

over 18 months since Hamesh Khan became the first American citizen extradited to Pakistan, and for those 18 months, Mr. Khan has been held without bail, without indictment, and without trial. Mr. Khan lives in a 6-foot by 6-foot prison cell in Pakistan.

I pray the American State Department did not anticipate that Mr. Khan would be held indefinitely without indictment or trial when they forcibly bound and shackled an American citizen and gave him to Pakistan.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I enter this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: It is time for America's State Department to use whatever influence is necessary and proper to cause Pakistan to treat Mr. Khan in accordance with Pakistan's own law and with international treaty obligations.

Justice cannot be served an American citizen in any other way.

WHO SAYS GOVERNMENT CAN'T CREATE JOBS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Who says, Mr. Speaker, that government can't create jobs? The greatest need of the American people today is jobs, but the question before them is this: Who is responsible and how should jobs be created?

Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, liberals, moderates, and conservatives all agree that the private sector is the primary source of jobs. However, with 9 percent official unemployment—the reality is it's much higher—and 25 million Americans either unemployed or underemployed, it's self-evident that the private sector has not supplied enough jobs and either can not or will not create enough full-time jobs today to employ the 25 million people who need them.

□ 1020

So what do we do? Throw our hands up and say, "Nothing can be done," Congress?

Democrats generally believe in "priming the pump," through deficit spending if necessary, to create jobs and stimulate the economy in order to put the overall economy back on track during these times when the private sector has obviously failed us. In the past, many Republicans have generally agreed; but this current Tea Party-Republican Party, all of whom have government jobs and employ government staffs, doesn't agree and generally argues that the government can't create jobs. Really?

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, we are reminded by Michael Hiltzik in his new book "The New Deal: A Modern History," reveals a different truth, which is the source of the following information:

FDR was sworn into office on March 4, 1933. He came up with the idea himself of a Civilian Conservation Corps on

March 13, the first jobs program of the New Deal. He presented his idea to a White House aide, Raymond Moley, on March 14—an idea that he had just come up with the night before. The idea was to put platoons of young unemployed men to work in the forests and the national parks. That very afternoon, a memo and a skeleton bill went out to the four Secretaries who would be involved in implementing his CCC plan—Frances Perkins, Labor; Henry A. Wallace, Agriculture; Harold L. Ickes, Interior; and George H. Dern, War—the first interdisciplinary agency of the New Deal.

The next day, on March 15, the four Secretaries returned a joint response proposing a wider relief program, encompassing not only a Civilian Conservation Corps, but a public works program and a grants-in-aid to States and municipalities for relief. On March 21, FDR sent a message to Congress involving, among other things, his idea of a CCC. In his message, he observed "more important . . . than the material gains will be the moral and spiritual value of such work . . . We can take a vast army of these unemployed out to healthful surroundings."

Congress debated and passed the Civilian Conservation Corps program in 8 days, on March 29. By early April, the CCC was open for business. The first registrant was 19-year-old Fiore Rizzo of New York, who arrived on April 7 in a cab with three of his friends at an Army recruiting station in downtown Manhattan. Rizzo belonged to a family of 13, whose father had not worked in 3 years.

So how did these government-created jobs work out?

The average enrollee signed up at the age of 18½, stayed for 9 months—6 months was the minimum tour, 2 years the maximum—and gained up to 30 pounds during his term, thanks to three square meals a day served up by the Army quartermasters as fuel for daily labor.

The program ramped up quickly. By July, there were 1,300 camps housing 275,000 enrollees, already working vigorously on projects that would rank among the most notable legacies of the New Deal. Before the CCC ended and with the coming of war mobilization in 1942, the CCC built 125,000 miles of roads, 46,000 bridges, more than 300,000 dams to check erosion, planted more than 3 billion trees, and strung 89,000 miles of telephone wire.

The camps instilled in many of these young men the concept of an American identity. No doubt the comradery was fostered by a shared resentment of the camps' martial regimen, the rising with the bugler's call, the mandate to keep their bunks and footlockers in order, and the heeding of senior officers without discussion. Mr. Speaker, I can only imagine that, today, these Army quartermasters would demand that our young men pull up their pants. The Army, too, found the experience valuable. As War Secretary George Dern

confided to Frances Perkins a year into the program, his officer corps had had to learn "to govern men by leadership, explanation and diplomacy rather than discipline. The knowledge is priceless."

The CCC would serve as a model for national service programs of a later era, such as the Peace Corps, AmeriCorps and VISTA.

"There was pride in the work," one former boy still recalls 60 years later. "We built something, and I knew I helped . . . It was something you could take pride in, and there wasn't a lot of pride available in those days."

Among the New Deal programs, the CCC would inspire almost universal affection, even more so than Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government can create jobs.

RON SMITH, A VOICE OF REASON FOR MARYLAND AND AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) for 2 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. On November 18 Ron Smith, a respected and beloved Baltimore-area radio talk show host on WBAL, as well as a columnist for the Baltimore Sun, announced his retirement after 26 years because of his diagnosis of inoperable pancreatic cancer and impending death.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me, along with thousands of loyal listeners and readers who have expressed their deep appreciation and admiration for Ron Smith. Ron unfailingly contributed a voice of reason with unmatched candor while providing a forum for civil and vigorous debate about politics and policy that is sorely needed everywhere in America.

I feel privileged to have been a guest a number of times on Ron's show on WBAL. It was always equally a pleasure and a challenge to meet Ron's high standards. Ron is a true conservative in the classical and historical meaning of the term. With equal enthusiasm and utmost respect, Ron asked tough questions of guests and callers and dissected the arguments of liberal elites, Democrats and Republicans, and others who call themselves conservative.

From a vast knowledge of both history and government, Ron Smith shared, and we in Maryland were most privileged to benefit from, his succinct and persuasive dialogue and dedication to liberty and reason.

Thank you, Ron. Godspeed.

STOP OUTSOURCING SECURITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. While many hours have been spent by this body debating the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, far too little time has been devoted to the United States' growing dependence on private military contractors: the weapon-carrying, for-profit security companies—mercenaries—who have become integral and counter-productive actors in our war efforts.

I believe that the increased reliance on hired guns to provide security in conflict zones undermines our policy objectives, and I am not alone. In 2007 then-Defense Secretary Robert Gates stated that the mission of many security contractors was “at cross purposes to our larger mission in Iraq.”

We should be concerned. Private contractors don't wear the badge of the United States. They answer to a corporation, not to a uniformed commander. Our government doesn't even know how many contract personnel we've hired. Because legal jurisdiction remains murky, we may lack the ability to prosecute contractors for alleged violations committed overseas.

We need to end our reliance on security contractors in conflict zones. Since 2007 I've introduced the Stop Outsourcing Security Act to phase out the use of for-profit contractors for mission-critical tasks, including security, intelligence and interrogation in conflict areas. The SOS Act builds on legislation I have introduced since 2001, including the Andean Region Contractor Accountability Act to prohibit military contracting in Colombia and neighboring nations.

While the problem applies to other private contractors, there is one company that has been synonymous with misconduct—Blackwater. Operating under a culture of recklessness created by its founder, Erik Prince, Blackwater employees have been implicated in a wide range of alleged misconduct since 2004—from shooting and killing civilians to gun-running.

Five former Blackwater executives, including its former president, Gary Jackson, were indicted in 2010 for weapons charges. The company agreed to a \$42 million administrative settlement with the State Department for 288 alleged violations of the Arms Export Control Act and International Traffic in Arms Regulations. At least seven civil suits for alleged abuses by Blackwater personnel in Iraq have been settled, and legal action is still pending against four Blackwater guards accused of massacring 17 civilians in Baghdad's Nisour Square in 2007. Further, the Iraqi Government, our ally, has repeatedly asked that Blackwater be ousted, leading the United States State Department to refuse to renew the company's contract in 2009.

In short, Blackwater, now renamed Xe, has been a center of controversy for years in congressional committees, the press and among members of the military. Yet the company has received over \$1.25 billion in taxpayer money.

Recently, Mr. Prince has launched a video game called “Blackwater,” glorify-

ing the discredited company he started, and now Mr. Prince has adopted yet another heavy-handed tactic—the attempted intimidation of a Member of Congress.

□ 1030

Last month a letter from his attorney was hand delivered to my congressional office. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the letter for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It accuses me of defamatory statements, characterizes my efforts to urge investigations into Mr. Prince as a violation of congressional power, and describes possible legal action if I persist.

