruction existed.

The President continued to advocate his case and, in my judgment, hype the

situation regarding weapons of mass destruction in the State of the Union Address where he talked about weapons of mass destruction-related program activities. I am still trying to figure out exactly what is a weapons of mass destruction-related program activity, but I can tell my colleagues what it is not. It is not a weapon of mass destruction, because we have not found those in Iraq, according to our chief CIA weapons inspector David Kay.

Then, in his Face The Nation interview recently, the President talked about Dr. Kay's report and said that Dr. Kay came home and, number 1, made an interim report and, number 2, suggested that things were worse in Iraq than we thought.

Well, in fact, may I say to my colleagues, Dr. Kay came back from Iraq not to make an interim report, but to quit. He said he has had enough. He is frustrated. He says he is not getting the support that he thinks the Iraq Study Group should get in order to focus on the search for weapons of mass destruction. He believes those weapons do not exist. And far from saying things were worse over there than he thought, he said we could not find the things that we were told we would find.

Then, the President finally appointed a commission to study the intelligence regarding Iraq and the weapons of mass destruction. And I am glad that he appointed such a commission, but he made two big mistakes, in my judgment. One, he limited the time, or maybe I should say he expanded the time so that the Commission will not complete its work until well after this fall's election. Secondly, he limited the scope of the Commission. He asked them to look into the accuracy of the intelligence gathering. And I agree that accuracy must be reviewed, but he did not ask the Commission to review the use of that intelligence by the White House itself.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. HOFFFEL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. On that exact point, if we were just reciting a litany of errors made in the sense of an honest misreading after a genuine inquiry, that would be one thing, but the really shocking evidence to the contrary is now coming out. In fact, we even see reports about where was the press? Why was this taking place? And it turns out the source for much of this information, not just for those in the intelligence agencies, but from those reporting on it, was coming from the same sources.

The general public listening to us might say, well, that is all well and good for you folks in the Congress to be mentioning these things now, to be commenting on it now, but we had no access to that. We were not privy to that kind of inquiry on the basis of a position in the Congress where we

could actually ask in depth in closed briefings and hearings as to what the source of this information was. Yet we find now in the Washington Post just 2 days ago a report taken from the London Telegraph on commentary from Ahmad Chalabi. That name has been on this floor previously. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) has examined Mr. Chalabi's career in detail. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFFEL), I believe, has done the same.

Mr. HOFFFEL. Mr. Speaker, if I may interrupt the gentleman for a moment, I am proud of the fact that last April in one of our very first Iraq Watches, I identified Mr. Chalabi in the words that my grandfather would have used as a four flusher. I have to explain what a four flusher is. A four flusher is a man whose word you cannot accept, and if it was good enough for my grandfather, it is good enough for me.

□ 2310

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, let me explain what Mr. Chalabi admitted to. He is now on the Governing Council. This is the body upon which the United States is presently relying. This is the body upon which the United States is presently conducting policy in terms of their being able to take over on June 30, this arbitrary date that has been set by the Bush administration.

He now lays claim to the following. He was accused of peddling phony tips about Iraq's weapons, the very thing that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFFEL) has been speaking of. Again quoting from the Washington Post, he shrugged off charges that he had deliberately misled U.S. intelligence. We are heroes in error.

He told the Telegraph in an interview Wednesday in Baghdad. As far as we are concerned, we have been entirely successful. Our objective has been achieved. That tyrant Saddam is gone and the Americans are in Baghdad. What was said before is not important.

Quoting it now from the Washington Post, not even to the families of all the killed and wounded?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, not even for the American taxpayers that are putting out some \$167 billion to date. That is absolutely outrageous.

What I learned this evening, and I find it particularly disturbing, is that Mr. Chalabi was present in this chamber during the State of the Union that was delivered by President Bush back in January and sat with other members of the Iraqi Governing Council in the box where the First Lady was sitting. This is absolutely unacceptable.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat then for those who may be tuning in and trying to get the context here. Let me repeat exactly what Mr. Chalabi said, our champion in Baghdad, the person upon whom is the principal resource apparently for the intelligence that was delivered to the

President, delivered to the Congress, and apparently delivered to reporters who were all supposed to be checking sources.

Part of the thing that we need to remind ourselves and remind the public of is that we are dependent upon the professional integrity of journalists as well. We are dependent upon it. We are certainly the object of it often enough. We are dependent on them checking their sources to make sure that they are reliable. Let me repeat what he said.

