

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

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

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

ERECTING AN EDIFICE FOR FUTURE WORLD PEACE

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, this afternoon I want to recognize the patriotism of our men and women of the Armed Forces who, halfway around the world in Afghanistan, in Iraq, and elsewhere, are in harm's way. They are brave, they care deeply about this country, so deeply they would lay down their lives for it, and have.

This is worth our reflection as we gather here in the comfort of this Chamber, air-conditioned on a hot day. We should take a moment to think about our troops, to stand in their boots, and to give our thanks. Our soldiers deserve our unqualified support, and in Congress we must do everything we can to make sure they have it, whatever they need to do their job, to do it quickly, to do it with a minimum loss of life, and to come home safely. Whether they are in Basra, Baghdad, Bagram, or Afghanistan, we stand by our troops.

War is cruel. Innocent lives are lost, families are devastated. We cannot but turn on the television to see graphically the horrors of war; some of our soldiers dying or dead, the loss of innocent civilian lives, some by errant bombs, others by the deliberate murder of Saddam's regime as it fired on those in the street.

What we do not often recognize, because it is not thrust in our living rooms or our consciousness, is another terrible truth that peace, too, can be cruel. The peace of Rwanda, where millions died as the world watched. The peace of Kosovo, where tens of thousands were ethnically cleansed before we acted without the approval of the United Nations. And the peace of Baghdad, too, was cruel. The peace of torture and rape, of starvation and repression, of a failed sanctions regime that Hussein used cynically to kill his own people. That, too, is cruel. And lastly, the peace of September 10 was cruel, holding the promise of a long and precious life for 3,000 Americans who would not live out the week.

Americans who oppose the war have many important points to make but must resist the temptation to merely attack the administration uncritically or nonconstructively, or to defend in

any manner the indefensible regime of Saddam Hussein. The failure to disarm Iraq peacefully, notwithstanding 17 resolutions of the United Nations, was not alone the United States' responsibility. It was a failure of the world body, of the United Nations, of the collective security of mankind.

Despite the intoxicating simplicity of the argument, the war in Iraq is not about American desire for oil, though our dependence on it is far too great. It is not about contracts for the French, although contracts they have. And it is not about debt to the Russians, although billions they are owed. Rather, it is about the post-Cold War failure to erect an edifice upon which the peace of the world can be built. And this problem, without our genuine reflection and determined effort, if left unattended and ignored, if lost in the dilution of a simpler answer, may mean that Iraq is only the second in a long line of future conflicts.

When the war is over, more hard work lies ahead. We must not only rebuild the Nation of Iraq for the Iraqi people, but we must rebuild the institutions of the world community which have been devastated by the last few months of fractious debate at the United Nations. These two tasks, to restore Iraq and to restore the collective security apparatus of the world, must go hand in hand. Indeed, we need the one to help repair the other. The United Nations must play the pivotal role in the provision of food and medicine to the Iraqi people and assist in the administration of Iraq until that troubled land becomes a self-governing nation.

Many have argued that democracy is incompatible with the traditions and tribal rivalries of the Iraqi people, or that a nation drawn artificially together on a map must tear if not held together by the noxious glue of tyranny. We must not have such low aspirations for the Iraqi people who have great talents that have not been allowed to flourish, and we must never indulge in the prejudice that any people are less capable, less suited, or less deserving of democracy. Democracy is the institutional reflection of the God-given rights of liberty, belief, and expression.

Democracy must be nurtured beyond Iraq and Afghanistan. We must be unstinting in our support for democratic movements in authoritarian nations. Democracy must come not only to our adversaries but to our allies as well, to the Saudis, to the Egyptians, and to Jordan. We must work to open these closed societies and closed economies to free the creative tall talents of their peoples, to lift the standard of living and expose the germ of terrorism to the cleansing power of opportunity.

HOMELAND SECURITY PRIORITIES

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to address my colleagues on the immediate needs of protecting America, and especially protecting those who protect us.

This week, Congress will vote on an almost \$78 billion war supplemental budget, of which most of this funding will be delivered to ensure America's Armed Forces, those protecting our liberties abroad, to make sure that they have the tools that they need to end this conflict successfully and return home as soon as possible. I, like most of my colleagues, will support this legislation.

While I am pleased that Congress is addressing those Americans who are protecting us from attack abroad, I am concerned about the lack of funding for those brave Americans who are protecting us right here at home; namely, our first responders.

The term "first responder" is thrown around a lot here. But it does mean something. They are our local police, firefighters, and emergency medical workers. They are the ones who run towards crime scenes, not away. They are the ones who run into burning buildings and not away. And they run towards the injured and dying, remaining calm and administering treatment and care.

Since the devastating day of September 11, these people have been hailed in every corner of our great country. But oftentimes, a lot of the rhetoric we hear is simply just that. It is rhetoric. We heard some absurd rhetoric today from a very prominent Republican Member of Congress, but the Rules of the House do not allow me to distinguish which body he serves in, who said that the New York City police and firefighters should work overtime without pay as a sacrifice to the war effort. I guess he does not think the loss of 414 first responders in our fair city have sacrificed enough. Of course, this same gentleman has continually supported the Bush administration in opposing additional funding for our first responders, like so many Republicans have, while supporting a tax cut for the wealthiest in this country. What about calling upon them to sacrifice? The call to ask our first responders to make a sacrifice while not simultaneously calling about the wealthiest 5 percent in this country to make a sacrifice is ludicrous.

My district is home to many of these first responders. I am the son of a New York City police officer and a cousin to several police officers and New York City firefighters. My family knows and understands sacrifice. We also know lunacy when we hear it, and the comments made today are simply lunacy.

On 9/11, of the 414 of these first responders who were killed, the number includes 23 New York City police officers, and 343 members of the New York City Fire Department, of whom I knew more than just a few. I remember people lining the streets of New York to thank them, and we all heard every

Member of Congress praise New York City's first responders for their heroism, and mourn them for the high price that they paid.

But now Congress has the opportunity to put these words of praise and gratitude into action. We have the opportunity to provide our first responders with the state-of-the-art tools that they need to perform their jobs, save others, and survive themselves.

On September 11 there was a breakdown in the communications equipment of our fire department, communications equipment that, if working as it should have been, could have alerted many of these firefighters and police officers of the impending collapse of the towers, the World Trade Center. Would they have left their position and fled? I doubt it, knowing the firefighters as I do. But at least they would have had the tools at their disposal to best protect themselves and to save others that day.

While every firefighter is now equipped with new digital radios, there is still not a system of "repeaters" in place throughout the city which help radio signals penetrate skyscraper walls. This means these radios really would not be any different than the ones that failed on September 11 of 2001.

Additionally, there is still no shared radio frequency between the police department and the fire departments, thereby forcing them to rely upon commanders for communication and coordination, a system that has failed in the past with tragic consequences. Additionally, New York State troopers still cannot communicate with New York City officers or Federal agents, causing yet another communications breakdown of our first line of domestic defense.

If we remember September 11, and we can never forget it, we should also never forget the sacrifices that these men and women made. We should take this opportunity in the supplemental budget to make sure they have everything they need to do their jobs properly in the way that they need to do it.

□ 1800

INQUIRIES OF MEMBERS OF DEFENSE POLICY BOARD AND REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF MISCONDUCT INVOLVING RICHARD N. PERLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to put into the RECORD a letter that I have sent to the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense asking that we investigate or have investigated the allegations of conflict of interest and other possible misconduct involving Mr. Richard N. Perle, formerly chairman of the Pentagon's Defense Policy Board.

As a special government employee, he is caught by all the ethics rules that preclude and severely limit his ability to operate with businesses connected with the military.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD this letter.

The material referred to is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, March 24, 2003.

Hon. JOSEPH E. SCHMITZ,
Office of the Inspector General, Department of Defense, The Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR GENERAL SCHMITZ: I am writing to request that your office immediately open an investigation into allegations of conflict of interest and other misconduct involving Richard N. Perle, Chairman of the Pentagon's Defense Policy Board. As a result of this position, Mr. Perle is considered a "special government employee," and is subject to government ethics prohibition—both regulatory and criminal—on using public office for private gain. As you know, under the Inspector General statute, your office is authorized to conduct investigations into any abuse or misconduct by senior officials.

I am aware of several potential conflicts that warrant your immediate review. First, Mr. Perle has contracted with bankrupt telecommunications company Global Crossing Ltd. to try to win U.S. government approval of its \$250 million sale to two Asian companies over the objections of the FBI and the Department of Justice. Perle is being paid \$125,000 for his advice and stands to reap a highly unusual \$600,000 bonus if the sale is approved by the U.S. Committee for Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS), a government group that includes representatives from the Defense Department.

Although Perle has denied that he has sought to use his government position to benefit Global Crossing, he has reportedly signed an affidavit which directly contradicts this contention. According to the New York Times, in a March 7, 2003 affidavit, Perle stated, "As the chairman of the Defense Policy Board, I have a unique perspective on and intimate knowledge of the national defense and security issues that will be raised by the CFIUS review process that is not and could not be available to the other CFIUS professionals." According to this article, Perle has even acknowledged contacting at least one government official on Global Crossing's behalf, though Perle refuses to identify this person. The fact that Mr. Perle may be reconsidering filing the affidavit does not alter the existence of the alleged conflict.

Second, Perle's position on the Board of Directors of software developer Autonomy, a data mining company that lists the Defense Department and the Homeland Security Department as customers would appear to present a significant conflict with his Defense Department. While Perle has drawn no salary, he has received more than 120,000 share options from Autonomy. Perle's award of these share options gives him a direct financial stake in the success of this company. Indeed, the National Association of Pension Funds recently recommended that shareholders "abstain" when Perle comes up for reappointment this summer because the group feels that share options "compromise the independent status" of independent directors such as Perle.

Third, Mr. Perle serves as managing partner of a private venture capital firm called Trireme Partners that invests primarily in companies that deal in goods and services related to national security. Again, this would seem to present a conflict of interest with

his position as Chairman of the Defense Policy Board. In this regard, Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist Seymour Hersh recently reported that on January 3, 2003, that Mr. Perle met with Saudi businessmen, including arms dealer Adnan Kashoggi, in Marseilles, France, to secure their investment in Perle's company. The article contains a highly disturbing quote from Prince Bandar bin Sultan, the Saudi ambassador to the U.S.: "There were elements of the appearance of blackmail—'If we get in business, he'll back off on Saudi Arabia'—as I have been informed by participants in the meeting."

Finally, I would note that it has been reported that on March 19, 2003, Perle spoke in a conference call sponsored by Goldman Sachs, in which he advised participants on possible investment opportunities arising from the war in Iraq. The conference's title was "Implication of an Imminent War: Iraq Now, North Korea Next?." Again, I would submit that it is a conflict of interest for a high ranking government official to be proffering advice on how to profit from the war.

As the Ranking Member of the House Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over conflict of interest rules, I have a strong interest in ensuring that our laws are being complied with, particularly those which touch on the integrity of our ethical requirements at a time of war.

Please respond to me through the House Judiciary Committee Democratic Staff, B 351-C Rayburn House Office Building, Attn: Perry Apelbaum/Ted Kalo, tel. 202-225-6504, fax 202-225-7680.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS, JR.,
Ranking Member.

Also, I will place into the RECORD a letter to the Honorable Secretary of Defense, Donald H. Rumsfeld, which requests that copies of financial disclosure be submitted by the members of the Defense Policy Board to be made public. This is an effort to short-circuit the investigations of the Inspector General, and also accommodate Mr. Perle and other members of this board that might be involved in questionable business dealings with military contractors.

The document referred to is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, April 1, 2003.

Hon. DONALD H. RUMSFELD,
Secretary of Defense, 1000 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to request copies of the financial disclosure forms submitted by the members of the Defense Policy Board as well as the minutes of all past Board meetings.

As the Ranking Member of the House Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over conflict of interest rules, I have a strong interest in insuring that our laws are being complied with, particularly those which touch on the integrity of our ethical requirements at a time of war. I therefore believe it is critical that this material be provided to help us assess the degree to which members of the Defense Policy Board face real or perceived conflicts of interest which would impede their ability to advise the Defense Department.

I believe such disclosure would be in the best interests of both the Department and the members of the Defense Policy Board. Richard Perle himself just wrote in yesterday's Wall Street Journal that "the first rule is full disclosure of financial interests of the adviser . . . the second rule is . . . if the