

operation of the ports as they currently are conducted.

Again, they are the largest seaports in the United States on the eastern seaboard, including New Orleans, so the potential threat to our country is not imagined, but is real. We have heightened security, as I mentioned, at the airports. We are trying to heighten security at the seaports, but I believe we will be impeded if we do not look at this transaction.

It is not a foreign entity; it is a foreign government that seeks to have controlling interest in these six ports on the eastern seaboard. We again inquired of Secretary Snow yesterday. We inquired yesterday of Ambassador Portman. I hope some answers are forthcoming as to how they strategically thought through this transaction.

But it is my fervent hope that as we continue to debate and discuss this issue that the President again will use the authority granted to him by the Congress and intercede and not allow the transaction to take place.

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

(Mr. WYNN 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 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 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 Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOHMERT 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 Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE NEED FOR STRAIGHT TALK ON NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, as I talk to my constituents, Democrats, Republicans and Independents alike, there is an increasing concern that the Bush administration is not talking straight to the American people on important issues of national security.

We know that during the lead-up to the war in Iraq, the intelligence community was put under pressure to come up with a certain view of the facts. And where we put ideology over facts, instead of having the facts shape our policy, it was the other way around.

We have now learned recently from a former CIA analyst, Paul Pillar, that not only did we play with the facts with respect to whether or not there were weapons of mass destruction and whether or not there were links between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein, but we also ignored many of the facts brought to us by some of the intelligence community with respect to the difficulties we would confront in Iraq in the case of a military invasion there.

And what happened, and he has laid this out very clearly, is the administration cherry-picked the information. They always took the rosy view of the facts as they presented us with their support of their case and tended to ignore those facts that did not support their case.

Now, whether you were for or against taking military action in Iraq, we should all be able to agree as Americans that it is important that we listen to those people who have experience, who have the professional know-how, people in our intelligence community who have spent years looking into issues around the world and in this case, issues with respect to the Middle East.

So I think it should concern all Americans that the administration decided to ignore warnings from non-partisan individuals who brought information to their attention. And it is not just the failure to take heed of that information. Now we are seeing the consequences in terms of the manpower in different intelligence agencies.

U.S. News and World Report has a story about how we are losing many of the most experienced people in the CIA as a result of the fact that they feel pressure to take a political position or that they are forced out of their positions. We are losing many of our most experienced people in the ranks of our intelligence community, and that certainly is not good for our national security.

We would have thought that after 9/11 we would have heeded some lessons, and in fact we formed a bipartisan 9/11 Commission that came out with a number of recommendations. One of their recommendations was to do more about the so-called "lose nukes," nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union.

Unfortunately, if you look at what has been done to date, it is very little. We are not doing what we should with

respect to the Nunn-Lugar program; and that is why if you look at the most recent report by the 9/11 Commission, they have given this administration and this Congress Ds and Fs, failing grades, in a whole range of categories, making it clear that we have not learned our lessons and that we are not more prepared.

In fact, we know we are not prepared because all we have to do is look at the government's response to Hurricane Katrina and the recent reports that have come out in the last couple of days showing the total failure of initiative by the Federal Government.

You know, a lot of people talk a good game about being prepared to deal with national security threats; but the fact of the matter is when you take the lid off and look underneath as to what is actually being done, the news is not good: more people leaving our intelligence agencies, the fact that we are continuing to get failing grades from the 9/11 Commission.

And just the other day in the Government Reform Committee, we had a hearing with a number of whistleblowers, all from national security agencies. These are people who have uncovered abuses within national security agencies, from the FBI to the NSA.

And instead of welcoming these individuals who have come forward to present the administration and the public with some truths, the testimony of these individuals, all under oath, sworn under oath, is that they are actually being punished for having come forward to try and tell the truth.

Now, again, I do not care what party affiliation you may have; it is not in the security interests of this country for us to punish people who come forward and tell the truth and reveal abuses that are going on within different national security agencies. That undermines our national security. That undermines our credibility as a government.

So I would just suggest that as we listen to a lot of the rhetoric from the administration, we remember that, unfortunately, this is the gang that cannot shoot straight with the American people. And in the last couple of days we have learned that that is not just figuratively true, it is also, unfortunately, actually true.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BALLOTS NOT BULLETS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms.

MCKINNEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my remarks this afternoon by congratulating first of all the people of Haiti, a small, very poor country that is our neighbor, but a country whose people still believe in the power of democracy. They still believe in the power of the vote. And so despite all odds, despite all intimidation, the people of Haiti overwhelmingly showed up at the polls and they voted. And not only did they show up at the polls and vote; they demanded that their vote be counted.

Now, we understand that there were about 85,000 ballots that had nothing on them. They were probably ready to have something put on them. But the people of Haiti demanded that the vote that was actually voted and the results of that actual vote count be the results of the election.

And I am also down here this afternoon to congratulate not only the people of Haiti, who prevailed, but to congratulate Rene Preval, who was their candidate of choice.

Now, the people of Haiti have to be congratulated because they have gone to the polls over and over and over and over again. They have gone to the polls. A few years ago, when I had just come to Congress, they went to the polls, before I got to Congress, they went to the polls and they elected a former priest, a man of the cloth, a man of the community, of the neighborhood, a man of the poor to represent them.

