

eight facilities audited. The report concludes that "The U.S. project to rebuild Iraq remains far short of its targets, leaving the country plagued by power outages, inadequate oil production, and shortages of clean water and health care."

Mr. Speaker, it is time to hold the Iraqi Government accountable. This bill's timetable and benchmarks finally hold the Iraqis and the President accountable. As Major General Paul Eaton stated, "This bill gives General Petraeus leverage for moving the Iraqi Government down a more disciplined path laid out by the Iraq Study Group. The real audience for the time-line language is Prime Minister al-Maliki."

Even Defense Secretary Robert Gates has noted that the timetable is helpful and sends a message that "The clock is ticking." Gates said, "The strong feelings expressed by Congress about a timetable probably have had a positive impact in terms of communicating to the Iraqis that this is not an open-ended commitment." That is Secretary Gates.

This bill represents the views of the American people. The latest CBS News/New York Times poll from April 26: 64 percent of Americans favor a timetable that provides a withdrawal of the U.S. troops from Iraq in 2008.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for accountability. The veto was wrong, and we must stand firm.

THE TERRORIST WE CAUGHT BUT WON'T PROSECUTE

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, next week Luis Carriles is scheduled to stand trial for allegedly lying to immigration authorities when he entered the United States 2 years ago.

Most Americans have probably never heard of Carriles, but everyone should know the real case against him because it shows the double standard of the Bush administration and its so-called commitment to fight terrorism.

Carriles is being prosecuted for an immigration violation in America, but he has been convicted in other nations for acts of terrorism, including the downing of a commercial Cuban airliner over 30 years ago that killed 33 innocent people. He is a wanted international fugitive. The Bush administration knows this, but instead of turning Carriles over to the sovereign Governments of Cuba or Venezuela, as they have asked, we are going to get him on an immigration violation.

Why is the Bush administration handling Carriles in this way? Three letters say it all: CIA.

Carriles was a CIA agent. He was part of the Bay of Pigs debacle, and his fierce opposition to Cuban President Fidel Castro has been reported by the media.

Officially, Carriles left the CIA in the middle of 1976. That is the year that Luis Carriles was convicted in Venezuela of masterminding the downing of the Cuban airplane.

The administration won't reveal what role Carriles played as a CIA agent or what his assignments were. His shadowy connections to the United States Government almost certainly continued after he and the agency parted ways. The media has reported that Carriles helped funnel U.S. supplies to the Contra rebels attempting to overthrow the Sandinista government in Nicaragua in the 1980s.

Carriles himself has personally boasted of a role in the deadly bombings of hotels in Havana, Cuba, in the 1990s. And Carriles was also convicted in Panama in the year 2000 for a plot to assassinate Fidel Castro. He was sentenced to prison, but he was later pardoned and set free.

You would think that capturing a man like this would have the administration calling a news conference to declare their success in the war on terror with a long-sought terrorist in custody. Not so. Instead, the administration is busy trying to get a court to bar him from testifying about what he did for the CIA. Carriles' lawyers have said his client will talk about that, and the assignments during and after his official employment. One of the CIA directors during the time of Carriles' connection to the agency was former President George H. W. Bush, the President's father.

The American people have a right to know what really happened in the 1970s and what role, if any, the United States played in the deadly games of Carriles. Was he a rogue agent or was he acting on CIA orders?

The Cuban Government wants him, but we are not talking to Havana as long as Castro is alive and in power. Venezuela, which has an 80-year-old extradition treaty with the United States, has repeatedly asked for Carriles. But the President isn't talking to Venezuela, either, so those requests have been denied.

The U.S. Customs and Immigration Service says Carriles poses a significant danger to our Nation, but the U.S. Justice Department just hasn't acted.

In a recent editorial that I submit for printing in the RECORD, the Los Angeles Times described Luis Posada Carriles as "the Zacarias Moussaoui of Havana and Caracas." The Times points out that Moussaoui is serving a life sentence without parole for his role in the 9/11 attacks, but Carriles was released on bail and is living at home in Miami, with his family, awaiting trial next week. The U.S. is holding a person convicted of major terrorist acts in other countries, but he is going to be prosecuted for an immigration infraction. That is like bringing Osama bin Laden in and trying him for a traffic ticket.

The moral compass of the Bush administration is just spinning round and

round over the treatment of Posada Carriles. Next week it is going to stop on a new direction: H, for hypocrisy.

[From the LA Times, Apr. 20, 2007]

A TERRORIST WALKS: LUIS POSADA CARRILES HAS BOASTED OF BOMBING HAVANA HOTELS, YET AMERICAN JUSTICE LETS HIM GO FREE

With a misguided decision upholding bail for Cuban-born terrorist Luis Posada Carriles, the U.S. 5th Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans has done more than free a frail old man facing unremarkable immigration charges. It has exposed Washington to legitimate charges of hypocrisy in the war on terror.

By allowing Posada to go free before his May 11 trial, the court has released a known flight risk who previously escaped from a Venezuelan prison, a man who has boasted of helping set off deadly bombs in Havana hotels 10 years ago and the alleged mastermind of a 1976 bombing of a Cuban airplane that killed 73 people. Posada's employees confessed to the attack, and declassified FBI and CIA documents have shown that he attended planning sessions.

In other words, Posada is the Zacarias Moussaoui of Havana and Caracas. Moussaoui is serving a life sentence without parole in a federal prison in Colorado for conspiracy in the 9/11 attacks; Posada is free to live in Miami.

Posada, a 79-year-old Bay of Pigs veteran who served time in Panama for plotting to kill Fidel Castro, has never been charged with crimes of terrorism in U.S. courts. Instead, Immigrations and Customs Enforcement nabbed him for lying to immigration authorities after he sneaked in the country in March 2005 and held a news conference announcing his triumphant return. Both Customs and the Justice Department lobbied to keep Posada behind bars, but U.S. law enforcement has never shown a strong interest in trying him for more serious crimes. In turn, Posada's lawyer has preemptively warned that if charged, his client would likely reveal extensive collaboration with the CIA.

The United States keeps 385 suspected terrorists imprisoned in Guantanamo Bay, many in isolation and all without U.S. norms of due process. Yet Posada, a confessed terrorist, is sent home with an ankle bracelet.

The United States has not been able to persuade any of seven allied nations to accept Posada. A federal judge has ruled that he can't be extradited to Cuba or Venezuela because he might be tortured. The best solution would have been for the court to refuse bail until trial while the State Department keeps searching for a third-party country that would agree to try him on terrorism charges.

Instead, Castro receives a propaganda victory gift, the White House has its moral authority undermined and the victims of Carriles' alleged crimes see justice delayed once more.

The U.S. government has done many odd things in 46 years of a largely failed Cuba policy, but letting a notorious terrorist walk stands among the most perverse yet.

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

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

IRAQ WAR SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the issue of the Iraqi supplemental that we are currently about to redo.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the President in his regional message indicated that the bill "is loaded with billions of dollars in nonemergency spending that has nothing to do with fighting the war on terror." He went on to say that Congress should debate these spending measures on their own merits and not as a part of an emergency funding bill for our troops.

Mr. Speaker, for 19 months now, we have been trying to get this administration to pay attention to the people on the gulf coast. We have for weeks and months been trying to get the President to support our efforts to make sure that many of the families and friends of our troops, who have been affected in Louisiana, Mississippi, and even in Florida and Texas by this catastrophic event perpetrated by Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma, get help. Today, we have not been able to get the President to support our efforts as we have tried to address these emergencies.

And so, Mr. Speaker, since we are doing an emergency spending bill, we thought it very appropriate for us to do both international and domestic emergencies all in one piece of legislation. Consequently, we have moved in this legislation to address issues such as the East and West Bank Levee Protection and Coastal Restoration System in New Orleans and the surrounding parishes by inserting into this legislation \$1.3 billion. We have added another \$30 million for K-12 education recruitment assistance, another \$30 million for higher education assistance.

I plan to be in Baton Rouge next week to address Southern University's commencement exercises. I would hope that, as I go there, I can carry them more than mere promises to get them to feeling, once again, that we in this body are paying attention to and responding to the problems that they are suffering, many of them having lost a full year out of their educational pursuits.

I would hope that those children in K through 12 can begin to feel that here in this Congress, with this emergency supplemental, that we are going to respond to them as well.

And then there is the Community Disaster Loan Forgiveness Program. We have put language in this bill to address that issue, \$4.3 billion for FEMA disaster recovery grants. These State and local grants will be waived, meaning that the Federal Government will be able to finance 100 percent of the grants.

We have been trying for a long time now to get this administration to treat the victims of Katrina, Rita and Wilma

in the same way we treated disasters after 9/11 in New York, the same way we treated the earthquakes in California, the same way we treated the Hurricane Andrew down in Florida some years ago and Hurricane Anika out in Hawaii. In each one of those instances, we waived matching requirements. In this instance, we have not. And so we want, in this administration, to waive those requirements of the Stafford Act, the matching requirements, so that we can begin to address these emergencies.

There are other emergencies that we plan to address here, and that is the Children's Health Insurance Program. We think, with 14 States out of money, another 3 States expected to be out of money by September 1, it is an emergency for the children in those 17 States, and I would hope that when we put the final bill together to send back to the President, we will address these emergencies that we have with our people here at home.

□ 1615

REPUBLICAN STUDY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COHEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minority Leader for affording not only myself, but other members of the Republican Study Committee, the House conservative caucus on the Republican side of the aisle, the opportunity to take advantage of these opportunities on the House floor periodically in the form of a Special Order.

While I come to the floor today with the objective, Mr. Speaker, of addressing this week's momentous events concerning the President's second veto in the history of this administration and the war supplemental bill, I wanted to also speak about an issue that House conservatives have been heard on and have been active on in the course of this week, and it has to do with today's passage, by a vote of 237-180, of H.R. 1592, the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act. This legislation passed the House today, but not without the strenuous opposition of both the Republican Study Committee, and virtually all of its members who represented a lion's share of the 180 Members who opposed this legislation.

And to lead is to be misunderstood. And it is very likely, Mr. Speaker, that both yourself and maybe others that might be looking in would question why anyone would oppose hate crimes legislation. And I thought I might, before I move on to the attendant topic of the day, address the concerns that House conservatives had with this legislation and why, last night, with the leadership of our caucus chairman, JEB HENSARLING of Texas, and with the support of myself as a former chairman of

our caucus, Mrs. SUE MYRICK of North Carolina, a former chairman of our conference, and JOHN SHADEGG of Arizona, we urged the President of the United States to issue a veto threat of this hate crimes legislation, which he did so earlier today by way of a statement of administration policy.

So let me speak to our concerns about this bill before I move on to the topic of the Iraq supplemental. Thomas Jefferson said, famously, "Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legislative power of government reach actions only, and not opinions," Jefferson went on to say, "I contemplate with sovereign reverence that the act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, thus building a wall of separation between church and state."

Again, Thomas Jefferson, framing, as perhaps only he in American history could, the issue that grounded conservative concern in the hate crimes legislation today, that legislative powers of government should reach actions only and not opinions, and then reflected on that as the core central logic behind the first amendment protections of the freedom of religion.

In the case of the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act, we did not meet that standard today, Mr. Speaker. I believe this legislation was bad public policy, and unnecessary, and many House conservatives in the Republican Study Committee agreed.

Violent attacks on people or property are already illegal, regardless of the motive behind them. And there is no evidence presented on the floor today or before the Judiciary Committee, on which I serve, that underlying violent crimes at issue are not already being fully and aggressively prosecuted in the States. Therefore, hate crimes laws truly serve no practical purpose and instead serve to penalize people for thoughts, for belief, for opinions.

Now, let's grant the point. Some thoughts, beliefs and opinions, like racism or sexism are abhorrent, and I disdain them and condemn them. However, hate crimes bills, as the one we passed today, are broad enough also to include legitimate beliefs, and protecting the rights of freedom and speech and religion must be paramount in cases like the bill we consider today.

The first amendment to the Constitution provides that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Now, America was founded on the notion that the government should not interfere with the religious practices of its citizens. Constitutional protections for the free exercise of religion are at the very core of the American experiment in democracy.