

are not known. Both strongly supported Mr. Chalabi before and during the war in Iraq.

Last Saturday, participants in the meeting with Ms. Rice and her deputy, Stephen Hadley, said Ms. Rice told them she appreciated that they had made their views known. But she gave no hint of her own opinion, participants said, and made no concessions to their point of view.

Newt Gingrich, the former speaker of the House of Representatives, also attended the meeting. A larger meeting later that day, with Mr. Hadley alone, included Danielle Pletka, a vice president of the American Enterprise Institute, a research institution in Washington.

In an interview, Ms. Pletka said that Mr. Chalabi had been "shoddily" treated and that C.I.A. and State Department people had been fighting "a rear guard" action against him.

"They've been out to get him for a long time," Ms. Pletka said. "And to be fair, he has done things and the people around him have done things that have made it easier for them. He is a prickly, difficult person and he drives them crazy. He never takes no for an answer, even when he should."

Ms. Pletka added: "There are questionable people around him—I don't know how close—who have been involved in questionable activities in Iraq. He is close to the Iranian government. And so all of these things have lent credence to the accusations against him."

Mr. Perle said the action against Mr. Chalabi would burnish his anti-American credentials in Iraq and possibly help him to be elected to political office. "In that regard, this clumsy and outrageous assault on him will only improve his prospects," Mr. Perle said.

Mr. Perle said that he had no business dealings with Mr. Chalabi, but that he believed the C.I.A. and D.I.A. were spreading false information that he did. He also said that Mr. Chalabi was not alone in supplying intelligence to the United States government that turned out to be false.

"I know of no inaccurate information that was supplied uniquely by anyone brought to us by the Iraqi National Congress," Mr. Perle said.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chalabi, if I am pronouncing it right, people will remember, is the man who we had thought was someone the President approved of, whom the President now tells us he cannot quite remember.

I do think, Mr. Speaker, as an aside, that probably we should be investigating Chamber security here because apparently at the last State of the Union address a man largely unknown to the President managed to seat himself next to the First Lady. Mr. Chalabi was seated next to Laura Bush. Now the President has no idea or only a vague idea who this man is; and when a stranger, apparently a stranger of some disrepute, if we listen to the White House, is allowed to seat himself next to Laura Bush, then I begin to feel nervous. In general, I think the people who run security do a very good job, I do not know, and this point probably was not their fault. They may have been misled by somebody in the Defense Department, but we better look into it.

We now go back to the spectacle of this administration's internal warfare. We read recently that the Secretary of State was very angry at the CIA be-

cause he now acknowledges that they gave him misinformation. I do not know if that is one of the reasons that the director of the CIA resigned. He is the man who, of course, told the President that it was a slam dunk that there were weapons of mass destruction. Apparently, he slammed when he should have dunked, and he is no longer with us, but the chaos continues.

Here we have in this story the conservative allies, according to Mr. Richard Perle, who is a close adviser to the Defense Department, and according to this article last Saturday, several of these Chalabi supporters said a small delegation of them marched into the West Wing of Condoleezza Rice, the national security adviser, to complain about the administration. For some of these people, who have been consistent advocates of war, marching into Condoleezza Rice, it was the only marching they ever did because certainly they have not been in uniform to march in any wartime conditions, but we have them denouncing the Bush administration, Bush advisers denouncing Bush advisers.

Mr. Powell was quoted in the New York Times last Sunday, well, big surprise, "we disagree with each other." That is not the problem. It is not a problem that the President's advisers disagree with each other. The problem is that the President appears to agree with each of them who disagree with each other. The President does not solve these problems. We have had this ongoing dispute. It is extraordinary to have someone being paid \$40 million or more by the American Government, supported by the Defense Department, Mr. Chalabi, then overthrown by the State Department or the CIA.

Here is Mr. Perle, again, a close ally of the Defense Department, remember the Defense Advisory Board, saying there is a smear campaign under way being perpetrated by the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency. This is Mr. Perle, and then he denounces Mr. Bremer. We are told you, Democrats, do not be critical of the people in Iraq who are running our policy, you will undermine them.