And hired thugs who were on the CIA payroll, whose leader enjoys the solace and solitude of America's neighborhoods, he should not even be here, helped to oust President Aristide.

And so the hopes and aspirations of the people of Haiti, who were finally able to throw off the yoke of American-imposed and -supported dictatorship, saw their hopes and their dreams vanish once again.

But thank goodness there was an administration in Washington, DC and there was a change in the face of the Democratic Caucus and so Members of the Congressional Black Caucus would not stand to allow this outrage to continue. And so working in concert with the Clinton administration, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus worked day in and day out and successfully saw the return of Jean Bertrand Aristide to power.

But that was not enough. Because, as soon as Clinton was out of office, and the George W. Bush administration was in office, something else happened, after the people of Haiti voted to renew President Aristide's mandate. And what happened happened 2 years ago.

The people of Haiti, in free, fair and transparent elections, elected Jean Bertrand Aristide to another term in office. U.S. Armed Forces showed up at his house and took him and his family away, put them on a plane, destination unknown. Kind of like what happened with the Katrina survivors.

So once again, the people of Haiti saw that when they went to the polls, participated in the process, put their full faith and confidence in the power of the ballot box, ballot box, not bullets, that bullets from some place else could come and dash their dreams. So now former President Aristide lives in South Africa.

I have to acknowledge the tremendous role that was played by my sister Congresswoman, Ms. WATERS. Here she is. Now I am all discombobulated because my sister is here.

□ 1300

I will let her tell her story. MAXINE, can I invite you to please tell the story of how you saved a little piece of America's honor by making sure that Jean Bertram Aristide was at least safely delivered to his final destination.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my sister. Ms. WATERS. I thank you very much. Congresswoman, I am very pleased that you have taken time to come to this floor to talk about what has just happened in Haiti.

As you know, Haiti for too long has been dropped off of the corporate media's agenda. And whenever they have written stories, for the most part it has been distorted information which helped to lead to the unrest and the destabilization of Haiti. But you are absolutely correct. There was a coup d'etat that removed President Aristide from office. They did drop him off in the Central Republic of Africa.

I got together with Randal Robinson and a few other people, and we chartered a plane, and we traveled to the Central Republic of Africa, and we negotiated with President Bokassa I think it is, who was holding him there and was afraid to release him because they had some kind of agreement with the French and also because the United States had brought him there. But we were able to convince them after many hours up in that country that they should let him go.

As a matter of fact, they did not want us to leave. They had said we could not leave the night we came in. We basically said to them we had to leave and we had to leave with him and that if I was not back in Washington by the next day or so, then they would consider that he had kidnapped me also and that he was holding Aristide prisoner. And they did not want that reputation. They were negotiating at the World Bank at the time, and they did not know what it all meant, but we finally got him out of there.

We took him to Jamaica where they kept him for 6 weeks. P.J. Patterson, the president there, gave him refuge until President Mbeki could be re-elected in South Africa. After his re-election, he gave him asylum in South Africa, and that is where he is now, and now he is working with the university. But the fact of the matter is he is alive and he is well.

I hope that he gets some joy in understanding that the Lavalas Party did

win, even though there was an attempt maybe to deny them the win. The people rose up. The people went into Port-au-Prince, and the people went to the Montana Hotel, and they were basically nonviolent, but they went in numbers. And they had no choice but to work something out.

I think Congresswoman MCKINNEY is telling you about the ballots and we will be talking about that a little more. I yield back and thank you very much, Congresswoman.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry. I would like to suspend my special order. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) has requested a 5-minute special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). The gentlewoman may yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) on her time.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have an hour, so I will yield to the gentlewoman.

CONGRATULATING RENE PREVAL, PRESIDENT-ELECT OF HAITI

Ms. WATERS. Thank you very much, Congresswoman. I appreciate your generosity.

Mr. Speaker, I really came to the floor today to congratulate Rene Preval, the President-elect of Haiti. Rene Preval was just declared the winner in Haiti's presidential elections this morning with 51.15 percent of the vote. President-elect Preval has said that his first priority as president will be to provide relief to the two-thirds of Haiti's population that is living in extreme poverty. His plans include universal public school education and at least a free meal a day for all of the poor children.

A little bit about him. He was first elected President of Haiti in 1995 as a member of the Lavalas Party, the party that represented the poor majority. He succeeded President Aristide and served until President Aristide's reelection in 2000. President Aristide, of course, as we have just talked about, was forced to leave Haiti 2 years ago in a coup d'etat that was planned and implemented and orchestrated by the United States, France and Canada.

This election that took place on Tuesday, February 7 was very interesting. At first, the early results showed an overwhelming victory for Rene Preval. Many polling stations posted their results the day after the election, and Preval won between 60 and 90 percent of the vote in all of these polling places. But then something happened. By Thursday, the election officials, the one heading the CEP, reported that, well, no, at that time by Thursday they reported that he had 61.5 percent of the votes counted thus far.

Then Haiti's anti-Aristide elites who opposed him, Rene Preval, they were opposing him because they believed

that he was influenced by President Aristide and he would carry out President Aristide's policies, policies that benefit Haiti's poor. These elites, of course, are the same people who helped to organize the coup d'etat in 2004 and the same people who have been responsible for oppressing the people of Haiti for decades in order to continue to operate the sweatshops and to profit from cheap labor and keeping the living standards low.

