

medals, and one could see what was important in this young man's heart, because every time they called him paratrooper, his eyes sparkled and one could tell that he knew that they were talking about something of which he was proud.

Today is almost the anniversary of that tremendous wound that Alan suffered. He is recovering, through the grace of God and some wonderful medical people across this country. He is now back at least in Texas undergoing therapy, recovering every day, only because he and his family are true heroes who support the effort of this country and are proud of the service of their son. Alan, along with his family, serves as an inspiration for his fellow soldiers, as well as his fellow Texans. We in Texas are very proud of Alan and we say, God bless America and God bless Alan for his sacrifice. Alan Babin is a Texas hero.

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

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

CONNECTING THE DOTS

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

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was Abraham Lincoln who said, "You can fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time." Until recently, the Bush administration has fooled some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time on Social Security, Medicare, tax cuts for the rich, economic recovery, the No Child Left Behind Act, nation-building, the war against terrorism, and, most especially, the war in Iraq. The President has been able to do this because most Americans simply do not believe that the President of the United States would distort and deceive on such basic issues as war and the well-being of children and the elderly.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the gentleman not to make personal references to the President.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, during the 2 days of the hearings of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States, it was clear that the time for the fooling of the people may be running out. Of course, there are those Americans inside and outside of Congress who always question the veracity of the President's arguments for going to war. My hope is that the testimony at the hearings, along with a series of

widely publicized books and articles published in the last year or so, the latest being Richard Clarke's "Against All Enemies," will enable the broader public to connect the dots to the truth. I believe they will see that the dots of deception lead straight to the Oval Office.

This response of administration officials to Mr. Clarke's charge that the President has done a terrible job on the war against terrorism is typical: throw sand into the public's eyes. Bait and switch. In other words, attack a person's motives while refusing to address the substance of the critique. Hide the facts. Concoct data. Delay. Blame everything on Clinton. Do the opposite of what you say. Claim not to remember a conversation or a meeting. Insist on redacting critical portions of critical congressional reports. Accuse critics of being disgruntled employees. All to cover up arrogant, reckless, and disgraceful conduct of foreign and domestic policy.

We should commend those public servants who, in the aftermath of 9/11-PATRIOT Act hysteria, have put loyalty to country above loyalty to the President, risking their careers to shed light on the dark underside of George W. Bush's Presidency. This lengthening list includes the Minneapolis and Phoenix-based FBI agent who revealed that FBI field operatives tried to get higher-ups to pay attention to individuals on the counterterrorism watch list, including several who later crashed airplanes into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, were in the United States taking flying lessons; the joint inquiry of the House and Senate Intelligence Committees that revealed serious lapses on the part of the senior administration and intelligence officials during the lead-up to 9/11; John Wilson, a former ambassador, who disputed the claim that Saddam Hussein had sought uranium fuel in Niger, Africa. Wilson rejected the tales of the President and Vice President, Defense Secretary, Secretary of State, and National Security Adviser were telling about Saddam's alleged nuclear weapons program and, as we now know, the White House retaliated by telling a journalist that Wilson's wife was a covert CIA operative.

In a book by Ron Suskind, former Treasury Department Paul O'Neill insists that from the very beginning, the administration and the President were fixated on invading Iraq. Mr. O'Neill, who told the President that a second round of tax cuts would damage the economy, and also reveals that Vice President CHENEY contended that Ronald Reagan had proved that deficits do not matter.

David Kay head of the CIA's Iraq Survey Group, congressional testimony that no weapons of mass destruction had been found, that no weapons of mass destruction were likely to ever be found, and that frankly, the administration and the intelligence community had it all wrong. And now, Rich-

ard Clarke, a senior counterterrorism official in the Reagan, Clinton, and both Bush administrations, who says immediately after 9/11, the President and other senior officials were focused more on finding a pretext for attacking Iraq than on finding Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda.

□ 2015

Clarke quotes Defense Secretary Rumsfeld as saying there were not any good targets to bomb in Afghanistan but plenty in Iraq. Mr. Clarke also contends that invading Iraq was a priority even before the President took office.

If what Clarke, Kay, O'Neill and others have said is true, then it is fair to not only say weapons of mass destruction was a hype but also that every new explanation the administration has given since it declared an end to major operations is part of a cover-up of a war of choice, not necessity.

This is the context in which the public can connect the dots of the administration's attempts to obstruct the joint congressional Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence investigation of 9/11 and its belated cooperation and then only under the threat of subpoena with the independent commission investigating intelligence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

SENDING OUR TROOPS INTO BATTLE WITHOUT ADEQUATE PROTECTION

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I probably will not take my 5 minutes, but I was standing here, sitting here listening to my colleague from Texas talk about the young man who had been wounded and was recovering. And I am reminded that there are some nearly now 600 soldiers who have lost their lives in Iraq and we do not know for sure but somewhere between 3,500 and 4,000 have been seriously injured.

I think it is a sad and a tragic fact that the President, Secretary Rumsfeld, this administration, sent our troops into battle without providing them with adequate protection. As a result, there are those who probably have lost their lives simply because they did not have body armor; and there are those who have lost their limbs simply because this administration has not taken care of the problem of unarmored Humvees in Iraq.

Many, many months ago I wrote Secretary Rumsfeld a letter after I had received a letter from a young soldier in

Baghdad, a young soldier who is a West Point graduate and a gung-ho Army guy. In his letter to me he said, "Congressman, I am so proud of the Army. We are doing everything that we can here to help these people." But later on in his letter he said, "My men are wondering why they do not have the protection of this interceptor vest, this high-tech vest that has the capacity because of its construction and the materials used to actually stop an AK-47 round."

I started exploring that problem, and what I found was that we sent soldiers in the initial assault into Iraq without this most basic protection.

Now these vests were used in Afghanistan, and we found out in the Afghanistan conflict that they were effective. It is thought that as many as 19 lives of our soldiers were saved during the Afghanistan conflict because they had this interceptor vest. And yet when we sent our soldiers into battle in Iraq many went into those fights without this body armor.

So I wrote Secretary Rumsfeld; and I got a letter back from Mr. Brownlee, his Chief of Staff, and in that letter I was told that we hoped that we would have all of our soldiers equipped with this body armor by November. That was November of 2003. The war in Iraq started in March.

Then a couple of weeks later I get a second letter from General Myers, the Chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In his letter General Myers informed me that it probably would be December before our soldiers were fully equipped with this body armor. And I remind you that the war started in March.

I asked Mr. Rumsfeld how many soldiers perhaps had lost their lives on the battlefield who were not equipped with this body armor, and he indicated to me he could not answer that question because they do not collect that data.

Well, Secretary Rumsfeld said November. General Myers said December. Before we left this city for our holiday period, Christmas, the Pentagon held a briefing; and one of my staff members went to the briefing and the person holding the briefing said it was likely to be January before our soldiers were equipped with this vest. The war began in March. And, lo and behold, about 3 weeks ago I get a letter indicating that finally, finally, a year after the war began, this administration is willing to say that all of our troops have access to the body armor.

Now, Chris Matthews visited many of the troops at Walter Reed and he had that on his show this weekend. During that show, near the end of the show, he indicated that the body armor could protect the lives but not the limbs of our soldiers.

I end my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by pointing out that we have unarmored Humvees in Iraq tonight. The only company that produces these armored vehicles is in Ohio. They tell me that they can produce 500 a month, and the Pentagon is only asking for 220 a

month. How many soldiers will have their arms and legs destroyed because this administration is not providing them with the equipment that could keep them safe?

NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR SHOULD TESTIFY BEFORE 9/11 COMMISSION

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to review the debate that has been going on between the distinguished National Security Advisor of the President, Condoleezza Rice, and those who believe that she should be called back to testify under oath. The reason that has been put forward that this is not possible is that Ms. Rice claims that it is a matter of constitutional principle that the separation of powers prevents the President's close aides from testifying to Congress.

But, as many have noted, there have been senior aides that have testified before. As a matter of fact, they have held the same position that she holds. Mr. Sandy Berger has testified before Congress and Mr. Zbigniew Brzezinski has, in fact, testified before the Congress. So what we realize now is that there is no problem here. There is no separation of powers argument for her to present.

I happen to serve with the House Committee on the Judiciary, and I can recall when President Gerald Ford came before the committee to try to deal with a very extraordinary national issue in which he explained why he had granted some extraordinary relief or pardon to former President Nixon. It was a national issue. Well, in my view, I believe the death of more than 3,000 Americans is an extraordinarily important issue that should allow Ms. Rice to come before the 9/11 Commission.

But the traditions really do not mean anything and the separations of power argument fails completely because it turns out that Condoleezza Rice has for 4 hours or more already testified before the Commission on February 7. So there is no issue about separation of powers.

This would be the same as allowing a person to testify before the Committee on the Judiciary privately about conversations with their attorney, but then when they come before the Committee on the Judiciary they would certainly not be able to invoke the attorney-client privilege and refuse to testify on the same matters that they have at an earlier meeting.

So what we are concerned about is about whether we can separate from the American people the truth of what has been happening in our White House.

Now the concept of the separation of powers doctrine was conceived by

James Madison to prevent any branch of this three-branch system of government from encroaching on the powers of the other two branches. This preserves the dispersal of power so that it is not concentrated in one branch, and it also preserves the constitutional system of checks and balances. But our friend has already testified to the Commission earlier. So that now that she has already given private testimony she cannot be heard to come back and claim that she is prevented from doing that.

The only problem that this raises is whether she wants to testify under oath. And I think that this makes it very important that she listen to one of the members of the panel, former Secretary of the Navy Lehman, appointee of the President, who said that this is very bad political strategy for you to claim that you are prevented from coming before the committee to give formal testimony.

It is not going to work. I think that it is very important that we realize that. The Congressional Research Service has done for me an analysis of the Presidential advisor's testimony before congressional committees.

Now this is made more curious by the fact that more recently, after the statements made by Richard Clarke, that Ms. Rice asked the Commission to again come before it to respond to the allegations of Mr. Clarke.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD the Report for Congress by the Congressional Research Service.

CRS REPORT FOR CONGRESS—PRESIDENTIAL ADVISERS' TESTIMONY BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES: A BRIEF OVERVIEW, APRIL 5, 2002

(By Harold C. Relyea, Specialist in American National Government, Government and Finance Division, and Jay R. Shampansky, Legislative Attorney, American Law Division)

SUMMARY

Since the beginning of the federal government, Presidents have called upon executive branch officials to provide them with advice regarding matters of policy and administration. While Cabinet members were among the first to play such a role, the creation of the Executive Office of the President (EOP) in 1939 and the various agencies located within that structure resulted in a large increase in the number and variety of presidential advisers. All senior staff members of the White House Office and the leaders of the various EOP agencies and instrumentalities could be said to serve as advisers to the President.

Occasionally, these executive branch officials playing a presidential advisory role have been called upon to testify before congressional committees and subcommittees. Sometimes, such invited appearances have been prompted by allegations of personal misconduct on the part of the official, but they have also included instances when accountability for policymaking and administrative or managerial actions have instigated the request for testimony. Because such appearances before congressional committees or subcommittees seemingly could result in demands for advice proffered to the President, or the disclosure—inadvertent or otherwise—of such advice, there has been resistance, from time to time, by the Chief Executive to allowing such testimony.