

Finally, the Cretan people participated in one of the most daring operations that brought shame and humiliation to the German occupation forces and exhilaration and hope to the enslaved peoples of Europe. Major-General Von Kreipe, Commander of all German forces in Crete, was abducted from his own headquarters in April 1944 and transferred to a POW camp in England.

The German troops had never encountered such resistance. Hitler had initially sent 12,000 troops to Crete, thinking that the occupation would be swift. By the end of the three-and-a-half years of occupation, Hitler had sent a total of 100,000 troops, to confront a little more than 5,000 Cretan Andarte fighters. These German troops could have been deployed somewhere else. More German troops were lost during the occupation of Crete than in France, Yugoslavia and Poland combined.

Most importantly, as a result of the battle in Crete, Hitler's master plan to invade Russia before the coming of winter, had to be postponed, which resulted in the deaths of many German troops who were not properly prepared to survive the harsh Russian winter.

As we Americans know from our history, freedom does not come free. For their gallant resistance against the German invasion and occupation of their island, Cretans paid a stiff price. Within the first five months of the Battle of Crete, 3,500 Cretans were executed and many more were killed in the ensuing three-and-a-half years of occupation.

Mr. Speaker, there are historical reasons why we Americans appreciate the sacrifices of the Cretan people in defending their island during the Battle of Crete. We have a history replete with similar heroic events starting with our popular revolt that led to the birth of our Nation more than two centuries.

We must always remember that as long as there are people willing to sacrifice their lives for the just cause of defending the integrity and freedom of their country, there is always hope for a better tomorrow. May we take inspiration from the shining example of the people of Crete in ensuring that this is indeed the case.

SMART SECURITY AND ABU GHRAIB SCANDAL

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, amidst all the debate about the defense bill, we seem to have forgotten one very, very important thing, which should be the driving force behind every decision we make with regard to Iraq. Mr. Speaker, nearly 800 young men and women have lost their lives as a result of the conflict. Eight hundred.

We must never forget that people are dying as a result of the decisions of this House. Many of our brave soldiers will never again walk this Earth because of the choices we have made. Many more will be lame for life. Clearly, something is wrong with our Nation's policies when 800 of our soldiers have died in Iraq, most of them after our flight-clad President declared an end to major combat operations.

Something is most certainly wrong when events occur such as the abuses

in Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq, or even events like the deaths of five Iraqi prisoners in war-torn detention camps, as the Denver Post recently reported. The fact that these actions occurred in separate places, under the command of different interrogators, demonstrates that this is a systemic problem.

The Pentagon's response has been to court-martial the young soldiers directly responsible for these instances of torture, calling them bad apples. And what has been the response by the leaders of this country? Two weeks ago, President Bush appeared on Arab television condemning the abuses by American servicemembers and private American contractors. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld testified before the Senate and House Committee on Armed Services for the same purpose. Both men in their respective addresses tried to distance themselves from the crimes.

Mr. Speaker, President Harry Truman made famous the quote "The buck stops here." President Bush would be well served to take notice of this quotation, which President Truman thought was so important that he kept it as a sign on his desk in the Oval Office.

In fact, it is becoming more apparent every day that all along both President Bush and Secretary Rumsfeld may have known more than they were letting on and that the crimes committed at the prisons could have originated in the Pentagon and passed through the Oval Office.

An investigation by Newsweek magazine provides evidence that President Bush and Secretary Rumsfeld, along with Attorney General John Ashcroft, may have personally agreed to a secret system of detention interrogation designed to circumnavigate the Geneva Conventions. This information was substantiated by a New Yorker magazine article, which similarly detailed a Pentagon operation known inside the intelligence community as Copper Green, which encouraged physical coercion and sexual humiliation of Iraqi prisoners in an attempt to produce intelligence about the post-war insurgency in Iraq.

Are we really to believe that the Secretary of Defense had no knowledge of the actions being taken by the soldiers under his command? And if the Secretary of Defense had absolutely no knowledge of this abuse, is that not a gigantic problem in and of itself? And if Secretary Rumsfeld did know of Copper Green, are we really to believe that nobody shared this information with the President? And if not, why not?

The buck stops with the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. The buck does not stop with the young soldiers interrogating Iraqi prisoners. The buck does not stop with Brigadier General Janis Karpinski, the U.S. general in charge of running the prisons in Iraq. The buck does not even stop with Donald Rumsfeld, the Secretary of Defense. The buck stops with

the President and only with the President.

There has to be a better way, because the Bush doctrine of passing the buck has been tried and it has failed. It is time for a new national security strategy, one that emphasizes brains instead of brawn, one that is consistent with the best American values.

I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392, legislation to create a SMART security platform for the 21st century. SMART stands for Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. SMART treats war as an absolute last resort. It fights terrorism with stronger intelligence and multilateral partnerships. It controls the spread of weapons of mass destruction with a renewed commitment to nonproliferation. And it aggressively invests in the development of impoverished nations with an emphasis on women's health and education.

The buck stops with the President of the United States. No more denials, no more passing the buck.

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

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

AMERICAN INVESTMENT IN INDIA

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, because the issue of American investment in India has been a particular point of debate here in the Congress, I want to say a few words about the recent elections in India and what they portend for Americans and Indians alike.

□ 1945

For many months now I have been talking about how our Nation's success in a 21st century economy is going to hinge on companies that are successfully able to invest and compete globally. It is these companies, the ones who invest in emerging overseas markets, that use global investment to maximize their efficiencies and create new opportunities right here in the United States.

Economic isolationists have tried to claim that investment in India is bad for Americans. They have claimed that new job opportunities in cities like Hyderabad and Mumbai mean job losses here at home. They have tried to tell the American people that we cannot compete with a growing Indian middle class.

As economic news from India, such as the 10 percent GDP growth rate last year, grew brighter and brighter, the isolationists' predictions of gloom grew darker and darker.