

HUMANE TREATMENT FOR GITMO PRISONERS

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, it is about supper time here in the United States. I wonder what is on the plates across our dinner tables. Perhaps lemon baked fish, broccoli, steamed carrots, fresh fruit. Sounds healthy to me, maybe delicious to some. This menu could be on any menu of any home or restaurant in the United States tonight.

But, Mr. Speaker, this menu is also what is being served in Guantanamo Bay prison on any given night. Mr. Speaker, we have a purpose in Guantanamo Bay. It is to house outlaws, criminals, radical terrorists; they are locked up there.

These detainees are people that have killed Americans and want to keep killing Americans. These are people picked up off the battlefield. They were not wearing uniforms. They were not state sponsored, but there were there for a reason, and that was to execute innocent people on the battlefield.

The Geneva Convention, Mr. Speaker, protects those people who are at war, who have a chain of command. They wear a uniform. They do not have concealed weapons and they do not kill the innocents. Mr. Speaker, terrorists do just the opposite. They kill innocents. They have concealed weapons. They certainly do not wear uniforms, and there is no chain of command. They are not protected, Mr. Speaker, by the Geneva Convention.

International law allows any nation the right to detain any combatants for a conflict's duration to prevent them from killing and to gather further useful information. The detainees at Guantanamo are enemy combatants. They are there because they shot our troops. They were involved in terrorism. Any many of them have information that could prevent further attacks.

Some of them have been released. And at least 12 of them have been recaptured on the battlefield trying to kill Americans.

Ann Coulter describes the tactics at Guantanamo Bay in her latest article. She said, Interrogators there cannot yell at detainees. They cannot serve the detainees cold meals except in certain circumstances. Cannot poke the detainees in the chest or engage in any type of pushing without some type of monitor. And we cannot subject the detainees to temperatures changes, of all things.

Once a suspected terrorist gets to Guantanamo, they are not treated like the Nazis treated the Poles and the Jews in World War II. Those that compare the Nazi concentration camps to Guantanamo owe an apology to those people and those families that died in those concentration camps, and they owe an apology to the American troops.

My dad served in World War II. He helped liberate those concentration camps, and 50 years later I went to Dachau and saw what it was like. And Guantanamo Bay, to be compared to a Nazi concentration camp, it is a sham and it is shameful conduct.

We even know that some of the prisoners at Guantanamo Bay have actually gained weight while they have been there. Mr. Speaker, before I became a Member of Congress, I dealt with criminals all my life. First, as a prosecutor, as you did, and then as a criminal court judge for 22 years. I saw murderers, thieves and street terrorists. And they came through my court. And we sent them to jail. We sent them to Texas jails and Texas prisons. And, Mr. Speaker, those are jails, those are prisons where no one wants to go. That is what prison and jail is about.

So I invite those that criticize the activities in Guantanamo Bay to go there, go with me and see firsthand, before other outrageous statements are made about the conduct there.

So tomorrow night at Guantanamo Bay, orange glazed chicken, fresh fruit crepes, steamed peas, and mushrooms and rice pilaf. It does not sound like bread and water to me.

And do you think our troops and in Afghanistan and Iraq are getting crepes tonight? Probably not. They are eating C-rations out of cans as they stand there in the desert and the heat, protecting the world for democracy.

Those that say there is inhumane torture there in Guantanamo, let me say this: That dog just will not hunt.

We need to be more concerned about Americans being killed by terrorists in Iraq than we are about some terrorist that is locked up in Guantanamo Bay that gets a cold blueberry muffin.

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.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio).

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

There was no objection.

AMTRAK

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. Once again in the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations, we see Amtrak being

treated like an ugly stepchild of this Nation's transportation system.

If we are wondering why only 19 percent of the American people feel that the Congress is in tune with their priorities, the cuts in Amtrak is one blatant reason why.

Yesterday we passed a \$408 billion defense appropriations bill, and it did not even include the costs of the war in Iraq. We are cutting Amtrak routes to local governments throughout the United States that have no other form of public transportation. We are spending \$1 billion a week in Iraq, \$4 billion a month, but this administration zeroes out funding for Amtrak, and the Committee on Appropriations does not even give them enough money to operate the Northeast corridor.

Just one week's investment in Iraq would significantly improve passenger rail for the entire country for an entire year. The current funding issue concerning Amtrak brings up a fundamental question as to where this Nation stands on public transportation. We have an opportunity to improve the system that serves our needs for passenger rail service, or we can let it fall apart and leave this country's travelers and businessmen with absolutely no alternative forms of public transportation.

□ 1745

Without the funding Amtrak needs to keep operating, we will soon see people that rely on Amtrak to get to work each day waiting for a train that is not coming.

We continue to subsidize highways and aviation; but when it comes to our passenger rail system, we refuse to provide the money Amtrak needs to survive.

This issue is much bigger than just transportation. This is about safety and national security. Not only should we be giving Amtrak the money it needs to continue to provide services; we should be providing security money to upgrade their tracks and improve safety and security measures in the entire rail system.

Once again, we see the Bush administration paying for its failed policies by cutting funds to vital public services and jeopardizing more American jobs.

It is time for this administration to step up to the plate and make a decision about Amtrak based on what is best for the traveling public, not what is best for the right wing of the Republican Party and the bean counters at OMB.

I represent central Florida, which depends on tourists for its economic survival. We need people to be able to get to the State and enjoy it. Ever since September 11, more and more people are turning from the airlines to Amtrak; and they deserve safe and dependable service.

