

Mr. Speaker, it is my expectation that a thorough and internationally validated investigation will uncover many facts about the assassination of Lebanon's former Prime Minister who remained a sitting member of parliament. Rafik Hariri was the leader of a political faction that many thought would take back control of Lebanon's government in parliamentary elections scheduled to take place in May. I know, from my personal meetings with Prime Minister Hariri, that he held deep reservations and misgivings about the continued presence of Syrian troops and Syrian secret police in Lebanon. Most often, it was not what he said, but what he indicated he could not talk about that most starkly expressed the reservations he had about Syria's role in Lebanon.

Following this national tragedy, Lebanon must now try to hold free and fair parliamentary elections in May. It is my fear that the assassination of Mr. Hariri, and the many other past assassinations that have too often gone without significant investigation in Lebanon, will have a chilling effect on freedom of speech and those who would vocally criticize the continued Syrian presence.

To say it plainly, it is time for Syrian troops and all the Syrian secret police to leave Lebanon. The security that Syria once provided is no longer needed and having security only for those who ally themselves with the continued Syrian presence is incompatible with democracy in Lebanon.

Mr. Speaker, I support UN Resolution 1559 that demands a, "strict respect of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity, and political independence of Lebanon under the sole and exclusive authority of the Government of Lebanon throughout Lebanon," and for all, "foreign forces to withdraw from Lebanon."

Rafik Hariri fought for a democratic and prosperous Lebanon. The United States, even after his death, should continue to press for Prime Minister Hariri's vision for Lebanon and a better Middle East.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing condolences to the family of Mr. Hariri, the families of others killed in the attack that took Mr. Hariri's life, and the people of Lebanon. While I support this legislation expressing sorrow over the murders, I do have some concerns that H. Res. 91 is being waved as a red flag to call for more U.S. intervention in the Middle East.

It is unfortunate that tragic occurrences like these are all too often used by those who wish to push a particular foreign policy. We don't really know who killed Mr. Hariri. Maybe an agent of the Syrian government killed him. Then again any of several other governments or groups in the Middle East or even beyond could be responsible. But already we are hearing from those who want to use this murder to justify tightening sanctions against Syria, forcing Syrian troops to leave Lebanon immediately, or even imposing U.S. military intervention against Syria. Just yesterday we heard that the U.S. ambassador to Syria has been withdrawn.

The problem is that these calls for U.S. intervention ignore the complexities of Lebanon's tragic recent history, and its slow return from the chaos of the civil war—a revival in which Mr. Hariri played a praiseworthy role. We should remember, however, that it was the

Lebanese government itself that requested assistance from Syria in 1976, to help keep order in the face of a civil war where Maronite Christians battled against Sunnis and Druze. This civil war dragged on until a peace treaty was agreed to in 1989. The peace was maintained by the Syrian presence in Lebanon. So, while foreign occupation of any country against that country's will is to be condemned, it is not entirely clear that this is the case with Syrian involvement in Lebanon. Hariri himself was not a supporter of immediate Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon. What most won't say here is that Syria has indeed been slowly withdrawing forces from Lebanon. Who is to say that this is not the best approach to avoid a return to civil war? Yet, many are convinced that we must immediately blame Syria for this attack and we must "do something" to avenge something that has nothing whatsoever to do with the United States.

So, while I do wish to express my sympathy over the tragic death of Rafik Hariri, I hope that my colleagues would refrain from using this tragedy to push policies of more U.S. interventionism in the Middle East.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay homage and tribute to Rafik Hariri, the former Prime Minister of Lebanon who was brutally assassinated and just recently laid to rest. Yesterday, the House of Representatives passed House Resolution 91 recognizing and celebrating his life of dedicated public service. His public as well as private contributions to his country were enormous. I commend all the members of Congress who worked quickly to develop this resolution, particularly members such as Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. ISSA. I am sure the people of the United States and the people of Lebanon will miss Mr. Hariri greatly. Yet again, the Middle East has incurred a tragic loss of a world class leader who stood for peace and a better way of life for all the people of Lebanon. As we ask questions about his death and pursue the perpetrators of this act of terror, let us forever be inspired by how he led his life and made this world a better place.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues and our Nation in honoring the life and legacy of former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafik Hariri and to express our condolences to his family and the people of Lebanon.

A true patriot and dedicated public servant, Prime Minister Hariri devoted his life to his country and his people, working to rebuild Lebanon after its civil war and contributing millions to programs to improve the lives of the Lebanese people.

He was well-respected by the international community for his efforts to build a free and independent Lebanon as evidenced by the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1559 affirming the right of the people of Lebanon to choose their leaders free from intimidation, terror and foreign occupation. Sadly he will not see his hope realized.

