

This gift to Big Oil is a waste of our taxpayers' money and will only lead to other Big Oil giants lining up for similar corporate handouts. We are going backwards. We have gone from shoveling money into the pockets of American multinationals like Enron, that is outrageous enough, to shoveling money into the pockets of foreign multinational corporations and foreign governments.

Where does it stop? Where do we draw the line? When do we adopt a real energy policy in this country that promotes biodiesel, ethanol and other renewable fuels and cures our addiction to foreign oil? How many wars do we have to fight? How many people have to die? How many taxpayer dollars have to be wasted to keep the foreign oil flowing?

The Colombian army brigade that will be trained with these funds will protect a pipeline that, when operational, will pump about 35 million barrels per year. This adds up to \$3 per barrel in costs to U.S. taxpayers to protect a pipeline for which Occidental currently pays security costs of about 50 cents per barrel. Very interesting. Moreover, as military Occidental Oil spokesman Larry Meriage admitted before Congress in February 2000, "This pipeline is 483 miles long, and so there aren't enough troops in all of Colombia to protect that pipeline along its corridor."

Americans should not be in the business of paying for the protection of privately owned foreign oil pipelines abroad. We must act now to defeat this dangerous and wasteful pipeline protection proposal. If this \$6 million down payment is provided now, it will be extremely difficult to stop the \$98 million that is still due when the 2003 foreign operations bill is debated later this year.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to just say no. Say no to the Cano Limon pipeline. Say no to foreign oil. And say no to the Bush administration policy to keep our Nation addicted to foreign oil.

REGARDING EVENTS OF SEPTEMBER 11

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, you have to have some patience to be sitting over here and listening to the last 20 minutes of Democratic rhetoric. Let us start with a little rebuttal because under the rules of the House, as you understand, they do not have to yield time and, of course, they would not yield time so their remarks all tell one side of the story.

Let us start with the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio). In the West we would call the gentleman from Oregon on this subject kind of a Johnny come lately. Where has he been? I noticed he

just ran onto the House floor, still in his Levi's, puts a suit coat on and starts talking about what the Republicans have not done with a company called Stanley Works which makes Stanley tools up there in Connecticut and is trying to avoid U.S. tax by registering with a post office box in Bermuda. He says nobody has heard anything about this. He acts as if he is breaking new ice.

The gentleman from Oregon should have signed on to my bill. I have got the first bill on that to close that loophole. It is a terrible loophole. I had the chairman of that corporation in my office, and I gave that chairman a list of the American soldiers that lost their lives in Afghanistan trying to defend this country and the interests of this Nation. I said that any corporation that does business in America has more than an economic interest in this country. They have a moral responsibility to their community.

□ 1945

They have an inherent obligation to their country that provides them with the freedoms and the fruits of freedoms that this Nation offers to business people.

This country provides the defense for Stanley Tool Company. And, by the way, Stanley Tool Company, which is registering in Bermuda, has zero sales in Bermuda. They freely admit all they are going to do is get a post office box and save \$30 million.

What bothers me about this, I think we can all agree on the issue, Stanley Tool Works, and many of you today, by the way, if you buy Stanley tools, you ought to quit buying them, because Stanley Tools is no longer that American company. They will keep all their manufacturing here, for a while, anyway, but they are going to put that post office box so they do not have to pay taxes, like any of the rest of you in this room. So keep that in mind. Next time you go down and want to buy a tool, you need a tool, do not buy Stanley tools.

What bothers me about the comments of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio), he comes in here strictly on a partisan issue and starts bashing the Republicans. I would say to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio), we have had this bill in place, it is my bill, I know a lot about it, we have had this bill in place for a couple of months. I did not see the gentleman at any of the meetings. I have not seen the gentleman at the Committee on Ways and Means. We have had several meetings in regards to this tax issue.

For the gentleman to come up to the floor, just like a greenhorn, that is what we would call you in the West, somebody that pops on the scene, you know, is kind of fresh to the thing and thinks they know everything, before the gentleman starts up here giving these blasphemous words and language and partisanship against the Republican leadership, the gentleman ought

to look up his bill directory, and I think the gentleman would be surprised. Not only do I have a bill there, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) has a bill, and the gentleman might be surprised there are a couple of people on his side of the aisle that have bills.

To the best of my knowledge, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) has not been at any of these meetings in regards to our effort to stop corporations like Stanley Tool Company from incorporating in Bermuda for the simple reason of avoiding taxes in this country.

So if the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) would spend more time working with us on our side, we are the majority. You were the majority. You could have shut this loophole when you were the majority; you did not. I hope we as the majority, in combination with people like the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) who want to work with us, will shut this loophole.

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) was correct, it is not fair to the American people what this corporation is doing. I hope that the chairman of that corporation who the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) says will make many, many millions of dollars, and I happen to believe he probably is correct, I hope the chairman of that corporation has that list that I gave him of the soldiers who have given their lives so far. Now, this is up to a week ago. I know we lost a soldier yesterday. But up to a week ago, those soldiers who had given their lives so you would be free to do business in this country. I hope that chairman is having second thoughts ever since the moment he left my office. My guess would be that he has not.