Well, the elites reacted to the news of Preval's decisive victory and we believe that there really was something in play, an attempt to steal the election. And there was evidence of election fraud. It was abundant. Just yesterday hundreds and possibly thousands of burned ballots marked for Preval were found in a garbage dump.

The counting rules used by Haiti's Provisional Electoral Council seemed to be rules that were designed to deny Preval a victory. About 125,000 ballots, or 7.5 percent of the votes cast, were declared invalid because of alleged irregularities. And another 4 percent of the votes were allegedly blank, but nevertheless they included them in the vote count, thereby pushing Preval's percentage below 50 percent.

When they announced that he was allotted 47 percent, I mean, not only did I, I simply could not believe my ears, the people of Haiti, the Lavalas Party, people normally referred to as shemeres, they said, oh, no. Not only do we want our President. These are people who were denied polling places in Cite Soleil and Bellair and other poor places.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I would like to point out that there were certain Members of Congress who actually traveled with Condoleezza Rice and they came back and said that Condoleezza Rice had promised that there would be some ballot access in Cite Soleil; isn't that correct?

Ms. WATERS. I am told that they were given assurances that there would be an election and there would be polling places in all of the provinces and that the rumors that we were hearing about the CEP not having the polling places in Cite Soleil and Bellair would not happen. So when they said it I was suspicious, and I thought that perhaps she was saying that to try to appease them at the time.

But we know that the Secretary of State has not paid any attention to Haiti. This is not on her radar, and I did not expect that there would be any follow-through to ensure that the people would have access to the ballot.

As a matter of fact, they did have the polling places. But people got up in the wee hours of the morning, and they walked for hours, and they stood in line and they demanded that the polling place be open. When they got there, the polling places were supposed to be open. They were not. They demanded they open them. They stayed in line, and they voted in record numbers. They voted in record numbers. And

that is why, when the announcement came that somehow his majority had fell below 50 percent, we were all upset, and I fired off a press release that was not too nice at all.

The Haitian people have suffered tremendously for decades. Haiti has been ruled by brutal dictators such as Papa Doc and Baby Doc Duvalier. They really were doing the bidding of the elites there. They kept their feet on the necks of the people so that the elites could profit from the cheap labor and from slave labor. These dictators controlled a brutal army that protected the interests of the wealthy elite and foreign visitors while oppressing poor people.

Haitians worked in sweatshops for foreign investors, receiving just pennies a day. Those who protested the exploitation and demanded better living conditions were arrested or killed by the army. The U.S. Government trained the army and supported the elite. After all of this suffering it would have been outrageous for the U.S. government to allow of the anti-Aristide elites to deny the Haitian people who have withstood so much pain, poverty and disenfranchisement and who persevered on election day, walked for miles, and waited for hours, the right to be governed by the president of their choice.

Well, the people have spoken, and I think it is clear, and this interim government that was put in, Mr. Latour from Boca Raton and the others, they should pack up their bags and go home. They should get out of the way and allow this new President to do everything in his power to really exercise democracy in Haiti. They stole it and they took it from President Aristide.

He was a priest who came from Cite Soleil, who was of the liberation theology, who preached for the least of these and who fought for the poor and fought for them, became a voice for them, speaking to them in Creole, in ways that had never been done before because the elite spoke in French to keep the poor people from even knowing what they were talking about. They never had a responsive government. Now they have got to give Preval a chance.

My message today is, Mr. Andy Apid of the Group of 184 that helped to implement the coup d'etat, Mr. Apid, get out of the way of Mr. Preval and allow him to preside.

To the Group of 184, to the elites who have profited so mightily on the backs of these poor people, they have to get out of the way.

To Mr. Wolfowitz over at the World Bank, you need to meet with Mr. Preval right away.

The International Monetary Fund, the funding agencies, USAID, let us get the resources in there to put in a water system so that people can have clean water. Let us support a health care system. Let us deal with the poor. Let us make sure that they have an opportunity to live and to grow and to have a decent quality of life.

I am optimistic.

And for all of those who have denied the people the right to just have a decent quality of life, I am not personally, and I think you, Congresswoman, we are going to say, okay, let bygones be bygones. If you do not try to oust this president, if you do not try to kill him, if you do not try to jail him, we are willing to work with you. We are willing to work in every way that we can to involve our country and our government in a way that it should have been involved before, for the people, on behalf of our neighbors in this very poor country.

So my message today to all of those who have undermined Haiti for so long, who have profited on the backs of the people for so long, give Haiti a chance, give this President a chance. We look forward to working with everybody, but we are certainly going to work with Mr. Preval. We are going to be there with him. We are going to back him up. We are going to stand with him. Now is an opportunity for a new day in Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield back the balance of my time, and I thank you so much, Congresswoman, for sharing this moment with me.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I am absolutely blown away by the things that Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS just said. She reminded us that the French and the Americans and the Canadians, which I did not realize that the Canadians were involved in this, they all got together to oust a duly elected president.

But now let me just tell you that from 2000 in Florida this President was not duly elected. I will say that because the election was stolen, and we all know that the election was stolen. And it is interesting that you would use invalid ballots, blank ballots. This is the same mechanism that was used to disenfranchise black people in this country in 2000 in the presidential election. And so now, of course, they surface again in Haiti, invalid ballots, blank ballots. But the people of Haiti took to the streets.

