Yet we have not had a national debate on the draft and we certainly did not have that debate this week. H.R. 163 was not marked up or voted on by any committee here in the House. This bill was added to the suspension calendar of the House reserved for non-controversial items. And yet it is quite controversial.

Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq—combined with other worldwide deployments in Afghanistan, Korea, and over 140 other countries—has put an enormous strain on our active duty and reserve soldiers. We have seen underpaid, ill-equipped, and overextended American troops fighting in Iraq. More than two-thirds of New Jersey’s National Guard will be activated this year. There are hard questions that need to be answered about how we can continue this war, at this pace. We do need to review our commitments overseas and assess our ability to meet them. This bill shows that a National debate on these issues is greatly needed. This week, we did not have that debate. The House leaders simply tried to make a political point, but I hope that this has sown the seeds of the discussion. The nation’s military leaders are nearly unanimous in saying that the military can meet its needs better without a draft. None of us here in the House today believe that a draft is necessary or advisable. I have co-sponsored legislation introduced by Representative ELLEN TAUSCHER to meet military manpower needs by temporarily increasing by 8 percent the end-strength numbers of our all-volunteer armed forces during the next five years and increasing enlistees’ pay and benefits accordingly (H.R. 3696). This alternative approach would increase the volunteer numbers of duty-soldiers gradually over the next five years, thus enabling members of the National Guard and Reserve to rotate out or transition voluntarily into active duty slots with better benefits and equipment.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard from many moms and dads, and I have heard from many students from all across my district who are disturbed by the idea of renewing the draft and I agree with them. We do not need to return to the draft system.

During this week, there will be a more visible push in the communities to get the information out about mental illness. There will be booths set up and mental health fairs across our country as a way to reach out to more people. I commend the efforts of organizations and individuals who not only during this week but throughout the year at the University of Michigan School of Law. She made a stirring speech, challenging everyone to do more for the common good.

With the onset of integration in the early 1970s, Jefferson High School came to an end. But the three-day reunion made clear that Jefferson lives on in the lives it made better. Hundreds of the alumni attending attested to better, more productive lives because of what they learned at Jefferson under teachers who cared, encouraged, and challenged.

MENTAL ILLNESS AWARENESS WEEK

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 7, 2004

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, October 3-9 is Mental Illness Awareness Week. During any one-year period, up to 50 million Americans—more than 22 percent—suffer from a clearly diagnosable mental disorder involving a degree of incapacity that interferes with employment, attendance at school or daily life. Like so many disorders, mental illness does not discriminate and affects every age, ethnic, and socioeconomic group.

IN RECOGNITION OF ADMIRAL THOMAS H. MOORER

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 7, 2004

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on February 5 of this year, a legendary American naval hero passed away in Bethesda, Maryland. Admiral Thomas H. Moorer epitomized the finest qualities of dedication and national service. His distinguished naval career spanned 41 years, including service as a naval aviator, as one of the first pilots off the ground during the attack on Pearl Harbor, as a participant in a number of combat missions in the Southwest Pacific and the Battle of Midway, as Commander of the Pacific Fleet, as commander of NATO’s U.S. Atlantic Command and the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, becoming the only officer in the Navy’s history to command both our Atlantic and Pacific Fleets, as Chief of Naval Operations, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and as a tireless advocate for American veterans. Admiral Moorer was instrumental in establishing the United States Navy Memorial on Pennsylvania Avenue. His numerous appearances before Congressional Committees, Admiral Moorer provided valuable testimony on a variety of national security concerns.

Capping this extraordinary career, Admiral Moorer made his final appearance on Capitol Hill on October 22, 2003, as Chairman of the Independent Commission of Inquiry into the 1967 attack on the USS Liberty. It is a privilege for me to introduce the Findings of the Independent Commission of Inquiry Into the Israeli Attack on the USS Liberty into the Congressional Record.

