

as he was with you. By being with him as he passed you truly fulfilled your wedding vow "until death do us part."

I once heard a Pastor of a younger congregation, who counseled many couples before marriage and continue in touch with them through a Married Couples club in the church, tell the story of the death of an elderly male member of cancer and saw at his bedside at the moment of his death his wife beside him holding his hands, mopping his brow, and giving him comfort. He said to the young people that evening that he knew there were many good ways for a marriage to begin, but there was no better way for a marriage to end.

I know, however, that what is important to you and your family at this time is that Kenny has been taken from you. May God give you the strength and courage at this time of sorrow to help you bear your burden of grief, and may He strengthen your faith in the resurrection promised by Jesus to provide hope of reunion in Heaven.

IN RECOGNITION OF BREAST
CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 26, 2005

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Breast Cancer Awareness Month and the brave survivors of this disease. The statistics for breast cancer are staggering. One out of every eight women in the United States will be diagnosed with breast cancer in their lifetime, and 1 out of every 229 women in their 30s will be affected by the disease at some point in their lives. The unfortunate truth behind these numbers is that there is a limited amount of information available on women under 35 with breast cancer. The general sentiment is that women in their 20s and 30s are too young to contract the illness, but the reality is that women of this age are not immune.

Four young women have shared their stories of survival with each other as part of a support group called Nordie's at Noon, and they recently published a book of the same name documenting their stories. These women were in the first stages of their lives when they were diagnosed with breast cancer, and their stories, although different, are bound together by a common challenge. These courageous women are Patti Balwanz, Kim Carlos, Jennifer Johnson, and Jana Peters.

Patti Balwanz fought a long and brave battle against breast cancer. She was diagnosed with breast cancer at the age of 24, while working as an IT consultant. Her cancer metastasized to her bones, lungs and liver, but she used her experience to educate women about the disease. Patti stayed active in breast cancer awareness outlets during her treatment by serving as a Board Officer of the Ribbons of Pink Foundation and being honored with the foundation's "You Are an Inspiration" award. Patti also continued her education by receiving a Bachelor of Arts degree from Southwest Missouri State University and remaining active in the Alpha Sigma Alpha sorority. Until her death in 2003, Patti continued to educate women about breast cancer while bravely facing her own fight.

Kim Carlos was diagnosed with breast cancer during the planning of her son's second birthday party. After three years of extensive treatment including eight rounds of chemotherapy, a mastectomy with breast reconstruction, and treatments for lymphedema, Kim is now cancer-free. Currently Kim serves as President of the Board for the Greater Kansas City Affiliate of the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation, and she was recently selected to serve on the Komen National Public Policy Council. Kim is also a member of the American Cancer Society State Advocacy Committee. She has been honored by Lifetime Television and SELF Magazine for her efforts in educating women about breast cancer. Kim now focuses on advocacy full-time with her business, K.C. Consulting, where her focus is governmental and public relations and grassroots advocacy.

While five months pregnant with her first child, Jennifer Johnson was diagnosed with breast cancer at the age of 27. Her treatment involved chemotherapy and a mastectomy during her pregnancy. Jennifer completed her final chemotherapy treatment in 2000, and the next day delivered a healthy baby boy, Parker Matthew. Three years later, Jennifer had a daughter, Emma Grace, and she has been cancer-free for six years. Jennifer is active in several breast cancer advocacy groups including the American Cancer Society, the Susan G. Komen Association, the Ribbons of Pink Foundation, and the Pregnant with Cancer organization.

Jana Peters was 27 and engaged to be married when she received her breast cancer diagnosis. She has undergone several treatments since then including a mastectomy and chemotherapy. In 1999 Jana founded the Ribbons of Pink Foundation, a non-profit organization with the goal of promoting breast health and serving as a support for young breast cancer survivors. She is a member of the United Methodist Church of the Resurrection, and she is a volunteer for several breast cancer organizations and events. Jana continues her career in the clinical research industry in San Francisco, where she resides with her husband Chris.

We celebrate these courageous women who have battled breast cancer and those who continue their fight against this illness. Breast cancer survivors and supporters gather to raise awareness and encourage the access of information for breast cancer in young women. Thank you to Patti, Kim, Jennifer and Jana for sharing their stories of bravery and determination.

**THE 9/11 COMMISSION FINAL
REPORT ONE YEAR LATER**

HON. CYNTHIA MCKINNEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 26, 2005

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter the following into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE 9/11 COMMISSION REPORT ONE YEAR
LATER

A CITIZENS' RESPONSE: DID THE COMMISSION
GET IT RIGHT?

A Congressional Briefing Convened on the First Anniversary of the Release of the 9/11 Commission Report, Friday, July 22, 2005

EXCERPTS FROM THE TESTIMONY

Opening Remarks: Rep. Cynthia McKinney: 9/11 Families Report

Lorie Van Auken, 9/11 Family Steering Committee "Unanswered Questions and The Call for Accountability"

Behind the 9/11 Commission: Flaws in the Process

John Judge, staff and 9/11 Citizens Watch: "Staff Report—A Citizens' Critique"

Mel Goodman, former CIA, Center for International Policy: "Conflicts of Interest—A Commission Investigates Itself"

Omissions and Errors in the Commission's Final Report

Paul Thompson, author of *Terror of Timeline*, "NORAD/FAA, P-56 Responses, Pre-9/11 Exercises"

John Newman, former NSA: "The \$100,000 Transfer—Pakistan ISI, bin Laden and U.S. Intelligence"

9/11 in Historical Perspective: Flawed Assumptions

Loretta Napolione, author of *Modern Jihad*: "The Underground World of Terrorist Financing"

Anne Norton, author of *Leo Strauss & the Politics of American Empire*: "The Rise of the Neo-Conservatives"

Peter Dale Scott, author of *Drugs, Oil & War: Deep Politics: Contragate, Drug, Oil, Covert Operations & Terrorism*"

Nafeez Ahmen, author of *The War of Truth*, "Afghanistan Mujahedin—Covert Operations, Creating Terrorism"

Foreign Policy: Immediate Response and Recommendations

Wayne Smith, former diplomat, Center on International Policy, "The End of International Law?"