But the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio), in my opinion, next time the gentleman wants to start blasting, it is obvious it is a political year, next time the gentleman wants to start blasting us, he ought to figure out if we have not already done the work on it.

I think it gives the gentleman a little more credibility to come in here, not as Johnny-come-lately, but come in here and really come up with some new information and come up with something positive that will help us move the ball.

Now, how interesting, I see in regards to the second speaker that attacks on a very partisan basis and says it is Bush's policy that we have to rely in the future on foreign oil, how little knowledge that individual, in my opinion, has on ethanol, for example.

Take a look at I think today's Wall Street Journal. I would ask my colleague to take a look at that column, on the editorial, guest column on ethanol. Do you know it takes more fossil fuel to generate the Btus of ethanol, to provide a gallon of ethanol, than a gallon of ethanol can give off?

This article points out there is a reason that the people who produce ethanol use fossil fuels for the generation

of the ethanol. It is because fossil fuels are cheaper to produce, and ethanol, in the long run, you are better off to pour the gasoline in the ground than replace it with ethanol, because you use more gas, more Btus, to produce less Btus through ethanol.

My colleague goes on and says all we have to do is have alternative energy. She ignores the facts, either intentionally or accidentally, ignores the facts of alternative energy in this country. Today if we took all of the alternative energy known to the world, all of the alternative energy known to the world, and were able to somehow magically put it in the United States of America, it would only meet about 4 or 5 percent of our energy demand. The fact is that alternative energy is the future of this country, but that future is still 15 or 20 years out there, and, in the meantime, you have got to have oil production in this country.

Now, if you do not support that kind of thing, then you yourself ought to quit driving an automobile. You yourself ought to quit appearing in a Chamber like this, look how many lights are lit in this Chamber, so you can present your point of view. You ought to quit using anything that has an oil base to it, which includes, by the way, prescriptions, medicine, clothes, you know the gambit. Our everyday life is very dependent on those fossil fuels.

The Republicans have led the way, in my opinion, with the help from Democrats, and there are a lot of things we have had a bipartisan effort on, of trying to work off fossil fuels. But before we leave fossil fuels, we had better figure out something that is going to work. We had better figure out something that is going to work. And today, throughout the whole world, as I said, everything that works outside of fossil fuels, including solar power, would only provide about 4 percent of our needs.

What I would suggest to my good colleague from the State of Ohio, instead of coming up here hollering about alternative fuels and about this President, which is a direct misstatement, about how President Bush's policy is to remain committed to foreign oil, what my colleague would be much better, much better off doing is talking about conservation.

If you want to save energy immediately, it is not alternative fuels, it is conservation. Put out every fourth light up there in that ceiling. Drive your car a little less. Do not idle your car. Turn off your light when you leave the room. Make sure your dishwasher is full when you wash your dishes. If you want to make a real dent in U.S. consumption of foreign oil, conservation is the answer, not come up here with some kind of partisan bashing of the Republican Party, which seems to be a favorite thing of the Democrats in this election year.

Now I want to move on to another topic. I hope this evening, I really, really want to spend some time with

my colleagues talking about the land issues in the West. My district is in Colorado. I am very proud of the State of Colorado. Colorado is a very unique State when it comes to whether it is energy issues, whether it is water issues or land issues or forest fire issues. I want to spend some time this evening talking about that.

But I feel compelled, I feel compelled to come up and give the other side of the story. And there is something else that I want to give the other side of the story. Last week as we were about to adjourn, colleagues, oh boy, guess what happened? We had a media circus around here. We had a media circus. And I am not trying to be partisan here, but the fact is, just like this energy thing, just like this Bermuda tax shelter thing, the Democrats last week were jumping for joy as we were about to get out of here thinking that Bush knew that this country was going to be attacked on September 11 and he did nothing about it.

That is, on its face, absolutely unfounded, absolutely ridiculous, and, in my opinion, scandalous. Show me one colleague, whether it is the most liberal Democrat we have in the House Chamber, whether it is the most conservative Republican we have in the House Chamber, whether it is the one independent or socialist, whatever he is, that we have in the House Chamber, show me one person, one person in here, that has ever served in here, that would get information about something happening like September 11 and would sit on it and do nothing about it.

There is not a person that holds public office in America, whether it is the local mayor, whether it is the county commissioner, State legislator, governor, congressman or senator or the President, that would get information that September 11 was about to happen and sit on it, which was exactly the implication the Democrats tried to paint on our President last week. And guess what happened? You know, they accomplished their goal.

Here is the kind of headlines we see coming out in this weekly magazine. "What Bush Knew." One of the senators over there stood over there with the New York Post, I think, "Bush knew about September 11."

You know, the problem we have got, and let us talk about these briefings and the information we get. I got information not too long ago from a fortune teller, and she swore to me that there was a bomb that was going to go off on a cruise ship. I mean, what do you do with this kind of stuff?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman in a moment, if he will just give me a couple of minutes, because I would like to have a conversation about this.

I am very upset about this. I am trying to say come on, instead of running right over here, and I will tell you, the minority leader did not even have time

to put his suit coat on before he was over there preaching about what did the President know? We need to have a task force. The United States Congress ought to get a task force to find out what the President knew, when he knew it.

