

Finally, Iran recently announced that it was prepared to convert approximately 40 tons of yellowcake into uranium hexafluoride gas, which is the raw material for centrifuge equipment. This is a sufficient quantity to produce nuclear weapons.

There is no doubt that Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons, along with the ongoing standoff with North Korea over its nuclear weapons program, constitute the gravest threat to American national security today. How we deal with this threat will shape our global security environment for decades. When coupled with the desire by terrorists to acquire and use these weapons against the U.S., the prospect of a nuclear-armed Iran and North Korea is petrifying.

In his new book, *Nuclear Terrorism: The Ultimate Preventable Catastrophe*, Graham Allison, founding dean of Harvard's JFK School of Government, states that if a terrorist were to acquire a nuclear weapon, its delivery to an American target may be almost impossible to stop.

Since coming to the Congress, I have advocated strengthening the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program that seems to secure enormous amounts of fissile material in the former Soviet Union and to expand that effort worldwide.

While securing this material is one element of preventing the production of nuclear weapons, we also have to make structural changes in the global regime that controls the manufacture, transfer and use of fissile material for peaceful use by governments. Chief among these structures is the "grand bargain" of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the NPT, first articulated by President Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" proposal.

In exchange for the commitment to forgo the acquisition of nuclear weapons and to agree to IAEA safeguards and inspections, the NPT guarantees non-nuclear weapons states who are parties to the Treaty assistance in developing nuclear energy. The problem with this bargain is that it allows nations like Iran and North Korea to access fissile material and technological know-how that are necessary precursors to a nuclear program. When the state feels confident it is ready to proceed with a weapons program, it simply opts out of the NPT. Unfortunately, the path of least resistance, the acquisition of a nuclear bomb, may run right through the NPT, not around it.

In February, the President gave a speech in which he proposed a series of tough steps. He asked, among other things, for the 40-nation Nuclear Suppliers Group not to sell uranium enrichment equipment and reprocessing equipment to countries that are not already in possession of those technologies. Months have passed. We have done little as a Nation in this area, and time, Mr. Speaker, is running out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

SHOCKING EVIDENCE REGARDING FORMER U.S. PRESIDENTS

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

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, it is very rare that I come to the well to encourage my colleagues to pay attention to television in general or the news in specific, but I do that here today because there are unconfirmed reports that there are some shocking documents that may be produced tonight by 60 Minutes and CBS News concerning some American presidents.

It turns out that, reportedly, CBS News has documentary evidence that Washington did not cross the Delaware to surprise the British but, rather, in an attempt to surrender in the American Revolutionary War. We are waiting to see the specifics of these documents.

Apparently, President Eisenhower, on the day of D-Day, was not commanding the American and allied troops but, rather, was golfing somewhere in the British Isles, and the allegations are that there may be a golf scorecard produced tonight on CBS and 60 Minutes news.

It turns out that President Richard Nixon, apparently, we again have not seen the evidence yet, never did have a dog named Checkers. Actually, the Nixon dog was named Alger Hiss, for whom the Nixons were secret admirers.

And finally, apparently, there is evidence that we may see tonight that President Reagan was all along a closet socialist and urged Mr. Gorbachev to tear down that wall to provide an opportunity to roll through and conquer Western Europe.

Mr. Speaker, 60 Minutes allegedly is not going to renounce any of these allegations until they have definitive proof to the contrary, and I would urge my colleagues not to always believe what you hear. And sometimes, do not even believe what you see.

□ 1345

SMART SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year people from around the world saw photographs of the mistreatment, the torture, the sexual abuse of Iraqi prisoners that took place at Abu Ghraib. If anti-American sentiment was not strong enough after the United States invaded a country that never had weapons of mass destruction and never once threatened us, these callous images of American soldiers torturing prisoners sealed the deal. Still, Bush administration officials deny any responsibility for the actions of these soldiers.

Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld shamefully called it the action of "a few bad apples." This scandal continues to get worse. It has come to light in recent months that prisoners also have been abused in Afghanistan and Guantanamo Bay and, moreover, evidence was uncovered earlier this week indicating American abuse of Iraqi prisoners in the northern Iraqi city of Mosul.

An American inquiry into the prisoner abuse uncovered the existence of ghost detainees, prisoners hidden from International Red Cross inspectors and kept off the inmate list of each prison, and military personnel have indicated that the number of ghost detainees may total in the hundreds. Even someone who does not closely follow the quagmire in Iraq would readily acknowledge the real possibility that the widespread prisoner abuse may not be the unfortunate actions of just a few bad apples.

In fact, the evidence overwhelmingly suggest that prison bias by U.S. forces has been coordinated by the Bush administration. The New Yorker Magazine recently detailed a high level Pentagon plan to encourage physical coercion, otherwise known as torture, of Iraqi prisoners in an attempt to produce intelligence about the post-war insurgency in Iraq. If abusing prisoners is not quite official U.S. policy, the widespread nature of these crimes indicate that they were at least deemed acceptable at the highest levels of command. Perhaps the few bad apples are located at the Pentagon and in the White House, not serving in Iraq.