□ 1315

They demanded a fair vote count, and they got a fair vote count, and they got a President.

I want to thank my sister congresswoman for joining me on the House floor but also for those strong and powerful words. Because she is absolutely right, that it is our responsibility now that the people's voices have been heard and so now we have to respect that. We need to respect that.

I want to shift gears for just a moment, and I do not think this poster should present a surprise to anyone as to what I am going to talk about now, and that is Hurricane Katrina. I want to remind people of these images that went all over the world. The black person who is trying to go through the water for food is looting. That is what Associated Press writes. That is what

Associated Press wrote, the black person was looting. Agence France-Press saw these white people, and they were finding bread and soda. Blacks loot; whites find. There is nothing more stark.

This is the beginning of the Hurricane Katrina story, and this is the way Hurricane Katrina was portrayed to the American people and throughout the world. We need to question all of the press images from not just Associated Press but every newspaper and on television.

What were our administration leaders doing as New Orleans was filling with water? The President was on vacation in Texas at the ranch. The Vice President was on vacation in Wyoming. He was fly fishing. The Secretary of State was visiting New York City and even in the midst of what was happening in New Orleans, she got booted, so the press reports tell us, because she took in a play, and then after she took in a play she went shopping for Ferragamo shoes and bought \$7,000 worth, reportedly, of Ferragamo shoes, and then, after that, she decided to play a little tennis. Donald Rumsfeld took in a Padres' game in San Diego, and Michael Chertoff, who is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, who is charged with taking care of the United States in a time of great trial and stress and catastrophe, stayed at home.

So, as a result, the select committee that was formed by this Congress to investigate the government's preparations for and actions during Hurricane Katrina issued a report yesterday. The name of the report, "A Failure of Initiative." It is a huge report.

The bottom line is that Secretary Chertoff needs to resign. It is amazing to me to see the Secretary on television through the powers of C-SPAN doing an intellectual dance, trying to defend the indefensible.

What happened to the people of the gulf States region and what is happening to them today is indefensible. And if thousands of families are being kicked out of their temporary homes, their temporary housing which was the hotel rooms, that is the responsibility at the end of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security who said, okay, we will let FEMA go ahead with that call. Of course, the President bears responsibility, too, and he has accepted responsibility, but I have not yet heard Secretary Chertoff accept responsibility.

Another sad fact about Hurricane Katrina and its aftermath is that in the metropolitan Atlanta area we have about 60- to 70,000 Katrina survivors. They want to go back home, many of them, but there is so much uncertainty because, as the congresswoman from Florida said earlier, there is still uncertainty as to how the Hurricane Katrina survivors are going to be treated.

I have introduced legislation that will force the EPA to look at tests and

make public the environmental circumstances under which people will be returning, in particular to New Orleans. It is a shame that we would have to have legislation in order to get the EPA to do its job, but, right now, structures are being tested for habitability on their structural soundness but not on their environmental soundness, and we have that toxic sludge that is everywhere.

So I would ask that this Congress look at the omnibus piece of legislation that was dropped in and signed by all of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus which addresses all aspects of the problem faced by those Katrina survivors.

In addition, I find it curious that the panel that produced this, what some people are calling, scathing report was boycotted by the Democrats. Well, it was boycotted by the Democratic leadership. I chose to participate in it because there is one thing about participating in Congress. We are elected, we come here, we write, and we speak, and everything that we write and speak for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will survive as long as there is a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and academicians and scholars, lawyers can search the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to understand the environment within which certain actions were taken, certain legislation was passed. Attorneys and judges all rely on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as well as scholars and academicians and historians and archivists. So the power of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is one that must not be thrown away.

I participated in the hearing and my remarks are included in the panel's report, but the leadership was suggesting that, instead, we needed an independent commission, like the 9/11 Commission. I do not have a problem with an independent commission, but to use the 9/11 Commission as a paragon of an example of how you ferret out the truth and find out what actually happened in a tragic event I think is not appropriately stated. Because yesterday in the Armed Services Committee we had three people who appeared before the Armed Services Committee in an Able Danger hearing. Able Danger is the data mining program that has been in the newspaper a lot because of the persistence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), one of our colleagues. These experts from the military and from intelligence said that if they had been allowed to do their job, their work product could quite possibly have prevented September 11. It provided the American intelligence community with the tools necessary to understand what was happening to our country in real time, but the program was shut down, and when efforts were made to brief the 9/11 Commission on what this Able Danger work product had demonstrated and had shown, their work was denigrated. Their work product was denigrated, and they were not given an opportunity to present their findings to the Commission as directly.

It has been said in public statements that their work was historically insignificant. Yet we have three people in open session yesterday say to us that if they had been allowed to do their job, to do their work, that quite possibly September 11 could have been prevented. And instead of grasping on to this information, the staff of the 9/11 Commission said that these people were not credible and that the results that they touted were historically insignificant and, therefore, this program was ignored.

Now I do not know why it was ignored, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) has had a lot to say about Able Danger and what it meant to our country and why it was shut down. I would encourage people to pay attention to Able Danger and the hearings that the House Armed Services Committee is having.

