

It cuts housing assistance for affordable housing. Returning again, in relationship to our veterans, it cuts the funding for research into brain trauma research, which is so significant. One of the greatest injuries for our veterans coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan have been the brain injuries that they have incurred there. And the first time ever we have gotten funding inside the Pentagon for that area, it makes a cut.

And then it doesn't deal with what we call earmarks here, as the President continues his earmarks in his budget. Across the board, from Social Security privatization to health care cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, to also not cutting children from their health care, to raising taxes on the middle class, in time and place, from health care to taxes to supporting our law enforcement community, this budget makes the wrong priorities.

It is time to have a new direction and a change here in the priorities in Washington. In addition to all that, while we have families not being able to get to their homes in the area of Louisiana and Mississippi and the Gulf Coast, the President asked for an additional \$245 billion for Iraq and Afghanistan. In every turn that we can, we have to right this ship that is wrong.

Most importantly, in the area the President's budget has relied on tax increases on middle class families, cuts Medicare and Medicaid, asked for \$245 billion in increased funding for Iraq and Afghanistan, cuts children from their health care, cuts heating assistance from our elderly, also cuts benefits for veterans. Those are not the priorities of the American people.

□ 1445

Every President in the history of the country in a time of war has thought about how to invest in America. Abraham Lincoln, in the height of the Civil War, had the land-grant colleges. Roosevelt, in the height of the final 2 years of World War II, developed the GI Bill of Rights. During the height of the Cold War, Eisenhower saw the interstate system as a way to invest in America. Kennedy, a man on the moon when we were facing down the Soviet Union.

At every critical juncture when America was at war, a President thought about how to invest in America to turn this country's efforts overseas here at home to make this a stronger and better country.

This is the first Presidential budget that in time of war, rather than looking for increases here on how to make America stronger, it looks for cuts in America. It looks for the areas of education, health care, veterans, and law enforcement to sacrifice, while we increase our investments in Iraq and Afghanistan.

If you look at the history of every time there has been a period of America's engagement around the world militarily, every President has looked

to invest here at home to make America stronger. This is the first budget that leaves America weaker in a time of military engagement.

DON'T DO IT, MR. PRESIDENT

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, if the President were to ask me for advice on foreign affairs, this is what I would say: Don't do it, Mr. President. It is a bad idea. There is no need for it. There is great danger in doing it. America is against it, and Congress should be. The United Nations is against it. The Russians, the Chinese, the Indians, the Pakistanis are against it. The whole world is against it. Our allies are against it. Our enemies are against it. The Arabs are against it. The Europeans are against it. The Muslims are against it.

We don't need to do this. The threat is overblown. The plan is a hysterical reaction to a problem that does not yet exist. Hysteria is never a good basis for foreign policy. Don't we ever learn? Have we already forgotten Iraq?

The plan defies common sense. If it is carried out, the Middle East and possibly the world will explode. Oil will soar to over \$100 a barrel, and gasoline will be over \$5 a gallon.

Despite what some think, it won't serve the interests of Israel. Besides, it is illegal. It is unconstitutional. And, Mr. President, you have no moral authority to do it.

We don't need it. We don't want it. So, Mr. President, don't do it. Don't bomb Iran.

The moral of the story, Mr. Speaker, is this: If you don't have a nuclear weapon, we will threaten to attack you. If you do have a nuclear weapon, we will leave you alone. In fact, we will probably subsidize you. What makes us think Iran does not understand this?

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to yield to my friend from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. PAUL for so many years coming down to the floor to defend the Constitution of the United States.

The United States Constitution, article I, Section 8, clause 11, vests in the Congress the exclusive power to declare war. Many of us in the past few days have put in a resolution, H.J. Resolution 14, to say that the President should not go into and bomb Iran unless he comes to the Congress so that the Congress can meet its constitutional responsibility.

James Madison said, "... The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature ... the Executive has no right, in any case, to decide the question, whether there is or is not cause for declaring war."

I want to thank you, RON PAUL, for always being a spokesman and a protector of the Constitution.

Mr. PAUL. I thank you very much for those comments.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to the President.

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ENDING THE IRAQ WAR

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the President has isolated himself from all the evidence, military advice, members of his own party, and the American people. He is not staying the course in Iraq. The President is making matters even worse by escalating the war.

