

was not an easy process, we have a very divided Government Reform and Oversight Committee, but we were unanimous on trying to address the problems of steroids.

Rafael Palmeiro thumbed his nose at this Congress, as did Mark McGwire, and then the reaction of the Baltimore Orioles when he actually went to testify, they said he was not welcomed back in their locker room because he named other players. If there is any doubt in our minds that Major League Baseball will never solve the problem of performance-enhancing drugs, it is that scene in the Baltimore locker room.

If their club mentality is to punish the players who finger the dealers, who punish the trainers who identify and cooperate with law enforcement, it will never be fixed internally. We can sit here and twiddle our thumbs and be bullied by different organizations that do not want this, but it is time during Red Ribbon Week for us to stand up and say we are going to do something in a bipartisan way on methamphetamine. We are doing to do something on steroids, and we will bring these bills to the floor and we will find out how to make them law.

That is how we can recognize Agent Camarena, a DEA agent who was shot by law enforcement officials on the other side of the border, one of the most tragic events that led to this whole national campaign. What we can do here in Congress, in addition to speaking out in our district, working with events, as I am going to be at South Side High School in Fort Wayne this Saturday. They are going to have a poster contest and a basketball event to try to get kids in other programs and keep them off the streets.

We need to do that as Members of Congress, but we are legislators. What we need to do is pass the bills that the House has already spoken out on regarding methamphetamines, pass the bills that have unanimous backing on steroids and stop holding it up, getting it done, even if a few powerful people want to stop it. What better time to do it when the White Sox finally win the World Series, and we take a strong stand on baseball.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 420. LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-253) on the resolution (H. Res. 508) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 420) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1461, FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE REFORM ACT OF 2005

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-254) on the resolution (H. Res. 509) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1461) to reform the regulation of certain housing-related Government-sponsored enterprises, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

There was no objection.

TRADE DEFICIT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, America's economy has an internal rot that threatens our actual independence as a republic. I want to talk about that tonight, and I rise to draw attention to the astronomical and growing current account deficit that grows every day. This is a chart that shows the trade deficit that has been getting worse and more and more red ink every year.

In the year 2004, that deficit rose to \$668 billion of more foreign imports coming into our country than our exports going out. This red ink drags down economic growth, results in job loss, wage stagnation and actual cuts now in people's benefits for health and retirement and, indeed, wages themselves.

This deficit has been clearly increasing. Again, just in the first half of this year, by almost 20 percent more at \$394 billion. This represents the equivalent of 2 billion more dollars per day or \$1.5 million more per minute in foreign debt. We are literally cashing out America.

The tourniquet gets tighter each year, and Americans can feel it. Wages do not go up, your health benefits are more expensive, everything costs more, and you seem not just to be running in place, but running and falling behind. Given the rising cost of oil imports, a significant increase over last year's record high figure is an absolute certainty this year.

According to one report, the higher price of oil could add an estimated \$60- to \$90 billion more to the Nation's trade deficit in 2005. Unbelievable. America, wake up. America's independence is at stake.

This deficit not only represents lost jobs in our communities, more and more each day, it is a very real threat to the economic security of our country for the future. The fundamentals are seriously out of whack.

Curiously, our sky high and growing trade deficit results in a growing U.S. debt held by foreigners. These foreign investors now hold over half of the publicly traded U.S. securities, and that number has been growing in recent years to the highest in American history. If you look, this is just a listing of some of the countries that own a piece of the rock, a piece of America: Japan, with holdings of nearly \$700 billion. Europe, \$427 billion. China, Hong Kong, nearly \$300 billion this year. That is the fastest growing. That number is going up astronomically. The oil exporting countries own over \$134 billion of us, all down the list.

If a large number of those investors decided to sell off those public securities at the same time for any reason, or even a portion of them, whether it was due to a sudden lack of confidence in our economy or to a coordinated political offensive, America would face a widespread financial crisis. We are in uncharted waters.

In addition to this insecurity, job losses due to increased imports are a reality in every one of our communities. One estimate suggests for \$1 billion of trade deficit, we lose 20,000 more jobs in this country. Delphi, and its struggles, are not a fairy tale.