FINDINGS OF THE INDEPENDENT COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO THE ISRAELI ATTACK ON THE USS “LIBERTY.” THE RECALL OF MILITARY RESCUE SUPPORT AIRCRAFT WHILE THE SHIP WAS UNDER ATTACK, AND THE SUBSEQUENT COVER-UP BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

We, the undersigned, having undertaken an independent investigation of Israel’s attack on the USS Liberty, including eyewitness testimony from surviving crewmembers, a review of naval and other official records, an examination of official statements by the Israeli and American governments, a study of the conclusions of all previous official inquiries, and a consideration of important
new evidence and recent statements from individuals having direct knowledge of the attack or the cover up, hereby find the following:

1. That on June 8, 1967, after eight hours of aerial surveillance, Israel launched a two-hour air and naval attack against the USS Liberty, the world’s most sophisticated intelligence gathering ship. Thirty-four American personnel were killed and 11 Americans wounded. U.S. Ambassador to Lebanon in 1967; (Ret.) and former Ambassador Dwight Odom, USA (Ret.), Admiral Bobby Ray Inman, USN (Ret.), and Marshall Carter; former NSA deputy directors Oliver Kirby and Major General John Morrison, USAF (Ret.); and Rear Admiral Lawrence Cristol and others, it is important for the American people to know that the facts of this attack from the American perspective compel me to share the truth.

2. That the Israeli air attack lasted approximately 25 minutes, during which time unmarked Israeli aircraft dropped napalm canisters on the Liberty’s bridge, and fired 30mm cannons and rockets into our ship, causing 621 holes, more than 100 of which were rocket-size; survivors estimate 30 or more sorties were flown over the ship by a minimum of 12 attacking Israeli planes which were jamming all five American emergency radio channels;

3. That the torpedo boat attack involved not only the firing of torpedoes, but the machine-gunning of the Liberty’s firefighters and stretcher-bearers as they struggled to save their ship and crew; the Israeli torpedo boats and machine-gun attack range three of the Liberty’s life rafts that had been lowered into the water by survivors to rescue the most seriously wounded;

4. That compelling evidence that Israel’s attack was a deliberate attempt to destroy an American ship and kill her entire crew; evidence of such intent is supported by statements of国家战略 Secretary Dean Rusk, Undersecretary of State George Ball, former CIA director Richard Helms, former NSA directors Lieutenant William Odland, Deputy Director Ray Inman, USN (Ret.), and Marshall Carter; former NSA deputy directors Oliver Kirby and Major General John Morrison, USAF (Ret.), former Defense Agency and the military intelligence services, and to determine Israel’s possible motive for launching said attack on a U.S. naval vessel;

5. That in attacking the USS Liberty, Israel committed acts of murder against American people and an act of war against the United States;

6. That fearing conflict with Israel, the White House deliberately prevented the U.S. Navy from coming to the defense of the Liberty by recalling Sixth Fleet military rescue support while the ship was under attack; evidence of this decision is supported by statements of Captain Joe Tully, Commanding Officer of the aircraft carrier USS Saratoga, and Rear Admiral Lawrence Gels, an Emergency Air Division commander, at the time of the attack; never before in American naval history has a rescue mission been cancelled when an American ship was under attack;

7. That although the Liberty was saved from almost certain destruction through the heroic efforts of the ship’s Captain, William L. Marshall, and his brave crew, surviving crewmembers were later threatened with “court-martial, imprisonment or worse” if they exposed the truth; and were abandoned by their own government;

8. That due to the influence of Israel’s powerful supporters in the United States, the White House deliberately covered up the facts of this attack from the American people;

9. That due to continuing pressure by the pro-Israel lobby in the United States, this attack remains the only serious naval incident of the Cold War that has never been thoroughly investigated by Congress; to this day, no surviving crewmen have been permitted to officially and publicly testify about the attack;

10. That there has been an official cover-up without the cooperation of the American military; the existence of such a cover-up is now supported by statements of Rear Admiral Merlin Staring, USN (Ret.), former Judge Advocate General of the Navy; and Captain Ward Boston, USN, (Ret.), the chief counsel to the Navy’s 1967 Court of Inquiry of the Liberty attack.

11. That the truth about Israel’s attack and subsequent White House cover-up continues to be officially concealed from the American people on the present day and is a national disgrace;

12. That a danger to our national security exists whenever our elected officials are willing to subordinate American interests to those of any foreign nation, and specifically are unwilling to challenge Israel’s interests when they conflict with American interests;

13. That in attacking the USS Liberty and the subsequent official cover-up of the Israeli attack, endangers the safety of Americans and the security of the United States.

Whereupon, we, the undersigned, in order to fulfill our duty to the brave crew of the USS Liberty and to all Americans who are asked to serve in our Armed Forces, hereby call upon the Department of the Navy, the Congress of the United States and the American people to immediately take the following actions:

First, That a new Court of Inquiry be convened by the Department of the Navy, operating from personal testimony from surviving crewmembers; and to thoroughly investigate the circumstances of the attack on the USS Liberty, as a case of “clear” declassification by the Central Intelligence Agency and the military intelligence services, and to determine Israel’s possible motive for launching said attack on a U.S. naval vessel;

Second, That every appropriate committee of the Congress of the United States investigate the White House and Defense Department that prevented the rescue of the USS Liberty, thereby threatened her surviving officers and men if they exposed the truth, and covered up the true circumstances of the attack from the American people; and

Third, That the eighth day of June of every year be proclaimed to be hereafter known as USS Liberty Remembrance Day, in order to commemorate the Liberty’s heroic crew; and to educate the American people of the danger to our nation’s military from the highest casualty rate ever inflicted upon a U.S. naval vessel that remained afloat after an attack;

AFFIDAVIT OF CAPTAIN WARD BOSTON, USN, JAG (RET.), SENIOR COUNSEL TO THE U.S. NAVY

For more than 30 years, I have remained silent on the topic of the USS Liberty attack. Admiral John S. McCain, Jr., then Secretary of the Navy, cited the refusal of Israeli pilots to admit to subordinate American interests to those of any foreign nation, and specifically are unwilling to challenge Israel’s interests when they conflict with American interests;

Johnson and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara ordered him to conclude that the attack was accidental. Today, an Independent Commission of Inquiry has found that Israel committed an “act of war” against the United States (see Findings of Independent Commission). In addition, the Navy’s chief attorney to the original 1967 military Court of Inquiry has issued a statement that orders to cover up the incident were given by President Lyndon Johnson and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara (see Statement of Captain Ward Boston, USN, JAG (Ret.).)

The truth about Israel’s attack on the USS Liberty was an Egyptian ship? Israel claimed the attack was accidental. Today, an Independent Commission of Inquiry has found that Israel committed an “act of war” against the United States (see Findings of Independent Commission). In addition, the Navy’s chief attorney to the original 1967 military Court of Inquiry has issued a statement that orders to cover up the incident were given by President Lyndon Johnson and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara (see Statement of Captain Ward Boston, USN, JAG (Ret.).)

The evidence was clear. Both Admiral Kidd and I believed with certainty that this attack, which killed 34 American sailors and injured 172 others, was a deliberate effort to sink an American ship and murder its entire crew. Admiral Kidd committed acts of murder against American sailors, whose bereaved shipmates have struggled with this egregious conclusion for many years.

COMMONLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT THE USS “LIBERTY”

1. What happened to the USS Liberty? The USS Liberty was a virtually unarmed American naval vessel that remained afloat after an attack.

2. What were the American casualties? 34 American sailors were killed and 172 injured. Israel’s official investigation into the attack found that the attack was accidental, but that the US government covered up the incident. Today, an Independent Commission of Inquiry has found that Israel committed an “act of war” against the United States (see Findings of Independent Commission). In addition, the Navy’s chief attorney to the original 1967 military Court of Inquiry has issued a statement that orders to cover up the incident were given by President Lyndon Johnson and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara (see Statement of Captain Ward Boston, USN, JAG (Ret.).)

3. What was Israel’s explanation for the attack? Israel claimed the attack was a “case of mistaken identity”; that they didn’t know it was an American ship.

4. Why would we question that explanation more than 30 years later? The ship’s survivors were afraid to speak out in the early years because of threats of “court martial, prison or worse” if they did not remain silent. However, as time passed, they have stepped forward to say the attack was deliberate.

Recently, high government and military officials have suggested that not only was the attack deliberate, but that the US government covered up the incident. Today, an Independent Commission of Inquiry has found that Israel committed an “act of war” against the United States (see Findings of Independent Commission). In addition, the Navy’s chief attorney to the original 1967 military Court of Inquiry has issued a statement that orders to cover up the incident were given by President Lyndon Johnson and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara (see Statement of Captain Ward Boston, USN, JAG (Ret.).)

The truth about Israel’s attack on the USS Liberty was an Egyptian ship? Israel claimed the attack was accidental. Today, an Independent Commission of Inquiry has found that Israel committed an “act of war” against the United States (see Findings of Independent Commission). In addition, the Navy’s chief attorney to the original 1967 military Court of Inquiry has issued a statement that orders to cover up the incident were given by President Lyndon Johnson and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara (see Statement of Captain Ward Boston, USN, JAG (Ret.).)
confused the USS Liberty with the El Quseir, an Egyptian ship allegedly firing upon its forces in the Sinai. But there was no Egyptian naval bombardment that day, nor did the El Quseir (an unmarked 1,700-ton, armed merchant carrier out of service in Alexandria) bear any resemblance to the Liberty.

6. How do you identify a ship if you’re in an airplane? In 1967, the USS Liberty was the most sophisticated intelligence ship in the world, with dozens of large antennas, including a large moon-bounce “satellite” mounted on a tall structure near the stern. It may have been one of the most easily identifiable ships of any navy in the world from a distance of 10,000 tons. It was four times the size of the Egyptian transport it is claimed to have resembled. Freshly painted, the Liberty carried large white identification numbers on its bow. Egyptian hull numbers are painted black.

7. Doesn’t Israel say that the Liberty flew no flag? According to American survivors, a 5-by-8 feet American flag was hoisted early that morning and was flying all day until it was shot away by attacking aircraft. Within several minutes after the attack, the White House and the Secretary of Defense were informed of the Liberty’s identity by an Israeli official. It was a case of mistaken identity.

8. Could Israeli thought have the ship was in a walled-in canal or harbor? According to surviving crewmembers, Israeli reconnaissance aircraft closely studied the Liberty over an eight-hour period prior to the attack. At least two hundred planes were launched against the Liberty. American survivors have never seen the Liberty’s crew sunbathing on the upper decks just before the attack. The flak was flying in a 12-knot breeze for most of the afternoon.

10. Doesn’t Israel say they ended the attack the minute they saw someone hoist an American flag? The Israeli attack by combined air and naval forces spanned two hours—longer than the attack on Pearl Harbor. The air attack alone lasted approximately 25 minutes: consisting of more than 30 sorties by approximately 12 separate Israeli Air Force fighter jets. The aerial assault was followed by a second wave of large white identification numbers on its bow. Egyptian hull numbers are painted black.

9. What is the American response time? To the air attack, the Liberty’s radio operators found it difficult to transmit a distress signal because the attacking Israeli aircraft jammed all five of the Liberty’s American, not Egyptian, emergency radio channels. However, a call for help did reach the U.S. Navy command in the Mediterranean.

12. What was the American response time? Although a radio call was transmitted at 6:10, it was only 40 minutes away, help did not reach the USS Liberty for seventeen hours. Navy fighters were launched from the aircraft carriers America and Saratoga while the Liberty was under attack. However, they were quickly recalled by the White House. This is the only war the United States has fought where a rescue mission was cancelled when an American ship was under attack.

13. Would Israel have deliberately attacked an American ship? Israel’s response to critics of its decision to launch the attack was: “We have been fifteen times investigated, and we are ready to turn over the record to the American people.” It is claimed to have resembled. Freshly painted, the Liberty carried large white identification numbers on its bow. Egyptian hull numbers are painted black.
PAYING TRIBUTE TO MANCEL PAGE
HON. SCOTT McInNIS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 8, 2004
Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mancel Page, a dedicated watchmaker from Grand Junction, Colorado. Mancel is retiring at the age of 81 after 40 years in the jewelry business, and I want to take this opportunity to recognize his many years of service before this body of Congress and this Nation.

Mancel came by the jewelry business naturally. His mother’s uncle was a jeweler in Germany, and Mancel began taking apart and reparing clocks when he was ten years old. His store, Page Parsons Jewelers, located on the main street of downtown Grand Junction, was founded in 1895 and is one of the oldest businesses in the city. Mancel, grew up repairing clocks and loving sports. He played basketball for his school in Missouri and during the time he served in the military during World War II. Athletics are something outside of work that he still makes time to enjoy.

While in the military Mancel worked at a local jewelry store and then went on to college to study gemology before becoming a certified gemologist. Mancel and his wife Anna moved to Grand Junction in 1950 and bought the jewelry store in 1964. Through the decades Mancel has enjoyed great success. Mancel is also active in Grand Junction community organizations such as the Downtown Development Authority, and the downtown merchant’s association that have been instrumental in revitalizing the downtown area to be more customer friendly.

Mr. Speaker, Mancel Page has dedicated 40 years to the jewelry business and his efforts in the Grand Junction community are highly commendable. I am honored to recognize his many years of service before this body of Congress and this Nation. Thank you for all your hard work Mancel, and I wish you, your wife Anna, and your daughter Peggy all the best in your future endeavors.

