

IRAQ AND TORTURE

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 gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, Yogi Berra once told us that "When you arrive at a fork in the road, you should take it." Well, the United States has reached a fork in the road when it comes to torturing other human beings, and it is time we took it, once and for all.

□ 1345

Senator JOHN MCCAIN has offered an amendment to the Defense appropriations bill clarifying that the United States Government, including the military and the CIA, does not condone the use of torture, putting the United States in a position to set an example for the rest of the world by clearly affirming our opposition to the use of torture as a military tactic.

Yet if the Bush administration has its way, Congress will reject this amendment, reserving its right to employ the use of torture in certain situations. That is right: The Bush administration has come out against an amendment that states for the record that the United States opposes the use of torture. Do they really want people to think we support torture?

For one thing, America's use of torture certainly has not helped us win any friends so far. It did not win us friends when it was revealed that the American military had abused prisoners at Guantanamo Bay. It did not win us any friends when thousands of photographs were released showing U.S. servicemembers torturing, beating, humiliating, and generally violating Iraqi prisoners of war. And it certainly did not win us any friends last week when it was revealed that the United States might possess dozens of top-secret military prisons in Eastern Europe for the sole purpose of viciously interrogating enemy prisoners. Never mind the fact that torture as a tactic does not provide accurate results. Individuals who are placed in unbearable situations will say just about anything to end the pain that they are suffering. Yet, even if torture produced positive results, it violates every single principle that our country stands for.

I am not the only one that understands this. Most Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle are opposed to torture. This weekend, Senator CHUCK HAGEL, who is no stranger to conservative politics, did not pull any punches when he said, "I think the administration is making a terrible mistake in opposing JOHN MCCAIN's amendment on detainees and torture." He said, "making a terrible mistake."

Yet, the President responds with the same tired talking points. Yesterday, he tried to justify his opposition to the McCain amendment by saying, our President, "We will aggressively pursue the enemy, but we will do so under the law." Then he went on to say, "We do not torture."

Mr. Speaker, does the President think he can paper over this problem and expect it to go away? If the President is so adamant that the United States does not torture, why does he continue to oppose the McCain amendment banning the use of torture? Unfortunately, this is just business as usual for an administration that has time and again taken the wrong path when arriving at a fork in the road.

Let us not forget that there were plenty of other options for the United States before the President made the decision to go to war in Iraq, a war that has subsequently cost the lives of nearly 2,100 American soldiers, uncounted tens of thousands of innocent Iraqi civilians, and caused grave injuries to another 15,000 American soldiers.

Now, the President and his administration have yet another choice. They ought to take the high road when it comes to permanently ending the use of torture, and they ought to take the high road in bringing our troops home from Iraq and returning Iraq to the Iraqi people.

The Bush administration can never take back the many mistakes that have been made over the past several years: A failed war in Iraq, heinous acts of torture around the world, and a shamefully cynical foreign policy that has put Americans at greater risk than ever before.

But we are at another crossroads, and it is not too late to take the right path. If we do not, we risk suffering another Yogi Berra prophecy: "Déjà vu all over again."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

REPUBLICANS HAVE A PLAN

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have 5 minutes in place of the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I did not plan to use these 5 minutes; but as we hear Bush-bashing and bashing of the

Republicans as you walk through the Halls of our Chambers here, I think it is appropriate that we do take a minute to respond.

We just heard more Bush-bashing about accusations of torture in Iraq. I wonder where some of these same people were when Abu Ghraib prison had the torture of thousands of innocent Iraqi civilians and other people in that society who had their limbs lopped off, who were taken to the precipice outside of the prison and lined up, to deal with prison-crowding. A former Iraqi prisoner told some of us Members of Congress they would line up the prisoners and then shoot them in front of a ditch and then bury them. One escaped who had been shot several times and he told us that story.

The Bush administration has wanted to stop the torture of people in that prison and the loss of life in that country. They do not want to talk about the 300,000 mass graves that we have uncovered in that country, the slaughter of his own people that Saddam Hussein conducted.