The reason I want to do that is that this is as cynical and sinister a pronouncement as I have heard in my political lifetime. I am quoting Mr. Chalabi, as reported in the Washington Post, We are heroes in error. As far as we are concerned, we have been entirely successful. Our objective has been achieved. That tyrant Saddam is gone, and the Americans are in Baghdad. What was said before is not important.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I would just like to, if I may, pick up on that point with Mr. Chalabi.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFFEL) described Mr. Chalabi in very unflattering terms, but I think a more apt description of Mr. Chalabi is that he is a convicted felon. When he fled Iraq he ended up in London for a period of time and then went ahead and conducted business, banking business, financial services, in the kingdom of Jordan. There he was charged with embezzlement and a series of other crimes that would constitute in our jurisprudence a felony. He was tried and convicted and was sentenced to 22 years by a Jordanian court. I am sure he would contest that. I am sure that he would proclaim his innocence, but that is a fact, a reality. That is not just simply an unflattering description of an individual.

When the king of Jordan came and visited with Members of the House Committee on International Relations, and I forget if the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFFEL) was there, but I posed to the king, who has been an erstwhile ally of the United States and his father before him in the region for decades and has cooperated with the United States in terms of the war against terrorism, I asked the king if he had been consulted by the United States Government because I was aware that Mr. Chalabi had been convicted of a serious crime, an embezzlement of some hundreds of millions of dollars. He said, with certain equanimity, No, I was not.

I did not pursue it because I did not want to cause the king any embarrassment, but it was clear to me and others at that meeting that he clearly was displeased, and to think that we turned our back on an ally, who according to newspaper reports, and the truth always outs, was encouraging defectors to provide intelligence that he should have known was false, was false.

If I can pursue for just one more moment, this is dated February 19 and is

from the Daily Telegraph in London, a British newspaper obviously. U.S. officials said last week that one of the most celebrated pieces of false intelligence, the claim that Saddam Hussein had a mobile biological weapons laboratory, had come from a major in the Iraqi intelligence service, made available by the INC.

Those watching us tonight should understand that the INC is an anachronism for the Iraqi National Congress which is the creation of Ahmed Chalabi.

U.S. officials at first found the information credible, and the defector even passed a lie detector test, but in later interviews it became apparent he was stretching the truth and had been coached by the INC.

This is a report from a respected British newspaper that segues exactly the reporting that was done in the Washington Post. This is outrageous and to think that this gentleman was in this institution while sitting in the First Lady's box during the State of the Union, meanwhile we had voted, and many in this chamber on both sides of the aisle had voted a difficult vote, cast an extremely hard vote in terms of war and peace based upon false intelligence? Then we are carrying the burden, not just of the war but of the reconstruction.

We are the only Nation, that I am aware of, that when we appropriated the moneys for Iraq did not insist that it be paid back at any point in time. All of the other donors insisted on some sort of a loan arrangement and we did not, and if we really want to pour salt on the wound, this is from the Houston Chronicle, and it is dated February 21. The headline is the United States still paying the source of the tainted intelligence. That is a Knight Ridder outlet. Indulge me for a moment while I read this to my colleagues.

□ 2320

"The Department of Defense is continuing to pay millions of dollars for information from the former Iraqi opposition group that produced some of the exaggerated and fabricated intelligence President Bush used to argue his case for war."

We are paying now. Today.

"The Pentagon has set aside between \$3 million and \$4 million this year for the information collection program of the Iraqi National Congress led by Ahmed Chalabi, said two senior U.S. officials and a U.S. defense official. They spoke on condition of anonymity because intelligence programs are classified."

Mr. HOEFFEL. If the gentleman will yield, as bad as the situation is that the gentleman from Massachusetts has just described, it could be even worse, the impact of this faulty intelligence on this country. Think back on the military strategy that our Armed Forces used. We all understand that our Armed Forces fought bravely, with

great courage. But remember that they rushed to Baghdad because they believed that weapons of mass destruction were there, in large measure because of the representations made by Chalabi and others, and the very false and misleading information that the gentleman from Massachusetts has identified tonight.

Our troops did not protect their flanks. They figured the most important thing they had to do was get to Baghdad and stop any potential use of these weapons of mass destruction against the American troops or the British troops or against the Iraqi citizens; that the key was to get there as quickly as possible. And in that rush, which they successfully did, very bravely and courageously, they left their flanks exposed. The insurgency started, and we began to lose soldiers right away because they were not taking their time, they were not protecting themselves. They thought they had to rush in.

