

justice and respect for obligations arising from treaties and the dignity and the worth of the human person?

In fact, in raising the United Nations' duty to promoting dignity and humanity, how ironic it has become that countries like Sudan, Zimbabwe, Cuba, Saudi Arabia, and even China now comprise the membership in the United Nations' Commission on Human Rights.

This body must act. It must act now. And it must start with demanding that Kofi Annan step down. He is responsible for the conduct of the United Nation, because in our society we look to the head of any organization. Then let us try to aid congressional investigators in their efforts to unravel the deception and gluttony and the corruption perpetrated for years by the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to make those comments; and I hope that we as a body can make a statement that the United Nations is going to be held accountable for its conduct.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for his comments. I thank you for bringing so many of points to the public's attention.

You raise a point of whatever happened to the U.N. charter. That is something we have been discussing tonight extensively. Whatever did happen to the charter and the role that the U.N. was set up for back in 1945?

You also used the expression, I noticed a couple of times as you went through, a litany, a litany of abuses by the U.N., whether it was the 150 human rights abuses or the forced prostitution and on and on. Each time I noticed that you mentioned the words, you said "not to mention this," as a phrase. Well, it is good thing. I appreciate the fact that you are here tonight. I appreciate the fact that you are mentioning these points, because, as you know, most of these points are not being mentioned in the mainstream media. Most of these points are not being driven home back at home, throughout our communities and the rest of the world as well.

So I applaud you for mentioning them and making sure that these are at the front of people's attention so that this body can do just as you said, hold this institution accountable. I thank the gentleman for his work.

□ 1530

The gentleman has raised so many important points that we need to go to in more detail. And as we begin to look at the reform next week, legislation, I hope that we will have the opportunity to explore each and every one of these in more detail so that the public can have a better understanding of just the number of abuses. We just touched on a little bit of detail about the Oil-for-Food scandal and abuses of the U.N. as far as that scandal and as far as the cover up that seems to be going on.

I join with the gentleman in saying that we should be asking for the head of the U.N. to step down now so that he can be replaced with someone that we all have confidence in in the interim period of time until, if ever, reform is made at the U.N. so that American taxpayers can look and say with pride, this is where our tax dollars are going, as opposed to the abuses where it is going on right now; the abuses that are, as I said before, just a litany. The gentleman mentioned the 150 alleged human rights abuses by the U.N., by the very peacekeepers who are going into these countries that are trying to make these countries safe, such as in the Congo. Instead, they bring tragedy to the very people who become victims of the U.N. as opposed to the warring factions that are over there.

The gentleman made reference also to the idea of forced prostitution. This is forced prostitution by little tiny kids. 10-year-old girls have been allegedly used and compelled into prostitution, a tragedy that is happening under the auspices of the U.N. body that we are funding. These young women, these young girls that are being compelled to be involved in this, the phrase used now just as we had the Oil-for-Food scandal, now we have the sex-for-food scandal as well.

We are talking about impoverished countries over there where food is hard to come by and people are starving in parts of Africa. And they are being, well, forced under these conditions to sell themselves for a jug of milk or a bit of food or for a dollar. For that reason now the phrase sex-for-food is here. They have also been phrased "the dollar girls" in these areas as well, again, under the watchful noses and willing acquiescence by the U.N. because it is the very people that the U.N. has engaged over there that have allowed this conduct to go on.

I believe we have significantly more issues to address, but we have only touched the tip of the iceberg as far as the need of reform or the drastic changes as far as the relationship between the United States and the U.N. I thank the Speaker for this opportunity to bring it to the American public.

CATCH THE BUS OF OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, last month I was able to do a Special Order thanks to the minority leader and her staff who have secured time so that I can come on to the House floor and address this Congress and the leadership of this Congress and the American people.

Last month's Special Order, which is what these talks are called after legislative business has been dispensed with, was about a bus, the bus of oppor-

tunity. And it was a plea to the leaders of this Congress, to the leaders of this administration, to the leaders of this country to not allow Americans to be left behind as the bus of opportunity pulls off.

I talked about the experience that I had with a little boy who was trying to catch a metro bus to school. And he yelled to me and I ran and I ran and I ran to catch up with that bus and I told the little boy, You can run. You can catch the bus. And we caught that bus as it idled at a red light. We pounded on the door. The bus driver nodded her recognition of my request to let the little boy board the bus, and then she shook her head no and drove away. The little boy was crushed, but he caught the next bus, and I assume he successfully made it to school.