I am nicer than Mr. Perle to these people. Mr. Perle is being much more vitriolic, and he has even managed, Mr. Perle, because he is the epitome of niceness, to find a way to defend Mr. Chalabi who we are now told by this government may have leaked important information to the Iranians.

Here is Mr. Perle's defense of Mr. Chalabi, and Mr. Perle is a man who chooses his words carefully. I wish he chose his friends as carefully as he chose his words, but he does choose his words carefully; and here is what he said about Mr. Chalabi's organization, the Iraqi National Congress, from the New York Times of last Saturday: "I know of no inaccurate information that was supplied uniquely by anyone brought to us by the Iraqi National Congress," Mr. Perle said."

In other words, he does not deny that Mr. Chalabi lied to us. He does not

deny that Mr. Chalabi in effect boasted he gave us misinformation and does not mind that it could help us go to war. His point is that Mr. Chalabi was not the only one who lied to us. I do not think it is much of a defense of Mr. Chalabi to say he is the only one who lied to us, nor does it say much for this administration that they listened to so many liars. The incompetence must stop.

□ 1530

GRAVE SHORTFALLS IN NATO'S INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ASSISTANCE FORCE IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANKS of Arizona). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises to inform our colleagues about grave shortfalls in NATO's International Security Assistance Force, ISAF, in Afghanistan and about efforts to ensure the mission has the resources needed for success.

This Member returned to Washington yesterday from Bratislava, Slovakia, where the spring session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly was held. This Member serves as the President of the Assembly, which for the last 50 years has served as the parliamentary adviser and support organization for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or NATO.

The inability of the Alliance to meet its commitments in Afghanistan was the most important issue we discussed in Bratislava. This Member cannot overstate how critical the next few weeks will be for the future of Afghanistan and for the credibility of NATO.

Several members of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly visited Afghanistan on behalf of the Assembly 2 weeks ago. They were unanimous in their praise for the professionalism of our soldiers but were equally convinced that, without additional resources, the Alliance faces failure in Afghanistan and risks losing all that it has currently invested.

The problems, as noted by those members, relate to the unwillingness of Alliance member countries to provide the personnel and the key air assets required to deploy additional provincial reconstruction teams, or PRTs, to provide security beyond Kabul and the surrounding environs.

In addition, the allies must provide ISAF with the extra forces needed to give the forthcoming elections the best chance of success. This is a matter of great urgency. If our allies do not commit more forces and the support assets to sustain them in the next 4 to 6 weeks, the September elections in Afghanistan will likely do little more than to legitimize the warlords and drug traffickers who are increasingly controlling much of the country.

In Bratislava, Alliance legislators urged our respective governments to examine carefully what further assets they can individually commit. We recognize, of course, that many NATO countries, like our own, already deploy substantial numbers of forces in Afghanistan and elsewhere. The United States currently has about 13,500 military personnel in and around Afghanistan, most in conjunction with Operation Enduring Freedom, the separate mission to fight the Taliban and al Qaeda in southeastern Afghan. Germany and Canada are the two largest contributors to ISAF, with about 1,800 troops each. But Canada's year-long commitment ends in August, and its forces must be replaced from elsewhere.

Compared with the total resources the Alliance can call on, the numbers needed now are not great. Their likely impact, however, is crucial. Time is not on our side. Excuses will not suffice. We must secure those assets now. To fail to do so will place in jeopardy all we have achieved thus far in improving stability in this crucial region.

Actually, this is a failure of political will, pure and simple. Make no mistake about it, this is a failure that jeopardizes the success of our mission in Afghanistan and jeopardizes the very credibility of the Alliance.

We often say that failure is not an option. Mr. Speaker, in Afghanistan, failure is a distinct possibility. And unless allied leaders in the next few weeks demonstrate the political will to deploy the necessary assets in Afghanistan, failure gradually will become a reality.

Drastic shortfalls exist despite the fact there are more than 2 million military personnel in the active and reserve forces of the European NATO allies. Less than 2 percent of those forces are deployed in missions in the Balkans and Afghanistan.

Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, the Secretary General of NATO, has stated repeatedly that the credibility of the Alliance is at stake in Afghanistan and so, it should be emphasized, is the future of the Afghan people.

Recognizing this reality, the leaders of all 26 NATO allies' parliamentary delegations to the Parliamentary Assembly, in an extraordinary, unprecedented step, authorized this Member to send a letter to all the heads of government of the NATO countries forthrightly expressing the concerns of the Assembly.

That letter strongly urges governments to provide the necessary resources for the NATO missions in Afghanistan and the fervent hope that effective action can be taken quickly and the necessary forces provided.

In addition, we agreed to raise this concern in our respective national legislatures in order to generate the widest possible parliamentary support for the required resources to be made available.

NATO already has made remarkable progress in Afghanistan and, with a lit-

tle more effort, our goal of bringing peace and stability to that troubled country is achievable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PENCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING OUR NATION'S VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce two pieces of legislation in this House that recognizes and honors the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces throughout the history of our great Nation.

The first bill is H.R. 4425, called the Honor Our Fallen Prisoners of War Act. Currently, prisoners of war who die during their imprisonment of wounds inflicted in war are eligible for a posthumous Purple Heart recognition. However, those who die of starvation, for example, or beatings or freezing to death are causes which are not eligible for the Purple Heart.

Can this be right? There should be no false distinction indicating more courage or more sacrifice by some who died and less by others. All POWs who died in service to our Nation should be eligible for this Purple Heart recognition, and H.R. 4425 will allow all members of our armed forces who die while a prisoner of war, regardless of the cause of death, to be awarded this honor. This will apply to all wars, past and present.

I am indebted to Rick and Brenda Morgan Tavares of Campo, California, and to Wilbert "Shorty" Estabrook of Murrieta, California, who brought this issue to my attention. Shorty survived the Tiger Camp death march during the Korean War and was imprisoned for over 3 years. Brenda's uncle, Corporal Melvin Morgan, died of starvation and beatings he suffered in 1950 at the age of 20 in Korea. Surely Corporal Morgan is deserving of a Purple Heart.

I am also introducing H. Con. Res. 434, a resolution to commend all persons who were inducted for service in the United States Armed Forces during World War II. I repeat, inducted into service. This is a particularly fitting time for such recognition. We all witnessed last Saturday the World War II Memorial on the Mall in Washington, DC, being dedicated as a lasting symbol

of our Nation's appreciation of these veterans. We are also approaching the 60th anniversary of D-Day on June 6, 2004, when tens of thousands of inductees, or draftees as they are usually called, were among the Allied Forces invaded Normandy, France.

To provide a bit of history, the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 was enacted 1 year after Germany invaded Poland, and the number of men to be inducted into the Armed Forces was increased 5 days after the United States entered World War II in December of 1941. Of the over 16 million uniformed personnel serving during World War II, 10 million were draftees. They distinguished themselves in war and peace, as we know, and Tom Brokaw has called them "America's Greatest Generation."

The Blinded Veterans Association of San Diego, California, and its President William Montgomery have asked for my help in gaining national recognition for the draftees in our Armed Forces, and I am honored to do so today. H. Con. Res. 434 commends the millions who were inducted during World War II and who served with great courage to advance the cause of freedom throughout this world.

Taken together, these two pieces of legislation remind us of the gift of freedom that we have been given through the service and sacrifice of men and women who came before us. I urge my colleagues to support both H.R. 4425 and H. Con. Res. 434.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ON THE RETIREMENT OF BRIGADIER GENERAL MICHAEL F. GJEDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Brigadier General Michael F. Gjede on his service to the United States of America. After more than 35 years in the Air Force, General Gjede will be retiring, and we in northeast Ohio have been very privileged to have him as the Commander of the Air Force Reserve 910th Airlift Wing at Youngstown Air Reserve Station in Vienna, Ohio.

A graduate of Northeastern University in Boston, General Gjede earned his commission through the Air Force Officer Training School program in 1968. Once he had earned his wings, he served two tours in Vietnam flying B-52s and logging over 140 combat missions.

General Gjede has held numerous command positions in the Air Force,