I think you can put onto the heads of these folks that gave us bad information the loss of life, the loss of American life by our brave soldiers whose leaders thought they had to adopt one strategy based upon incorrect information, when it would have been a little safer for our troops to protect the flanks, move more carefully and cautiously, which I am sure they would have done if they were not worried about these weapons of mass destruction that did not exist.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the question now then becomes, unless I missed something, this Chalabi is a hired gun. This Chalabi is a creature of the administration. He has no executive authority here. He has no voting power. He does not make recommendations to the President of the United States as an adviser, other than as a hired hand. Where was the verification? This man has a vested interest in getting this country into war in Iraq.

What bothers me, what distresses me is that what he was saying fits very conveniently into the ideology and the philosophy and the foreign policy desires of some of the people who have been most adamant in advocating war with Iraq before the weapons of mass destruction principle was laid down as the foundation for war with Iraq.

It is not as if it is a conspiracy. It is not as if it is a hidden plot. It is not as if it is some diabolical machination taking place in secret. Matter of fact, we have had dialogue. I have had dialogue and discussion personally with those who advocated this, like Mr. Perle, Mr. Kristol, Mr. Boot, Mr. Woolsey, who himself was head of the CIA. They published their articles. They have their books written. They have had this position for some time.

So it is not as if this is something that I have suddenly discovered or others have suddenly discovered and now are shocked. I am not. What shocks me is that people would take ostensible in-

formation or intelligence and assume it to be true without checking it out thoroughly, precisely because it fit what they would like it to be.

I know when somebody is telling me something I want to hear, something I would like to be true, something I hope is going to take place, I know that a little bell goes off, a little tremor takes place in me saying, wait a minute, let us make sure that I am not being told something because I want to hear it, because I would like to believe it, because I want it to be so, particularly when the consequences are going to be those of life and death.

When you are making a recommendation and have the authority, particularly as President of the United States, as the Commander in Chief, have the capacity and the authority to act on that recommendation and to make it in turn to the people of this country, then it is incumbent upon you, more than perhaps any other person in this Nation, to be absolutely sure you know what you are talking about, what your sources are and how reliable they are, not just because someone has told you what you want to hear, but because you know it to be factual and the implications to be clear in terms of war and peace.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman has heard the term before, but when we speak of a blind man in a room with deaf mutes, this is an apt description of absolutely what has occurred in this particular case involving this particular individual by the name of Chalabi, Ahmed Chalabi, a convicted felon.

But let me give another possible motive. And again, this is simply a news story that I am reading to my colleagues and to those that are watching here this evening, because I think it is very important that the American people start to understand the dimensions and the magnitude of what occurred here and the absolute need for a thorough transparent presentation of all the facts over an extended period of time to the American people.

This is not about politics. No, it is not. This is about the national security of the United States and how we are viewed by the rest of the world. Our credibility is at risk here. If we perceive another situation that is fraught with peril for our people, and we present intelligence to the rest of the world, who is going to believe us?

Let me suggest another motive. This is from Newsday, a New York paper, and it is dated February 15. "U.S. authorities in Iraq have awarded more than \$400 million in contracts to a start-up company that has extensive family and, according to court documents, business ties with Ahmed Chalabi, the Pentagon favorite on the Iraqi Governing Council. The chief architect of the umbrella organization of the resistance, the Iraqi National Congress, Chalabi is viewed by many Iraqis as the hand-picked choice to rule Iraq."

What a disaster that would be. And while we know there are very sensitive negotiations and discussions going on currently between elements in Iraq and between the United Nations, clearly Secretary General Kofi Annan has sent a special representative. He is in the process of reviewing it to make recommendations as to how power is transitioned to the Iraqi people. Yet here we are discussing on the floor of the House tonight the potential of having this particular individual as the hand-picked representative of American interests assuming a role in a future Iraqi Government that clearly, clearly most in the region, my earlier reference to my conversation with King Hussein from Jordan, will find particularly offensive. Clearly there is no support from the Iraqi people.

□ 2330

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if I may ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, who did the hand picking? Who did the hand picking? He did not pick himself. Is there someone in the administration, are there a group of people in the administration?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Of course there are people in the administration.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Perhaps the gentleman can enlighten me by answering that question.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Let me read from the original story that I discussed; we are still paying for the tainted intelligence. The American taxpayers are going to foot the bill for Ahmed Chalabi to come to the United States and sit in the First Lady's box. Let me read this: "The decision not to shut off funding for the information-gathering effort could become another liability for Bush as the Presidential campaign heats up, and suggests that some within the administration are intent on securing a key role for Chalabi in Iraq's political future." Chalabi, who built close ties to officials in Vice President CHENEY's office, and among top Pentagon officials, is on the Iraqi Governing Council, a body of 25 Iraqis installed by the United States, to help administer the country following the ouster of Saddam Hussein in April.

