

do operate the Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System.

The NIH does not have a concerted effort to fund vaccine safety research. They provide funding for research in a haphazard manner. If one happens to submit a proposal and it passes peer review, the study may get funded. The NIH has funded only a handful of studies over the past 2 years investigating vaccine safety issues. The CDC has the greatest responsibility in this area. Unfortunately, they have the greatest conflict of interest. The CDC's vaccine safety program amounts to a \$30 million, million, a year program, and half of it goes to pay HMOs for access to the Vaccine Safety Database. The biggest conflict within the CDC is that they are also responsible for a \$1 billion, \$1 billion, vaccine promotion program. The CDC largely measures its success by high vaccination rates, and here lies the conflict. Any study raising concerns that there might be adverse reactions to some vaccines in some children has the ability to lower vaccine rates, and lower vaccination rates are in direct conflict with the CDC's top measurement of success. Clearly due to its overwhelming size and the manner in which the agency measures its success, the vaccine promotion program overshadows and influences the CDC's vaccine safety program. In fact, rightly or wrongly, the Vaccine Safety Office within the CDC is largely viewed by outside observers as nothing more than another arm of the vaccine promotion program, giving support to vaccine promotion policies and doing very little to investigate and better understand acute and chronic adverse reactions.

Further complicating the CDC's role in undermining the research is the fact that the vaccine safety studies produced by the CDC are impossible to reproduce. External researchers are not granted the same level of access to the raw data sets that the CDC's internal researchers are granted. The bottom line is that the CDC studies related to vaccine safety cannot be validated by external researchers, a critical component in demonstrating the validity of scientific findings. The CDC's recently convened Blue Ribbon Panel to examine how the CDC might better review vaccine safety is a step in the right direction. However, I do not hold out much hope because the panel is limited in its scope. Much like the IOM was limited in the outcome they were allowed to draw, this panel is limited to deciding where within CDC vaccine safety monitoring should be housed. The NIH recently recognized the importance of moving patient safety monitoring out of the NIH. I believe the same should be done with vaccine monitoring. It should be completely removed from CDC's jurisdiction. The CDC is too conflicted to oversee this function.

□ 1745

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on one more additional issue, and that is

something called the Brighton Collaboration. I am very concerned about the development of the Brighton Collaboration, which began in the year 2000. This is an international group comprised of public health officials from the CDC, Europe, and world health agencies like WHO and vaccine manufacturers.

The first task of the Brighton Collaboration, created several years ago, was to define what constitutes an adverse reaction to a vaccine. They have established committees to work on various adverse reactions to vaccines. Particularly troubling to me is the fact that serving on these panels defining what constitutes an adverse reaction to a vaccine are the vaccine manufacturers. What is even worse is the fact that some of these committees are chaired by vaccine manufacturers.

It is inappropriate for a manufacturer of vaccines to be put in the position of determining what is and what is not an adverse reaction to its product. Do we allow GM, Ford and Chrysler to define the safety of their automobiles? Do we let airlines set the safety standards for their airlines and determine the cause of an airline accident? Do we allow food processors to determine whether or not their food is contaminated or causing harm? Then, I ask, why are we allowing vaccine manufacturers to define what constitutes an adverse reaction to a vaccine?

This collaboration is fraught with pitfalls, and merges regulators and the regulated into an indistinguishable group. It is critical that the American public look at what is going on here and how this entity may further erode the ability for us to fully understand the true relationship between various vaccines and some adverse reactions in some subsets of our population. I plan to devote additional attention to this effort in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with you and others in this body to address the problem that we face today.

As I stated at the outset of my comments this afternoon, autism was once in America a rare and infrequently seen condition. I went through 4 years of medical school, internship, residency, and years of private practice and practice within the military and had not seen one single case. I have seen case after case in my congressional district over the last 7 years, a disease that I had never seen before.

The disease incidence was previously thought to be one in 10,000. It is now thought to be as high as possibly one in 167, an almost 100-fold increase in the incidence.

We need to get answers to these questions. We need to restore public confidence and safety in our vaccine program. Our vaccine program saves millions of lives, it saves millions of kids from a life of disability, and the best way for us to ensure public confidence and make sure that all the kids get vaccinated properly is to get answers

to these questions. The way the CDC and the Institute of Medicine and the industry is going about trying to answer these questions is highly flawed.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to begin to look at this issue. I know that many of them are coming to me saying they have parents coming in their offices now with autistic kids, saying something needs to be done. Something needs to be done.

#### THE PROBLEM WITH U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again, as I always say, it is a pleasure to address the House of Representatives and the American people. Tonight I will be joined by some of my colleagues who will this evening be talking about the issue that is facing not only our military but our future as we start to deal with this effort against terrorism.