In my community in Ohio, workers and businesses are losing out as we struggle to save production. Companies like La-Z-Boy, companies like Clay, reforming firms, Delphi most recently, Ford Thunderbird, so many companies are literally struggling or have closed their doors.

As Princeton economist Paul Krugman noted last week, when corporate executives say they have to cut wages to meet foreign competition, workers have every right to ask, why do we not cut the foreign competition instead.

During prior decades, America held a surplus in automotive parts. But last year, we had turned that surplus into a trade deficit of over \$24 billion, and that deficit grows even more this year. That is why I am now drafting a bill, the Balancing Trade Act of 2005. It would require the President to renegotiate trading relations with a country, if America's trade deficit with that country reaches more than \$10 billion for 3 consecutive years. This initiative would require action on the \$45 billion deficit we already have with Mexico, a country we enjoyed a small trade surplus with when NAFTA passed in 1993. It would require the President to take action in the face of deficits, like our

current \$162 billion deficit and growing deficit with China, which has almost doubled since PNTR was passed in 2000, just a short 5 years ago.

Each new trade agreement, while expanding U.S. markets so slightly, has brought in a flood of new imports that cancels any gains we make. Not only cancels, but pushes us further behind, resulting in the ownership of the rock by foreign investors.

The only action we have seen so far in this administration's efforts to expand the flawed NAFTA in two more countries in this hemisphere was through CAFTA. Look at their effort to muscle that through just about a month ago by one vote here in this chamber, and it was not on the legit. They had to wring arms for every single vote. If the American people were inside these chambers, that never would have passed.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the American people, wake up, America's independence really is at stake.

THE VALERIE PLAME INCIDENT

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter which I wrote last month, which is addressed to United States Attorney Patrick Fitzgerald, who is currently conducting an investigation with regard to who it was who revealed the name of Valerie Wilson, who is and was an undercover operator for the Central Intelligence Agency, which I will enter at this point into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2005.

Re request to expand investigation.

U.S. Attorney PATRICK FITZGERALD,
Justice Department,
Washington, DC.

DEAR UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FITZGERALD: We hereby request that you expand your investigation regarding who in the Bush Administration revealed to the press that Valerie Wilson, the wife of Ambassador Joseph Wilson, was an undercover agent for the Central Intelligence Agency (C.I.A.). We believe that expansion should include investigating the Administration's false and fraudulent claims in January 2003 that Iraq had sought uranium for a nuclear weapon, which the Administration offered as one of the key grounds to justify the war against Iraq.

President Bush made two uranium claims, one in his State of the Union Address to Congress and another in a report that he submitted to Congress concerning Iraq, and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice, Secretary of State Colin Powell, and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld made three other uranium claims. We request that you investigate whether such claims violated two criminal statutes, 18 U.S.C., Sec. 1001 and 18 U.S.C., Sec. 371, that prohibit making false and fraudulent statements to Congress and obstructing the functions of Congress.

You have broad discretion to conduct this investigation. The issues we raise are directly related to your current investigation and clearly fall under your authority. The desire to discredit the information provided

by Ambassador Wilson regarding the lack of evidence to support the Administration's contention that Iraq sought uranium from Niger is the nearly-universally accepted motive behind the leak of Mrs. Wilson's identity. In order to fully investigate the disclosure of an undercover CIA agent's identity, it is clear that you should fully investigate the reasons for that disclosure.

As we outline below, we believe that members of the Administration may have violated laws governing communications with Congress with respect to assertions about Iraq's nuclear capabilities. Ambassador Wilson's efforts to publicly contradict these assertions seem to be the reason for the under-covering of Mrs. Wilson's identity. It is very likely that you would encounter these assertions during the course of your investigation, and thus their legality should be the subject of your investigation.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S CLAIMS ABOUT IRAQ SEEKING URANIUM WERE FALSE AND FRAUDULENT

The uranium claims of the Administration in January 2003 that Iraq had sought uranium for a nuclear weapon were shown to be false because, after intensive post war investigations, the Iraq Survey Group found no evidence that Iraq had sought the uranium. In the months prior to the war, weapons inspectors of the United Nations (U.N.) conducted extensive inspections in Iraq and found no evidence that Iraq had revived its nuclear weapons program. The Administration has never produced any legitimate actual evidence that Iraq had sought the uranium.

The uranium claims were also fraudulent because although some in the American intelligence community (including the C.I.A.) may have agreed at the time with the British opinion that Iraq had sought uranium, numerous people with the Administration did not tell the whole truth consisting of the contrary views held by the best informed U.S. intelligence officials. C.I.A. Director George Tenet told the White House in October 2002 that C.I.A. analysts believed the reporting on the uranium claim was "weak" and thus the Director told the White House that it should not make the claim. Later that same day, the C.I.A.'s Associate Deputy Director for Intelligence sent a fax to the White House stating that the "evidence [on the uranium claim] is weak." The National Security Council (N.S.C.) believed in January 2003 that the nuclear case against Iraq was weak. Secretary of State Powell was told during meetings at the C.I.A. to vet his U.N. speech of February 5, 2003 that there were doubts about the uranium claim and he therefore kept it out of his speech for that reason. The U.S. government told the U.N. on February 4, 2003 that it could not confirm the uranium reports.

Furthermore, the original draft of the State of the Union Address stated that "we know that [Hussein] has recently sought to buy uranium in Africa," but after the White House consulted with the C.I.A., the White House changed the speech to refer to the British view rather than the American view. The final draft stated that the "British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa." The parties involved stated that they had no discussions about the credibility of the reporting and the reason for the switch was to identify the source for the uranium claim.

However, in response to the uproar over the op-ed article by Ambassador Wilson, C.I.A. Director Tenet issued a statement in which he admitted that C.I.A. officials who reviewed the draft of the State of the Union Address containing the remarks on the

Niger-Iraqi uranium deal "raised several concerns about the fragmentary nature of the intelligence with [White House] National Security Council colleagues" and "[s]ome of the language was changed." Tenet stated that "[f]rom what we know now, Agency officials in the end concurred that the text in the speech was factually correct—i.e. that the British government report said that Iraq sought uranium from Africa."

What this tells us is that although Administration officials, informed by the highest ranking members of our own intelligence operation, knew that the claim of Niger uranium going to Iraq was "weak" and could not be confirmed, they were still determined to use it in the President's address to Congress and fell back on the dubious language of the British report. The Administration clearly sought to cover up their own officials' doubts about Iraq's nuclear capabilities and hide those doubts from the Congress and the U.S. public.

MOTIVE

A motive for making such false and fraudulent uranium claims would have been to thwart Congressional and U.N. efforts to delay the start of the war. Pending at the time that the Administration made its uranium claims in January 2003 was a Congressional resolution, H. Con. Res. 2, submitted by five members of Congress on January 7, 2003, which expressed the sense of Congress that it should repeal its earlier war resolution to allow more time for U.N. weapons inspectors to finish their work. On January 24, 2003, a few days prior to the State of the Union Address, 130 members of Congress wrote to the president encouraging him to consider any request by the U.N. for additional time for weapons inspections. On February 5, 2003, 30 members of Congress submitted another resolution, H.J. Res. 20, to actually repeal the war resolution.

Had it not been for the uranium claims in the State of the Union Address, which sought to squelch congressional concern over the impetus for the pending war, the number of sponsors for H.J. Res. 20 would have been far greater. The influence of the uranium claims can be seen in the fact that 130 members of Congress signed the letter before the State of the Union Address, but only 30 sponsored H.J. Res. 20, which was introduced after the speech. The Administration's uranium claims thwarted the congressional efforts to delay the start of the war since the Administration used the claims to allege that Iraq had a nuclear weapons program—despite the failure of the U.N. inspectors to find such a program—and thus falsely assert that Iraq posed an immediate threat that needed to be nullified without further delay.

Concerning the importance of the uranium claims, the report Iraq On The Record, produced by the Minority Staff of the House Committee on Government Reform, states: "Another significant component of the Administration's nuclear claims was the assertion that Iraq had sought to import uranium from Africa. As one of few new pieces of intelligence, this claim was repeated multiple times by Administration officials as proof that Iraq had reconstituted its nuclear weapons program." A nuclear-armed Iraq was a key reason, if not the most important reason, used by the Administration to justify the need for a preemptive war against Iraq. Rather than allow the U.N. inspectors to finish their inspections, the results of which might have fueled further congressional efforts and resolutions to stop the war, the Administration commenced the war in March 2003.