So here we are. We received false information, as the gentleman indicated in response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) yielding. He said the Americans are in Baghdad, we got what we want, and he is continuing to get paid. And according to reports from British newspapers, business associates of his just secured more than \$400 million of American taxpayer resources for contracts awarded by the CPA, by Paul Bremer.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I have never seen a picture or any film of Mr. Chalabi when he was not smiling and when he did not have the smuggest look on his face and when he did not have the demeanor of someone who had pulled off a coup, when he did not have a patronizing attitude towards those doing the interview. I can understand

why. He has played us for saps and suckers, and the result is we have dead and wounded, grievously wounded. The result is the sacking of the Treasury of the United States, and the result is that we have had people whose ideological bent in the administration was such that they wanted to go to war using each other, Chalabi using them, them using Chalabi, in the most cynical fashion, the result of which we now see before us.

He said, and I remind Members and those listening to us, what was said before is not important. That which became the justification for what we did is not important. He got what he wanted. Those who wanted to have war with Iraq got what they wanted. They are not paying the price. They are not the ones who have to suffer for the rest of their lives either by having grievous wounds or by having the irretrievable loss of someone that they love as a result of this.

The question for us and the question that we have to ask not just ourselves but the American people are going to have to ask, is, is this going to be allowed? Is this going to be something that we are going to pass off? The fact that the Newsweek cover that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) referred to in his remarks just previously could have a headline, "How Dick Cheney Sold the War," the crass indifference of a headline like that in terms of its implications, as if you sell a war, not that you are driven into it, not that necessity forced you to come to that sorry and reluctant conclusion, but rather how you sold the war.

Nothing, I think, could be a commentary more persuasive to me of how this has been manipulated, how this has been maneuvered in a way that discredits this administration, discredits Mr. CHENEY in that role. He has yet to come to grips with it, and the White House and the administration as a whole has yet to come to grips with it, because if my information is correct and the information given to The Washington Post is correct, and this is something that one would have the opportunity to see whether it is correct unless it has changed since its publication on February 22 was that the Web site for the White House, the White House official Web site cites the same false information today. It has not changed since March. I quote from the Web site of the White House as of February 22: "The United Nations and U.S. intelligence sources have known for some time that Saddam Hussein has materials to produce chemical and biological weapons, but has not accounted for them: 26,000 liters of anthrax, enough to kill several million people; 38,000 liters of botulism toxin; 500 tons of sarin mustard and VX nerve agents; and 30,000 munitions capable of delivering chemical agents." And finally: "He recently sought significant quantities of uranium in Africa, according to the British Government."

These are the same lies and the same fabrications, the same prevarications, the same falsehoods, the same misleading directions that took us into this war and continue to be repeated in the face of the knowledge that we know them not to be true.

How could it be that these continue to be repeated? Is it any wonder that Mr. Chalabi laughs at us? Is it any wonder that he adopts a smug disposition when we continue to support him, we continue to pay him, we continue to support the policies that he espoused, and he is able to say what was said before is not important because obviously there are no penalties attached to it?

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, we have talked quite a bit tonight about Ahmed Chalabi, and rightly so; but he is not apparently the only favorite of the American government involved in positioning themselves for leadership in Iraq.

In today's Roll Call, one of the Hill newspapers, a fascinating front-page story titled "Iraqi Money Flows" detailing how four different Iraqis seeking power in Iraq are paying over \$100,000 a month for lobbying costs and public relations costs here in the U.S. capital. It is a million-dollar-plus annual industry.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, where does the money come from?

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I do not have a clue. Ahmed Chalabi and three others listed in the article are paying up to a combined \$100,000 a month.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Chalabi and his cohorts are paying this kind of money, what is the principal source of income that we have already enunciated for Mr. Chalabi and his friends?

Mr. HOEFFEL. The principal source I know of is U.S. Government.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. In other words, the U.S. taxpayers are paying this guy to in turn pay lobbyists in Washington to advocate his position and influence Members of Congress.

Mr. DELAHUNT. To influence Members of Congress and influence the administration.

□ 2340

Mr. HOEFFEL. Before we get too carried away with Chalabi, let me just make the point that is in the Roll Call article. There were three others doing this. One of them is the favorite of the CIA to be the new Iraqi leader and a third the favorite of the State Department to be the new Iraqi leader. The gentleman from Massachusetts is right, the Defense Department has long wanted Chalabi to be the new leader of the Iraqi Government.

Mr. DELAHUNT. The convicted felon.

Mr. HOEFFEL. The favorite of the State Department is Adnan Pachachi, who is another member of the current interim government in Iraq as Chalabi is. And, according to Roll Call, the favorite of the CIA is Ayad Allawi, also a member of the Iraqi Governing Council.

We have got a three-headed monster here. The administration itself cannot agree on who should be the next leader of the Iraqi Government. There are three different agencies pushing three different people.

Mr. DELAHUNT. We would hope that that would be the Iraqi people, because if we preach democracy, hopefully we will abide by the decision that the Iraqi people in an election reach on their own. That is a message that I think, and I think we speak for many Members on both sides of the aisle here, that yes, the absolute *sine qua non*, the essential ingredient to a democracy is to give voice to all of the people, not some selected individuals hand-picked by DICK CHENEY, by the CIA, or by anybody else to run the country for the Iraqis, because if that happens, the American taxpayer is going to end up with a much larger bill than we have already assumed.

Mr. HOEFFEL. The gentleman from Massachusetts is making a lot of sense here, but the situation is made that much worse by the fact we are not just trying to hand-pick the next leader from Washington, but the Bush administration has three different favorites, one from the Defense Department, one from the State Department, one from the CIA.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If the gentleman will yield, not having seen the article, does the article go on to elucidate for us who these individuals are who are doing the lobbying? Are there firms here? Are there American firms who are going to come to Members of Congress and advocate on behalf of these individuals our appointees?

Mr. HOEFFEL. Yes. All the firms are identified, the monthly retainers. It is an interesting article. It is a million-dollar industry.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Would the gentleman consider submitting that article for the RECORD so that those who want to read the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD subsequent to our discussion tonight will know all of the details?

Mr. HOEFFEL. I will be delighted to do it.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I will ask to have the article that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is referring to entered into the RECORD as part of our deliberation.

[From Roll Call, Feb. 24, 2004]

IRAQI MONEY FLOWS
(By Brody Mullins)

Several well-heeled Iraqis who hope to play central roles in Iraq's emerging government have launched lobbying campaigns in Washington to influence the Bush administration and Congress as they work to shape a permanent government in Iraq.

The group of Iraqis, which include three members of the U.S.-created Iraqi Governing Council, are spending as much as \$100,000 per month on lobbying firms and public relations agents to press U.S. officials to create a modern, democratic government that is not dominated by Islamic conservatives.

"It's like they are running for president," said one U.S. official of the competing public relations efforts in Washington.

The three Iraqis began their public relations efforts in Washington more than a decade after another Iraqi member of the Iraqi Governing Council—Ahmed Chalabi—began cultivating close ties to now-Vice President Cheney and other key administration officials.

According to forms filed with the Justice Department, Ayad Allawi, a member and former president of the Iraqi Governing Council, has begun an expensive lobbying and public relations effort to press U.S. officials to build a modern democratic government that builds on Iraq's existing foundations.

Allawi has already paid more than \$300,000 to Washington from Preston Gates Ellis & Rouvelas Meeds LLP to help open doors on Capitol Hill and at the White House.

Allawi also hired a former U.S. ambassador to coordinate his Washington effort and a New York advertising firm that once worked for the Beatles to manage his image in the United States.

The public relations effort, which could top \$1 million this year, is funded by Mashal Nawab, an Iraqi-born physician who is a "close friend and admirer" of Allawi, according to the Justice Department forms.

Adnan Pachachi, another member and former president of Iraq's interim government, has also signed up a Washington public relations firm to help him get his message across to the Bush administration and Congress.

F. Wallace Hayes, working on a pro bono basis for now, will write press releases for the 70-year-old Pachachi that "promote democracy in Iraq," according to the Justice Department forms.

Meanwhile, Baqir Jabbar, an Iraqi exile appointed by the United States to run Iraq's housing and construction department, has asked former Rep. Bob Livingston (R-La.) and his influential Washington lobbying firm to help arrange a series of meetings with the Bush administration during his upcoming visit to the United States.

Officials at Livingston Group said Jabbar is not a formal client of the firm. Other details of Livingston's work with Jabbar are not yet available because Jabbar first asked Livingston for help only last month.

The new public relations campaigns in Washington come as the Bush administration struggles to complete an interim constitution for Iraq by the end of the month in order to turn control of the government over to Iraq this year.

In the past few days, it has become clear that the United States will fail to meet both deadlines.

Over the weekend, the Kurds in northern Iraq—which comprise 20 percent of the country—rejected key parts of the constitution. Meanwhile, Paul Bremer, the U.S. administrator in Iraq, acknowledged last week that it is unlikely that Iraq will be able to hold an election for at least another year.

By hiring lobbyists in Washington, the Iraqi leaders hope to one day play a central role in the emerging government.

The Iraqis who have hired lobbyists are each former exiles who want the United States to create a democratically elected government.