Then we heard the previous speaker talk about how bad things are in America under the Bush administration and Bush policy. They did not tell us that under the policy of President Bush we have actually, in just this last fiscal year that ended the end of September, we have \$100 billion in additional revenue into the United States Treasury. That is a plan of failure? In one year we have reduced the deficit, the projected deficit a year ago by some 25 percent, a sizable feat; we had unemployment before Katrina go to 4.9 percent, one of the lowest percentages on record, and even in the last quarter, with the incredible natural disaster that we faced in the gulf coast and in Florida, we had a remarkable 3.8 percent economic growth. They do not want to talk about the jobs that have been created under this policy.

So we do have a plan. We have a plan this week or soon to reduce some spending. We have balanced the budget before; we can do it again. We can bring about the reforms, and some of those are tough reforms, but we have a plan. It involves reform, and it will result in savings and we will see continued growth, economic growth in this country, and fulfill the dreams of Americans who want better jobs, who want lower taxes, less government regulation, and less litigation. All of those things, higher taxes, more government regulation, and litigation, we know drive jobs and opportunity out of this great Nation.

So Republicans have a plan. We will make reforms. They will result in savings and better opportunities for all Americans as opposed to the rhetoric that we have had here on the floor this afternoon. So I am pleased to present those items to the House in response to the rhetoric we have heard.

ONE NATION—TWO PRESIDENTS

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, across the country today, Americans are going to the polls to vote for candidates and issues. A year ago, the Americans went to the polls and voted for a President, but they got two instead. We have George W. Bush, the President of domestic policy, like appointing a self-described fashion God who left the gulf coast unprotected; and we have DICK CHENEY, the President of foreign policy, including secret CIA presence around the world.

Now, today the President of foreign policy is trying to round up votes in the Senate to exempt the CIA from an amendment that would ban the torture and inhumane treatment of prisoners. It is a sure sign that America has lost its way when we even have to talk about banning torture and inhumane treatment of prisoners.

America has never had two Presidents until now, and America has never had a question about its moral integrity, until now. The President of foreign policy would have us believe that we must become the enemy to defeat the enemy. Like so much from this administration, this is not true. America's moral imperative is true enough, strong enough, and safe enough to keep this Nation a shining light of freedom without secret, black ops demanded by someone who was never elected President.

Throughout our history, Presidents have led this Nation through wars at home and abroad by remaining true to America's principles and values. In the mid-19th century, America had never before faced a more ferocious enemy than the one from within that reduced us to the Civil War. President Lincoln never lost sight of what we were fighting for. He said: "Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as a heritage of all men in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit, and you have planted the seeds of despotism around your own doors."

In the early 20th century, America had never before faced a ferocious foe like the one that plunged the whole world into war, but President Woodrow Wilson did not forget what America stood for. He said: "The present and all that it holds belongs to the nations and the peoples who preserve their self-control and the orderly processes of governments; the future to those who prove themselves the true friends of mankind."

In the mid-20th century, America had never before faced an enemy more like one that had plunged us again into a world war, but Franklin Delano Roosevelt never wavered in his defense of his country: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

And with the world on the brink of nuclear terror during the Cuban Mis-

sile Crisis, John Kennedy kept America free and safe without subverting American values. JFK knew a lot about winning a war without losing the peace. He said: "When at least at some future date the high court of history sits in judgment on each one of us, our success or failure in whatever office we may hold will be measured by the answers to four questions: Were we truly men," and I would add women, "of courage, men and women of judgment, men and women of integrity? Were we truly men and women of dedication?"

Presidents Lincoln, Wilson, Roosevelt, and Kennedy knew a thing about freedom and liberty; and they knew a lot about America. We are the land of the free and not the home of the afraid. But the President of foreign policy would have it otherwise. His demands for black ops is a black eye on this Nation. American history, not the unelected President of foreign policy, should be our guide.

Great American Presidents have led this Nation in times no less frightening than today. Ask any veteran of the Second World War what was at stake. They called it a world war for a reason. They did not shrink from their duty, and we must not forget that we did our best and we are the best hope of this world. We keep America free without losing America's moral integrity.

The unelected President of foreign policy wants an exemption on an amendment that would ban torture and inhumane treatment of prisoners. He wants the CIA to be free to do whatever they want.