He has ordered at least 21,500 more U.S. soldiers into the middle of a bloody and violent civil war. This President has stepped backward in history. He is making the same tragic mistakes of Vietnam all over again.

The President's speeches won't stop a bullet, and they won't protect soldiers from the tsunami of violence inundating Iraq. Our soldiers don't have enough equipment or support. Soldiers know it, but the White House ignores it.

Some of the best newspapers and magazines in the Nation are reporting the facts, and they are not just repeating the President's spin.

From the McClatchy newspapers, here is a recent headline: "Soldiers in Iraq view troop surge as a lost cause."

From the San Francisco Chronicle: "Corners cut in rush to add troops; shorter training time, lack of equipment hurt readiness, experts say."

And the latest issue of Business Week said: "Military equipment: Missing in action."

I will enter these stories into the RECORD.

[From BusinessWeek]

MILITARY EQUIPMENT: MISSING IN ACTION
A NEW DEFENSE AUDIT SAYS THE PENTAGON HAS FAILED TO PROPERLY EQUIP SOLDIERS IN IRAQ—JUST AS THE PRESIDENT STRUGGLES TO FIND SUPPORT FOR A TROOP INCREASE

(By Dawn Kopecki)

The Inspector General for the Defense Dept. is concerned that the U.S. military has failed to adequately equip soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan, especially for nontraditional duties such as training Iraqi security

forces and handling detainees, according to a summary of a new audit obtained by BusinessWeek.

The findings come as the Pentagon prepares to send another 21,500 troops to Iraq and as Democratic leaders levy threats to restrict funding for a war that's already cost about \$500 billion. The Army alone expects to spend an extra \$70 billion on an additional 65,000 permanent troops from fiscal year 2009 through 2013. According to Army officials, \$18 billion of that will be spent on equipment.

The Inspector General found that the Pentagon hasn't been able to properly equip the soldiers it already has. Many have gone without enough guns, ammunition, and other necessary supplies to "effectively complete their missions" and have had to cancel or postpone some assignments while waiting for the proper gear, according to the report from auditors with the Defense Dept. Inspector General's office. Soldiers have also found themselves short on body armor, armored vehicles, and communications equipment, among other things, auditors found.

"As a result, service members performed missions without the proper equipment, used informal procedures to obtain equipment and sustainment support, and canceled or postponed missions while waiting to receive equipment," reads the executive summary dated Jan. 25. Service members often borrowed or traded with each other to get the needed supplies, according to the summary.

Pentagon officials did not immediately return phone calls seeking comment.

The audit supports news reports and other evidence that U.S. troops have been stretched too thin or have performed tasks for which they were ill-prepared. It is likely to add fuel to the opposition to President George W. Bush's decision to send more troops to Iraq in an effort to quell the violence there.

Already, support for the troop increase is tepid in the Senate, where Democrats are preparing to vote on a nonbinding statement against the President's plan. While lawmakers have threatened to reduce funding for the war, few have publicly committed to using the "power of the purse" to block funding for the troop surge. "The thing we're going to do now is very important, to show the American people that the United States Senate, on a bipartisan basis, does not support an escalation," says Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.). "Even the Republicans are very timid in their support for the President at this stage."

In the summary of the Inspector General's audit, the equipment shortages were attributed to basic management failures among military commanders in Iraq and Afghanistan. U.S. Central Command lacked standard policies for requesting and tracking equipment requirements or for equipping units to perform nontraditional duties. Auditors surveyed 1,100 service members stationed in Iraq and Afghanistan from all four military branches, the National Guard, and Reserves.

The Inspector General recommended that the Pentagon establish new internal controls and policies to address the funding, equipping, and sustaining forces performing nontraditional duties.

[From McClatchy Newspapers]

SOLDIERS IN IRAQ VIEW TROOP SURGE AS A
LOST CAUSE

(By Tom Lasseter)

BAGHDAD, IRAQ.—Army 1st Lt. Antonio Hardy took a slow look around the east Baghdad neighborhood that he and his men were patrolling. He grimaced at the sound of gunshots in the distance. A machine gunner on top of a Humvee scanned the rooftops for

snipers. Some of Hardy's men wondered aloud if they'd get hit by a roadside bomb on the way back to their base. "To be honest, it's going to be like this for a long time to come, no matter what we do," said Hardy, 25, of Atlanta. "I think some people in America don't want to know about all this violence, about all the killings. The people back home are shielded from it; they get it sugar-coated."