On behalf of the people of Guam, I extend our deepest sympathy to the families of the victims of the February 14th attack.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). The question is on the mo-

tion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 91, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 66) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 66

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, February 17, 2005, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, March 1, 2005, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on Thursday, February 17, 2005, or Friday, February 18, 2005, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, February 28, 2005, or at such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 112) and ask unanimous

consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 112

Resolved, That the following Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Resources: Mrs. Musgrave.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN EXECUTIVE ORDERS BLOCKING PROPERTY AND PROHIBITING CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-10)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to, inter alia, section 203(a) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702(a)) (IEEPA) and section 201(a) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1621(a)) (NEA), I exercised my statutory authority to declare national emergencies in Executive Orders 13224 of September 23, 2001, as amended, and 12947 of January 23, 1995, as amended. I have issued a new Executive Order that clarifies certain measures taken to address those national emergencies. This new Executive Order relates to powers conferred to me by section 203(b)(2) of IEEPA and clarifies that the Executive Orders at issue prohibit a blocked United States person from making humanitarian donations.

The amendments made to those Executive Orders by the new Executive Order take effect as of the date of the new order, and specific licenses issued pursuant to the prior Executive Orders continue in effect, unless revoked or amended by the Secretary of the Treasury. General licenses, regulations, orders, and directives issued pursuant to the prior Executive Orders continue in effect, except to the extent inconsistent with this order or otherwise revoked or modified by the Secretary of the Treasury.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 16, 2005.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair will recognize

Members for Special Order speeches without prejudice to possible resumption of legislative business.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

□ 1515

SMART SECURITY AND \$82 BILLION IRAQ SUPPLEMENTAL, PART 2

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to our Nation's spending priorities, President Bush and his administration do not know which way is up. Already the President has given Congress a 2006 budget that is all but certain to explode in the year 2009; a ticking time bomb set to detonate after President Bush leaves office. In a move that should surprise no one, this budget conspicuously omits funding for any and all military operations and reconstruction efforts in Iraq, leaving the funding to a supplemental spending bill that does not count against the President's deficit estimates.

These funds are not insignificant. To date Congress has funded a \$154 billion military operations and reconstruction budget in Iraq, and the Democratic staff on the House Committee on the Budget has estimated that the war in Iraq could cost the United States as much as \$650 billion by the year 2015. Adjusted for inflation, this amount rivals the combined costs of the Korean War, the Vietnam War, and the first Gulf War; the combined costs.

Let me be clear that my opposition to the President's reckless fiscal policies is not a condemnation of the service men and women who so bravely serve our country. I want everyone to know that I oppose the war, not the warriors. Hundred of thousands of selfless troops were uprooted from their families and their everyday lives to answer the call of duty for their country, and we owe them our absolute gratitude. Sadly, so far, 1,500 of these brave men and women will not return home alive. Another 11,000 will return home forever wounded as a result of injuries sustained in battle. These are the casualties of this ill-conceived war.

A lot of people talk about supporting our troops, but the call to support our troops is yet another reason to oppose President Bush's latest supplemental spending request. If the Bush administration really cared about our troops, they would take all measures to get them out of harm's way and bring

them home as soon as possible. But the latest supplemental assumes that 150,000 American soldiers will stay in Iraq as sitting ducks for years to come. And this bill does not bring them home. It is wholly irresponsible for the Bush administration to fund an unending military operation without devising an exit strategy and without even considering the possibility that the military option is not working.

The supplemental spending bill that President Bush sent to Congress also fails to include any type of reporting mechanism, which means that these funds can be spent by military commanders without any accounting of how or where that money was spent. This is a woefully irresponsible way to spend American taxpayers' money.

This, on top of \$9 billion in reconstruction funds that cannot be accounted for by the Coalition Provisional Authority, the American governing body that was in charge of overseeing Iraq until 2004. This, on top of \$3 billion in reconstruction funds that had to be reprogrammed for military operations because the Bush administration failed to account for an angry Iraqi insurgency.

What did the President think would happen when he invaded a country that never posed a threat to the United States and never wanted us there in the first place?

Instead of continuing down our current path, I believe we must pursue a national security strategy that I call SMART security, which is a sensible, multilateral American response to terrorism for the 21st century. I have also introduced legislation, H. Con. Res. 35, that would help us pursue a smarter strategy for rebuilding Iraq. Twenty-seven of my House colleagues have joined me in offering this important legislation.

Instead of financing billions of more dollars to continue a failed military occupation, under my plan, the United States would help secure Iraq by rebuilding schools so that children can learn, constructing new water processing plants so that this desert country does not face water shortages, and building new roads so that citizens can travel from one city to another.

Our assistance should not end there. If we want to be truly smart about how we rebuild Iraq, we also need to bring NGOs and humanitarian agencies into the country to help create a robust civil society and ensure that Iraq's economic infrastructure becomes fully viable.

It is time for us to support the Iraqi people by giving them the resources they need, and it is time to support our own troops by bringing them home.