Look, we are not investigating the President. Why are we trying to eat our own? The President did not know September 11 was going to occur. For God's sake, he is a Texan. Have you ever seen a Texan that knew a fight was coming that did not stand up to give the first slug? He did not sit there. He did not have the information September 11 was going to happen.

Now, we all wish that our intelligence network would have been better, and it is always easy, it is always easy after a fire to figure out where the fire trucks should be, and it has never failed. I used to be a police officer, and I can tell you every serious crime I ever investigated, I would have people come up as we were doing the investigation that would say, you know, I told them there was going to be a murder over here in this neighborhood. I told them they were going to have a car accident at this intersection and they needed to put more traffic lights in here. I told them this school child was going to get hit and they needed to have intersection guards 8 hours a day instead of 7½ hours a day.

It is always easy to second-guess. But what does this do to our country, what does it do to our Nation, when on a Friday we can get a little partisan pool of people speaking up, and the next week it leads to these kind of headlines? What do you think the foreign press does with that kind of stuff?

We have a war to fight here. We ought to stick together, instead of coming up with this hodgepodge stuff about, well, Bush must have known, and Congress ought to be privy to all of this intelligence. Oh, yes, see how long a secret could remain if you had a task force made up of congressmen with highly sensitive material.

Let the President do his job, and rest assured, not one Democrat or not one Republican in the Senate or in the House or any level of government would have sat on information that said you are about to lose 3,000 of your citizens on September 11, and say, well, let us put it in this drawer. I do not want to act on that.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Colorado for yielding. I understand the gentleman's concern and passion.

I would just like to share with the gentleman that some of us feel the same as does the gentleman, and that is that the President would not have sat on information, had he known.

My criticism, and I have been critical, and I might add I think it is legitimate, is the way they choose to do business in secrecy, and that is why

some of us call for an independent commission such as the Kerner Commission or the Watergate Commission to go forward and make an investigation in this matter.

Finally, I do genuinely feel that most Democrats do not impugn the integrity of the President. I certainly do not. But I do believe that in this instance, with information that was available, not to the President's desk, but the CIA and the FBI, that they did not serve him well by coordinating that information, for had he had the information, he may have acted in a different manner.

I thank my colleague very much for yielding, and I will do likewise when I get an opportunity.

Mr. MCINNIS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would stay around. I have the gentleman from Florida that would like to join in the conversation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Does the gentleman mean my buddy, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY)?

Mr. MCINNIS. The gentleman's buddy, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. Speaker, I think we can have a good, legitimate conversation right here. Let me tell Members, the gentleman is well spoken and well thought. I agree with the gentleman, I do not think the President was well served. I do not think the dots were connected that maybe could have been connected. That is not my point here.

My point is for people to come out here, and I agree with the gentleman, not all the Democrats did this, but the gentleman would agree with me, I think, it was your minority leader in that room over there, talking to the media, what did the President know, when did he know it, et cetera, et cetera.

The implication of that, and, of course, one can see what the implication of it is as in Newsweek and all the newspapers throughout the weekend. That is what concerns me.

First I will yield to the gentleman from Florida and then we can just kind of all join in, if you do not mind. Let us talk about what level of intelligence we should put out here in the U.S. Congress.

My concern is that several of these memos, for example, may release innocently, may release the name of individuals, or somebody brighter than us can connect some dots out there and we are going to blow the cover of people, like Condoleezza Rice says, who are trying to protect these people. So I would look forward to just a few minutes, if the gentleman does not mind, to talk constructively about, okay, what should our role be and what, by necessity for the security of the people of this Nation, has to remain secret with the President and cannot be disclosed with 535 Members of the Congress.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

□ 2000

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, let me underscore the comments of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS); I agree. I think we need to find out what the agencies knew at the time and why they were not, if you will, cross-pollinating that information, because that is one of the problems we have to review.

What I take umbrage with is I think there was a certain amount of glee in some of the voices here in this Capitol because they had sensed that finally, they thought they found a weakness in the President to exploit for political purposes. That is what troubled me. I sense that we do have a lot of work to do, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is on the Select Committee on Intelligence; and he probably is privy to a lot more than I.

We do have to find out the failures of the FBI, the CIA, Border Patrol, Immigration and Naturalization, student visas. I mean, we have a tremendous amount of activity that we have to undertake collectively as Democrats and Republicans. But I just in my heart of hearts was so startled when we left here last Thursday. I know politics, believe me. Both sides play it; our side played it in the prior administration, and I am sure that when one is the target of it, one becomes somewhat anxiety-ridden, as I was, over the weekend.

I cannot tell my colleagues how much more distressed I became as the days went on when I felt in my heart that individual Members had actually not just speculated, but impugned the President, suggesting that he not only knew, he almost knew the date, time and sequence of events. That is what I found startling. I thought that was launched strictly to weaken him up and to potentially create the political atmosphere that we currently find ourselves in.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I might add that the President himself, President Clinton, our previous President, his comments were when they asked him, what do you think about these reports, he said, it was nothing to do with intelligence. He said, generally what those reports are used for is public sources to speculate on what bin Laden might do. A lot of that is pure speculation.

Our government every day, as the gentleman from Florida knows, especially on the Committee on Intelligence, we get thousands, thousands of reports every day about this could happen, that could happen; and I have had a number of my colleagues, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Florida, not my colleagues, but a number of citizens from Colorado who have come up and said, look, I think they are going to get our water supply here, or I think they are going to blow up the tunnels on the mountain.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I especially am appreciative

of both of the gentlemen, and I thank the gentleman for yielding. I know my colleague's district abuts mine, and we have 50 percent of all of the vegetables grown in the United States, or grown in my and the gentleman from Florida's district. So when the gentleman talked about the failure to cross-pollinate between two of our agencies responsible to report to the President, I know he knows that from agriculture, our cross-pollination.

I always say that for humor, I say to the gentleman from Colorado. I want the gentleman to know that I think the Vice President was correct when he said that we need to lower the volume. But I think the Vice President is incorrect when he advises the President that this matter should not be made known, particularly having to do with the briefing that he received; it could be appropriately redacted. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), our colleague that is involved in this colloquy, was involved in the Florida legislature when we passed the sunshine law in the State of Florida. And do my colleagues know what? The executive branch of government moaned and groaned, and they were Democrats in the executive branch then, they moaned and groaned all the way to openness.

When I go with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) next week in Russia and in Beijing and in Korea, do my colleagues know what we are going to say to those people? That they should be transparent with reference to their government and that they should have openness. The one thing I caution is, and I think the gentleman from Colorado got it right, that a media circus can develop; and those of us who serve our own egos find ourselves in a position of being consumed by the media. That Newsweek report did not come from the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT); that came from the minds of some editor who quoted what the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), as the gentleman from Colorado correctly pointed out, said.

I thank the gentleman so much for yielding, and I must take my leave; but I will come back another time to discuss this matter with the gentleman.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman; and I would say to the gentleman, he is a member of the Committee on Intelligence, and if he does not mind staying for a couple of more minutes, maybe the gentleman could very briefly advise the rest of us of the differences in the secrecy levels, we are classified top secret, the secrecy levels between the gentleman from Florida and I. I take some comfort in what the gentleman is saying as far as it goes with the Committee on Intelligence, because the gentleman is trained; the gentleman knows he cannot do that. But when it goes beyond to the general body, our life rotates around the media; and that is where the media circus starts. So if the gentleman would just explain a little for the rest of us

the difference between his secrecy and my secrecy.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. First, I appreciate the continuing compliment, and I do likewise. I want the gentleman to know that a month ago I took leave from the Committee on Intelligence to allow the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), our colleague, to go on the committee. That does not mean that all that time before then that I was not a full member.

To answer the gentleman specifically, there are 1,000 people that get a general report on a regular basis that are in the loop, so to speak, about classified information. There are 20 individuals who get a higher clearance and a more detailed and specific report. The report that the President of the United States receives, unless the President determines, and those determinations are made by him and his advisors, are not to be made public, nor at any point in time are they to be revealed unless they become unclassified. And there is dispute about even that unclassified portion as to whether or not they should be in the public realm.

What I am saying is that in this case, so many people were victimized that we would be very wise to take it out of our political hands. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) who just came in, he and I get along extremely well until we start talking about politics; and when we start talking about politics, we have a different point of view.

What we need this thing to be is in the hands of some people that can look at the CIA and the FBI and, guess who else? They need to look at the Committee on Intelligence members and all of us and see whether or not we were discharging our oversight responsibilities. The secrecy part of it can be handled with open meetings and closed meetings where necessary. We did it every day in Federal court; every day, and we protected the source and methodology of our very critical intelligence-gathering apparatus.

The gentleman has been very generous with his time, and I hope I get an opportunity to do likewise.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman joining in on a constructive conversation during Special Orders.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate joining the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Florida. I wanted to speak about this notion of an independent investigation, which I think, unfortunately, if we look at those who are supporting that, Senator DASCHLE, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), there is a real partisan question, along with Senator LIEBERMAN, for crying out loud. Senator LIEBERMAN, incidentally, is actually on the committee and does not show up. That is a matter of record. But he is calling for an independent investigation.

I think there are three reasons we do not need it. Number one, we already have it; number two, it is going to drain the sources of the Committee on Intelligence; and, number three, it would become a political football. And I will explain why.

Since February, and earnestly since January, the chairman of the House Committee on Intelligence, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), a Republican, and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Intelligence, who is a Democrat, Bob Graham, have been talking, and are forming what is a bicameral, both House and Senate, and a bipartisan, one Democrat, one Republican chair, investigation of what went wrong on 9-11. They have hired 100, maybe 200, staffers, all have been given top secret security clearance. They have the cream of the cream of the intelligence community together, some of the best minds that are available; and they have been looking into what went wrong, what lessons have been learned, what can we do right, what can we do better, all of the good stuff. So this blue ribbon committee is already going on, and it is balanced.

Number two, if my colleague can imagine already, there is something like 184,000 documents that have already been turned over to this committee, and they have the cooperation and the work of over 200 FBI agents who are right now working on that. I think it is good for them to. But what seems to be suggested is that we take even more FBI agents and put them to yet another committee doing the exact same thing. Well, somebody has to make sure that the world is being watched and we have our surveillance going. I would rather leave the soldiers on the frontline fighting the battle than coming back to the headquarters and hobnobbing with the desk jockeys, but that seems to be the assertion.

Number three, the other reason we do not need this is that who in the heck do people in this town think will control this? Congress funds all committees. It would become a political football because Congress would ultimately control what decisions are made through the appropriations process, and what appointments are made through our powers. I am sure that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), for example, would have a different view than the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a Democrat who seems to be a little bit more balanced, who just left. I am sure the gentleman from Colorado and I would have a different view of who should be on that committee, but Congress would be the ones appointing it. Then, since we already have this bipartisan, bicameral committee working, what are we going to do, take the resources away from them? It is ridiculous. It is purely politically motivated.

Yesterday in Afghanistan, we lost yet another American soldier. We are really getting down to the tough part of this war, because the ones who are

left in al Qaeda are survivors, they are smaller in numbers, harder to find, harder to identify. The fact that they are still around shows something, and so this is not the time for the Democrat leadership to jump ship with soldiers in the war theater and start their political sniping. Do they really think that George Bush would sit on information and knowingly endanger lives of Americans? There are a lot of Republicans who had some tough opinions of President Clinton, yet I never heard any Republican say that President Clinton would sit on information.

Mr. Speaker, if the American people elect somebody in the Oval Office who would do such a thing, there is also the CIA and the FBI. Is the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) saying, and he seems to be, that members of the Select Committee on Intelligence, the CIA, the FBI, the national security advisors, knew about something and sat on it?

One can play partisan with the President, and that is maybe fair game; but I think it is pretty low when someone starts picking on members of the intelligence community, who are non-partisan, patriotic, professional men and women.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I agree with the gentleman. I do not think we need another task force. My main focus here this evening was the allegations and the points that were made by the minority, frankly, last week as we were getting out of session. If the gentleman will recall, there was media running all over the place, the headlines: What did Bush know, as if Bush knew something.

This media circus was fed by the minority leader, frankly, the Democratic leader on the other side of the aisle. That is not fair game. I mean, it is so preposterous to think that any Member of Congress, let alone the President of the United States, who I think has performed admirably since September 11 in response to September 11, it is out of line to come up here and for the sake of media and an election year, start saying, well, the President knew about this before September 11 and we could have avoided it. As the gentleman knows, we have a very active Democrat here on the House floor who goes so far as to allege that the President not only knew about September 11, but let it happen because he was somehow benefiting from military contracts that were going to friends of his in the defense contract. This thing is getting out of hand.

As the gentleman from Georgia has very correctly stated, we lost another American yesterday or the day before. We have a war going on here. We have a very capable President. We have a very capable Vice President, Dick Cheney. We have Condoleezza Rice; we have Colin Powell. We have our Joint Chiefs of Staff of the military, our military soldiers, from the private on up. Let them do their jobs.

□ 2015

They are not back holding secrets from the American people that would cause harm to the American people, but by necessity, there are secrets that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence knows that we should not know in order to protect the lives of the American people.

The security of America is number one. I cannot think of a job, I say to the gentleman from Georgia, and he would agree with me, I cannot think of a responsibility that is higher in its calling to the gentleman and I as Congressmen, elected by the people of this country, I cannot think of any other issue that is more important than for us to provide for the security of the people of this Nation, not only today but in the future, whether we talk about missile defense, whether we talk about the war in Afghanistan.

When we start eating up each other, people would think we were Siamese fish. Friday or Thursday over here with this media circus going on, it was like putting 2 Siamese fish in the same bowl together. We are the same team. Siamese fighting fish are bred to fight each other. We should not be bred to do that. These allegations against the President were strictly for Democratic partisan purposes.

As the gentleman from Florida said, not all of the Democrats agreed with that, and I agree that that is right. So I am not labeling all of our colleagues, but that is their leader. They need to get him back in the corral, in my opinion. We need to get on with the business at hand, which is not creating new task forces or so-called blue ribbon panels to oversee the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and then pretty soon we'll need a task force to oversee the blue ribbon committee that oversees the task force that oversees the intelligence force that shares intelligence with the President.

Wake up. Common sense will tell us the American public wants us to get on with the business of protecting the people of this country and settling the score, frankly, of what happened on September 11.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I think the gentleman is certainly right.

One of the things that is important to remember is that when a committee is briefed in a classified manner so that that information does not get outside the room, and they have all taken an oath to that effect, some of the reasons for keeping that information quiet are not just to protect our own soldiers on the ground, but the informants in various places of the world, all of the countries in the world. I am not sure if they number 170, or something. We have intelligence coming in from every corner of the globe. We cannot endanger those networks.

But another factor that is equally as important, some of this has to do with the judicial sensitivity, prosecuting folks. We do not go out when we are in-

vestigating and tell all to the other camp because they can cover their tracks, so sometimes we just have to be quiet. This idea that everything has to be on the front page of The New York Times in order for it to be real is absolutely absurd.