DEMOCRATIC PROGRESS IN KAZAKHSTAN
HON. RALPH M. HALL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 8, 2004
Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Republic of Kazakhstan on its continued—and steady—progress toward building a democracy. In particular, I note the recent parliamentary elections held in Kazakhstan on September 19. While the elections show that Kazakhstan has work to do in order to more fully meet international standards for democratic elections, they were a significant improvement over past elections.

Earlier this year, I was visited by members of the Kazakhstan Embassy. Among other information I learned that Kazakhstan gained its independence in 1991. It held its first multiparty election in 1994. In 1999, the republic conducted parliamentary elections that were widely criticized by the international community. Since that time, Kazakhstan passed a much-improved law on elections, held twelve televised debates, conducted effective voter education, permitted more than 1,000 election observers to monitor the elections, and registered 12 parties—including an opposition party that had been refused registration in prior elections. These are all positive steps forward for Kazakhstan—steps that were unthinkable in past elections. I thanked them for their vision, and assured them that as Chairman of the Helsinki Committee on Human Rights and Freedom of the Press, I was part of an American delegation who had visited Kazakhstan to conduct an Air Quality Subcommittee hearing.

Unlike many of his colleagues, Mr. Fossedal examined the situation within the context of Kazakhstan’s young history. He looks at how far Kazakhstan has come since its independence and how it compares with its neighbors. Moreover, the essay makes a compelling case that, considering Kazakhstan’s geographic and demographic position, its steady progress is important to U.S. security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read this essay and I would like to have the text of this essay placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my statement.

OUTSIDE VIEW: BIG PROGRESS IN KAZAKHSTAN
(By Gregory Fossedal)
WASHINGTON, DC, Sept. 24 (UPI)—Kazakhs held national elections on Sunday, prompting comments from a number of outside observers, and all the local opposition, that the vote was a step backwards for democracy. But what’s still small for an emerging middle-income country with 16 million people. But of course, everyone can see that what’s still small for an emerging middle-income country with 16 million people.

By most of these standards, the country seems to have made steady progress. Progress, that is to say, motion towards a goal. Furthermore, considering Kazakhstan’s geographic and demographic position, that’s important to U.S. security and democracy in general.

Measuring a democracy’s progress at the low end of development is a tricky matter, but Kazakhstan’s recent vote appears to have at least two positive signposts.

First, the vote was held, and with numerous international observers. Some of these, especially as covered in the major press, had complaints about both voting mechanics and the results of the poll. However, if this vote took place—especially including reports of “intimidation” of some voters on Election Day, and the lack of a paper trail from vote-counting machines used by about 20 percent of the voters.

In fact, to an extent, that’s the point. Kazakhstan has now held a competitive election, with a largest number of independent observers per capita compared to (say) recent votes in Venezuela, Indonesia or the Philippines. Critics can point out flaws, document the ruling party’s heavy-handedness, and urge future improvements.

The most balanced report to emerge, by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, generated Western headlines saying the election “failed the democracy test” (The New York Times) and even was “fraudulent” (The Washington Times). But the report itself noted positive areas of “progress” as against previous Kazakh elections—the relevant unit of comparison.

Professor Frederick Starr of Johns Hopkins, who was in Kazakhstan to observe, judged the voting to be fundamentally improved over recent Kazakh standards. “Over all . . . the election was “a step forward, not backwards” (The Washington Times).”

Professor Starr, and more importantly, if the results hold up, at least one opposition party will be seated in the Kazakh Parliament. This is an important signpost in democratic development, as the evolution of Mexico, the Philippines, Pakistan, Turkey, and other countries shows. Looking back at countries that have completed a successful democratic transition, opposition seating is normally a key inflection point.

This doesn’t mean that Kazakhstan will be a full democracy shortly, or even in five or 10 years; the government could always crack down and reverse direction. It is, however, forward motion.

In social terms, Kazakhstan also parallels some of the developments seen in Mexico or the Philippines in the 1980s. Income is surging, the economy has grown at an 8 percent to 12 percent pace each of the last five years. The middle class, is growing, with greater access to information, and insistence on freedom of expression.

Kazakhstan doesn’t enjoy much of a democratic free press, for Western audiences. But foreign newspapers and magazines are available in most cities. Mobile telephone usage has more than tripled over five years. In 1997, there were as paltry 15,000 Internet users. This rose to more than 70,000 in 2000, more than 150,000 last year, and probably exceeds 200,000 today. This is still small for an emerging middle-income country with 16 million people. But of course, everyone can see that what’s still small for an emerging middle-income country with 16 million people.