Iraq's Shiites make up as much as 60 percent of the country and are better organized than their political and ethnic rivals, the Kurds and the Sunnis.

The leader of Iraq's Shiite conservatives, Grand Ayatollah Ali al-Sistani, hopes to schedule quick elections, knowing that he and his allies would dominate the government if elections are held soon.

Allawi, Jabbar and Pachachi share another rival in Chalabi. But unlike the Iraqi newcomers to Washington, Chalabi has worked

for years in Washington cultivating friendships with key players like Cheney, Paul Wolfowitz and Richard Perle.

Since 1986, Shea & Gardner has represented Chalabi and his Iraqi National Congress in Washington for about \$10,000 a month. One of the partners at Shea & Gardner is James Woolsey, the former CIA director.

Chalabi also gets help from Francis Brooke, a political consultant, and Riva Levinson of BKS&H & Associates, the Washington firm founded by Charles Black, a long-time ally of President Bush.

Those contacts have paid off: At this year's State of the Union address, Chalabi sat in the VIP box with first lady Laura Bush.

Chalabi also was one of the few Iraqis permitted to meet face to face with Saddam Hussein in his cell in the hours after his capture in late December.

Chalabi has long been considered the favorite of Defense Department officials to lead Iraq's new government.

However, his star appears to be fading as Pentagon officials question some of the military intelligence he provided before the war and as Iraqis increasingly view Chalabi as a pawn for the United States.

Meanwhile, the State Department is thought to favor Pachachi, while the CIA backs Allawi. His main opponent in Washington is thought to be Chalabi, a distant relative.

Though Chalabi and Allawi both oppose an Iraqi government run by Islamics, they split over the structure of a new secular government.

Chalabi would like to rid the country of anything to do with Hussein's Baath Party, while Chalabi—a member of the Baath Party before it was hijacked by Hussein in the 1970s—believes the new government should be built upon the existing foundations.

"There are options available to make use of the civil structures that are available in Iraq rather than throwing everything out," said R. Paul Stimers of Allawi's lobbying firm, Preston Gates.

Allawi, a neuroscientist by training, survived a vicious assassination attempt in the late 1970s when Hussein allies tried to axe him to death in his sleep. He later became a source of important—and sometimes suspect—intelligence information to the CIA.

After the war, he was appointed to the interim Iraqi Governing Council and tapped to take charge of security for the country.

In Washington, Allawi and his British benefactor last fall hired Patrick Theros, a former U.S. ambassador to Qatar, to build his base of support among key Members of Congress and the Bush administration.

Theros runs a consulting firm, Theros & Theros, with his wife and son out of their home in a leafy section of Northwest Washington.

With a total monthly budget that began at \$122,000, Allawi brought on New York public relations agency Brown Lloyd James Ltd.—a firm that once represented the Beatles—for \$12,500 a month.

For lobbying work, Allawi tapped Washington lobbying shop Preston Gates for \$100,000 a month, though the firm has since lowered its monthly retainer to less than \$50,000.

According to contracts filed with the Justice Department, the firms will help Allawi "gain U.S. government support for his policy suggestions for Iraq" by "explain[ing] his views on the security and political situation in Iraq."

Theros, who is making about \$10,000 a month from Allawi, plans to attend "public forums, seminars, events and meetings which represent an opportunity" to express Allawi's ideas.

Allawi's lobbying effort was expected to end this spring when the United States was

expected to hand control over the government to Iraq.

But with the prospects of meeting that deadline dim, the lobbying and public relations campaign is expected to continue.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If the gentleman will yield, I think I can answer his question at least in part here. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania just indicated, there are rival camps now that presumably the American taxpayer is supporting in their lobbying efforts in terms of securing more resources and more tax dollars from Congress and the administration. But it would appear that Mr. Chalabi has an advantage. According to the Roll Call edition of today, it reports that unlike the Iraqi newcomers to Washington, Chalabi has worked for years in Washington cultivating friendships with key players like CHENEY, like Vice President DICK CHENEY, Paul Wolfowitz and Richard Perle, all gentlemen that we have heard from during the course of the debate that many in the majority party have described as so-called neoconservatives.

The Roll Call article goes on to indicate that since 1986, Shea & Gardner has represented Chalabi and his Iraqi National Congress in Washington for \$10,000 a month. So Mr. Chalabi certainly was an individual of some affluence. Clearly that was the impression that the Jordanians had when they convicted him of embezzling some 300 million American dollars from a significant financial institution in Jordan. But that was \$10,000 a month. For your edification, for those of the viewing audience, they should be aware that one of the partners at Shea & Gardner is James Woolsey, the former CIA Director who has been an outspoken advocate for military intervention in Iraq.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If the gentleman will yield, I want to make sure I understood really, because I have had some conversations with Mr. Woolsey. They were affable. I considered them informative and straightforward. I just want to make sure. You mean when he was talking to me about these issues, he was part of a firm that was being paid \$10,000 a month by one of the individuals, by Chalabi himself?