Mr. MCINNIS. I might say to the gentleman, The New York Times is not charged with the protection of the people of the United States of America. In fact, we saw during the Afghanistan war several reporters, including Walter Cronkite, were critical of the media because they were taking too much of America's side.

They are Americans. They are U.S. citizens. But we can see that several people in the media take it as their responsibility, although they are American citizens, although they receive all the privileges of this Nation, that they should be neutral parties.

The fact is, if they want to assume that role, their utmost responsibility is not to provide for the security of the people of this Nation. That is our responsibility, and we do it at different levels.

The President obviously has to know secrets. We do not allow everybody access to the nuclear codes, for example. We allow a very, very thought-out, delicate system to have that occur, and we do not have 435 congressmen and 100 senators who have that capability. We structure this thing.

Last week we saw very quickly where I think several Members were perhaps envious of the fact that they are not the President; or for political purposes, they just got out of line. That is what I am saying tonight, that we have to come back together.

This war is a war that is going to last for a long time. The tough part of the war has not even begun. We have not been hit twice. We got hit once. We got hit with the embassies and so on, but I mean since September 11. We know it is going to happen again. We have to be on our toes.

On the other hand, we have to be reasonable about this. Every time somebody calls an office and says, hey, I think they are going to hit the Sears Tower today in Chicago, if they know that every time somebody puts an anonymous phone call in that they are going to blow up the Sears Tower, that the Sears Tower has to be evacuated, they can paralyze this country.

It is like calling in bomb threats to a school. If we call one in day after day after day, there are lots of these kinds of things that go on every day in this country.

What we do, what our responsibility is at the congressional level, is to make sure we have properly funded and properly provided for the staffing and properly provided other resources that are necessary for our Federal Bureau of Investigation and for our intelligence agencies to go out, pick up the dots, put the dots together, and present those dots, put together, to the President and to the Security Council and

to our national security adviser, et cetera. That is what needs to occur.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, the other thing is what the gentleman is saying is there is such a thing as a specific threat. A specific threat is when we know the time and place and what method of weapon or destruction that is going to be used against us and we can act very quickly against the specific threat, if given all the information.

But a general threat, which there must be hundreds of them that go out each year.

Mr. MCINNIS. Thousands.

Mr. KINGSTON. Thousands, it does not give a time specific, a place specific, or a method specific. So what happens is we are guessing.

Okay, there is going to be something that happens to the water system in New York. Do we close down all the drinking water that day? That is a general threat, and what is the practical way out of it? There are so many things, like the gentleman is saying, are like a bomb scare. The gentleman will know that the intelligence-gathering system is not perfect.

I remember that we evacuated on September 11. When we were in the Longworth Building we were not told actually to evacuate. There was confusion. In fact, I personally went downstairs to the police and said, I have some employees here. Are we evacuating? And they said no, because at that time nobody knew what was going on.

We went outside the United States office buildings, outside of the Capitol, and we were told that the Capitol had been hit. This was just the rumor, not by the police, but this was the rumor on the street, that the Capitol had been hit, the mall area had been hit, the State Department had been hit, and the Sears Tower. That was the street discussion, because no one could get out on their cell phones because all the communication was jammed.

Later in that day, Congress gathered in a safe spot. The gentleman will remember that. And those Members of Congress who still had their beepers on that could get the word to gather in this particular location, we were given our first post-morning of 9-11 briefing. I think it was about 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock on September 11.

At that time, there were still a few airplanes in the air unaccounted for. Some of them were off track. Nobody knew for sure what to do with those airplanes.

We were also told at that time that there were 5 airplanes that had been involved; that along with the one that had crashed in Pennsylvania, another one had crashed just outside of Kentucky. That is the information level that was available at that time to Members of the United States House and Senate. It is not classified information, but that is what we were told.

So this is a very inexact science. And again, that was from the best sources

to people who wanted to have the best information. So it is not—for anybody who knows anything about intelligence, they know that we cannot always trust the sources. It is an inexact science.

For somebody at a time of national tragedy to grab this, this question, this uncertainty in the name of partisanship is just disgusting and disturbing.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, we saw it on Thursday. I am telling the gentleman, we saw when the minority leader, and this was strictly for political purposes, went out there and did this little media circus. That is the kind of thing that I speak so strongly about up here.

Let me also point out that we have sources that are bad sources. We have false rumors. We have people who want to paralyze us by calling in false alarms.

But the fact is, we have good sources out there. Maybe the most important key we can talk about here is the necessity to protect the good sources. The President has access through our intelligence network to many, many people. I think Condoleezza Rice said it yesterday, that many, many people throughout the world care about the United States of America. They have good information to give to the United States of America, and they share it. Those sources need to be protected.

Those names should not be given to a task force or a blue ribbon committee here in the United States Congress. They should not be given to us at all, except under extraordinary circumstances. These sources need to be protected.