Then I talked about some statistics from leading organizations that keep them about the dire straits faced by too many Americans, and in particular too many African Americans. I showed these charts on imprisonment, the disparities that exist in our country. If you look at imprisonment, which is an indication of the status of justice in this country, it will take for the gap to close between the rates of imprisonment for African Americans and the rates of imprisonment for white Americans to close, it will take 190 years.

For poverty, for the rate of poverty experienced by African Americans, to catch up to the rate of poverty experienced by white Americans it will take 150 years to close that gap if nothing is done in the area of public policy. Child poverty, 210 years to erase the gap of a large number of African American children who experience poverty. Income, 581 years to close the income gap experienced by African Americans in this country. And, finally, because the President talks about homeownership and the power of homeownership and how this budget that this Congress is now in the process of passing, is to promote homeownership in this country, sadly the rate of homeownership in the African American community pales in comparison to that experienced in the white community. It will take 1,664 years to close the homeownership gap if nothing is done.

So I ask the leadership of this Congress to please pay attention to these statistics because these statistics represent real people. And despite what the Republicans say about us having a growth economy, the sad fact is that if we do nothing, too many Americans are being left behind, too many Americans. And so I ask that we leave no American behind.

Mr. Speaker, in Iraq I ask the question tonight, are we leaving our soul behind? Who are we as a country? What have we become? Do the American people even care? What can we do to regain our soul?

Mr. Speaker, I have noted on this floor that the snows of Kilimanjaro are melting, that the glaciers in the Arctic are melting, that we have real serious

problems that the best minds in our country can devote their talent to solving. And I would like to read a quote from Dwight David Eisenhower about how we choose to spend our resources. He said, "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies in the final sense a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed." President Eisenhower said that.

Then John F. Kennedy in his inaugural address reminded us that the world is very different now for man, for man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life. Kennedy said, "Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request. That both sides begin anew the quest for peace before the dark powers of destruction released by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction." Planned or accidental self-destruction.

Today I would like to do a rollcall, a rollcall of the young men and women who have died in Iraq from my home State of Georgia as compiled by my local newspaper on Monday, May 30. In addition, I would like to read a few articles and I would like to read those articles all with one question or one series of questions in mind: Who are we? What do we stand for? What is being done in our name? Is there a way out?

I will begin to read Georgia's Memorial Day honor roll. Jamaal Addison, 22, died March 23, 2003; Diego Fernando Rincon, 19, died March 29, 2003; Wilbert Davis, age 40, died April 3, 2003; Edward J. Korn, 31, died April 3, 2003; David T. Nutt, 32, died May 14, 2003; John K. Klinessmith, Jr., died June 12, 2003; Michael Crockett, age 27, died July 24, 2003; Nathaniel Hart, Jr., age 29, died July 28, 2003; Bobby Franklin, age 38, died August 20, 2003; Benjamin Freeman, age 19, died October 13, 2003; Jerry Wilson, age 45, died November 23, 2003; Marshall Edgerton, age 27, died December 11, 2003; Christopher Holland, age 26, died December 17, 2003; Nathaniel Johnson, age 22, died January 8, 2004; Ricky Crockett, age 38, died January 12, 2004; Thomas Thigpen, age 52, died March 16, 2004; William R. Strange, age 19, died April 2, 2004; Justin Johnson, age 22, died April 10, 2004; Antoine Holt, age 20, died April 10, 2004; Marvin Camposiles, age 25, died April 17, 2004; Marquis Whitaker, age 20, died April 27, 2004; Christopher Dickerson, age 33, died April 30, 2004.

□ 1545

Juan Lopez, age 22, died June 21, 2004. Tyler Brown, age 26, died September 14, 2004. Foster Pinkston, age 47, died September 16, 2004. Michael Scarborough, age 28, died October 30, 2004. Kelley Courtney, age 28, died October 30, 2004. Dan Malcom, Junior, age 25, died November 10, 2004. Jonathan Shields, 25, died November 12, 2004. Jeffrey Blanton, age 23, died December 12, 2004.