Sadly, it has become obvious that while a few soldiers are standing trial for the prison abuse, the Bush administration and the Republicans in this House have no plans whatsoever to hold any high ranking officials accountable for these terrible misdeeds. In fact, the House Republican leadership refuses to hold hearings on this subject. The House GOP leaders could learn something from the Senate, which has readily investigated this widespread scandal, and it does appear from their hearings to extend to the highest levels of our government.

What has President Bush done about this situation? Absolutely nothing. The White House continues to deny, dodge

and deflect any and all rumors that individuals in the administration may have been involved at any level in the prison abuse scandal.

Mr. Speaker, there must be a better way, because the current method of hiding prisoners from humanitarian agencies and using vicious attack dogs to help conduct so-called prisoner interrogations is further hindering the war on terror and encouraging anti-American sentiment around the world. That is why I have introduced H. Con. Res. 3792, a SMART security platform for the 21st century. My SMART plan will keep America safe.

SMART stands for sensible multi-lateral American response to terrorism. SMART means interrogation, not torture. It encourages open government, not a secretive government that fails to investigate and covers its own back. SMART security encourages negotiations and leadership, not aggression and unilateralism. SMART invests in developmental and humanitarian aid for the most impoverished nations, not an expensive and unproven missile defense system and certainly not the inhumane treatment of prisoners.

The situation in Iraq requires the best America has to offer. SMART security, accordingly, relies on the very best of America, our commitment to peace and freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for multi-lateral leadership. SMART security treats war as a last resort to be considered only after every diplomatic alternative has been exhausted, and it controls the widespread use of weapons of mass destruction with a renewed commitment of non-proliferation.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH FOR OUR CHURCHES

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have been on the floor for the last 3 or 4 years from time to time to talk about the need, the importance

of having our spiritual leaders in America to have freedom of speech, to speak on a Sunday or Saturday and talk about the moral and political issues of the day. This year has probably been one of the worst I have seen as far as the attack on people of faith in this great Nation.

Let me read from the St. Petersburg Times, an article from today. It says, "As the political influence of churches grows, opponents are wielding the Tax Code as a weapon against them."

State Representative Arthenia Joyner, a Tampa Democrat who is African American, she says, "It could have a chilling effect. I see it as a way to try to intimidate people, but I think it's not going to work."

I would say to Representative Joyner she is exactly right. That is why I hope that she and many other people, both here in the Congress as well as other State representatives, will get behind this effort to return the freedom of speech to our churches and synagogues.

A lot of people do not know the history, but prior to 1954 any speech or sermon by a minister, priest or rabbi in this great Nation was protected by the first amendment rights.

In 1954 Lyndon Baines Johnson's amendment on a revenue bill going through the Senate basically stifled our churches because our churches are 501(c)(3)s. Well, it seemed like not really much of a law that was enforced until the early 1970s and mid-1980s, when the moral majority got involved in campaigns. When I say got involved in campaigns, I meant speaking out about the moral issues of the day and saying to their congregation who stands for protecting morality. But what has happened even this year in the last 3 months? First of all a Catholic bishop, Bishop Sheridan in Colorado Springs wrote a pastoral letter to 125,000 Catholics. He said nothing about President Bush or Senator KERRY. He did use the word "pro-life."

You might say, well, what is wrong with that? That is what the Catholic church stands for. That is what many churches stand for and also synagogues. Well, the problem is that the Internal Revenue Service has said because of the Johnson amendment there are certain code words that cannot be used. Because Bishop Sheridan used the word "pro-life" in his pastoral letter, Barry Lynn with the American Center for the Separation of Church and State filed a complaint. In addition to that, he has filed a complaint against a Reverend Ronnie Floyd, a Baptist minister in Arkansas. He is now with a group of 100 volunteers monitoring churches in Kansas each Sunday to see what the minister might be saying about morality and might be saying about how we can protect the Judeo-Christian principles of America.

I want to say to Representative Joyner that she is exactly right. The great movements of this country, such as Martin Luther King and the civil rights movement never would have

happened if it had not been for the churches. The churches do have a role in this Nation and our synagogues, and that is to ensure and to help protect morality.

So I am hoping this year that maybe the House will look seriously at this legislation that has been introduced. We have 164 co-sponsors. It is time to protect the moral future of America, and the way that is going to happen is with our spiritual leaders of America being free with the first amendment rights that are guaranteed by the men and women serving this great Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say again that a nation built on Judeo-Christian principles, if it is going to survive, then we have got to be able to have our spiritual leaders speaking freely with the first amendment rights.

With that I would like to make one close and then I will finish. I first ask that the good Lord bless our men and women in uniform and their families, and I do ask the good Lord to please bless America. America is in trouble and we need the blessings of our Lord and Savior.

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.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

SHAMEFUL MEDICARE INCREASE

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Bush said about a year ago he would veto any Medicare bill that cost taxpayers more than \$400 billion. The President then signed a bill that cost \$551 billion. His Medicare Administrator, who had lied to Congress, who had not shared any of this information as they continued to say it was \$400 billion to people on both sides of the aisle, his Medicare Administrator knew the true bill's cost long before the President signed it, and you have got to think that the President knew what the bill cost since the Medicare Administrator works for the President, that the President knew what the bill cost before he picked up his pen and signed that legislation late last year.