It is a part of the structure of the protection blanket that we are trying to form over the United States of America and for our allies. It is just as important as our missile defense system to keep our sources secure, and we have a structure in place that does it. We have got to let that structure work, and we have got to refrain from making the kind of partisan attack that we saw that took place against President Bush when he was, as our local newspaper in Colorado said, bushwhacked. Then they went on to say, what did Bush know prior to September 11? Their conclusion was, very little, let him do his job, get off his back, and this is nothing but a political distraction.

That is what has happened. That is exactly why I took the podium this evening. We have to call it as we are seeing it. What we are calling here is what took place last week was not right. They hurt the efforts of the country.

It seems to me that apparently there has been some backpedaling by the minority leader and some of the leadership of the Democratic party, although I must say there is a colleague from the gentleman's State who certainly has not backpedaled from her allegation that Bush did this on purpose to assist military contractors.

But the realization is, we have to come back to our senses. We have to get back to steady as she goes. We have good guidance of this country with President Bush. He is doing a remarkable job under these kinds of circumstances. He is leading this country in a time of war, and he is fully and completely focused. DICK CHENEY is completely and fully focused in responding to the President. Condoleezza Rice is fully aware, as the national security adviser; Colin Powell, as our Secretary of State. I could go through all the list of names.

We have probably the most experienced team by far anywhere in the world in a government and military structure protecting this country over any other country in the world, but it still has some holes in it. So we can talk about how we patch the holes, but in the process of doing that, in the process of figuring out how to get our goose to lay a better egg, we do not pull the goose's neck off.

So this is the point, that I think we are well prepared, and I think we have had a good discussion this evening. I might add, I would ask if the gentleman has any concluding remarks. Our time is narrowing.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say that this House has taken a lot of action on a bipartisan basis to try to analyze 9/11, some of it that is appropriate to have in the open, and some of it is secret. It has been bipartisan. It has also been bicameral.

But we, Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, we want to avoid any possible terrorism, not just America but anywhere in the world. So it is in all of our interests at this time to keep the shoulders to the grinder and to fight this war in a unified manner, and keep the partisan politics in a back room somewhere and let us just get this job done.

Mr. MCINNIS. I might say to the gentleman, take a look since last Thursday when this media circus began, take a look at how much time President Bush and his staff and his intelligence organization, our country's intelligence organization, take a look at how much time they had to devote to rebutting some of the allegations that were implied by the minority leader of this House.

Look how much time was devoted from our national leaders to address these kinds of headlines. This is exactly what our enemy wants to see us do. They want to see us so confused within our own government. They want to see us like Siamese fighting fish, fighting each other within our own government. That is exactly what happened over this last weekend.

We can bet that the President of the United States, instead of having his full attention focused on the war and on the possible threats against this country, they had to prepare for talk shows on Sunday, they had to defend themselves, and they had to get all of their staff to spread them out to talk

to the media to try and defend themselves, that our President did not have knowledge prior to September 11 that this country was going to receive a surprise attack that killed 3,000 people.

Let me conclude with this. I dare any of my Democratic colleagues, I challenge them, any of them, I challenge my Republican colleagues, I challenge anybody in America, show me one elected official today that would take information, knowing that one of the most horrible events in the history of this Nation was going to occur, and they would sit on it. Show me one. It does not exist.

So before any of my colleagues go out there and make the implication or the allegation or the outright statement that the President of this country, who has done a tremendous job in his leadership as a result of September 11, show me, just show me one time where any of these people would have gone out and in effect have been a traitor to the country. It does not exist. We all care about the security of this Nation. It is incumbent upon us to provide for the security of the people of this country, and we are doing the best job we can.

If we can improve our job in a constructive fashion, I am all for it. Last week, instead of contributing to or initiating the media circus, in my opinion, the minority leader maybe even could have called the President himself and said, Mr. President, I do not want to go out and talk to the media implying you knew something prior to September 11. How can I help?

□ 2030

That phone call did not take place, and that is what ought to be happening. Instead of making our President spend an entire weekend trying to defend this position, we should have had our President spending the entire weekend doing what he was going to do, and that was focus on the immediate needs of all of the citizens of the United States instead of having to focus on political defense strategy throughout the weekend.

I will yield to my colleague but would advise we are probably down to the last few minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say we have heard so much from the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), Senator DASCHLE, and the partisans about the August 6 memo; but there was not a warning in there and it was not a threat report. What it was it was an analysis of al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden, and it talked in general terms about the threat that they posed to general world problems; and they did not mention anything about using aircraft as missiles. It did say they could hijack a plane, but up until then no one had used an airplane as a missile.

So all of this stuff sounds really great for Senator DASCHLE and the Democratic National Committee to sit around and say this is what they

should have done, but the reality is nobody knew this information. But, again, if he wants to criticize President Bush; let him attack him for health care, Social Security, whatever, but a war effort while we have soldiers on the ground and a very unstable situation in the Middle East with our ally, Israel, is very poor judgment, not just bad politics but poor judgment.

Mr. MCINNIS. The gentleman agrees with me there is something to be learned by September 11. We have learned a lot of things, whether it the design of our skyscrapers, what we could have done to assist our firefighters and our policemen more, maybe what we could have done for our fighter jets that scramble out there. There are lots of things we could learn from that. That was not the effort that was being made on Thursday. It was not an approach that said let us get together and figure this out. Maybe put our minds together and think out what constructively we could do to improve the situation.

