

This has contributed to the pool of several hundred thousand HIV+ Americans who are unable to access available appropriate treatment for their HIV disease. This is dangerous to their personal health and quality of life, as well as to the public health. This ensures that more costly hospital interventions will be forthcoming in federal, state, local, and private funding streams, as HIV progresses without proper treatment.

I urge the conference committee to fully fund ADAP at \$303 million. All Americans living with HIV/AIDS must get the help they need to purchase their medications and save and improve their lives.

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 24, 2005

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the courage, spirit and resiliency of refugees around the world and the compassion, generosity and valor of those who have helped them rebuild their lives. The amazing stories of these people are an inspiration to us all.

The lives of refugees are driven by fear of persecution based on race, religion or nationality; or even by membership in a particular social group or political opinion. The United States government plays a unique role in protecting the human rights of current refugees, resolving the conflicts and problems that produce refugees and preventing further refugee crises. Our government must remain a world leader in protecting the human rights of all refugees.

According to statistics from the U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants, as of December 31, 2004 there are approximately 11.5 million refugees and asylum seekers worldwide. The United States has the capacity and the potential to receive many more refugees: in fiscal year 2004, the refugee ceiling was set at 70,000, while admissions into the United States totaled only 52,875.

I challenge the United States government to ensure a fair process for determining refugee status and to provide physical protection for those seeking asylum. Moreover, the United States should not unnecessarily detain refugee seekers in an attempt to deter them or others from seeking asylum in the United States; such a process is fundamentally contrary to the hope of freedom and democracy that our country represents.

I applaud the United States government for granting refugees basic human rights such as access to work, the means to earn a livelihood and the freedom of movement.

As a representative from California, a State with one of the highest number of refugee arrivals each year, I know there is much yet to be done to protect the rights of refugees.

Mr. Speaker, honoring the courage of refugees requires more than mere praise; we need concrete actions and durable solutions. In their battle against despair, let us be an ally to refugees; let us provide a glimmer of hope; let us be the beacon that America has always symbolized.

PAUL KRUGMAN'S ESSAY
ENTITLED "THE WAR PRESIDENT"

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 24, 2005

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to my colleagues Paul Krugman's essay entitled "The War President" which was published in today's New York Times. How this country gets involved in a war always matters and since Congress has the Constitutional power to declare war, every Member of Congress must know how we got there, what we're doing there now and how the war shall end.

[From the New York Times, Jun. 24, 2005]

THE WAR PRESIDENT

(By Paul Krugman)

In this former imperial capital, every square seems to contain a giant statue of a Habsburg on horseback, posing as a conquering hero.

America's founders knew all too well how war appeals to the vanity of rulers and their thirst for glory. That's why they took care to deny presidents the kingly privilege of making war at their own discretion.

But after 9/11 President Bush, with obvious relish, declared himself a "war president." And he kept the nation focused on martial matters by morphing the pursuit of Al Qaeda into a war against Saddam Hussein.

In November 2002, Helen Thomas, the veteran White House correspondent, told an audience, "I have never covered a president who actually wanted to go to war"—but she made it clear that Mr. Bush was the exception. And she was right.

Leading the nation wrongfully into war strikes at the heart of democracy. It would have been an unprecedented abuse of power even if the war hadn't turned into a military and moral quagmire. And we won't be able to get out of that quagmire until we face up to the reality of how we got in.

Let me talk briefly about what we now know about the decision to invade Iraq, then focus on why it matters.

The administration has prevented any official inquiry into whether it hyped the case for war. But there's plenty of circumstantial evidence that it did.

And then there's the Downing Street Memo—actually the minutes of a prime minister's meeting in July 2002—in which the chief of British overseas intelligence briefed his colleagues about his recent trip to Washington.

"Bush wanted to remove Saddam," says the memo, "through military action, justified by the conjunction of terrorism and W.M.D. But the intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy." It doesn't get much clearer than that.

The U.S. news media largely ignored the memo for five weeks after it was released in The Times of London. Then some asserted that it was "old news" that Mr. Bush wanted war in the summer of 2002, and that W.M.D. were just an excuse. No, it isn't. Media insiders may have suspected as much, but they didn't inform their readers, viewers and listeners. And they have never held Mr. Bush accountable for his repeated declarations that he viewed war as a last resort.

Still, some of my colleagues insist that we should let bygones be bygones. The question, they say, is what we do now. But they're wrong: it's crucial that those responsible for the war be held to account.

Let me explain. The United States will soon have to start reducing force levels in

Iraq, or risk seeing the volunteer Army collapse. Yet the administration and its supporters have effectively prevented any adult discussion of the need to get out.

On one side, the people who sold this war, unable to face up to the fact that their fantasies of a splendid little war have led to disaster, are still peddling illusions: the insurgency is in its "last throes," says Dick Cheney. On the other, they still have moderates and even liberals intimidated: anyone who suggests that the United States will have to settle for something that falls far short of victory is accused of being unpatriotic.

We need to deprive these people of their ability to mislead and intimidate. And the best way to do that is to make it clear that the people who led us to war on false pretenses have no credibility, and no right to lecture the rest of us about patriotism.

The good news is that the public seems ready to hear that message—readier than the media are to deliver it. Major media organizations still act as if only a small, left-wing fringe believes that we were misled into war, but that "fringe" now comprises much if not most of the population.

In a Gallup poll taken in early April—that is, before the release of the Downing Street Memo—50 percent of those polled agreed with the proposition that the administration "deliberately misled the American public" about Iraq's W.M.D. In a new Rasmussen poll, 49 percent said that Mr. Bush was more responsible for the war than Saddam Hussein, versus 44 percent who blamed Saddam.

Once the media catch up with the public, we'll be able to start talking seriously about how to get out of Iraq.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2005

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2475.

I commend the leadership of the Chairman and Ranking Member, and thank them for supporting the amendment I offered at markup to align the authorization for an important technical program with the level set by the Armed Services Committee.

H.R. 2475 also underscores the importance the Committee places on providing full-funding of intelligence requirements related to the global war on terrorism. For years, Intelligence Committee Democrats have fought hard for this. If fact, some of us voted against the intelligence bill last year because it contained less than one-third of the funding needed for counterterrorism. This year, I'm pleased the Committee has finally brought a bill before the House that provides full intelligence funding for our dedicated men and women on the front lines.

This bill also includes House Resolution 173, a measure which encourages the DNI to establish a uniform, multi-tiered security clearance system. Such a system is needed to ensure all intelligence agencies fully-leverage the cultural knowledge and foreign language skills of people who may not be able to be cleared, in a timely manner, to the highest levels. It will also help increase the workforce diversity and skills-mix, both of which are critical to the future success and viability of the Intelligence Community.