First of all, I would like to give my condolences to the family that lost their loved one that was held hostage. Our thoughts and prayers are with you and your family and your local community. Unfortunately, all too often now, violence has played such a very strong role in the way not only Americans live but also how individuals live abroad.

I just would like to make some opening comments. When we start talking about how we entered Iraq, claiming we were better than the dictator Saddam Hussein, which I do believe very strongly we are still, there are some decisions that are being made that are putting into jeopardy how the world feels about the United States of America and also how the world views our moral high ground, or what is left of it as it relates to abuse.

I think it is important for us to remember that Iraqis at the beginning gave us a great deal of credit. They were believing that we would deliver on our promise of providing security, safety and democracy that they could believe in and live under. Now revelations of prisoner mistreatment have really clouded the minds of many Iraqis that had hoped.

Some Iraqis saw us as being a part of holding out the flag of hypocrisy in the region due to the fact of the Abu Ghraib issue. The scandalous impact of opinions, especially of Iraqis and other members of the world, of photographs that have been made public throughout the Muslim world, is deeply repugnant to most Muslims.

I think it is also, Mr. Speaker, important for us to remember that as we start to look at what is taking place in Iraq, at the top of the week we thought it would be a good week for coalition forces as it pertains to the new Iraqi

government taking over by June 30. We thought the topic of the week would be Iraqi's soccer team joining the Olympics. But it was overshadowed by tales of a gentleman by the name of al-Dory, a 39-year-old father of three, imprisoned by coalition forces on August 6 of last year and was held until February 17 of this year.

al-Dory was arrested in his office in the oil ministry and initially interrogated at one of Saddam Hussein's palaces in the capital city. Suspected of being a member of an anti-U.S. insurgency, he was battered with the butt of a gun and hung from the ceiling in a way that injured his right arm. Last fall he was moved to Abu Ghraib prison on the outskirts of Baghdad, where humiliation of those in photographs was open and no longer secret.

By that time, he was released without explanation. al-Dory had lost 100 pounds of his 260 pounds. For the coalition forces, the mistreatment of this prisoner also may have transformed places like Abu Ghraib into insurgency recruitment stations.

Coalition forces told the Red Cross that 70 percent to 90 percent of the individuals arrested in the past year were mistakenly jailed, according to the Red Cross report in February. The United States also tried to remedy the issue by releasing several thousand of these young men, many of whom emerged bitter towards Americans in uniform.

This is what al-Dory said: "Based on my experiences in prison, most of the guys who were released will go to join insurgents immediately because of the unjust treatment and the lack of response by the U.S. Government."

But tactics like these, really, Mr. Speaker, do not work towards the safety of troops, and I will tell you that the culture that has been set in the Department of Defense and the blocking of giving information to this Congress to be able to respond to some of these issues are so very, very important.

Veterans that are listening to us now who have served in previous conflicts on behalf of democracy in foreign lands and also on behalf of our country, their honor is at stake. Their honor is at stake making sure that when people look at men and women in uniform, the world and Americans, that they are doing a noble job, which I believe they are, which I know they are.

It is some of the individuals that are making the decisions in the suits and the ties that I am growing more and more concerned about.

I am so glad that tonight I share this session and this floor of the House with two of my colleagues from Ohio. I would like to recognize my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I also want to extend my sympathies to the family of the prisoner on behalf of myself and my family and the citizens of the 17th Congressional District in Ohio, and really all Americans. We are reminded, unfortunately, daily about

the struggles that we do have here and how real they are, and when you see the kind of torture and the kind of treatment and the kind of abuse and the murdering that go on every day in Iraq, in Afghanistan and, unfortunately, now in Saudi Arabia and many other countries, I think we are all beginning to question more and more and I think at deeper and deeper levels about the policy of our government and its effect on the credibility of this country.

I think ultimately we come to this House floor with a certain amount of humility. President Reagan had his peace through strength, and I think it is easy for the bully to go around and kick people around, and we have had to do that on a number of occasions. We needed to do that in Afghanistan, and we did it in Iraq to a certain extent; but we have now gotten ourselves bogged down in a situation that I believe is making the American people less safe than they were before we went to war in Iraq.

I just want to share some thoughts. We are wrapping this congressional session up here for the week. We are on our way to catch some planes back home. But we wanted to come down here and share some of our thoughts, because there is this growing amount of frustration among many of us, not only those of us who sit on the Committee on Armed Services, those of us who have consistently backed the troops with the defense appropriations bills that I voted for and the gentleman voted for. No one can come to you orally and say you are not supportive of the troops. We put the money where our mouth is, and we are saying we support the troops, and we voted for the defense appropriations. We worked it through committee; we made sure there were the proper modifications after the war already began.