Bennie J. Washington, age 25, died January 4, 2005. Jesus Fonseca, age 19, died January 17, 2005. David Salie, age 34, died February 14, 2005. Tyler Dickens, age 20, died April 12, 2005. John McGee, age 36, died May 2, 2005. Charles Gillican, the Third, age 35, died May 14, 2005.

The sad fact, even sadder than the way I feel right now after having read those names, is that we may not even have the real story. We may not know the true costs of this war. I am told U.S. military personnel who died in German hospitals en route to German hospitals are not counted. So, in addition to the more than 1,000 Americans who have lost their lives in this war, there are an additional 6,210 who died in German hospitals or en route to those hospitals.

Brian Harring writes in the Domestic Intelligence Reporter that the Bush administration has sworn up and down that it will never reinstate the draft. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, in an op-ed blaming conspiracy mongers for attempting to scare and mislead young Americans, insisted that the idea of reinstating the draft has never been debated, endorsed, discussed, theorized, pondered or even whispered by anyone in the Bush administration.

However, in the Domestic Intelligence Reporter, Brian Harring writes that assertion is demonstrably false. According to an internal Selective Service memo made public under the Freedom of Information Act, the agency's acting director met with two of Rumsfeld's under secretaries in February, 2003, precisely to debate, discuss and ponder a return to the draft.

The memo then proposes in detail that the Selective Service be reengineered to cover all Americans, men and, for the first time, women, ages 18 to 34.

I ask the question, what are we setting ourselves up for? What exactly are we doing?

The Washington Post ran an article, and it told us that the Army was going to issue combat badges for soldiers not in the infantry. The opening paragraph states: Any Army soldier who has seen active combat while in Iraq or Afghanistan may now receive a new Combat Action Badge, making tens of thousands of soldiers who are not in the infantry ranks, including women, eligible for a combat award for the first time. It recognizes that in the current realities of the battlefield and insurgency any soldier can be subject to a combat situation.

However, the story also recognizes that more than halfway through fiscal year 2005 the Army is 15 percent behind in its effort to enlist new soldiers.

What is this administration's position on women in combat?

The Mideast Stars and Stripes ran a story entitled, Marine Raid Breaks Gender Barrier.

"Lance Corporal Erin Libby doesn't want to be treated the same as her male Marine Corps counterparts. But

she does want to be treated as an equal, even in combat.

"In a way, she got her chance last weekend when Marines from the 3rd Battalion, 8th Marine Regiment, led a raid into the city of Karmah in search of high-value targets and hidden weapons.

"'We're out here, and we're rocking on the front line,' said Libby, a 21-year old from Niceville, Florida.

"'This is history,' Chief Warrant Officer Jill St. John is quoted as saying. 'I've been in the Marine Corps for 18 years, and this is my first opportunity to be out with an infantry company. Even 5 years ago, the Marine Corps wouldn't be doing this. This is a major change in how we think women can be used in the military.'"

Then there is the headline from the Guardian that says, The U.S. Lowers Standards in Army Numbers Crisis. Why do we need to do this?

"The U.S. military has stopped battalion commanders from dismissing new recruits for drug abuse, alcohol, poor fitness and pregnancy in an attempt to halt the rising attrition rate in an Army under growing strain."

Last month, the Army announced that it was 6,000 soldiers short of its recruitment targets for the year so far, and tomorrow we are supposed to hear the latest numbers for recruitment.

We are told in this article that recruiters have been given greater leeway. By doing things to increase quantity, you are also doing things to decrease quality, but they have made the judgment that that is the way to go.

Now the Stars and Stripes ran a story that has to be disheartening to anyone who would read it. The headline: Advocates See Veterans of War on Terror Joining the Ranks of the Homeless.

"Advocates for the homeless already are seeing veterans from the war on terror living on the street and say the government must do more to ease their transition from military to civilian life.

"Veteran affairs officials estimate that about 250,000 veterans are homeless on any given night, and another 250,000 experience homelessness at some point."

How can it be that if we have a million people sleeping on the streets of America at night that a quarter of them could be veterans? How do we choose to spend our money? It is certainly not to decrease the disparities that exist in this country, and it certainly is not to get rid of those who are homeless, and it certainly is not to take care of even the veterans, the veterans of our current war on terror. Too many of them are sleeping on the street.

