

track record of neglect that the U.S. Congress felt compelled to take action. And as a result, Congress in recent years has enacted three separate statutes seeking to ensure veterans access to chiropractic care—Public Law 106–117, Public Law 107–135 and Public Law 108–170. The last of those statutes gives explicit authority to the DVA to hire doctors of chiropractic as full-time employees. I'm proud to have worked with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help advance those initiatives—and I am hopeful that a reluctant DVA has finally seen the light.

I understand that the VA Secretary Principi has just released some new policy directives regarding chiropractic care and that, at last, we may be on our way to seeing the true and full integration of chiropractic care into the DVA. But Mr. Speaker, if the past is any guide to the future, then I must remain concerned until I see these new policies firmly in place and working well in all DVA treatment facilities. To help ensure that in the future, barriers to veterans who want and need chiropractic care are fully removed, I am pleased to introduce legislation that would require the DVA to make chiropractic care available on a direct access basis to our veterans. If the previous legislation had actually been implemented, my legislation would not be necessary—because referrals to doctors of chiropractic would actually be taking place with the encouragement and support of the DVA leadership. I hope this is what happens under Secretary Principi's new guidance—but as insurance, Mr. Speaker, in case the Department loses their newfound enlightenment somewhere along the way—perhaps under a less supportive Secretary—then the enactment of the legislation I propose would guarantee the right of a veteran to obtain this important service without the cost and stumbling blocks of going through potentially hostile gatekeepers. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting unimpeded access to chiropractic care throughout the veterans health care system and help enact this measure.

HONORING LEW AND SUSAN
MANILOW

HON. RAHM EMANUEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 2004

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Susan and Lew Manilow of Chicago on their recent 30th wedding anniversary.

Both Susan and Lew have been active members of the community and continue to support the many causes important to them.

Lew is a retired attorney who has wide interests in the arts, public policy and business. He grew up in Chicago and has lived there all his life, where his passion for theater continues to grow.

Lew has served as the former chair of the United States Advisory Committee on Public Diplomacy and was a key member of the Democratic Leadership Council. He is a long-time member of the board of directors of the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs and was the founding chair of its Middle East Committee.

In addition, Lew is a founding trustee and former president of the Goodman Theatre and

leading advocate for the North Loop Theatre District. In addition, he is on the board of trustees for both the Museum of Contemporary Art and The Art Institute. Lew's generosity and devotion to the fine arts earned him the prestigious distinction of being one of 24 recipients of the National Medal of Arts and Humanities awarded by President Clinton in December 2000.

Dr. Susan Manilow, also actively involved in our community, has been a chairman of both the Mount Sinai Health System and the Chicago Health Policy Research Center. She is currently a chairman for the Foster A. McGaw Prize Committee, which recognizes health care organizations that are committed to community service, and to improving and expanding care.

Family has also always been a priority in Lew and Susan's life. Her two children, Edwin and John Eisendrath, are the proud parents of six grandchildren. His children, David, Karin, and John, are parents to seven grandchildren, with one more on the way.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the fifth district and entire Chicago community in congratulating my friends Lew and Susan Manilow on their 30th anniversary, and wish them, and their extended family, all the happiness in the future.

HONORING THE PUBLIC SERVICE
OF ANTONIA HERNÁNDEZ

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 2004

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, today, my colleagues Mr. ANÍBAL ACEVEDO-VILÁ, Mr. JOE BACA, Mr. XAVIER BECERRA, Mr. DENNIS CARDOZA, Mr. CHARLIE GONZALEZ, Mr. RAÚL GRIJALVA, Mr. LUIS GUTIERREZ, Mr. RUBÉN HINOJOSA, Mr. ROBERT MENENDEZ, Ms. GRACE NAPOLITANO, Mr. SOLOMON ORTIZ, Mr. ED PASTOR, Mr. SILVESTRE REYES, Mr. CIRO RODRIGUEZ, Ms. LINDA SÁNCHEZ, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, Mr. JOSÉ SERRANO, Ms. HILDA SOILS, Mr. NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ and I join together to honor the career of Antonia Hernández as President and General Counsel of the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF), a nationally recognized non-profit organization. Through the legal system, community education, research and advocacy MALDEF is dedicated to protecting the civil rights of the nation's 40 million Latinos. We would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Ms. Hernández on her 23 years of distinguished service at MALDEF and to thank her for her tireless advocacy on behalf of the Latino community in this country.

In so many ways, Antonia Hernández is a role model for all Americans. Born in Mexico, she and her family moved to the United States when she was only 8 years old. They settled in the Maravilla area of East Los Angeles where her father supported his wife and six children as a gardener and laborer. As the eldest child, Antonia Hernández learned English quickly and excelled in school. She would later go on to attend UCLA where she received her bachelor's degree, teaching certificate and, in 1974, her law degree.

Soon after passing the California State Bar exam, Antonia Hernández became a U.S. citizen. She later told a Los Angeles Times re-

porter that her patriotism to this country helped to inspire her interest in public service. "I love (this country) more than most because I don't take the rights and privileges of an American citizen for granted. I remembered there was a knot in my throat when I took the oath (of citizenship)," The Los Angeles Times reported in 1985.

An expert in civil rights and immigration issues, she began her legal career as a Staff Attorney with the Los Angeles Center for Law and Justice and worked as counsel to the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary under the leadership of Senator EDWARD KENNEDY. In 1981, Ms. Hernández joined MALDEF as Regional Counsel in Washington, DC. Ms. Hernández was elected to MALDEF's presidency in 1985 where she was responsible for directing all litigation and advocacy programs, managing a \$6.2 million annual budget, and supervising a 75 person staff.

Ms. Hernández's management expertise guided the organization to long-term financial stability. In 1991, she created a permanent endowment for MALDEF by raising funds for the national headquarters building in Los Angeles. She has been pivotal in overseeing the national expansion of the organization, which today has offices in Chicago, Houston, Sacramento, Washington DC, San Antonio, and Atlanta. Most recently, Ms. Hernández directed the opening of the Atlanta office in 2002, to serve the burgeoning Latino population in the Southeast.

A tireless champion for educational equity, Ms. Hernández has numerous accomplishments in this area. She led MALDEF's legal challenge to the state of Texas in Edgewood Ind. Sch. Dist. v. Kirby to counter the economic and racial disparities used in financing Texas public schools. This legal battle, which began in 1984, ended successfully in 1995 when the Texas Supreme Court held that the Texas legislature had the authority to require wealthier school districts to share their funding with poorer districts, in turn creating an educational system that provides greater opportunities for all Texas children.

In California, MALDEF successfully challenged a similar school financing system in *Godinez v. Davis*. The state had a system that short-changed urban schools while providing more money to suburban areas. This case resulted in the award of hundreds of millions of dollars for urban area schools, many with a significant number of Latino students.

Antonia Hernández fought for the rights of limited-English proficient students by mounting a case against the Denver School District in 1984 for their lack of programs to educate non-English speakers. As a result of their legal victories, MALDEF won the creation of noted bilingual and multicultural programs for the Latino students of Denver.

Antonia Hernández also won key victories for Latino students by expanding their access to higher education. In 1993, MALDEF was victorious in *LULAC v. Richards*, where the Texas Supreme Court ruled that the lack of higher education programs in the predominantly Latino area of South Texas violated the state constitution.

Under Ms. Hernández's leadership, MALDEF helped to secure the right for undocumented students in California to attend state universities. In 2001, MALDEF developed a successful grassroots campaign in support of legislation that allows undocumented students in California to enroll at any

publicly financed California university for the same cost as other state residents. To further this effort nationwide, in 2003, she established the Ellen and Federico Jimenez Scholarship Fund for undocumented students who are ineligible for state or federal financial school assistance. This scholarship makes the critical difference in the lives of students who would otherwise be unable to afford the cost of a higher education.

As a mother of three children, Antonia Hernández also realizes the tremendous influence parents have in lives of their children. That's why, under her leadership, MALDEF graduated thousands of parent leaders from its Parent School Partnership (PSP) program, which instructs parents on how to become involved in their children's education.

In the area of employment, Antonia Hernández has provided opportunities for Latinos by mounting legal battles for fair hiring practices. Her work on the landmark legal case of *Ballasteros v. Lucky* forced the food service industries to allow Latinos to work in every major grocery chain in California. The victory resulted in the hiring of Latinos in several hundred retail stores.

Antonia Hernández has been a tenacious defender of immigration reform. Working with Congress and state governments, she has been a devoted advocate on behalf of fair and just immigration reform. Most notably, in 1985, MALDEF successfully halted the implementation of California's Proposition 187, which would have barred immigrants from receiving public education, medical services, and other public benefits.

Underlying all of MALDEF's efforts is a steadfast commitment to political empowerment in the Latino community. With this in mind, under Antonia Hernández's leadership, MALDEF has vigorously defended the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In 1982, she helped to create a new section of the Act that explicitly outlaws discriminatory election practices. She also championed a bilingual provision to protect limited-English proficient voters. In order to ensure a strong political voice for Latinos throughout the country, MALDEF led nationwide census outreach campaigns in 1990 and 2000. Over the years, MALDEF has won many Latino-majority voting districts, one of which resulted in the first Latino seat in 100 years in Los Angeles County (1990 Garza v. County of L.A.) and another which created the state of Illinois' first Latino Congressional district as a remedy for past discrimination in the Chicago area (1995 King v. Illinois State Board of Elections).

Antonia Hernández has worked to ensure that Latinos receive their fair share of public services, including access to medical insurance, language translation for public services, and fair and equitable treatment in land-use decisions. Just one example is the 2001 case in which MALDEF won a case against the City of Poth, a South Texas town that finally agreed to pave the streets in its Latino neighborhoods.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Hernández is a visionary. Through her work at MALDEF, her service to the Latino community has truly improved lives and helped to carry out the organization's unwavering mission to remove obstacles that prevent the Latino community from realizing its dreams. We thank her for her many years of public service and we are grateful that she will continue her work in the community as she

moves on to serve as President and CEO of the California Community Foundation. Her courage, compassion, and, above all, her dedication to helping others have made a difference at MALDEF and in the Latino community. We trust that this is indeed not an end to her work in public service, but a new beginning to even greater victories ahead.

USES AND MISUSES OF INTELLIGENCE

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 2004

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, in just over 3 years the United States has faced two acute intelligence failures. The first was the tragic events of September 11, 2001. The second can be found in the arguments made to go to war in Iraq. Weapons of mass destruction have not been found. Anti-American sentiment has been strengthened and spread across the Islamic world. In the aftermath the United States has been saddled with a long-term commitment to pay the rising costs of war and endure the continuing loss of life in Iraq. It is in this context America's hard-won lessons from its past covert activities should be turned to, to guide us in our current endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a copy of the following speech by Professor Raymond H. Close delivered to the Princeton Middle East Society at Princeton University last month on the uses and misuses of intelligence in the conflict with Iraq.

USES AND MISUSES OF INTELLIGENCE

(By Raymond H. Close)

Today I want to describe to you the details of a few specific situations that took place a number of years ago where intelligence estimates and covert actions were employed, and in some cases deliberately distorted, in a manner calculated to support policy objectives of the U.S. Government that might otherwise not have received the support of the American people and the approval of the world community. From an assessment of those experiences in the past, perhaps we can draw some useful lessons to guide our intelligence officials today in fulfilling their professional obligations more honestly and appropriately.

My own experiences in the twenty years that I spent actually engaged in clandestine operations in the Middle East were entirely in the areas of old-fashioned espionage and so-called covert action—which I define as the effort to achieve specific strategic objectives for the United States through secret intervention in the political processes of another country. As you all know, the term “covert action” can also include the employment of lethal violence in some situations to accomplish objectives that could not otherwise be justified by our own legal system or by humanitarian principles, carried out by methods designed to hide our government's role behind a shield of “plausible denial”.

Let me start by telling you about some of my experiences in Lebanon during the years 1952–1958, from which some lessons can still be drawn, I think.

In 1957, I participated in a covert action operation in Lebanon, explicitly ordered by President Eisenhower, in which it was our objective to keep a government in power that was committed to the open and enthusiastic support of American policy objectives

in the region, but was under assault by internal elements determined that their country should adopt a more independent stance. We were initially successful, but our crude manipulation of the democratic process during Lebanon's 1957 parliamentary elections contributed directly to a civil war that was ended only on the landing of a large U.S. Marine and Army military force one year later. To justify that armed intervention, we deliberately and knowingly provided false intelligence to the United Nations purporting to prove that our forces had responded to indirect aggression against the freely elected government by forces inspired and supported by international communism. This was pure fabrication. By the autumn of 1958, following our military intervention, the government that we had supported by our covert action had been replaced by a regime composed primarily of individuals who had been leaders of the political opposition, but who were not by any objective standard enemies of the United States. The supreme irony, I always thought, was that shortly thereafter Barry Goldwater wrote a book in which he extolled the glorious success of our ill-advised and ultimately counterproductive covert action operation in Lebanon. Goldwater recorded that, in a triumphant demonstration of how to employ U.S. power in the cause of freedom, a communist regime had been overthrown in Lebanon and replaced by a pro-western government. This breathtaking contradiction of historical fact was an example to me of how effective the big lie can be, and has, particularly in recent months, reminded me to keep an open mind when it comes to assertions of fact by senior American policymakers. A case in point: On February 5th, 2003, just one year ago, Secretary of State Colin Powell, in his now-famous report to the United Nations Security Council, said this: “My colleagues, every statement I make today is backed up by sources, solid sources. These are not assertions. What we're giving you are facts and conclusions based on solid intelligence.” Secretary Powell's use of the pronoun “we” in this statement was clearly intended to include CIA Director George Tenet, whose face appeared right over Powell's shoulder throughout the presentation. Tenet's presence could only have been intended to put the CIA's official stamp of approval on everything Powell was reporting—even information that Tenet must have known was highly questionable.

The Bush Administration apparently felt under pressure to strengthen its case for war in Iraq by persistent enhancement of whatever intelligence happened to be available that seemed to support their policy objectives. The details of how that corruption was implemented are much less important, however, than the violation of principles that allowed a preemptive war to be initiated on the basis of evidence that was known by the senior levels of our government to be inconclusive, and even demonstrably false in some cases. This misuse of intelligence will have long-term costs, first among which is that American and world public opinion will, in future crisis situations, be so dubious about the credibility of American intelligence that approval and support of other U.S. military actions overseas may be withheld by the international community even in situations where intervention is urgently called for. Secondly, the personal image of George W. Bush relying on questionable information to make life and death decisions has drastically compromised his credibility and effectiveness as a national and world leader. Finally, the present crisis has revealed flaws in the way various intelligence agencies in Washington evaluate their product, and how honestly and objectively it is packaged and marketed to their customers in a competitive