While senior military officials and the Bush administration say the president's decision to send more American troops to pacify Baghdad will succeed, many of the soldiers who're already there say it's a lost cause.

"What is victory supposed to look like? Every time we turn around and go in a new area there's somebody new waiting to kill us," said Sgt. 1st Class Herbert Gill, 29, of Pulaski, Tenn., as his Humvee rumbled down a dark Baghdad highway one evening last week. "Sunnis and Shiites have been fighting for thousands of years, and we're not going to change that overnight." "Once more raids start happening, they'll (insurgents) melt away," said Gill, who serves with the 1st Infantry Division in east Baghdad. "And then two or three months later, when we leave and say it was a success, they'll come back."

Soldiers interviewed across east Baghdad, home to more than half the city's 8 million people, said the violence is so out of control that while a surge of 21,500 more American troops may momentarily suppress it, the notion that U.S. forces can bring lasting security to Iraq is misguided.

Lt. Hardy and his men of the 2nd Brigade of the Army's 2nd Infantry Division, from Fort Carson, Colo., patrol an area southeast of Sadr City, the stronghold of radical Shiite cleric Muqtada al-Sadr.

A map in Hardy's company headquarters charts at least 50 roadside bombs since late October, and the lieutenant recently watched in horror as the blast from one killed his Humvee's driver and wounded two other soldiers in a spray of blood and shrapnel.

Soldiers such as Hardy must contend not only with an escalating civil war between Iraq's Sunni and Shiite Muslims, but also with insurgents on both sides who target U.S. forces.

"We can go get into a firefight and empty out ammo, but it doesn't accomplish much," said Pvt. 1st Class Zach Clouser, 19, of York, Pa. "This isn't our war—we're just in the middle."

Almost every foot soldier interviewed during a week of patrols on the streets and alleys of east Baghdad said that Bush's plan would halt the bloodshed only temporarily. The soldiers cited a variety of reasons, including incompetence or corruption among Iraqi troops, the complexities of Iraq's sectarian violence and the lack of Iraqi public support, a cornerstone of counterinsurgency warfare.

"They can keep sending more and more troops over here, but until the people here start working with us, it's not going to change," said Sgt. Chance Oswald, 22, of Tulsa, Okla.

Bush's initiative calls for American soldiers in Baghdad to take positions in outposts throughout the capital, paired up with Iraqi police and soldiers. Few of the U.S. soldiers interviewed, however, said they think Iraqi forces can operate effectively without American help.

Their officers were more optimistic.

If there's enough progress during the next four to six months, "we can look at doing provincial Iraqi control, and we can move U.S. forces to the edge of the city," said Lt. Col. Dean Dunham, the deputy commander

of the 2nd Infantry Division's 2nd Brigade, which oversees most of east Baghdad.

Maj. Christopher Wendland, a senior staff officer for Dunham's brigade, said he thinks there's a good chance that by late 2007 American troops will have handed over most of Baghdad to Iraqi troops.

"I'm actually really positive," said Wendland, 35, of Chicago. "We have an Iraqi army that's actually capable of maintaining once we leave."

If the Iraqi army can control the violence, his thinking goes, economic and political progress will follow in the safest areas, accompanied by infrastructure improvement, then spread outward.

In counterinsurgency circles, that notion is commonly called the "inkblot" approach. It's been relatively successful in some isolated parts of Iraq, such as Tal Afar on the Syrian border, but in most areas it's failed to halt the bloodshed for any length of time.

Across America, the newspapers are filled with stories and editorials about the tragic consequences of this war and the dread over the President's escalation. From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, their editorial published yesterday is titled: "Iraq War: Advice and dissent."

While the President is acting like he can go it alone, the PI correctly places responsibility on the co-equal legislative branch of government: Congress. The PI wrote: "No resolution, however, can absolve Congress of its responsibility to cut off spending on a hopeless occupation."

It is time for Congress to act responsibly by exercising its constitutional responsibility and deny funding for the President's escalation of the Iraq War. The history of the Vietnam War shows us how to deal with the Iraq War, and I am prepared to apply the lessons of history in this Congress.

In 1970, the McGovern-Hatfield amendment was introduced to stop the President from continuing to escalate the Vietnam War. It capped funding for troops for a short period of time, after which money could be used to bring the troops home and for bringing the prisoners home. It didn't pass, but it began a 5-year process that ended the war.

