

A recent editorial in the December 14, 2005 issue of USA Today expresses my views very well, and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

[From USA Today, Dec. 15, 2005]

MISGUIDED MORALITY

(By Andrew C. McCarthy and Clifford D. May)

No one favors torture. Torture is already illegal under both U.S. and international law. Nonetheless, the United States is fighting a war against ruthless enemies who obey no rules. We cannot afford to treat all of them with kid gloves all the time.

On the battlefield, we can—and do—kill our enemies. Those we don't kill but only capture should be treated humanely, despite the fact that they do not return the favor when they seize Americans. But those who have information that could save lives must be interrogated effectively. That does not imply torture. It does imply measures that the McCain amendment would ban.

Contrary to what you might have heard, "ticking time-bomb" scenarios are not uncommon. Consider the situation faced by Army Lt. Col. Allen West: Fighting near Tikrit, he captured a suspect who refused to divulge information about a planned ambush.

West fired his revolver to frighten the suspect. The trick worked. The terrorist talked. American lives were saved. And West was accused of torture, charged with assault and drummed out of the military. Next time, will an officer in the same situation decide to let Americans be killed—believing that's what Americans back home demand?

Even more common than the ticking time bomb is the scenario in which a "high-value" suspect is captured, for example a senior al-Qaeda commander who might not know about an imminent attack but who does have information on terrorist recruiting, training and communications.

In this circumstance, torture is not only unneeded but also unhelpful. But the use of "stress and duress" techniques, including rewards for cooperation and punishments for defiance, can, over time, induce a subject to reveal what he knows.

Good policy requires clarity and accountability. Though torture is to be avoided, vague terms such as "cruel" and "degrading" inevitably would be stretched to coddle terrorists unduly. Congress should instead set clear standards, consulting intelligence experts and medical professionals to flesh out which techniques should always be prohibited (for example, those likely to cause death or permanent disability), and which are permissible—and most likely to yield reliable lifesaving information.

Accountability means not leaving serious judgments to junior personnel. Harsh interrogation methods, such as covert operations under current federal law, should require approval by a high-ranking administration official.

Obviously, distinctions must be made between terrorist leaders and low-level operatives. Even so, those arguing that it is better to sacrifice the lives of U.S. troops—or even an American city—rather than cause a terrorist temporary discomfort are making a terrible mistake. They urge a self-destructive policy and a misguided morality.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

**AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO PRODUCE DUPLICATE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 4525**

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized, if necessary, to produce a duplicate engrossment of H.R. 4525.

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

There was no objection.

**ROBERT T. FERGUSON POST OFFICE BUILDING**

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1287) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 332 South Main Street in Flora, Illinois, as the "Robert T. Ferguson Post Office Building," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1287

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. ROBERT T. FERGUSON POST OFFICE BUILDING.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 332 South Main Street in Flora, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "Robert T. Ferguson Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Robert T. Ferguson Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. ROBERT T. FERGUSON POST OFFICE BUILDING.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 312 East North Avenue in Flora, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "Robert T. Ferguson Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Robert T. Ferguson Post Office Building".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 312 East North Avenue in Flora, Illinois, as the 'Robert T. Ferguson Post Office Building'".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**DR. ROBERT E. PRICE POST OFFICE BUILDING**

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4246) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8135 Forest Lane in Dallas, Texas, as the "Dr. Robert E. Price Post Office Building," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4246

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. DR. ROBERT E. PRICE POST OFFICE BUILDING.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8135 Forest Lane in Dallas, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "Dr. Robert E. Price Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Dr. Robert E. Price Post Office Building".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**STATE SENATOR VERDA WELCOME AND DR. HENRY WELCOME POST OFFICE BUILDING**

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4108) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3000 Homewood Avenue in Baltimore, Maryland, as the "State Senator Verda Welcome and Dr. Henry Welcome Post Office Building," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4108

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*