Also, there was one other thing very sad that came out of the hearing that we had yesterday, and that is poor whistle-blower treatment. In fact, whistle-blower mistreatment and all kinds of allegations were made against average, ordinary Americans who had extraordinary jobs that put them in a position to know something, and because they saw something was wrong and they tried to inform the higher ups that something was wrong, they were personally mistreated at the workplace and away from the workplace, even comments made about their personal and private lives.

□ 1330

What that says to us is that we have got to do a better job in this place of allowing the truth to come out. I remember when I was in Congress during my previous tenure, and at that time we were working very hard on U.S. foreign policy in Africa. We wanted the truth to come out about the real events surrounding the Rwandan genocide. It seemed that everybody who was associated with not telling the truth, or making sure that we didn't get access to the truth, got a promotion.

I have become fond of saying, it seems that it is only in Washington, DC where you can be incompetent and get a promotion. Anywhere else in America, if you are incompetent, you lose your job, but not so here in this country.

As we contemplate the enormity of what the Able Danger panelists told us in open testimony yesterday, as we contemplate as a country the enormity of this revelation, let us also weigh it against what is happening now. What is happening now is that the war drums are beating once again.

I have a constituent who is over the age of 40, and he has been told he has got to report for duty to go to Iraq. Over 40. The drumbeats for war are sounding, not just against Iraq now, but also against Iran and Syria.

In the face of these beating drums, the backdrop is that this administration is being investigated. This administration being investigated has two

ongoing investigations. The Department of Justice just opened another one today, which makes this the third investigation, the third investigation on wiretapping. This administration is being investigated and has drawn indictments and a guilty plea. The Vice President's former chief of staff, Lewis Libby, has been indicted, and Lawrence Franklin, who is being investigated by Paul McNulty, has been sentenced for 12 years for passing classified material over to another country.

This administration is being investigated on how we got into the first war, and now they want us to go to a second war, to open another front on this war. It is about time that we say no more war. No more war, Mr. Bush.

I also want to, as I remember the gentleman in my district who is over 40 years of age who has been told that he has got to report for duty in Iraq, remember Kevin Benderman, whose wife frantically contacted my office asking for help for her husband. Kevin Benderman went to Iraq one time. He was asked to do things that he thought as a human being went against his conscience.

We know that collateral damage is not just a number: 100,000; 200,000. It is people. It is little boys and little girls. It is women. Kevin Benderman said, I am not going to kill innocent people. Don't ask me to do that. I have done it once. Once is too much.

He decided that he would apply for conscientious objector status. Well, Kevin Benderman is in the brig because he did not want to kill innocent little girls and little boys and women and men in Iraq. He is in the brig.

Last weekend, there was an action to free Kevin Benderman. It's a shame.

I didn't expect to take all of my time, but I was pleased that my sister from California chose to come down and say a few words of congratulations to the people of Haiti and to the new President-elect, Rene Preval.

I was clicking around on the computer, and I came across a very interesting article written by Thom Hartmann, and it can be found on Common Dreams at commondreams.org. The title of it is "Rumsfeld and Cheney Revive Their 70's Terror Playbook."

Basically what they say in this article, which I am going to submit for the RECORD, is that when they were in office before, this dynamic duo decided to cook up an idea of Soviet military dominance to frighten the American people and justify huge defense contracts, or the huge defense budget, which then would result in defense contracts.

Let me just read. They said that the Soviets had a new secret weapon of mass destruction. They succeeded in recreating an atmosphere of fear in the United States, and making themselves and their defense contractor friends richer than most of the kingdoms of the world. Trillions of dollars and years later, it was proven that they had been wrong all along, and the CIA

had been right. Rumsfeld, Cheney, and Wolfowitz lied to America in the 1970s about Soviet weapons of mass destruction and the Soviet supersub technology.

But the Cold War was good for business and good for the political power of its advocates, from Rumsfeld to Wolfowitz to Cheney, who have all become rich, in part, because of the arms industry.

I am going to place this into the RECORD, because it appears that America has been through this before.

[From the Common Dreams News Center,
Feb. 13, 2006]

RUMSFELD AND CHENEY REVIVE THEIR 70S
TERROR PLAYBOOK
(by Thom Hartmann)

Donald Rumsfeld and Dick Cheney are at it again.

Last week, Rumsfeld told the press we should be preparing for "the Long War," saying of the war this administration has stirred up with its attack on Iraq that, "Just as the Cold War lasted a long time, this war is something that is not going to go away."

The last time Rumsfeld talked like this was in the 1970s, in response to the danger of peace presented by Richard Nixon.

In 1972, President Richard Nixon returned from the Soviet Union with a treaty worked out by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, the beginning of a process Kissinger called "détente." On June 1, 1972, Nixon gave a speech in which he said: "Last Friday, in Moscow, we witnessed the beginning of the end of that era which began in 1945. With this step, we have enhanced the security of both nations. We have begun to reduce the level of fear, by reducing the causes of fear—for our two peoples, and for all peoples in the world."

But Nixon left amid scandal and Ford came in, and Ford's Secretary of Defense (Donald Rumsfeld) and Chief of Staff (Dick Cheney) believed it was intolerable that Americans might no longer be bound by fear. Without fear, how could Americans be manipulated? And how could billions of dollars taken as taxes from average working people be transferred to the companies that Rumsfeld and Cheney—and their cronies—would soon work for and/or run?

Rumsfeld and Cheney began a concerted effort—first secretly and then openly—to undermine Nixon's treaty for peace and to rebuild the state of fear.