Mr. DELAHUNT. By Chalabi himself.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. That was never revealed to me. I must say, and I want it on the record, that I resent that. If I knew that at least, that is okay. I am an adult. I am perfectly capable of differentiating between someone's sincerely held views and business associations they might have. If somebody represents to me that, look, I just want to tell you that we have a business relationship with this person, but I hope you will grant me that I am speaking to you, giving you my best and sincerest personal judgment regardless of my connection, I can accept that, and I would have, surely, because I like to think that I am a person, I hope, of some integrity, and I would do the same. If I have strong views about

something, I will certainly tell people the whys and wherefores of it. But as a Member of Congress and having had conversations with Mr. Woolsey concerning some of these issues, not to have that kind of information, I think, is a subterfuge.

I am sorry to say it. It pains me. It pains me to say that. What you just said to me is, in fact, shocking. If people want to be cynical about it or think that I am just making some rhetorical flourish, they can think so, but it is not. I do not conduct my affairs that way. I do not deal with other people that way. I feel personally offended, to tell you the truth, that such a thing could take place. I had no idea that there was that kind of relationship, because I think that might have colored what was said to me.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I would hope, and yet it would appear to be a remote possibility, given all that we know, that Mr. Woolsey was unaware of the representation possibly by another partner.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Woolsey has appeared on television numerous times as a commentator. He has been introduced as the former head of the CIA. I have seen him often making commentary and being asked for his perspective, and never once have I heard on any of those television shows, never once, unless I missed it, maybe I tuned in in the middle, maybe there is something that I missed, but I do not believe ever once on any of those shows that any of those hosts ever indicated that he is being paid by a member of the Governing Council, or that his firm is being paid by a member of the Governing Council, and that therefore, at the very least, on the basis of full disclosure that we should know that so that you can take that into account if you think that is pertinent with respect to what he is saying.

I wonder if the hosts of some of these television shows and radio shows and even those newspaper columnists who are quoting Mr. Woolsey are aware or whether they have made the inquiry as to whether or not such a situation exists. What bothers me as a Member of Congress, does this mean that I have to ask every single person that speaks to me, every single person with whom I have a conversation for a list of particulars as to what their associations are before I engage in a conversation or can expect on my part to receive information that is the best judgment of this person rather than the paid retorts and paid-for positions of someone who is in the hire of somebody else?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I share your disappointment. I really do. I find it so incredulous that I will presume that there is some responsible answer why that disclosure was never made.

□ 2350

Maybe this is a question of inaccurate reporting, but this is what appeared today in the Roll Call magazine

that is distributed throughout the Capitol building.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield again to me, the newspaper article, again, I am presuming that it is accurate. Does it indicate that this is a current relationship?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Let me read it again, and let me go on because there is more information.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I realize I am taking time up here, but I am genuinely upset and shocked by this because I feel personally used. I mean, some of these conversations took place on official trips of the United States Government.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Again, I am reading for the gentleman's benefit and for those who are viewing our conversation here this evening: "Since 1986 Shea & Gardner has represented Chalabi and his Iraqi National Congress in Washington for about \$10,000 a month. One of the partners at Shea & Gardner is James Woolsey, the former CIA director.

"Chalabi also gets help from Francis Brooke, a political consultant, and Riva Levinson, the Washington firm founded by Charles Black, a long-time ally of President Bush.

"These contacts have paid off: at this year's State of the Union address, Chalabi sat in the VIP box with the first lady, Laura Bush. Chalabi was also one of the few Iraqis permitted to meet face to face with Saddam Hussein in his cell in the hours after his capture in late December.

"Chalabi has long been considered the favorite of the Defense Department officials to lead Iraq's new government."

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, there is something else troubling about this. The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) is correct and he is right to be personally offended by the lack of disclosure. And it is also clear from this article that a lot of money is being spent to influence the gentleman from Hawaii and me and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) and every other Member of Congress, and we have a right to know who is being paid to influence us and what the subject matter is.

But the fact that this article also demonstrates that the Bush administration is pushing three different people to be the next leader of the Iraq government leads to the following question: What does come next in the larger governance question? We know that Paul Bremer has been advocating on behalf of the Bush administration this concept of caucuses, that when the Bush administration leaves Iraq on June 30, at least the civil authority is pulled out, that Paul Bremer has been pushing for caucuses to take the place of direct elections and somehow lead to a representative form of self-government for Iraq.