As for the war in Iraq, how did we get into this? My colleagues can come down and talk about the war. War is just a word for many of us who do not experience it, who do not feel it, who do not understand it. But there is an author by the name of James Bamford

who has done a lot of writing about the U.S. intelligence establishment. He has written a new book, and he was interviewed by a Kevin Zeese about the new book. That book is entitled, *A Pretext For War*, and this is how Bamford explains how it came to be that we got involved in this war. This is what Bamford says.

James Bamford says of his book, "Pretext is the only book to take an in-depth look at the U.S. intelligence community from before 9/11 to the war in Iraq. It describes how CIA Director George Tenet, while succeeding in increasing the personnel strength of the CIA's clandestine service during the late 1990s, failed to change the culture, direction and training from a Cold War focus to a counterterrorism focus . . . Thus, the CIA never even tried to penetrate al Qaeda during the years leading up to 9/11, believing it too difficult, too dangerous or not their job, depending on which agency official I interviewed." This is James Bamford speaking.

He continues to say, "Pretext also takes the only minute-by-minute look, about one-third of the book, at the confusion and chaos taking place among senior officials in Washington and elsewhere in the hours following the 9/11 attack. It examines everything from the secret locations to which the Vice President and other officials disappeared, to the evacuation of the intelligence agencies, to the highly secret continuance of government procedures that were activated, many for the very first time.

"Next, Pretext describes how the claims involving Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, the connections between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda and Hussein's involvement with 9/11 were simply used as pretexts for a war long planned by a small group of neoconservatives supportive of the Israeli government's policies and the expansion of U.S. military power throughout the Middle East. It examines how top Bush administration officials, Richard Perle, Douglas Feith and David Wurmser first drafted a plan outlining an attack on Iraq and removal of Saddam Hussein in 1996.

□ 1600

"But the document titled 'A Clean Break' was drafted for Israel not the United States." This is James Bamford speaking: "At the time the three were acting as advisers to newly elected Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu. 'Israel can shape its strategic environment. This effort can focus on removing Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq, an important Israeli strategic objective.' Not satisfied with regime change in Iraq, they went on to recommend that Israel shape its strategic environment by rolling back Syria."

Bamford continues: "Wurmser then authored a paper in January 2001 arguing that the U.S. and Israel jointly launch a preemptive war throughout the Middle East and North Africa to es-

tablish U.S.-Israeli dominance. The U.S. and Israel should 'strike fatally, not merely disarm, the centers of radicalism in the regions of Damascus, Baghdad, Tripoli, Tehran and Gaza.' He added that 'crisis were opportunities.'" This is Wurmser being quoted by James Bamford. Bamford continues: "About the same time on January 30, 2001, President Bush held his first National Security Council meeting, and according to former Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill discussed only two topics, becoming closer to Israel's Ariel Sharon and locating targets to attack in Iraq."

Bamford continues: "As Wurmser had suggested following the 9/11 attacks, the Bush administration immediately began using the crisis as an opportunity to launch their long-planned war against Iraq.

"At 2:40 p.m. on September 11, as the Pentagon was still burning," and this is Bamford continuing, "Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld dictated notes of his intention to blame Saddam Hussein even though there was no evidence of such link and all of the intelligence pointed exclusively to bin Laden and al Qaeda. 'Hit S.H. at same time.'" That is Rumsfeld. "Sweep him up whether related to 9/11 or not." Bamford continues: "Next Wurmser was put in charge of a secret unit in Feith's office with a cover name Policy Counterterrorism Evaluation Group. Its function was to gather and feed less than credible intelligence, intelligence discounted by the CIA such as the supposed Niger uranium deal to the White House and Vice President CHENEY's office. Wurmser is now Cheney's top Middle East adviser."

Bamford continues: "Finally, Pretext closely examines the numerous lies and deceptions presented to the Congress, the American people, and the world in order to justify the war in Iraq."

Bamford says: "Finally, Pretext closely examines the numerous lies and deceptions presented to the Congress, the American public, and the world in order to justify the war in Iraq."

One last note: he also tells us that there is another problem and that is of the CIA's new license to kill anytime and anywhere, overseas without oversight. He says they are now using missile-armed drones to do assassinations in Pakistan, Yemen, Afghanistan, and other places in total secrecy, often without notice even to the host countries; and these problems just scratch the surface in the intelligence community. James Bamford, author, investigative journalist, reporter, telling us the truth about how we came to be in Iraq.

I would invoke another name, the name is Pat Tillman. Pat Tillman's family questions the reversal on the cause of the Ranger's death. The Washington Post tells us that former NFL player Pat Tillman's family is lashing out against the Army saying that the military's investigations into Tillman's friendly-fire death in Afghani-

stan last year were a sham, and the Army's efforts to cover up the truth have made it harder for them to deal with their loss more than a year after their son was shot several times by his fellow Army Rangers.

Tillman's mother and father said in interviews they believe the government and the military created a heroic tale about how their son died to foster a patriotic response across the country. They say the Army's lies about what happened have made them suspicious and they are certain they will never get the full story. "Pat had high ideals about the country, that is why he did what he did," Mary Tillman said in her first lengthy interview since her son's death. "The military let him down. The administration let him down. It was a sign of disrespect. The fact that he was the ultimate team player and he watched his own men kill him is absolutely heartbreaking and tragic. The fact that they too lied about it afterwards is disgusting."

Pat Tillman's father says, "Maybe lying is not a big deal any more. Pat is dead, and this is not going to bring him back. But these guys should have been held up to scrutiny right up the chain of command, and no one has.

"If this is what happens when someone high profile dies, I can only imagine what happens with everyone else." These are quotes from the Washington Post from Pat Tillman's parents.

And then there is the matter of the money, the money, the cost of this war. The cost of these priorities is at the expense of America's neighborhoods. Where is the money?

The Washington Post again tells us that an audit of Iraq's spending spurs criminal probe. Now the Department of Defense has admitted that they cannot track \$2.3 trillion, and we know that \$100 million has been lost here and \$9 million has been lost there, an estimate of \$1 billion being lost every month. This Washington Post article says investigators have opened a criminal inquiry into millions of dollars missing in Iraq after auditors uncovered indications of fraud and nearly \$100 million in reconstruction spending that could not be properly accounted for.

But the leadership in this administration has told us that we can expect war for the next generation. And, indeed, it appears that preparations are being made for such a war, for such an endeavor. Military expansionism, directly against what Dwight Eisenhower warned us about.

We have been told that Bush and Karzai signed a pact for long-term U.S. military presence in Afghanistan. They called it a strategic partnership. The Guardian tells us that the U.S. military is going to build four giant new bases in Iraq.

These U.S. bases pave the way for long-term intervention in Central Asia. The U.S. Government, we are told, has acquired basing or transit rights for passage of war planes and military supplies from nearly two dozen countries

in Central Asia, the Middle East and their periphery, a projection of American power into the center of the Eurasian land mass that has no historical precedent. All told, there are about 350,000 troops deployed worldwide. According to 2002 Pentagon documents, there were only 46 countries in the entire world that had no U.S. military presence. Only 46 countries in the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention tonight as I begin to wind down, H.R. 2723, which was introduced recently by my esteemed colleague from New York to provide for the common defense by requiring that all young persons in the United States, including women, perform a period of military service or a period of civilian service in furtherance of the national defense and homeland security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2723 establishes civilian service, military service, a requirement. It sets out the length of time of that service, conditions for termination of that service, types of civilian service, implementation standards by the President, compensation and benefits for people age 18 to 26. It establishes deferments and postponements for high school students, those experiencing certain hardships and disability, establishes induction exceptions, for example, for people who do not have proper training. It establishes conscientious objection and alternative noncombatant or civilian service, discharge, and includes women.

So I thought I would go to the Selective Service Web site and it tells us that Selective Service is also capable of providing inductees with special skills such as health care personnel after authorizing legislation is passed by Congress and a draft is ordered by the President.

□ 1615

The agency would also administer an alternative service program for men classified as conscientious objectors who are required to perform such service in lieu of serving in the military. The question I asked is, how did we get here and where are we going?

I would just like to conclude with the words, and I do not think I will have enough time to read the entire document, but all of this information that I have recounted today is available on the Internet. It is in the public domain. It is available in newspapers, domestic and international. It is just a matter of being able to put it all together and reading, reading and understanding.

Smedley Darlington Butler, who was a major general in the United States Marine Corps, wrote a little tome entitled, *War is a Racket*. I would like to submit the entire document into the RECORD and I will read as much of it as I think I can. At least I will read the first opening paragraphs.

“War is a racket. It always has been.