We have come a long way from the days of great Presidents to arrive at the day of an unelected President. He acts not in the shadow of the White House, but standing in front of the person elected President. We used to shine light into the darkness of regimes where people disappeared into secret prisons, gulags. Now, the unelected President of foreign policy would have us become the custodians of gulags.

For a long time, people have wondered just how President Bush could get it so wrong so often. Now we know: he has help. America has a second President we never elected.

Mr. Speaker, I will include for the RECORD an article from the Village Voice.

PRESIDENT SHOULD DUMP CHENEY

(By James Ridgeway)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Politicians across the political spectrum are hoping against hope that President Bush can take control of the nation and jumpstart a second term, kicking out chief adviser Karl Rove—who remains at risk in the Plame Affair—and changing policy in Iraq, where U.S. soldiers continue to die. But as everyone in Washington knows, Rove isn't the real problem here. The real problem for Bush is Vice President Dick Cheney—it's Cheney's now former chief of staff, Scooter Libby, who has been indicted in the Plame Affair, and it's his pushing that has the administration taking a hard line on the handling of detainees. And the best way, perhaps the only way, for Bush to take charge of the country is to dump the vice president,

forcing him into retirement before he can be charged by Plame Affair prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald with violating the espionage laws.

These last few days, while Bush wandered around South America from one fruitless meeting to another and fended off charges of prisoner abuse in Iraq with bland statements such as "We do not torture," Cheney was busily working away behind the scenes seeking to persuade Congress not to impose restrictions on the CIA torture interrogators. The Washington Post revealed last week the CIA was running interrogations in secret jails for suspected terrorists in eastern Europe.

Cheney, even more than Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, is the man behind the Iraq war. Fitzgerald's indictment of Libby bluntly states that Cheney's top aide learned Valerie Plame, the covert CIA agent, was administration critic Joe Wilson's wife from Cheney. Given that, how can Cheney avoid testifying in a Libby trial? He does not have the immunity of a president.

"Libby is the firewall protecting Vice President Cheney," writes John Dean in his FindLaw column:

The Libby indictment asserts that "[o]n or about June 12, 2003 Libby was advised by the Vice President of the United States that Wilson's wife worked at the Central Intelligence Agency in the Counterproliferation Division. Libby understood that the Vice President had learned this information from the CIA."

In short, Cheney provided the classified information to Libby—who then told the press. Anyone who works in national security matters knows that the Counterproliferation Division is part of the Directorate of Operations—the covert side of the CIA, where most everything and everyone are classified.

If Fitzgerald were successful in flipping Libby—and that seems pretty clearly to be his intention—then Cheney himself would face charges of violating the espionage act.

The outcome? Libby will probably hold fast through the 2006 election, his lawyers dragging out the case by interviewing reporters, etc. and then Libby, if convicted, can expect a pardon. As for Cheney, he could save face, resigning for health reasons—that suspect ticker of his coming to the rescue.

At that point, Bush could appoint a new vice president to serve out the remainder of his term. This appointment would require majority approval of both houses of Congress under the 25th Amendment.

Meanwhile, its business as usual, Bush drifting from day to day with the currents. Yesterday just as Bush uttered his denial of torture, the army charged five Rangers with abusing prisoners in Iraq. This morning, Italian state TV aired a documentary describing how the U.S. used white phosphorous bombs against civilians in Falluja. The U.S. admits using the weapons to illuminate battlefields. We are not signatories to a treaty banning the use of white phosphorous weapons. The film is being broadcast on the first anniversary of the U.S. attack on Falluja, which destroyed much of the city and displaced its population of 300,000.

Tomorrow, Ahmed Chalabi, a deputy prime minister of Iraq, the man who fed the gullible American press wrong information on Saddam's possession of weapons of mass destruction, is visiting Washington to address neocon headquarters at the American Enterprise Institute. Chalabi also is to meet with Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. A thoroughly disgraced liar, the conduit of so much of the phony information that led us to war, a man with no political base outside the conniving neocon circles, Chalabi is now seriously discussed in Washington as a possible American-backed compromise candidate for Iraqi prime minister because he might appeal of the Shiite southern part of the country. As it stands, he is now in control of the