But the question we have here is really of two different strategies. The one strategy was take the \$200 billion that you are going to spend in Iraq, and take that money and not only invest it in the United States, but use it like we passed today the Homeland Security bill, use more of that money to secure our ports, to make sure people are looking through the cargo that is coming into the country.

One or two out of 50 ships that actually come into the ports actually get checked. If you ask the American people, would you rather spend \$200 billion in Iraq or would you rather spend that money looking through and hiring people to work at our cargo ports, I think the decision is clear.

We put ourselves in this predicament that it is going to be very, very difficult for us to get out of. I am not saying we should cut and run. We have to do the best we can there.

Another point that I want to make is that we had the opportunity. If we wanted to set up an Arab democracy in the Middle East, we could have done it with Afghanistan. Talk about a trag-

edy, is what we have done in Afghanistan.

We went in there, and now we only have 10,000 to 12,000 troops in Afghanistan, when in fact we have 130,000-some in Iraq. Osama bin Laden was in Afghanistan; the Taliban that was the home of al Qaeda was in Afghanistan. That is where we needed to be.

If you wanted to set up an Arab democracy, we had the opportunity to do that in Afghanistan. As we learned a couple weeks ago in committee with the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Myers, when we began to talk about the drug production in Afghanistan, which is the funding mechanism for al Qaeda, billions of dollars in heroin is grown in Afghanistan, is sold, the money goes to al Qaeda and these different terrorist organizations, and they use that money to fund terrorist attacks all around the world.

□ 1800

So we need to go to the heart of it. We need to cut out their financing. We did that through the special organizations and the nonprofits, and a lot of these that people had here in the United States, but we also needed to go into Afghanistan and we needed to rid them of the poppy and get rid of it. And the answer we got from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, when I asked him directly what are we doing about drug sales, drug production in Afghanistan, because it seems like at least at this point that is the only crop that they can grow, and the answer was stunning. I think the American people need to know this. The answer was: they harvested the crop early this year, and so we did not have the opportunity to stop them.

Let me repeat that. The answer from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and the policy of the United States in response to a question by a Member of Congress as to what are we doing about getting rid of the drugs in Afghanistan, the answer is: they harvested the crop early.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to let the gentleman know, I just could not believe that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would respond, because I was there, would respond in that manner. I think that he is a man of honor but also, at the same time, we are looking at the way the Taliban is being funded. And they said that they harvested the crop early. That is what he said. I was there. This is once again not the Tim Ryan report, this is what actually took place. It is very serious.

I know that the Pentagon would like to save the lives of many troops, but it is some of the decisions that are being made at the top, not at the bottom, but at the top that is putting American lives at stake.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we want to include our good friend, the gentlewoman from Cleveland, Ohio (Mrs. JONES), from the good old Buckeye State, but before I yield to her, I

want to say that obviously we do not have enough troops in Afghanistan. So here we are in Iraq doing what we are doing with 130,000 troops, we only have between 10,000 and 15,000, I do not know the exact number, I think it is about 13,000 troops in Afghanistan right now. Now, just imagine if we took some of the money that we are spending in Iraq and we used it for homeland security and we took some of the money and some of the troops that we are using there and we had them in Afghanistan, Afghanistan has natural resources we could be developing, the water infrastructure we could be developing in Afghanistan, and setting up an Arab democracy. Is that not what we want to do? Was that not the goal after hearing about weapons of mass destruction, hearing that al Qaeda is tied to Iraq, and Iraq is tied to 9/11 and they have weapons pointed at us, there is an imminent threat and all of this other nonsense that we heard before the war. But then the story eventually changed, and there is always that undercurrent of: we need an Arab democracy in the Middle East for stability purposes. Why did we not do that in Afghanistan?

We have many, many other points to make here, but I would like to begin to include our good friend here from Cleveland, Ohio into the discussion, and I am happy to yield to the gentleman, who is my surrogate mother here in the United States Congress.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), for inviting me to participate in this Special Order this evening. I am so proud of both of them. I am only 2 minutes older than either one of them, but I am very proud of the work and leadership that both of them are showing in the U.S. Congress. I always remind people that both of them remind me of my man child Mervin, who is very tall and very good looking, and 200-plus pounds, and I see TIM pulling his collar here. But I am so proud of the leadership that both of them are showing.

So I suppose my colleagues want to know, what is a woman my age doing with these two young guys on the floor of the House talking about issues. I am just glad to be in the House with them and glad to be a part of the work that they are doing.

As we are talking about this, first of all, let me express my sympathies to the Johnson family on behalf of my entire family and the people of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio. I can empathize with the wife of Mr. Johnson, having lost my husband only in October of last year. It reminds me of all of the terrible things that are going on across the United States of America. It reminds me also of the need for the United States to be aboveboard and the need for the United States to be able to do things that in 20 years will withstand the light of day.

I am reminded of a meeting that I had at the Pentagon with some of my

colleagues and Secretary Rumsfeld. This was around the time of military tribunals and the discussion: what are we going to do with military tribunals and how are they going to be handled? Those of my colleagues who do not know, prior to coming to Congress I was a Cuyahoga County prosecutor or DA and, prior to that I was a judge for 10 years.

So I said to Secretary Rumsfeld, Mr. Secretary, I have concerns about military tribunals. What we need to make sure that we do in the course of these tribunals is to assure that the rules of evidence are complied with if, in fact, we are going to use people who have no experience in hearing law and in hearing cases. But if we are going to use people or judges who have had some experience, then the rules of evidence may not be so important. But what is important is that we have in place rules and regulations that will assure that a trial in Afghanistan or a trial in Iraq or a trial in the United States involving the same offenses will be treated commonly and that there will not be any disparity.

But more importantly I said to him, Mr. Secretary, any of our activity needs to be able to withstand the light of day. And I was reminded of that today when I read this article in the Wall Street Journal saying that Rumsfeld defends hiding prisoners at CIA urging. And what it does is it adds another layer of distrust upon the United States and upon the United States military when he says in the article that he suggested, without elaborating, that often this is done. There are instances where it occurs that they hide prisoners from the Red Cross.

The Red Cross in the international community is supposedly the organization that will come in and say to the world that we did not see any problems there and, therefore, you should not be concerned.

Now, if the United States admits to hiding people from the Red Cross, that is another layer of concern or distrust that is put in place.

So I would again encourage Secretary Rumsfeld to not engage in such conduct. In fact, I said not too long ago that Secretary Rumsfeld ought to do the United States a favor and do the President of the United States a favor and withdraw from his position. He should not wait for someone to put him out; he should be man enough to resign and step away from his conduct.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, as the gentlewoman brought up, this is the latest with the Red Cross, that we first said that this was just an isolated incident. This is just a few wild folks we have working with us and it is an isolated incident. Now we find out that the Secretary of Defense is the one saying pull him aside over here and put him back here and do not put a number on him.

It is the same with the Halliburton contract. Vice President CHENEY for

months and months said, I do not have anything to do with it. My office does not have anything to do with this Halliburton contract. Well, we find out earlier this week, it has been a long week, earlier this week that Scooter Libby, the Chief of Staff of the Vice President of the United States, okayed the contract to Halliburton. It went right through his office. You cannot tell me that the Vice President did not know anything about it.

So when you keep looking, we see the subversion of the Geneva Convention. All of a sudden in the United States of America, we have lawyers saying, well, Mr. President, you do not have to follow the Geneva Convention. Why would you want to follow the Geneva Convention? Some people out there are saying, yes, we would like to get these guys and treat them maybe the way they deserve to be treated. But when we look at what has happened today with the beheading and the murder that happened today in Saudi Arabia, where is the moral high ground in the United States? Where do we come out, and what can we possibly say? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my colleagues that how the United States is viewed in the world is important. Some people may discount it. Some people may feel, oh, well, who are they to judge us? Well, let me just say that the United States spearheaded the creation of the United Nations. Let us come together. I want the American people to understand. There are a lot of veterans out there that shed a lot of blood for this country, and I am so appreciative of their service. There are a lot of diplomats that have gone and stood in the eyes of communism, stood in the eyes of what was humane, I mean in trying to promote democracy and treating people in a humane way. And then now, for very few individuals at the top, and I am not talking about the troops. It is very interesting, when we start talking about the Pentagon, they have greater knowledge, especially of men and women in uniform than many Members of Congress have, and for Secretary Rumsfeld to okay an investigation by General Taguba to look at the Iraqi prisoner abuse, knowing all along that he was a 2-star general and he could only look at certain people, the first person that was court-martialed was an enlisted man.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want the gentleman to repeat that, because that is a very important point and we need to share this with the American people. Reiterate that point, about the man doing the investigation.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. General Taguba, who is an honorable man, he was doing what he was told just like many men and women in uniform, he was only able to interview MPs, number 1. Number 2, he was not able to go over his rank of a 2-star general. So this means from the very beginning, the fix was on.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. So the gentleman is saying that if there was a 3-star or a 4-star or any officer above a 2-star, General Taguba could not investigate?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. No, he could not. I mean that is just the way it is.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is the way the military runs. You cannot have someone low on the chain of command investigating Jack Nicholson, the top dog.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. No, you could not. But we would never, through what the Pentagon has said, we would never know whether the mistakes were made at the top. That is pretty much what I am saying.

So the way the deck, if I can, the way the deck is fixed now, that all of the investigations that are taking place need to be reviewed or what have you, will be done from the 4-star on down.

Now, Secretary Rumsfeld has appointed someone out of his office, a 4-star, that is going to go take over the investigation in Iraq. I can tell my colleagues that this Congress does not have what they need to be able to know what is going on with these investigations. This is actually putting American troops at risk. This is putting contractor lives on the line. And we will continue to see this abuse of prisoners that are taking our Americans that are taken and made examples out of, the first thing that this group said that has connections to al Qaeda has said, we are doing this because of Abu Ghraib, and we are not responding. The American Congress, we are not responding in a way to be taking this thing seriously.

We have the chairman of the Armed Services Committee in the other body who dared to have a couple of hearings and then he was chastised by his colleagues, including our chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

So I think it is important that it is okay for Members to say how they feel. There is nothing wrong with that. We are doing that now. But I think it is fundamentally wrong when we know that we are becoming an incubator for more individuals to fight against American troops that will be in Iraq for some time to come.

So I think it is important that we remember that. I just wanted to mention this U.N. thing before I yield real quick.

I mean the gentleman from Ohio mentioned a minute ago of how the world thinks of us. Kofi Annan, Secretary General Kofi Annan of the United Nations, a very honorable man, who has tried his best to be with us as long as he could. But now, we would like to renew our relationship with the Security Council of not having our troops or our military come before an international criminal court. This international criminal court was established by a treaty in 1998, a conference in Rome that would put forth saying prosecuting individuals responsible for most serious crimes, including genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. The treaty was signed by 135

countries and was ratified by 94, including us, and took effect in 2002.

Just today or yesterday, Secretary General Kofi Annan urged the Security Council on Thursday to oppose renewing the resolution that would shield U.S. troops serving in U.N.-approved peacekeeping missions from prosecution before an international court.

□ 1815

He said, Exemption is wrong. This is from The Washington Post today. In light of what took place, the circumstances of abuse that took place, the detainees of Iraq and Afghanistan, I think it is very, very important that we pay very close attention to this.

Then check this out. China, of all people, said that they may veto the security council approving the United States this blanket exemption.

Mr. Speaker, that article is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 18, 2004]

ANNAN OPPOSES EXEMPTING U.S. FROM COURT  
(By Colum Lynch)

UNITED NATIONS, June 17—U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan urged the Security Council on Thursday to oppose renewal of a resolution that would shield U.S. troops serving in U.N.-approved peacekeeping missions from prosecution before the International Criminal Court, saying the "exemption is wrong."

Annan noted that the United States is facing international criticism for abuses of detainees in Iraq and Afghanistan. He told reporters: "It would be unwise to press for an exemption, and it would be even more unwise on the part of the Security Council to grant it. It would discredit the council and the United Nations that stands for the rule of law."

The U.N. chief's remarks added momentum to a campaign by supporters of the war crimes court to defeat the U.S.-sponsored initiative. Senior U.N. diplomats said Annan would press his case in a closed-door luncheon Friday with the 15 Security Council members.

"Blanket exemption is wrong," Annan said. "It is of dubious judicial value, and I don't think it should be encouraged by the council."

State Department spokesman Richard Boucher said the United States is well aware of Annan's position but will press the council for renewal. The resolution, first adopted two years ago, applies to "current or former officials" from countries that have not ratified the treaty establishing the court—which includes United States—and exempts them from prosecution before the court for crimes committed in U.N.-authorized operations. The council expressed an "intention" to renew the resolution each year "for as long as may be necessary."

"It should be renewed the way the council said it would," Boucher said. "And so we're still talking to other governments in New York and discussing this with them."

The United States faces fierce resistance within the council as the July 1 deadline for renewal approaches.

China has threatened to veto the resolution, citing concern that it could be used to provide political cover for abuses. U.S. and other Security Council officials say that China—which also has not ratified the court treaty—is confronting the United States because it recently supported Taiwan's bid for observer status in the World Health Assembly. "This could have an impact," said one

council ambassador, who spoke anonymously because of the sensitivity of the issue. China is sending a "signal" to Washington that this "will threaten the development of bilateral relations."

U.S. diplomats acknowledge that they are struggling to line up the nine votes required to pass the resolution. Six countries—Russia, Britain, the Philippines, Pakistan, Algeria and Angola—are expected to support the United States, according to council diplomats.

France, Spain, Germany, Brazil, Benin and Chile have indicated they will abstain. Romania's U.N. ambassador, Mihnea Ioan Motoc, said his government will abstain unless its vote is responsible for defeating the U.S. resolution.

The International Criminal Court was established by treaty at a 1998 conference in Rome to prosecute individuals responsible for the most serious crimes, including genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. The treaty has been signed by 135 nations and ratified by 97; it took effect in July 2002.

President Bill Clinton signed the treaty in December 2000, but the Bush administration renounced it in May 2002, warning that it could be used to conduct frivolous trials against U.S. troops. The United States subsequently threatened to shut down U.N. peacekeeping missions in Bosnia and East Timor unless the council exempted U.S. personnel from prosecution.

That strategy has fueled resentment against the Bush administration at the United Nations. More than 40 countries have a standing request to discuss the resolution in a public debate. A senior diplomat said most nations will use the event to criticize the resolution, and to draw attention to U.S. abuses of detainees in Iraq and Afghanistan.

"We think the resolution is not compatible with the U.N. charter," one Canadian diplomat said. "It's harmful to international accountability for serious crimes and the rule of law."

China. You mean to tell me that we are at the point now that China gets to say something about the United States and how we treat individuals?

Now, American troops did not put us in this posture. This is the culture from the top of the Pentagon. And I will tell you this, if we want to save American lives, if we want to save the ways Americans think about us, if we really care about what happened in World War II, World War I and all of the wars after that up to this point, about the sacrifice, blood their grandfathers and fathers and mothers have shed, on behalf of how the world thinks that we are the good guys on the face of the Earth, then it is important and we should not allow this kind of leadership that is deeply flawed to continue.

I share with the gentleman, I was with the gentlewoman, I was with many Members of this Congress when I asked Secretary Rumsfeld, maybe you have done all that you can do at this point. Maybe you need to just say, I had a good run. Maybe you need to allow someone else to move on and lead the Pentagon in a way that it should be led, on behalf of saving American troops' lives.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. As with anything, if you propose to resolve a situation, when you put the person in leadership, that gives credibility to the investigation, to the resolution. And

clearly this government, this Secretary knew better than to put a low-level military person in charge of an investigation that would be so very, very important. And it goes back to what would be on your mind. How could you lead and not put in place the people who are needed to give credibility to a situation?

I am just continually reminded as the gentleman talked about the United Nations and China and Kofi Annan being concerned about what the United States is doing, that again, what we do must be able to withstand the light of day, because we are set aside or set out as the country who is trying to move forward and permit or encourage democracy or freedom and trust around the world. And if we are not encouraging freedom and trust right here in our own Nation or in areas where we have control, then who is going to believe us? Who is going to be behind us?

I am with you once again, gentlemen, that this country has to continue to show leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the article I referred to previously is as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jun. 18, 2004]

**RUMSFELD DEFENDS HIDING PRISONER AT CIA  
URGING**

(By Christopher Cooper)

WASHINGTON.—Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld defended his decision to hold a prisoner incommunicado in Iraq last year, taking pains yesterday to separate the incident from the unfolding detainee abuse scandal involving U.S. soldiers.

Mr. Rumsfeld said he made his decision to hold a suspected combatant out of the sight of international monitors when he was asked to do so last October by George Tenet, director of the Central Intelligence Agency. He suggested, without elaborating, that concealing detainees from Red Cross monitors is done from time to time, despite international conventions that forbid it. "There are instances where that occurs," Mr. Rumsfeld said.

But the secretary bristled at what he said was an attempt to link the decision he made in the case of the "ghost detainee" with the scandal at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq, where a handful of low-ranking U.S. soldiers stand accused of abusing prisoners. "The implication that's out there is the United States government is engaging in torture as a matter of policy, and that's not true," Mr. Rumsfeld said, adding he has seen no evidence that senior Pentagon officials were complicit in the abuse at Abu Ghraib or elsewhere.

An Army general assigned to investigate abusers at Abu Ghraib prison, Antonio Taguba, criticized the military for housing what he called "ghost detainees" for the CIA, saying in a report that the practice was "deceptive, contrary to Army Doctrine, and in violation of international law."

Mr. Rumsfeld's comments to the press came a few hours after President Bush told reporters he remained confident in his appointee. Mr. Bush said he hadn't previously known about the detainee who was held incommunicado. "I'm never disappointed in my secretary of defense," Mr. Bush said. "He's doing a fabulous job and America's lucky to have him in the position he's in."

But nearly every day for the past month the Bush administration has found itself on the defensive about treatment of detainees in Iraq or Afghanistan. In Afghanistan, the

U.S. Army is investigating several suspicious detainee deaths. Yesterday, a federal grand jury indicted a CIA civilian contractor in one of the cases. David A. Passaro, described by a CIA spokesman as a retired Army special forces officer on contract to the agency, was charged with beating an Afghani to death with a flashlight last summer. The indictment said Mr. Passaro murdered a detainee who had turned himself in to military forces at Asadabad military base.

Investigators have said they are looking into three prisoner deaths in Iraq and Afghanistan that may have come at the hands of CIA agents or their proxies. The CIA said Mr. Passaro's relationship with the agency was a short one. He signed a contract to work for the agency in December 2002 and arrived in Afghanistan in mid-May. The alleged murder occurred the following month.

"We take allegations of wrongdoing very seriously, and it's important to bear in mind that CIA immediately reported this allegation to the [CIA] inspector general," said spokesman Mark Mansfield.

The case of the ghost detainee doesn't involve abuse allegations. CIA and Pentagon officials say the man was captured last June in northern Iraq and spirited out of the country by CIA operatives. When the Justice Department ruled several months later that the man shouldn't have been taken from Iraq, he was returned and placed in the custody of the U.S. Army.

According to two U.S. officials, the CIA asked that the man be held without an identifying serial number because making his arrest public might hinder an ongoing operation. Because his case wasn't recorded in Pentagon prisoner files, however, U.S. officials acknowledged they lost track of him for a time. He resurfaced in May when senior Pentagon officials got wind of his case. Pentagon spokesman Bryan Whitman said the man will soon be issued an identifying number, and placed in the general prison population in Iraq if the CIA voices no objections.

Let me say one more thing. I want to send out kudos to all the veterans across this country, those who are from World War II, from the Korean War. One of my favorite veterans is my father, Andrew Tubbs, who is now 84 years old. But to all the young people serving, the ones that I met when I went over to the United Arab Emirates and when I went to Turkey and when I went to all these places in the military and Kosovo, we are so very proud of you. The reason we are standing here on the floor this evening is not because we are ashamed of your conduct. We are standing on this floor this evening, not because we are patriotic, because we are all patriotic.

We are standing on the floor of the House this evening to say to the world that the United States wants people in leadership who are going to set an example. We want people in leadership who are going to allow our troops to do what they need to, but not have the work of the troops diminished by the conduct of those in leadership.

I thank the gentlemen for the opportunity to be heard.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. As I begin to wrap up here, I want to make a final statement that maybe next week, to the gentleman from Florida, I have about 6 pages here that a member of my staff put together for me, Dean Thomas who does my military work, that has about

6 pages' worth of claims by the administration, President, Vice President, different Secretaries; and then it has the facts.

Let me suggest that maybe next week the gentleman and I come down here, whether it is with our 30-something hour or maybe another Special Order, and we go through these because it is astonishing to me that in the United States of America we can have a commission put together, a bipartisan commission, the likes of Lee Hamilton and Senator KERRY and the distinguished group that we have with the 9/11 Commission, and the commission issues a report and the report says what we have known for many, many months, and that is that there is absolutely no connection between Iraq, Saddam Hussein, and al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden, two separate entities that did not want to work together.

And to have the administration just come out and just keep repeating the fact that they have a connection is a slap in the face to the American people. And that is not the only claim. We talked about the Halliburton claim that was denied and found out to be true. We found out the claim, it was only a couple of soldiers; now we found out it is more of a systemic problem.

The American people need to know what the facts are, and just because the administration wants to keep repeating what they want the world to be like and what they want the situation to be like, as opposed to what the truth is; and hopefully next week and over the course of the next few weeks and the next few months we can really try to shape the debate here and move the ship back to the truth. Because I get very, very frightened when the majority of the American people think that Saddam Hussein had something to do with 9/11 and Iraq has connections, direct connection, military connections and terrorist connections with al Qaeda, when everyone is saying it is not true, when the experts are saying it is not true, when the CIA is saying it is not true, when the 9/11 Commission says it is not true.

And the administration keeps repeating it just to muck up the waters, just to make it unclear, just because people are working two or three jobs and they are worried about getting their kid a pair of tennis shoes and some health care, and they do not have time to pay attention.

So, hopefully, over the course of the next few months, the gentleman and I and maybe other Members of this Chamber, we can try to establish what the truth is and what the facts are and let the American people make the kind of decision that they want to make it, and they can make it at least in an informed way.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I will tell the gentleman, we have maybe 10 more minutes. We shared with the majority side that we were going to go about 40 minutes so that their Member can get down here.

So I just want to say very quickly, it is important that we share that information. This is a Special Order that we thought that was important. As members of the Committee on Armed Services, to come to the floor to talk not about politics but to talk about our troops, to talk about the leadership of our troops as it relates to the shirts and ties over at the Pentagon, the folks that are not supplying the information that we need in the Committee on Armed Services for the correct oversight.