“It is possibly the oldest, easily the most profitable, surely the most vicious. It is the only one international

in scope. It is the only one in which the profits are reckoned in dollars and the losses in lives.

“A racket is best described, I believe, as something that is not what it seems to the majority of the people. Only a small ‘inside’ group knows what it is about. It is conducted for the benefit of the very few, at the expense of the very many. Out of war a few people make huge fortunes.

“In the World War,” and he is talking about World War I because this was written a long time ago, “a mere handful garnered the profits of the conflict. At least 21,000 new millionaires and billionaires were made in the United States during the First World War. That many admitted their huge blood gains in their income tax returns. How many other war millionaires falsified their tax returns no one knows. How many of these war millionaires shouldered a rifle? How many of them dug a trench? How many of them knew what it meant to go hungry in a rat-infested dugout? How many of them spent sleepless, frightened nights, ducking shells and shrapnel and machine gun bullets? How many of them parried a bayonet thrust of an enemy? How many of them were wounded or killed in battle?

“Out of war nations acquire additional territory, if they are victorious. They just take it. This newly acquired territory promptly is exploited by the few, the selfsame few who wrung dollars out of blood in the war. The general public shoulders the bill.

“And what is this bill?

“This bill renders a horrible accounting. Newly placed gravestones. Mangled bodies. Shattered minds. Broken hearts and homes. Economic instability. Depression and all its attendant miseries. Backbreaking taxation for generations and generations.

“For a great many years, as a soldier, I had a suspicion that war was a racket; not until I retired to civil life did I fully realize it. Now that I see the international war clouds gathering, as they are today, I must face it and speak out.”

These are the words of Smedley Darlington Butler in his book, *War is a Racket*.

He goes on, in chapter two, to discuss who makes the profits. He goes through all of the war industries. He talks about the powder people, the steel companies, Anaconda, copper companies, a little increase in profits of approximately 200 percent.

Does war pay? It paid them. But they aren't the only ones, he writes. There are still others. Leather, nickel, sugar. Chicago packers. The bankers. He goes through airplane and engine manufacturers. Shipbuilders.

He says that the Senate committee probe of the munitions industry and its wartime profits, despite its sensational disclosures, hardly has scratched the surface. Even so, it had some effect. The State Department has been studying “for some time” methods of keep-

ing out of war, and so the war department suddenly decides it has a wonderful plan to spring to limit the profits in wartime.

Then he asks the question, but what about a limitation on losses? As far, he writes, as I have been able to ascertain, there is nothing in the scheme to limit a soldier to the loss of but one eye, or one arm, or to limit his wounds to one or two or three. Or to limit the loss of life. Of course, the committee cannot be bothered with such trifling matters.

And then in chapter three, he asks, Who pays the bills? He says that the soldier pays the biggest part of the bill.

In chapter four he says, How do we smash this racket? He says a few profit and the many pay. But there is a way to stop it. It can be smashed effectively only by taking the profit out of war. And then he goes on to describe how that could be done.

He says, let the workers in the plants, let the CEOs of the corporations, let the Members of Congress who appropriate the money all get the same wages, all, even the generals and admirals. Let them get the same wages as the total monthly income of a soldier in the trenches. He says, when you can let the kings and the tycoons and the masters of business earn what the soldiers earn, then maybe we will not have war. Maybe we can take the profit out of war and maybe we can put an end to the racket.

In chapter five, Smedley Butler tells us, I do not use these words, but he says, To hell with war.

I wanted to use some of my time, and I do not have much left, to talk about, maybe to introduce what I will talk about next month, and that is the depravities of war and how we can become inhuman and inhumane. It does not take war, but it certainly seems to be exacerbated by war.

I have a situation in my district where young black men already subdued, confined, in jail, tasered to death, how many black men, unarmed black men have been murdered on the streets of our country? The depravities of war. Who are we? What are we becoming? Why is this? I was told that I have to maintain decorum in this place. I think we as a people, we as a country, we as a Nation need to ask ourselves, what are we doing in Iraq? What are we doing around the world? What are we allowing the leadership of this country to do in our name? And when will we stop it?

BILL GOETZ

(Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of William H. Goetz, who, after 46 years of service to the City of Fort Mitchell, Kentucky, has announced his retirement from public service.

Bill Goetz' career began in 1964 when he began serving on the City Council of