I come to the floor today because I believe it is my responsibility as a Member of Congress to speak out against policies and entities that I believe are damaging to our Nation. I want to make it clear to Mr. Prince that I will not stop working to end our reliance on private security contractors or to investigate any and all allegations of misconduct. I want to make it clear to the military men and women who have shared their concerns that they are endangered by the behavior of hired guns employed by Blackwater-like companies, that I will keep speaking out to protect our mission and our brave troops from risk.

And I want to tell the families of the men and women who have been killed in incidents involving Blackwater and other such companies that I will continue to push for full investigations and, whenever appropriate, criminal charges.

DIGENOVA & TOENSING, LLP,
ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW,
Washington, DC, October 7, 2011.

Delivered by Hand

HON. JAN SCHAKOWSKY,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SCHAKOWSKY: This firm represents Erik Prince concerning false and defamatory statements you have made against him.

On September 8, 2011, Guy Adams, a Los Angeles-based correspondent, published in the London-based Independent an article discussing “Blackwater” (2011), a video game owned by Mr. Prince. In that article, Mr. Adams attributes to you the following observation: “If Mr. Prince had not emigrated to the United Arab Emirates, which does not have an extradition agreement with the US, he too would now be facing prosecution.”

We demand you cease and desist any further public statements that suggest in any way that Mr. Prince “would be facing prosecution” or has engaged in criminal conduct under any circumstances.

Your caprice in making a false and defamatory statement about criminal culpability is particularly galling in light of your husband's guilty plea to federal fraud and his time in prison. One would think you would be sensitive about falsely accusing others of criminality.

Mr. Prince has answered his country's call to serve both in military uniform and civilian life. Mr. Prince served his country with honor as a commissioned officer in the United States Navy SEALs. He deployed with SEAL Team 8 to Haiti, the Middle East, and the Balkans.

Mr. Prince's support for human rights around the world is well established, from

funding famine relief in Somalia and the Sudan, to contributing to the building of hospitals, schools, orphanages and churches and mosques in the Middle East and Asia. He financed a feature film, *The Stoning of Soraya M.*, about the oppression of women in Iran. Mr. Prince has spent time and resources to improve conditions for many who live under despotic regimes surrounded by war, drought, and famine.

Your statement to Mr. Adams, which imputes commission of a crime, is per se libelous. *Raboya v. Shrybman & Assoc.*, 777 F.Supp. 58, 59 (D.D.C. 1991); *Farnum v. Colbert*, 293 A.2d 279,281 (D.C. 1972).

Your malice cannot be questioned. You have a multi-year history of making derogatory comments about Mr. Prince and his former company, Blackwater. You have abused your Congressional power to request that Mr. Prince be investigated.

In May of this year, you attempted to initiate a Department of State investigation of Mr. Prince in a letter to Secretary of State Clinton. You based your request on your “concern that Mr. Prince is now exporting his services.” Absent from your letter was any mention of other American security consultants who are performing the same business in the Middle East and Asia.

You brag on your official website that you have “focused” on private security contractors who “work for companies like the infamous Blackwater.” In October 2007, you requested then Secretary of State Rice to “terminate[] Blackwater's contract immediately.” In February 2009, you issued a press release alleging Blackwater's actions have put “our troops in harms [sic] way and jeopardized our mission in Iraq.” In September 2010, you purposely evoked a criminal context by mischaracterizing Blackwater as a “repeat offender.”

The facts you assert about Mr. Prince show complete reckless disregard for the truth. For example, Mr. Prince did not immigrate to the UAE. He maintains a residence in the United States. Mr. Prince has never committed nor ever been charged with any crime.

A federal court in July 2011 dismissed Mr. Prince from a civil law suit finding there was no evidence on which to base the claims. Moreover, a jury found there was no liability for United States Training Center, the company formerly known as Blackwater. A quick check would have verified these readily available facts.

Your interview with Mr. Adams is not protected by the Speech or Debate clause. *Hutchinson v. Proxmire*, 443 U.S. 111, 124-125 (1979).

As you are surely aware, since articles quoting you are published in other countries, you are subject to defamation laws in those countries as well as in the United States. If you do not like the “Blackwater” video game, you are free to express your opinion. But you are not permitted under the laws of the United States and numerous countries where your statements are published to make false accusations about Mr. Prince's status under the criminal law.

Sincerely,

VICTORIA TOENSING,
Counsel for Erik Prince.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair, not to others in the second person.

RIGHTS OF WORKERS TO ORGANIZE AND BARGAIN COLLECTIVELY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from