The problem is none of the Iraqis like that idea. The head of the majority

Shiite Muslims do not like that idea. The Kurds do not like that idea. That is not going to happen. What is going to take the place of the American-appointed 25-member group of what most Iraqis think are American puppets, the Iraqi Governing Council, what is going to take their place, particularly if the Bush administration has three different favorites to lead the next government? What comes next? We have got an arbitrary deadline set by the President of June 30 to withdraw the civilian authority, a date that seems more based upon the upcoming election than any ability of the Iraqi people to actually conduct a self-government.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman suggesting that there is no exit strategy?

Mr. HOEFFEL. I could not have said it better. There is clearly no exit strategy. In fact, there are three different strategies, if the Roll Call article is correct, about who is supposed to lead the next government, and all of this is supposed to come to fruition by June 30.

Iraq Watch has to come to fruition in 5 minutes tonight. I want to give my two colleagues an opportunity to make any closing comments.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say in that regard that this is my 30th year in public service. I have made friendships and conducted business, legislative business, and evolved personal relationships over those 30 years with a great number of individuals. I have particularly valued those who are sometimes disparagingly referred to as special interests or lobbyists as if that is seen by many people as a derogatory term or a term of denigration. And I do not see it that way. I want to make it clear in terms of my expressed disappointment with regard to this revelation about Mr. Woolsey; and now I guess I am going to have to wonder about everybody else too that I have a conversation with, I am not trying to keep people from making a living.

It does not bother me any. As I say, I have friends who lobby on behalf of what are called special interests. We all have special interests. We are a multiplicity of special interests. One has only to read the Federalist Papers to understand that. In fact, it can be seen as the bulwark of a democratic republic because we do have factions and many interests competing with one another for attention and for approbation. There is no question about that. The only question to be answered in that is do we know that, do we know who they are and what they are and why they are and so on so we can discern what the difference is?

I have no problem with people who are our friends, personal and otherwise, making their positions known to me or to anyone else in the Congress or anywhere else in public office. What bothers me is when positions are represented to us and we do not know that someone, in fact, is a paid representa-

tive, particularly on issues of war and peace, life and death. The folks know and the Speaker knows that I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services and those are the kinds of things we vote on every day, and I think every member there, regardless of party, takes seriously, deadly seriously, I might say without any sense of irony attached to it, take seriously their responsibility.

But we are dependent in the Congress on getting good information. The President of the United States is dependent upon getting good information and making solid judgments based on that information. Anybody who fails to give the best possible information with the fullest knowledge behind it and the resources is undermining the Constitution of the United States and failing their responsibilities as a citizen. In this regard, then, I feel ill used in this process by Mr. Woolsey, and I feel very definitely that the press and the Congress need to make inquiries of everybody who comes before us presenting that information and perspective to us upon which we have to act in matters of life and death. Everybody has to have the fullest inquiry made of them as to what their sources of income are and what their sources of information are, whether they are tainted.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, if I can add to the gentleman's comments, specifically about what appeared to be the distortions of information in Iraq. I am not speaking of Mr. Woolsey. I am speaking of the Iraqi Governing Council representatives, Mr. Chalabi and others. I do not want to see them benefit any more than they already have from their relationships if they have misled this country and this government, and I hope that Congress can figure out a way to deny those individuals, if we can show they intentionally misled us, from any further contract with the U.S. Government, promotion by the U.S. Government. If we have been intentionally misled, if we had gone to war in part under their false comments and under false pretenses, and particularly, as I believe happened, there have been additional American deaths because of that faulty information, we need to cut off those relationships and prohibit any further financial relationships with these malfeasors.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think what he is saying is what we need is something that does not exist here in Washington at this moment in our history. And that is openness and transparency and accountability, and it is not happening. To think that, and I do not know whether it was the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) or the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) that mentioned it, they continued to benefit and with an attitude that arrogance is not a suitable adjective. It is far beyond ar-

rogance. And it is time to lay everything out on the table or the American people will lose confidence, not only in the President but in the Congress.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Can we conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that, at least for the three of us I think I can speak, there will be openness and transparency and accountability on this floor.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their comments. Iraq Watch will be back next week.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel problems.

Mr. OSE (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of family reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEFAZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Mr. MEEKS of New York, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Mr. PAYNE, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Ms. CARSON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
- (The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)
- Mr. DEAL of Georgia, for 5 minutes, February 25.
 - Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, February 25.
 - Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.
 - Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, February 25.