I intend to offer a similar amendment to the first appropriation bill related to Iraq that is introduced in this House. There should be no new funding for any escalation of this war, not one dime, because it only leads to more U.S. casualties. Resolution in Iraq will never come on the bloody streets of Baghdad. It is time for us to act on behalf of the American people and on behalf of our soldiers. They deserve our strong and unwavering support.

We can provide that by passing my amendment to channel our funds to the immediate redeployment of U.S. forces out of Iraq, out of occupation, and out of harm's way. We have waited far too long to act, and our soldiers have paid for our delay with their lives and their limbs.

I believe it is time for Congress to reassure the American people that the President cannot go it alone. It is time for Congress to put an end to the President's reckless disregard of the truth about Iraq.

Those who fail to learn the lessons of history are doomed to repeat them. The President is doing today exactly what happened in Vietnam. On September 1, 1970, George McGovern spoke eloquently on the floor of the other body where he introduced the McGovern-Hatfield amendment.

He said, "It does not take any courage at all for a Congressman or a Senator or a President to wrap himself in the flag and say we are staying in Vietnam, because it is not our blood that is being shed. But we are responsible for those young men" and now young women "and their lives and their hopes. And if we do not end this damnable war, those young men will someday curse us for our pitiful willingness to let the Executive carry the burden that the Constitution places on us."

I believe we must apply the lessons of history, and I urge my colleagues to approve that amendment when it comes up so that we can begin to end a damnable war that never should have been brought in the first place.

COLTS SUPER BOWL XLI VICTORY

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my colleagues who have just spoken here on the floor, but today I am here on some happy news, so I will confine my remarks to what I consider to be a real celebratory event.

Sunday, the day before yesterday, I sat in the rain with 75,000 other Americans cheering the Indianapolis Colts to victory in the Super Bowl, and I want to tell you that it was one of the greatest football games that I have ever seen.

We were very much in favor of the Colts, as you might imagine, and when the kickoff came to the Bears, and Devin Hester ran 92 yards for a touchdown, everybody's heart went down to their feet because we thought it was going to be a real letdown for us.

But Peyton Manning and the Colts came roaring back and won a very convincing victory in the Super Bowl. And after that they had a parade in downtown Indianapolis for the Colts in 8-degree weather. Can you imagine people going out in 8-degree weather to be in a parade? I can't. But the streets were filled by Hoosiers who were celebrating the victory and giving tremendous accolades to the Colts and the coach and Manning and everybody else that made this victory possible.

I would like to just make a couple of comments on what happened. The Colts gained 430 yards in that game against the third strongest defense in the National Football League. Peyton Manning completed 25 of 38 passes for 247 yards and was named the Most Valuable Player. Running back Dominic Rhodes ran for 113 yards against that Bears defense, in driving rain, I might

add. Running back Joseph Addai received 10 passes for 66 yards and ran the ball for 77 more yards in that driving rain.

And the Colts did a tremendous job on defense. Kelvin Hayden intercepted one of the Chicago quarterback's passes and ran it back 56 yards for a Colts touchdown, and the Colts scored in every single quarter in all four playoff games for the first time in playoff history.

So I would just like to congratulate Tony Dungy, the coach of the Colts, one of the most popular people in football and especially in Indianapolis; and we think he is one of the nicest guys you will ever meet. He is only the third person in football history to win a Super Bowl both as a coach and a player.

I want to congratulate my friend Bill Polian, the president of the Indianapolis Colts, who put this team together over the past several years and did an outstanding job. Bill, we are very proud of you.

And I want to congratulate the CEO and owner of the Colts, Jim Irsay, who took control of the team in 1997 and dedicated himself to making us a Super Bowl champion.

It was a great day for Indianapolis. We are very, very proud of the Colts. On behalf of all Hoosiers, we want to say to the Indianapolis Colts, you are the world champions, and we are very proud of each and every one of you.

One more thing I want to mention. The Colts defense was maligned throughout the season. Later in the season, they said the Colts defense was one of the worst in football. In the playoff games, they took on everybody and held them to very, very low yardage. So congratulations to the Colts defense as well as our offense. You did a great job.

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 of California 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 Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WALDEN of Oregon 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 New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE 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 gen-

tleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER 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 New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. POE 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 Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. TIAHRT 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO 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 Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GINGREY 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 the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, 110TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL