

even after the investigation into detainee abuses at Abu Ghraib had already begun. For example, an interrogation policy approved in February 2004 in Iraq included techniques such as use of military working dogs and stress positions. (p. 220).

A policy approved for CJTF-7 units in Iraq in March 2004 also included aggressive techniques. While much of the March 2004 policy remains classified, newly declassified excerpts indicate that it warned that interrogators "should consider the fact that some interrogation techniques are viewed as inhumane or otherwise inconsistent with international law before applying each technique. These techniques are labeled with a [CAUTION]." Among the techniques labeled as such were a technique involving power tools, stress positions, and the presence of military working dogs. (pp. 220-221).

Some have asked why, if it is okay for our own U.S. personnel to be subjected to physical and psychological pressures in SERE school, what is wrong with using those SERE training techniques on detainees? The committee's investigation answered that question.

On October 2, 2002, LTC Morgan Banks, the senior Army SERE psychologist warned against using SERE training techniques during interrogations in an email to personnel at GTMO, writing that:

[T]he use of physical pressures brings with it a large number of potential negative side effects . . . When individuals are gradually exposed to increasing levels of discomfort, it is more common for them to resist harder . . . If individuals are put under enough discomfort, i.e. pain, they will eventually do whatever it takes to stop the pain. This will increase the amount of information they tell the interrogator, but it does not mean the information is accurate. In fact, it usually decreases the reliability of the information because the person will say whatever he believes will stop the pain . . . Bottom line: the likelihood that the use of physical pressures will increase the delivery of accurate information from a detainee is very low. The likelihood that the use of physical pressures will increase the level of resistance in a detainee is very high . . . (p. 53).

Likewise, the Deputy Commander of DOD's Criminal Investigative Task Force at GTMO told the committee in 2006 that CITF "was troubled with the rationale that techniques used to harden resistance to interrogations would be the basis for the utilization of techniques to obtain information." (p. 69).

Other newly declassified emails reveal additional warnings. In June 2004, after many SERE techniques had been authorized in interrogations and JPRA was considering sending its SERE trainers to interrogation facilities in Afghanistan, another SERE psychologist warned: "[W]e need to really stress the difference between what instructors do at SERE school (done to INCREASE RESISTANCE capability in students) versus what is taught at interrogator school (done to gather information). What is done by SERE in-

structors is by definition ineffective interrogator conduct . . . Simply stated, SERE school does not train you on how to interrogate, and things you 'learn' there by osmosis about interrogation are probably wrong if copied by interrogators." (p. 229).

If we are to retain our status as a leader in the world, we must acknowledge and confront the abuse of detainees in our custody. The committee's report and investigation makes significant progress toward that goal. There is still the question, however, of whether high level officials who approved and authorized those policies should be held accountable. I have recommended to Attorney General Holder that he select a distinguished individual or individuals—either inside or outside the Justice Department, such as retired federal judges—to look at the volumes of evidence relating to treatment of detainees, including evidence in the Senate Armed Services Committee's report, and to recommend what steps, if any, should be taken to establish accountability of high-level officials—including lawyers.

TRIBUTE TO LINDSEY JEWELL

Ms. SNOWE. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the 5 years of outstanding service that Lindsey Jewell has provided to me in various capacities in both my personal office, and on the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, of which I am ranking member. Ever since Lindsey began working in my office in 2004, I have been consistently impressed with her dedication, professionalism, and hard work, and I am sad to see her leave the Senate.

While still a student at the University of Maine Orono, my alma mater, Lindsey began her Senate career as an intern in my Washington office and thereafter as a staff assistant in my Bangor office. There, she served as a key liaison between my office and Maine constituents, assisting them in solving their problems and concerns with the Federal Government. Lindsey's work on behalf of Mainers proved to be her true passion, and after graduating in 2005 with a B.A. in political science, she came back to Washington, DC, to join my staff here.

Upon arriving in Washington, Lindsey hit the ground running as a legislative correspondent, handling a hefty portfolio of issues ranging from taxes, budget, and banking to agriculture, immigration, and foreign affairs. Lindsey's stellar stand-out performance in dealing with these issues led to her earning a promotion to Director of Constituent Correspondence in 2006. In this role, she oversaw all of my office's legislative correspondents, helping me ensure that mail was responded to in a thoughtful and timely manner. Through this position, Lindsey gained immense experience dealing with a vast array of issues the Senate faces. She also proved to be a

capable, talented, and amicable leader, who was a tremendous supervisor.

During the summer of 2007, Lindsey left my personal office and moved three floors up in the Russell Building to serve as Senior Research Analyst on the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship. As ranking member of that committee, I continued to benefit from Lindsey's wisdom and insight. That said, her departure certainly left a large void in my personal office. As Lindsey continued to provide me with detailed and thorough materials on a range of small business issues, she once again earned a well-deserved promotion to Professional Staff Member early in 2008. In that capacity, Lindsey advised the committee on matters relating to women-owned businesses, small business energy concerns, entrepreneurial development programs, and military base redevelopment initiatives.