They did it by claiming that the Soviets had a new secret weapon of mass destruction that the president didn't know about, that the CIA didn't know about, that nobody knew about but them. It was a nuclear submarine technology that was undetectable by current American technology. And, they said, because of this and related-undetectable-technology weapons, the US must redirect billions of dollars away from domestic programs and instead give the money to defense contractors for whom these two men would one day work or have businesses relationships with.

The CIA strongly disagreed, calling Rumsfeld's position a "complete fiction" and pointing out that the Soviet Union was disintegrating from within, could barely afford to feed their own people, and would collapse within a decade or two if simply left alone.

As Dr. Anne Cahn, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency from 1977 to 1980, told the BBC's Adam Curtis for his documentary "The Power of Nightmares": "They couldn't say that the Soviets had acoustic means of picking up American submarines, because they couldn't find it. So they said, well

maybe they have a non-acoustic means of making our submarine fleet vulnerable. But there was no evidence that they had a non-acoustic system. They're saying, 'we can't find evidence that they're doing it the way that everyone thinks they're doing it, so they must be doing it a different way. We don't know what that different way is, but they must be doing it.'

"INTERVIEWER (off-camera): Even though there was no evidence.

"CAHN: Even though there was no evidence.

"INTERVIEWER: So they're saying there, that the fact that the weapon doesn't exist . . .

"CAHN: Doesn't mean that it doesn't exist. It just means that we haven't found it."

But Rumsfeld and Cheney wanted Americans to believe there was something nefarious going on, something we should be very afraid of. To this end, they convinced President Ford to appoint a commission including their old friend Paul Wolfowitz to prove that the Soviets were up to no good.

Wolfowitz's group, known as "Team B," came to the conclusion that the Soviets had developed several terrifying new weapons of mass destruction, featuring a nuclear-armed submarine fleet that used a sonar system that didn't depend on sound and was, thus, undetectable with our current technology. It could—within a matter of months—be off the coast of New York City with a nuclear warhead.

Although Wolfowitz and Rumsfeld's assertions of this powerful new Soviet WMD was unproven—they said the lack of proof proved the "undetectable" sub existed—they nonetheless used their charges to push for dramatic escalations in military spending to selected defense contractors, a process that continued through the Reagan administration.

Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz helped re-organized a group—the Committee on the Present Danger—to promote their worldview. The Committee produced documentaries, publications, and provided guests for national talk shows and news reports. They worked hard to whip up fear and encourage increases in defense spending, particularly for sophisticated weapons systems offered by the defense contractors for whom many of these same men would later become lobbyists.

And they succeeded in recreating an atmosphere of fear in the United States, and making themselves and their defense contractor friends richer than most of the kingdoms of the world.

Trillions of dollars and years later, it was proven that they had been wrong all along, and the CIA had been right. Rumsfeld * * * and Wolfowitz lied to America in the 1970s about Soviet WMDs and the Soviet super-sub technology.

Not only do we now know that the Soviets didn't have any new and impressive WMDs, but we also now know that the Soviets were, in fact, decaying from within, ripe for collapse any time, regardless of what the US did—just as the CIA (and anybody who visited Soviet states—as I had—during that time could easily predict). The Soviet economic and political system wasn't working, and their military was disintegrating.

But the Cold War was good for business, and good for the political power of its advocates, from Rumsfeld to Wolfowitz to Cheney who have all become rich in part because of the arms industry.

Today, making Americans terrified with their so-called "War On Terror" is the same strategy, run for many of the same reasons, by the same people. And by hyping it—and then invading Iraq to bring it into fruition—we may well be bringing into reality forces

that previously existed only on the margins and with very little power to harm us.

Most recently we've learned from former CIA National Intelligence Officer for the Middle East and South Asia Paul Pillar that, just like in the 1970s, the CIA disagreed in 2002 with Rumsfeld and Cheney about an WMD threat—this time posed by Iraq—even as Rumsfeld, Cheney, and Wolfowitz were telling America how afraid we should be of an eminent “mushroom cloud.”

We've seen this movie before. The last time, it cost our nation hundreds of billions of dollars, vastly enriched the cronies of these men, and ultimately helped bring Ronald Reagan to power. This time they've added on top of their crony enrichment program the burden of over 2200 dead American servicemen and women, tens of thousands wounded, as many as a hundred thousand dead Iraqis, and a level of worldwide instability not seen since the run-up to World War Two.

When Hillary Clinton recently noted that the only political card Republicans are any longer capable of playing is the card of fear, she was spot-on right. They're now even running radio and TV commercials designed to terrorize our children (“Do you have a plan for a terrorist attack?”), the modern reincarnation of “Duck and Cover.”

Now that former Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge has confessed that many of the terror alerts that continually popped up during the 2004 election campaign were, as USA Today noted on 10 May 2005, based on “flimsy evidence” or were done over his objection at the insistence of “administration officials,” it's increasingly clear that the Bush administration itself is the source of much of the “be afraid!” terror inflicted on US citizens over the past 5 years.

It's time for patriotic Americans of all political affiliations, and for our media, to join with Senator Clinton, former CIA official Paul Pillar, and the many others who are pointing this out, and refuse to allow the Bush administration to inflict terror on Americans—and the world—for political gain.

