

last week, held in leg irons where audiences are required to watch their sentencing as a lesson in obedience to the law and government; and after the show, prisoners are paraded off to a firing squad. It is frightening and medieval stuff.

China today executes more people than all other countries in the world combined, according to Amnesty International, some 20,000 executions over the last decade, an average of 40 people a week; and that is just what is public, Mr. Speaker. Not only are they engaged in the moral horror of widespread public summary executions, but also China is in the business of carefully executing persons and then quickly harvesting prisoners' organs for sale on the international market. We heard from State Department officials who even acknowledged this.

It is an extraordinary thing, to say the least. The practice of taking human organs from condemned prisoners is in itself condemned by every known standard of medical ethics in the civilized world, and it goes on with American and Western customers paying top dollar for those organs each and every day.

I call on the United States of America and our State Department, as I did in the congressional hearing, to act in a number of ways, to issue a warning through HHS and the CDC to American citizens who are traveling abroad to the Asian Pacific Rim of not only the dangers of obtaining a human organ, but of the profound immorality of doing so. It is imperative that the United States of America speak in moral terms of that which is immoral, and it is immoral to harvest organs from condemned prisoners.

I also challenge the administration to rethink this entire business of engagement and to do as Ronald Reagan did whenever his administration did visit the Evil Empire, the Soviet Union. They met with dissidents; they associated themselves with people who were advancing freedom. The Good Book tells us, I am a friend to those who fear you, and so the United States should be to the Chinese people, a friend to those who cherish liberty and cherish the sanctity of human life and condemn the outrage of mass executions and the harvesting of human organs.

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

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

HONORING GEORGE GARCIA

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to honor a dear friend from my

district, George Garcia, who died early this morning at the age of 51. He was a resident of El Sereno community of East Los Angeles in my district. He was born on May 6, 1952, in Los Angeles and grew up in the community of Chino, California.

At the age of 18, George Garcia answered our Nation's call to duty and voluntarily enlisted in the United States Army. He was signed to the 82nd Airborne Division, where he served with great honor during the Vietnam War. In Vietnam, George served as a "tunnel rat." I asked my colleagues what is a tunnel rat. Apparently these young men in that era courageously dug tunnels behind enemy lines in the Vietnam War.

Upon returning from Vietnam, George married his high school sweetheart, Roberta Melendez. Together, they raised three beautiful children who mourn his loss today, as well as myself and other people from our community. One of his children, George, Jr., is carrying on his father's commitment to defending our Nation as a member of the United States Navy.

Upon returning from Vietnam, George Garcia dedicated his life and career to helping fellow veterans. For the past 25 years, he worked as an employee of the Employment Development Department in California finding jobs for unemployed veterans.

□ 2045

He founded the San Gabriel Valley East Los Angeles Veterans Employment Committee. He also fought vigorously to address the special needs of Latino veterans, including immigration, substance abuse and education training. George also formed coalitions among multi-ethnic groups and gave numerous hours to grassroots organizing to ensure a voice for his fellow veterans.

Most recently, George dedicated his time and expertise to military families who were waiting to hear about their loved ones who are currently serving in Iraq. He spent many, many years helping us each year provide gifts to poor children during Christmastime in the communities of East Los Angeles. Throughout his life, George Garcia gave unselfishly to his fellow veterans and their families. The imprint of his efforts can be felt throughout the Los Angeles community, and we all grieve for him today.

His commitment to serving his fellow veterans earned him in 2002 the honor of being named the State of California's Veteran of the Year by the Department for Veterans Outreach Programs in the State of California.

Whenever there was an event or a project to help veterans, George was there. I met him years ago as a State Senator in California. Every time I would ask him, what can we do to help the veterans, what can we do to help the homeless veterans, he was there giving his ideas, sharing with his heart and his compassion, tirelessly as a vol-

unteer, no pay, but out of the love of his heart.

I want to ask all my colleagues here to join me in honoring a true American hero. To him and his family, his son and to all those people and all those veterans, homeless veterans who met and touched him, he touched their hearts and he touches our hearts every day. We will remember you, George. We love you. God bless you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

QUESTIONS CONCERNING IRAQI WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the White House has been backtracking on how it was that fraudulent intelligence information was included by the President in his January State of the Union address delivered in this Chamber. Specifically, the statement by President Bush was that Iraq had sought to buy processed uranium for weapons of mass destruction from Niger, Africa. That information was wrong. Indeed, the documents involved appear to contain forged signatures of leaders from those nations who are no longer in office. How could this kind of information be placed in a State of the Union address?

The current Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. George Tenet, over the weekend has claimed publicly that he will take responsibility for this serious statement that misled Congress, misled the American people and indeed the people of the world about Iraq's intentions and capabilities relative to nuclear weaponry. The real question about this revelation is who exactly knew what and when did they know it? And who is responsible for these words being included in the President's State of the Union address, an address of such major proportion that preceded the invasion?

At the same time as I ponder these questions as I know the American people are, I am in receipt of a letter from an intelligence officer. I have read it and reread it and reread it again. In the letter and in my dealings with intelligence officers, I have been told that they are trained to triple-check, to verify significant intelligence information, triple-check. So when a statement is made in the State of the Union address of such consequence, I ask myself, was it triple-checked? Who really knew what and when did they know it? Surely someone, more than one person in that White House and other places checked and rechecked and then

checked again every word and every sentence in the speech.