Lindsey was instrumental in my recently introducing the Defense Communities Assistance Act of 2009, a key bill aimed at providing immediate economic development benefits to all base communities, for both closed and active military installations across the country. Additionally, Lindsey helped me prepare an amendment to the fiscal year 2010 budget resolution to ensure that small businesses receive adequate funding under the Energy Star program. Lindsey's versatile nature and willingness to assist her colleagues in any way possible led to her drafting statements and press releases for a variety of committee hearings, bill introductions, and small business events, covering a host of issues.

Lindsey's sense of humor and easy-goingness make her instantly likeable. But more crucially, her responsible nature and advanced analytical skills make her indispensable to anyone she is working for. And Lindsey is a true team player, never considering any task beneath her. Indeed, she was a key member of my office's softball team this past summer, someone equally feared and respected by opponents!

That is why I am deeply saddened that Lindsey will be leaving us this week. But I am thrilled for Lindsey's future, as she will be marrying her long-term boyfriend, Patrick Hughes, in just a few weeks in Portland, ME. Pat, a Marine officer, and Lindsey will be moving to the San Diego area shortly thereafter, where Pat will be stationed at Camp Pendleton. I wish them both the best in married life, and hope that they enjoy the beautiful California sunshine!

A native born Mainer, Lindsey Jewell is an incredibly talented person. Coming from hard-working, community-oriented roots in the Aroostook county town of Monticello in northern Maine, Lindsey displays the classic values of our State: solidly dependable, intellectually curious, and immensely industrious. I am proud to have had someone like Lindsey on my staff, and even prouder to have gotten to know her

over the past several years. Her sincerity, thoughtfulness, creativity, and consideration of others will be sorely missed. Lindsey, thank you for your service to Maine and America, and best wishes for your bright future.

IDAHOANS SPEAK OUT ON HIGH ENERGY PRICES

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, In mid-June, I asked Idahoans to share with me how high energy prices are affecting their lives, and they responded by the hundreds. The stories, numbering well over 1,200, are heart-breaking and touching. While energy prices have dropped in recent weeks, the concerns expressed remain very relevant. To respect the efforts of those who took the opportunity to share their thoughts, I am submitting every e-mail sent to me through an address set up specifically for this purpose to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is not an issue that will be easily resolved, but it is one that deserves immediate and serious attention, and Idahoans deserve to be heard. Their stories not only detail their struggles to meet everyday expenses, but also have suggestions and recommendations as to what Congress can do now to tackle this problem and find solutions that last beyond today. I ask unanimous consent to have today's letters printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I own a small construction business and, on the surface, high prices do hurt my bottom line; however, that is not such a bad thing. I have always been conscious about my personal and worldwide energy use, but the fast rate of price increase has made me even more, especially about my driving. My driving efficiency has increased, and my total mileage for the year has decreased several thousands of miles. This is a good thing especially when I consider that everybody I am talking to is thinking the same way. Statistics say Americans are driving less; that is a good thing. It is good the people get humbled and remember that every bit of energy and every material object we use was made in the natural world and refined using human intelligence; there are no freebies.

Americans need to plan a future without oil for energy. For some reason, it is taboo to mention solar energy and subsidy in the same sentence. Solar is the best hope for continuous energy yet nobody wants to subsidize the fledgling industry. Farmers and ethanol are subsidized, though they hate to admit it; the coming second nuclear program will be fully subsidized though they attempt to account around it. Even the fossil fuel industry is subsidized, among other ways, by being protected by the U.S. military. (Oil has caused all the havoc in the Middle East, so Iraq and Afghanistan and all the other military deployments acts of security for big oil). Hundreds of billions go to these fruitlessly revolving enterprises. Let us pay to get a nationwide solar plan fully off the ground. Imagine if every single house south facing roof was solar panels and all flat topped roofs were solar panels, we could power the entire country without having to build another structure. Subsidize and organize turning the entire fleet of cars over to

solar/battery/electric cars. It would work. Ethanol is a joke, nuclear is a waste, wind is like putting high rise buildings far into the countryside, coal and gas and hydro could be back up to solar; to even the load.

PIKE, *Nampa*.

Our family has been working to get out of debt and have breathing room to finally start saving for retirement; but with the price of fuel going up daily, there is no way. In fact we are sinking deeper in debt. We have to really struggle with going to watch the grandchildren play ball or buy groceries. We both have to drive quite a distance to our work each week and now feel trapped. We love our home, but cannot afford the commute, but with the housing market and fuel costs, we cannot sell either! So we are still forced to commute, going straight to where we stay when we go down for our work and then our jobs and back again.

We have always been a nation of integrity, of a backbone, fueled by necessity. If our government will get out of the way and let her people do what we need to do to be self-sufficient again, we will all be better off. It is so sad that so many people think the only way we can make it is if government controls, but when government controls we lose as is shown by the dropping dollar and high fuel prices. We have our own fuel and our own ingenuity, let us use it and refine it.

NANCY.

You may not want my input on the high energy prices, because I see a lot of good coming from them. For one thing, the air is a lot cleaner. Also, I would assume there are fewer car accidents/deaths due to fewer cars on the roads. People are improving their health because they are out there walking, bicycling, etc. And I see them reaching out to help one another. It is also forcing people to be more creative in the ways that they are dealing with the higher price of products/food. They are asking themselves, is it something they want or do they actually need it. They are fixing up the things they have instead of throwing them away and filling up the landfill. To me, I see the high energy prices as a change of direction. A good change of direction.

As for all the money that is being accumulated, I think it would be best used on developing alternate forms of energy—wind, solar etc. Drilling for more oil is just going to extend the inevitable. The oil is going to run out and, while we are waiting for it to run out, we will continue to destroy the planet and ourselves.

KATHLEEN.

Thank you for asking for my experience with the recent rapid rise in gasoline/energy prices. My husband and I are in our mid-fifties, and remember the first "energy crisis" in the mid 1970s when fuel prices more than doubled but were still way below one dollar. I purchased my first car during that time—a Toyota Corolla that got 36 mpg. My husband reserved his Dodge van which had much lower mileage for only special needs trips; then he purchased a Ford small truck (made by Mazda) which got 35 mpg. It travelled anywhere in Montana the big 4 wheel drives did with some weight in the bed in winter. We have only driven fuel efficient vehicles since, except for the special trip farm/plow vehicles.

At this time I drive 36 miles round trip from our rural home to work at IDL in Sandpoint. The 2000 Honda CRV gets 29 mpg with windows down and 27 mpg with windows up and internal fan using heat or AC. I find I fill up every 10 days (extra errands after work) and am spending perhaps an extra \$1/day on gas. Not a big deal.

My husband has telecommuted for his job as an electrical engineer for the last 13 years so he rarely drives his extremely fuel-efficient Honda Fit—a perfect commuter vehicle for one person at 35+mpg. The little Kubota tractor runs on diesel and uses perhaps 10 gallons per summer season. We can absorb that. Our house is fully electric and electric rates have stayed the same. Food at the grocery store has been increasing for a year or two so we eat smarter and raise our own meat.

By learning the lesson of the 1970s, we are not victim to the fluctuations of the fossil fuel markets or contributing greatly to the damages which result. Opening fragile and deteriorating ecosystems to offshore drilling will not bring down fuel prices—people are going to get used to them anyway, as they always have. There are still plenty of large expensive SUVs on the roads in Sandpoint.

If the country, led by Congress, would focus on funneling money to alternative fuels and technologies to get off this destructive bandwagon of the oil companies everyone could be better off. Think about it and please start being a constructive leader.

JAN.

The energy crisis is hitting us like almost everyone in Idaho. It is not bad enough that we are paying outrageous prices at the pump but we are also paying nearly twice what we were this time last year at the grocery store. In Idaho we do not have mass transit to utilize so we are stuck paying for the gas at the pump.

I did have one idea to help Idaho rely less on oil for power. My husband works at the INL and we have seen the negative publicity about nuclear power. The Federal Government owns all that land, as I understand it is about the size of Rhode Island. Why not put wind mills up out there? That would be free power after paying for the wind mills. There is probably enough area for wind mills that they could power the entire state of Idaho without the use of water or oil. You could most likely find some kind of federal grant to help fund the wind mills. It is just one idea for you to consider.

GAYLE.

I find it absolutely ridiculous that we cannot drill for oil within the United States. I find it insane that we are dependent on foreign sources. I find it ludicrous that Congress refuses to do anything about the issue. I drive forty miles to and from work each day. It is not much, but it adds up quickly at \$4.00+ a gallon. I cannot even pay at the pump anymore, because the \$75 limit on my credit card will not fill my tank. I fully support the Drill Here, Drill Now, Pay Less campaign. Please support any legislation that increases our energy independence and gets the price down!

DANN, *Rigby*.

This last school year 07-08 I lived in Twin Falls and attended the College of Southern Idaho. We had four girls living in our apartment. The first semester two of us had vehicles and two of my roommates received help from their parents. In January, those two roommates moved out and the two that moved in did not receive financial help from their parents either. Because of rising fuel costs we mostly walked to campus even when it was cold because we could not afford gas (campus is a good 25-35 minute walk one way). And when we did go somewhere like to the grocery store we car pooled. We only ate out if it was a special occasion but even then most of the time we had large dinner parties at our apt and we had every one bring something. But we made it! However with the rising cost of everything, partially due to the