As Franklin D. Roosevelt said in his first inaugural address in 1932, when Americans were terrorized by the Republican Great Depression, the echoes of World War One, and the rise of Communism in Russia: This is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly. Nor need we shrink from honestly facing conditions in our country today. This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper. So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance.

Indeed, the best hope for the growth of democracy around the world and the survival of individual liberty in the United States is for us to turn away from Rumsfeld's and Cheney's politics of terror and fear, and once again embrace the great vision of this nation, held by her great statesmen and women from 1776 to today. Indeed, they are still among us, as we saw most recently when a brave few senators stood up to filibuster the nomination of Samuel Alito.

In this election year, we must redouble our efforts to swell their ranks, to involve ourselves in local and national political groups, and to return America to her destiny as the world's beacon of courage, liberty, and light.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY.) The gentlewoman will suspend. The gentlewoman is reminded to refrain from personalities toward the Vice President.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman is not suggesting that I cannot say the name of the Vice President. I am reading an article. Is the gentleman suggesting?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend. The gentlewoman may state the name of the Vice President or make policy references, but she should refrain from engaging in personalities with regard to the Vice President, even by quoting the words of another.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I did not make a personal reference, so I will move on with my time. I would commend this article to this Congress: “Rumsfeld and Cheney Revive Their '70's Terror Playbook,” and everything I have said is quoted right here in this article. Now, I think the last thing this Congress wants to do is try to snuff out the right of people to speak.

The next thing I would like to draw to your attention is an excerpt from a book. The name of the book is “War is a Racket.” It is written by Major General Smedley Butler, and this is how it goes:

War is a racket. It always has been. It is possibly the oldest, easily the most profitable, surely the most vicious. It is the only one international in scope. It is the only one in which the profits are reckoned in dollars and the losses in lives. A racket is best described, I believe, as something that is not what it seems to the majority of the people. Only a small inside group knows what it is about. It is conducted for the benefit of the very few at the expense of the very many. Out of war, a few people make huge fortunes.

In the world war, because this was written at the time of World War I, a mere handful garnered the profits of the conflict. At least 21,000 new millionaires and billionaires were made in the United States during the world war. That many admitted to their huge blood gains in their income tax returns.

How many other war millionaires falsified their tax returns, no one knows. How many of these war millionaires shouldered a rifle? How many of them dug a trench? How many of them knew what it meant to go hungry in a rat-infested dugout? How many of them spent sleepless, frightened nights ducking shells and shrapnel and machine gun bullets? How many of them parried a bayonet thrust of an enemy? How many of them were wounded or killed in battle?

Millions and billions of dollars would be piled up by a few. Munitions makers, bankers, ship builders, manufacturers, meat packers, speculators, they would fare well. Yes, they are getting ready for another war. Why shouldn't they? It pays high dividends. But what does it profit the men who are killed? What does it profit their mothers, their sisters, their wives and their sweethearts? What does it profit their children? What does it profit anyone except the very few to whom war means

huge profits? Yes, what does it profit the Nation?

But the soldier pays the biggest part of the bill. If you don't believe this, visit the American cemeteries on the battlefields abroad, or visit any of the veterans hospitals in the United States where there are thousands of the living dead. The very able chief surgeon told me that mortality among veterans is three times as great as among those who stayed at home. Boys with a normal viewpoint were taken out of the fields and offices and factories and classrooms and put into the ranks.

□ 1345

There they were remolded. They were made over. They were made to about face, to regard murder as the order of the day. They were put shoulder to shoulder and through mass psychology they were entirely changed. We used them for a couple of years and trained them to think nothing at all of killing or of being killed.

Then, suddenly, we discharge them and told them to make another about face. This time they had to do their own readjustment, without mass psychology, without officers aid and advice and without nationwide propaganda. We did not need them anymore, so we scattered them about without any speeches or parades.

Too many of these fine young boys are eventually destroyed mentally because they could not make the final about face alone. In the government hospitals, these boys are in a barracks with steel bars and wires all around outside the buildings and on the porches. These already have been mentally destroyed. These boys do not even look like human beings. Oh, the looks on their faces. Physically, they are in good shape. Mentally, they are gone. There are thousands and thousands of these cases, and more and more are coming in all the time. Another step is necessary in this fight to smash the war racket.

To summarize, three steps must be taken to smash the war racket. One, we must take the profit out of war. Two, we must permit the youth of the land who would bear arms to decide whether or not there should be war. And three, we must limit our military forces to defense purposes. He says home defense purposes. This is an excerpt from Smedley Butler's War is a Racket.

Now, juxtapose what this man of war said to the drumbeats of war that we hear in our media now, that are emanating from high places within this administration, people who have not borne the rifle, who have not been in war. In fact, when America called them because America needed them, they were full of deferments. And yet they want to put a young man like Kevin Benderman who does not want to kill children and women and innocent people in Iraq anymore in the brig, and they would tell our country that we need to prepare for a long war. We do

not prepare for a long war. Certainly not George Bush's war. And if Tom Hartman is right in his assessment, we do not need to prepare for Dick Cheney's war either.

We have had some discussion in this body about war, and one of my colleagues from Pennsylvania did what Major General Smedley Butler said we ought to do. He visited the young men and women who have been asked to fight this war, who are on the front lines of Donald Rumsfeld's long war. There he was compelled to make a change, a change in his conviction, that perhaps this is not the right war for America; and he came back to this Congress and he said so. I am talking about my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA.