This is just one example of Amtrak's impact on my State. Amtrak runs four long distance trains from Florida, employing 990 residents, with wages totaling over \$43 million, who purchased

over \$13 million in goods and services last year. They are doing the same thing in every State that they run in.

Some people think the solution to the problem is privatizing the system. If we privatize, we will see the same thing we saw when we deregulated the airline industry. Only the lucrative routes will be maintained and routes to rural locations will be expensive and few.

I was in New York shortly after September 11 when the plane leaving JFK airport crashed into the Bronx. I, along with many of my colleagues in both the House and Senate, took Amtrak back to Washington. I realized once again just how important Amtrak is to the American people and how important it is for the Nation to have alternative modes of transportation.

This is not about fiscal policy. This is about providing a safe and reliable public transportation system that the citizens of this country need and deserve.

I am asking all of my colleagues to join me and support the full funding of Amtrak.

INFORMATION THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, last week H.J. Res. 55 was introduced. This resolution requires the President to develop and implement a plan for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq. The plan would be announced before December 31, 2005, with the withdrawal to commence no later than October 1, 2006.

The media and the opponents of this plan immediately and incorrectly claimed it would set a date certain for a total withdrawal. The resolution, hardly radical in nature, simply restates the policy announced by the administration. We have been told repeatedly that there will be no permanent occupation of Iraq and the management will be turned over to the Iraqis as soon as possible.

The resolution merely pressures the administration to be more precise in its stated goals and make plans to achieve them in a time frame that negates the perception we are involved in a permanent occupation of Iraq.

The sharpest criticism of this resolution is that it would, if implemented, give insurgents in Iraq information that is helpful to their cause and harmful to our troops. This is a reasonable concern, which we address by not setting a precise time for exiting Iraq. The critics, though, infer that the enemy should never have any hint as to our intentions.

Yet, as we prepared to invade Iraq, the administration generously informed the Iraqis exactly about our plans to use "shock and awe" military

force. With this information, many Iraqi fighters, anticipating immediate military defeat, disappeared into the slums and hills and survived to fight another day, which they have.

One could argue that this information made available to the enemy was clearly used against us. This argument used to criticize H.J. Res. 55, that it might reveal our intentions, is not automatically valid. It could just as easily be argued that conveying to the enemy that we do not plan an indefinite occupation, as is our stated policy, will save many American lives.

But what we convey or do not convey to the Iraqi people is not the most crucial issue. The more important issue is this. Do the American people deserve to know more about our goals: the length of time we expect to be in Iraq; how many more Americans are likely to be killed and wounded; will there be a military draft; what is the likelihood of lingering diseases that our veterans may suffer, remember Agent Orange and the Persian Gulf War syndrome; and how many more tax dollars are required to fight this war indefinitely?

The message insurgents do need to hear and believe is that we are serious when we say we have no desire for a permanent occupation of Iraq. We must stick to this policy announced by the administration.

A plausible argument can be made that the guerrillas are inspired by our presence in Iraq, which to them seems endless. Iraqi deaths, whether through direct U.S. military action, collateral damage, or Iraqis killing Iraqis, serve to inspire an even greater number of Iraqis to join the insurgency. Because we are in charge, justly or not, we are blamed for all the deaths.

Continuing to justify our presence in Iraq because we must punish those for 9/11 is disingenuous to say the least. We are sadly now at greater risk than before 9/11. We refuse to deal with our own borders while chastising the Syrians for not securing their borders with Iraq. An end game needs to be in place, and the American people deserve to know exactly what that plan is. They are the ones who must send their sons and daughters off to war and pay the bills when they come due.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

SMART SECURITY AND IRAQ WITHDRAWAL PLAN

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, our Constitution states that Members of Congress must be chosen by the people of the United States and Congress must represent the people of the United States. That means that we, as Members of Congress, need to listen and act when the people speak.

Well, the American people have spoken. The latest Gallup poll released last week indicates that the American people are ready for our military forces in Iraq to begin coming home.

Nearly 60 percent of Americans believe that the United States should bring home some or all of our troops from Iraq. Just as revealing, the Gallup poll showed that only 36 percent of Americans support maintaining our current troop levels in Iraq. This is the lowest level of support for the war since it began in March 2003.

The American people have stated loud and clear where they stand, and their numbers are increasing. They know that the only way to keep our sons and daughters from being killed in Iraq and the only way to end the death and destruction that occur there every single day is to start the process of bringing our troops home. Clearly, the American people are way ahead of Congress on this issue.

Unfortunately, the President of the United States is way behind on the issue of Iraq. We have asked the President to come up with a plan for ending the war. He has not; so we will.

Our efforts to come up with a plan began in January when I introduced legislation calling for the President to begin bringing our troops home. Thirty-five Members of Congress support this legislation.

We continued our effort on May 25 when I introduced an amendment to the defense authorization bill calling for the President to create a plan for Iraq; 128 Members of Congress, including five Republicans and one Independent, voted in favor of this sensible amendment.

It is clear that the United States must develop a smarter agenda, an agenda for Iraq, an agenda that will go beyond when we bring our troops home from Iraq.

It is more important that we have a plan for the future than a continued military occupation, because this 2-year war has left us disturbingly weakened, weakened against the true security threats we face here at home. Let us not forget that Osama bin Laden is still at large, and al Qaeda continues to recruit new members in Iraq and elsewhere.

Once we have a plan in place to end the war in Iraq, we can start the long process of securing the United States and Iraq for the future. We can accomplish this through SMART Security.