I believe there should be more oversight because that is the only way we are going to find out what actually took place, what memo was written so that we do not have to read about it in the newspaper. The thing is that I do not like coming in here and quoting the newspaper. I would much rather have some sort of memorandum or some sort of committee testimony that I can make reference to, saying that General X told me Y, or Secretary X told us this. We do not have that privilege. We have to read about it in the paper. We have to read about it in Time magazine. We have to read about it in Newsweek.

And for us to be 60-something-odd members of the Committee on Armed Services, the largest military on the face of the Earth, the most capable, able, agile, mobile military on the face of the Earth, for us to have to read the newspaper to understand what is going on, and taking from General Myers's testimony when he did come before us and in his 30-plus years of service he has never seen anything like this Abu Ghraib issue. He said that to us. He has never seen it.

So for us to have an event that has not happened in 30-some-odds years, or I do not see anywhere in U.S. history that this has happened, it is documented the way that it is documented, for that to happen and for us to put a two-star, as much respect that we have for him, to investigate the little guys and gals that were a part of this bad behavior, it sets forth a culture that it is okay. If you are in the Pentagon, you are okay. You are a protected class. Do not worry. No one will look into you or no one will call you down to the Hill and ask you some tough questions, because if they do, they will be chastised by members of the Committee on Armed Services. Unfortunately, from the majority.

And it is also unfortunate that we have to come to the floor to be able to share thoughts in a way that we should be able to share thoughts with members of the military. I would love to ask Secretary Rumsfeld questions about why he came before the committee, shared with us what he shared with us at that particular time.

We received the Taguba report 2 weeks after that. I have taken a look at the Taguba report. Many members of the Committee on Armed Services have looked at the Taguba report. But now we just received new information from the Pentagon.

So when are we going to get all the information so that we can represent our constituents in the way that we should and be able to protect and make changes in legislation that is moving through this process now to protect American troops, to save American troops' lives, to be able to carry out all of our missions as we look abroad in what we are trying to do. But if we are not getting the information, then who is? And if they are getting the information and it is continuing to be suppressed, then it is not going to help save the lives of American troops.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Then when we get this information through the newspapers or through some other entity where we can get it, and then when we get the information and we try to share the information, people were questioning, why are we doing this? And I think the short answer is with the war and all the preliminaries of the war, with the weapons of mass destruction, and the ties to 9/11 and greeted as liberators and we do not need 200,000 troops, we are going to use the oil as revenue to fund the war, all of these things that have been said and now denial of Halliburton, and then saying it is an isolated incident when in fact it seems like more of a systemic problem that we have, detaining prisoners and keeping them away from the Red Cross.

Why are we bringing this up? Because it is wrong. That is wrong. It is not right that you do that. The way we got into the predicament right now, I just could not disagree more with how this all transpired. And if the original reason was you wanted to go to the Middle East to set up an Arab democracy, tell the American people that and let them answer yes or no with their support for or against it. But do not give us all those reasons that there is going to be a mushroom cloud in Cincinnati when we have a dictator that is writing romance novels, boxed in in the fly zone and the sanctions were working.

So do not mislead the American public with this. This is wrong, and we have to say it is wrong. We have to call a spade a spade here.

Hopefully, over the hours of the next few weeks and months, we can be able to do that.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for coming down here this evening.

I also want to share with the gentleman that on the upcoming Tuesday we have the first Democratic hour, and we can share the information that the gentleman has pulled together.

We look forward to seeing that and sharing with the American people. A part of the reason why we came down to the floor was to bring to light some of the issues that needed to be illuminated a bit more and also talk about solutions. Solutions are having the Congress do what it is supposed to do,

an oversight of the Department of Defense. Solutions are doing what the junior Senator from Missouri, Senator Truman, who became President Truman, in his committee that he had from 1941 to 1948 during World War II. To say that we do not have time to do this, we are at war, does not reflect on past history.

So I think it is important even if it is the good, bad and ugly, it helps the American troops, our troops be able to get the up-armor that they deserve.

□ 1830

It will probably have avoided us from having to put in this Armed Services bill reimbursing families for bullet-proof vests that they bought. Why should they have to buy them in the first place? If someone is going into harm's way, they should have the equipment that they need. I think that is so very, very important.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 18, 2004.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 18, 2004 at 3:24 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3378.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3504.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAH, L,  
*Clerk of the House.*

#### ECONOMIC GROWTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have some prepared remarks that I would like to offer to our colleagues this evening about economic growth and how important that is, but before that I would like to join, as my colleagues did earlier, in extending condolences and our thoughts and prayers to the family of Paul Marshall Johnson, as we have all seen in the last couple of hours, who was tragically killed in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, and it clearly has underscored our Nation's resolve and the resolve of the civilized world to deal with this issue.

It is out of this tragedy we have gotten the news that Abdulaziz Muqrin, who has links to al Qaeda, was shot in the gunfire that took place afterward,