I know the President practiced the speech before coming here. All Presidents do. So who knew what and when did they know it?

A retired intelligence officer from the Marine Corps wrote me this letter just a few months ago, but his words have been coming back to me, and I reread this after these revelations this weekend, and I want to share some of it with my colleagues. He says he is a retired United States Marine Corps officer with over 30 years of active and reserve service. Upon his retirement from the Marine Corps, he has worked in domestic intelligence and law enforcement in our country at a senior level.

He basically informs me, in starting his letter, that his intelligence background is operationally based. But he says in the letter, first of all, there is no such thing as an intelligence failure, Congresswoman. Intelligence is a command function, just as operations is a command function, just as logistics is a command function. If a commander decides to do something that is not supported by intelligence, then that is a command failure, not an intelligence failure.

He wrote to me that in his opinion the evidence of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction had not been vetted through the intelligence community, and he adamantly believes that that process is absolutely critical to an adequate analysis of the question. I thought about those words a great deal.

He says in his letter, look at the decision to go to war in Iraq. Our Commander in Chief decided to go to war, he planned for an operation, and nobody was about to give him any information to the contrary.

I ask myself, even if they had that information? Who had the information? Who knew what and when did they know it? We have a responsibility to the Constitution, to this country and to the people of the world. We ought to get to the bottom of who knew what and when did they know it.

REGARDING REMARK IN PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a little under 20 years ago, the maiden holder of this congressional seat, the Honorable Barbara Jordan, served in this House. She served at a time that this Congress took up the impeachment process of then President Richard Milhous Nixon. Impeachment had not been done in the 20th century; and, of course, it was a very troubling, very serious and very sobering time for America and for this Congress.

As I recollect, Chairman Rodino attempted to work across party lines,

and it was at a point of consensus on the House Judiciary Committee to the extent that Republicans conceded that maybe Mr. Nixon should resign that this process operated under. In fact, the Honorable Barbara Jordan was well noted for the words that she would not allow the Constitution to be diminished. It was at that time that I think Congress was at its best, bipartisan, in finding out the truth and telling the truth to the American people.

I was not there in Congress, obviously, and so I do not know whether the media chose to demonize those who felt in their hearts that the truth needed to be told.

We now come to almost 30 years, I believe, later, 2004, and we have a question of integrity and credibility, that on some sense there is a desire to know the truth. I have seen some light as this has unfolded to the American public, but I have also seen the effort to demonize those who would raise this question about what happened with respect to the intelligence that was given to the White House and the National Security Council.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to present that this is another serious question of the integrity of government. Just a few years ago, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, in almost an uncanny way, I participated in an impeachment that my friends on the other side of the aisle thought was imperative so that the American people could know the truth. By them dominating the United States Congress, the articles of impeachment moved forward and a trial was held in the United States Senate against the President of the United States at that time, President William Jefferson Clinton. I may have vigorously disagreed, and I did. I participated in the process through the democratic processes and argued that those charges did not reach a constitutional charge of impeachment. But the process proceeded, and the American people were able to tell or denote for themselves truth or consequences, truth or falsity.

Today I ask the question of my Republican colleagues, is it no less important to find out whether or not the American people were misled as relates to intelligence given that was then recounted in one of the most sacred commentaries to the American people, the State of the Union?

In that address, the President offered that there was evidence that had been received from the British that the Iraqi government had tried to buy uranium from Africa. Whether that statement was vetted, the key word was recent purchase. Because, based upon the overall presentation that was made, it suggested to the Congress and to the American people that there was an urgent need to go to war and an urgent basis upon which to perpetrate a preemptive strike.

We now have the owners of this House, the majority of this House, demonizing those who are simply asking

for truth, suggesting it is frivolous, suggesting it has already been answered, asked and answered, and I absolutely disagree.

The American people deserve the truth, Mr. Speaker, because, as we speak, the sons and daughters of Americans are dying in Iraq. None of us would fail to defend this Nation, but it is a travesty that as we find the smudging fingerprints of misrepresentation across this administration that our colleagues would not rise to join us in a unanimous effort to ensure that an investigation is had.

Ambassador Joe Wilson went to Africa in January, February and March of 2002 to investigate this, if you will, representation. He found that there was no truth to this. He said it over and over again.

I have asked for the stepping aside of the CIA Director or the firing so that he can come forward under subpoena and speak the truth to the United States people. I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by simply saying that I will write a resolution of inquiry in order to find out the truth for the American people.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JOE BACA, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOE BACA, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 11, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for documents issued by the Superior Court of the State of California.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

JOE BACA,
Congressman, 43rd CD.

ISSUES OF THE WEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this evening the bulk of my comments I intend to make about issues of the West, issues involving the concept of multiple use, issues delving really around public lands. But preceding those comments I cannot help but give some type of rebuttal to the preceding speakers who in my opinion spoke solely for the purpose of self-serving interests.

Having spent this last weekend looking at the TV periodically and seeing some of the reports that I saw on TV, it is very clear to me that we have a