Instead, it was a very targeted attack on the President of the United States alleging or implying or outright saying the President of the United States had knowledge prior to September 11 that would have allowed us to avoid September 11. That did not exist. And there is not anybody in these Chambers that had that kind of information. And to the best of our knowledge only the hijackers and bin Laden and his organization knew what was going to happen on September 11.

If we come together as a team, we can continue to put together or march forward to do, again, what was our number one calling. And our number one calling is to provide for the security and the protection and safety of the people of the United States of America.

LIFT THE RUSSIAN POULTRY BAN

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am actually here tonight in cooperation with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL), who I understand to be on his way over here, but wanted to talk about an issue to Georgia that has become a big economic issue; but it is also one of international trade having to do with Russia and its trade embargo against United States poultry.

I wanted to make a few points about that, Mr. Speaker, that according to the U.S.A. Poultry and Ag Export Council no U.S. poultry exports shipments have moved since the ban on American poultry was lifted in Russia. And Russia because of the competition used a non-tariff trade barrier to stop American chickens from coming into Russia, and then that ban was lifted. However, nothing has happened since then. And because of Russian paper-

work, at least 20,000 metric tons of U.S. poultry shipped prior to the ban that was imposed on March 10 now sit in Russian ports waiting to be unloaded. The import ban is costing the U.S. poultry industry more than \$25 million a week.

Although Russia has issued few import permits, it is abundantly clear that Russia wants to stop or substantially reduce the United States poultry program. Again, it is such a huge issue to our area, a big employer in Georgia.

Here are some of the impediments that Russia is using to stop the poultry: all previously issued import permits have been rescinded by Russia, even though these licenses were valid for additional quantities.

Russian importers are being advised that not only must they apply for new import permits to import poultry from the United States, they are also being told they must apply for new import permits for products currently waiting unloading at the port.

The Russian minister of agriculture told the U.S. that permits would be issued more or less automatically. That is not the case. Russia issues an import license but it is only a portion, sometimes as little as 25 percent of the requested quantity. So one cannot get in there with this.

Russia has issued as few of these import permits as possible. Even though they are not adequate standing alone, they still will not issue all of them. Despite the fact that on March 31, U.S. and Russia protocol does not call for the original USDA export certificate to be on board the ship that is transporting the poultry, the Russian minister of agriculture is demanding that the original certificate be on the transport ship. This is extremely costly and cumbersome. No other nation does these kinds of things.

Mr. Speaker, I can go on because there are lots of other issues that Russia is using as basically a paper tiger to stop American imports, but it is something that we urge the President to bring up on his trip to Russia and do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has been a lead on this. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) is from the poultry country of Georgia. He is the one that has been leading our experts to try to get Russia to quit playing games and open their borders.

RUSSIAN POULTRY BAN

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

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, many of us have lived through some very interesting times in the international political atmosphere. I think all of us were very pleased, of course, years ago when we saw the Berlin Wall collapse and when we saw the Soviet Union literally dissolve. And over the years that have passed, one of the

things that many of us have been encouraged about is the fact that Russia has become a new partner with the United States.

I know personally I was very pleased with the past visit with President Putin with our own President Bush and the relationship that they developed. I think that is certainly an encouraging sign, certainly something that our two nations will benefit from in the short term as well as the long term.

But I am here tonight to talk about a subject that I believe the Russian Government must address if they are to lay a foundation for a continued good working relationship with our country; and that is a result of a ban that was placed by the Russian Government on March 10 of this year on the import of all American poultry.

Poultry is somewhat unique in the agricultural scheme of things. It is totally unsubsidized. We have debated a farm bill, and it was a controversial bill in many respects in which we were attempting to do what we could to support production agriculture in this country. Much of it did involve subsidies; it involved quotas and allocations of production capacity. But the poultry industry stands on its own.

It is a very successful industry, and it has proven that it can compete all around the world. What has happened, though, is that Russia with this import ban has placed a tremendous burden on American poultry companies. In fact, it is estimated that they are currently losing in the neighborhood of \$25 million a week. Now, even though the ban has been supposedly lifted, as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) referred to, there have been all sorts of artificial barriers that have been placed that as a practical matter have made it impossible for us to be able to ship any poultry. In fact, the indications are from the United States Poultry and Ag Export Council that no United States poultry export shipments have been moved since this ban was supposedly lifted. And, further, due to the Russian paperwork impediments, at least 20,000 metric tons of United States poultry that was shipped prior to the ban on March 10 are still sitting in Russian ports awaiting being unloaded or disbursed. And it is costing approximately \$10,000 a day for those shipments to remain there in the Russian ports.

There is a serious problem. It is one that the United States Poultry Industry needs the assistance of the President and his visit to Russia to talk with President Putin to stress on him the importance of taking affirmative action to remove these impediments.

Currently there are still bans on some States in the United States, namely, North Carolina, Virginia, Maine, and Pennsylvania; and that is because of an avian influenza outbreak and they are on the restricted list. My State of Georgia, which currently is the largest poultry producer in the United States, supplying somewhere in