We need to really think about where we are as a country. We need to think about who we are as a country, as Americans. What does it mean to be an American?

Look at the people of Haiti who have nothing but their hopes and aspirations in democracy. And despite dictatorship and coup d'etat and dictatorship and coup d'etat again, they went to the polls and they demanded that their votes be counted.

We, too, have, in this country, the opportunity to express ourselves at the ballot box. The way I stand here is the way all 535 Members of Congress stand here, because people choose to participate or people choose not to.

In my case, I was put out of Congress because I spoke up about September 11. And the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia said, we are not going to stand for that, and they sent me back, showing the power of the vote, as the people of Haiti have demonstrated to the world the power of the vote. I would hope all Americans would value the power of the vote and exercise it.

OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy that the leadership has extended me in hosting this hour. We are going to talk about a number of things this hour, but I think it is important for the folks at home to know what this hour is. This is called the leadership hour, and what that means is that the leadership of the Republican party allows individuals to come to the floor for this hour. The leadership of the Democrat party allows individuals to come to the floor and speak about topics that are of interest to Congress and of interest to the American people, of interest to the world.

And what you have just heard is an interesting presentation that, apparently, the leadership of the Democrat

party endorses. I am not certain what, how one would describe it or how one would categorize it, but it was more fiction than truth. I would love to hear the other side, the leadership of the other side stand up and say what they disagree with about what has just been presented.

You know, when I go home and I talk to constituents, one of the things that they say over and over and over again is that they just cannot understand the tone that is going on in Washington. What is going on? Why are people so angry? And I do not understand it, frankly.

We are all elected here to come solve problems, and that is the challenge that we have been given. But the tone that we get so often is this culture of cynicism. It is a culture of pessimism. It is a culture of negativity. To make statements about our members of the executive branch and leaders who are elected in ways that just have no foundation does a disservice to everybody.

So I am a member of the freshman class, and as a member of the freshman class we get together once a week. And one of the things that we talked about toward the end of last year was we need to try to raise the level of the rhetoric here. We need to try to put a more positive message out because of the tone that we so often hear in Washington.

So we have developed what we call the Official Truth Squad. This is a group of individuals who are willing to come to the floor and talk about messages, talk about things that are of interest to the American people in a positive light and also to bring truth to the debate. Because, as you oftentimes hear, those who have been watching, we are given great latitude in what we can say and, in fact, it does not have to be the truth. Many people put issues out here and things are not countered, so people begin to believe them. You know, they say that in Washington, if somebody says something three times, that makes it true. Well, it just is not so, Mr. Speaker, as those around the Nation know.

So what we would like to do is to talk about things in a truthful way to try to make certain that we counter much of the negativity that has been presented. You know, Senator Moynihan had a wonderful, wonderful quote that he had. It was, you know, everybody's entitled to their opinion, but they are not entitled to their facts. And I think that is so true.

So this afternoon, what we, the Official Truth Squad, are going to be talking about is national security. It kind of dovetails with the discussion that we have just heard.

I am pleased to be joined by many of my colleagues in the freshman class and others, and I would like to introduce first to talk about national security, Congresswoman JEAN SCHMIDT. Congresswoman SCHMIDT is from Ohio. She comes with great expertise, representation at the State level, and has

a passion for not just America, a positive passion for America, but a passion for national security and national defense.

So, Congresswoman SCHMIDT, I would like to yield to you and have you bring us some words about national security.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, Congressman PRICE, I rise today to speak on the importance that we as a Nation do all that we can to prevent another terrorist attack on our homeland.

Like many of my colleagues, I will never forget the attacks of September 11. My daughter lived in New York City at the time. I remember that morning all too well because I did not know where she was. I did not know how close she was to the proximity of the attacks. For hours and hours, literally, almost 2 days, I could not get through to her, worrying about her safety and her well-being, worrying about how she was. My husband and I were so blessed and so grateful that she was just scared, but certainly safe.

But, you know, thousands of other people were not lucky like us. Thousands of others lost their loved ones in that attack. We must do everything in our power to prevent another attack from happening.

I rise today to congratulate the hard-working men and women of our intelligence agencies and the first responders on preventing another attempt like 9/11. I, like most Americans, wake up each morning safe, proceed with my day without even worrying about the threat of an attack because I know, from law enforcement to our national security apparatus, thousands of highly trained professionals are diligently watching and working. Men and women using the latest technologies and a lot of muscle are hard at work around the clock making sure that those that want to hurt us are kept at bay.

I hope everyone understands that the desire of the terrorist organizations to launch a deadly attack has not gone away. It has not subsided. They are out there. They want to attack us.

What has changed is our ability to thwart the attacks. That ability has dramatically increased. The latest in database technology, coupled with surveillance technologies, is proving to be a powerful force in identifying potential attackers. We owe a great deal of gratitude to these men and women on the front lines of our defense here at home as well as abroad.

Just this week the media reported that some 200,000 people across the globe are on our watchlist, persons that we have reason to believe wish us harm, wish us death, wish our Nation destruction.

□ 1400

But most importantly, 200,000 persons we have already identified as potential threats. When we wake up each morning and turn on our television sets and there is no news of an attack, we do not even think that there might have been one. That in itself is a tribute to