Bob McIlvaine, September 11 Families for Peaceful Tomorrows, Alternatives to Pax Americana and Permanent War

Domestic Policy: Immediate Response and Recommendations

Elaine Cassel, author of *The War on Civil Liberties*

Rebecca Daugherty, Reporters Committee on Freedom of the Press: "The Rise of Secrecy After 9/11"

William Michaels, author of *No Greater Threat*, "The Patriot Act—Sunset of Freedom?"

Intelligence Reform: Immediate Response and Recommendations

David MacMichael, former CIA: "The Wall": Breaking Down the Division of Intelligence, Military and Law Enforcement"

John Nutter, author of *The CIA's Black Operations*, "Covert Operations and Increased Intelligence Budget—Solution or Cause?"

Opening Remarks

Rep. CYNTHIA MCKINNEY: Last year, we got the final report, an extensive, prosaically impressive report, but as some of us sat down to read it, the errors and omissions immediately jumped out at us. How was it that it took over an hour after the first transponder went off before planes were scrambled to meet the threat, all of them too late? What happened to those reports that surfaced within months of September 11th stating that seven or more of the alleged hijackers had come forward and claimed they were victims of stolen identities and were alive and well, living in Saudi Arabia, Morocco,

and Tunisia? Why did the Commission choose not even to address this? What about Osama bin Laden and his role in the Mujahedin backed by the CIA in the 1980s to fight the Soviets? The Commission didn't go there . . . We cannot afford to shy away from inconvenient truths. Many of you may find what you hear today to be inconvenient information. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said the ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of comfort and convenience, but times of challenge and controversy. I encourage you to engage with the issues that are raised. If you don't agree or don't like what you hear, challenge it. I believe that we should take in what every reasonable person has to say, to inform our decisions, because that is the best way to find the truth. In our pursuit of the truth, I encourage you to emulate the courage and the determination of the September 11th families in their struggle to know what really happened.

9/11 Families Report

Ms. LORIE VAN AUKEN: A thorough and definitive investigation by the Commission . . . would have subpoenaed for the information it required and examined the plethora of information that other citizens and groups responsibly provided. . . . it would have reported all of its findings with its redactions blacked out and submitted to the American people. In essence, the Commission could have produced a final product where the resulting conclusions and recommendations could be trusted. Instead, at the end of the day, what we got were some statements that truly insulted the intelligence of the American people, violated our loved ones' memories, and might end up hurting us one day soon.

One such statement was that 9/11 was a failure of imagination: a failure of whose imagination? What exactly does that mean? When you have a CIA Director with his hair on fire, a system blinking red, 52 FAA warnings, an August 6, 2001 PDB entitled "Bin Laden Determined to Strike in the United States," leads on several 9/11 hijackers . . . warnings from many foreign governments, a Phoenix memo, warning of Islamic extremists taking flying lessons, the arrest of would-be terrorists Zacarias Moussaoui, facts imparted to one agent, Agent Frasca, at the RFU of the FBI, 9/11 was truly a failure, all right, but I would certainly not call it a failure of imagination. Another outrageous statement made at the time of the release of the 9/11 final report that got a fair amount of media coverage was the one "Everyone's to blame, therefore, no one's to blame." The problem with that assumption is that it creates a no fault Government, and a no fault Government does nothing to ensure that things will be different or better in the future. When you hold people accountable, it serves as a deterrent for those that would repeat that same behavior in the future. For the record, I would like to see that assumption restated to read "Everyone's to blame, therefore, everyone's to blame." In fact, the fact that there has been no accountability for the failures that led to the deaths of almost 3,000 people is truly unconscionable and irresponsible on the part of all of our nation's leaders. The tools of democracy available to the citizens of America to address these issues are incredibly limited. We asked for an independent commission to investigate 9/11 because that was the only tool that we, as American citizens, had access to, and hoped that our leaders, the members of Congress and the American public, would ensure its validity and that its ensuing recommendations would make us all safer, as safe as we could reasonably expect to be in the event of another attack. Sadly, as Americans, we have all been let down.

Behind the 9/11 Commission: Flaws in the Process

Mr. JOHN JUDGE: This Commission's report is not a rush to judgment. It's rather a rush to exoneration. It fails to really hold people to accountability . . . By approaching the whole matter as an intelligence failure in the report, it obscured the evidence that what was normally a standard operating procedure in the period prior to 9/11 fell apart, apparently, in the months around and on that day. It led to them pursuing leads and suspects, basically accepting earlier reports without doing further follow up, blaming certain suspects, even though the evidence is we don't yet clearly know who the suspects were that got onto the plane, and that's because several people have come forward saying that their identity was stolen, basically, by these people. We are left with a story that comes from people that we can't get to, and we are left with a story that perhaps is giving us the wrong direction in terms of how we are looking. Until we open up the report and until we can look at the actual evidence and compare it, and begin to actually investigate further on many of the areas that the Commission ignored, then we have a report that doesn't eventually serve the mandate that this Commission was required to take care of, looking at the truth of terrorist acts upon the United States.

Mr. MELVIN GOODMAN: The most important individual to me, other than a commissioner, was the staff director, Philip Zelikow. His conflicts of interest were so great that you do have to wonder why this individual was appointed to head this important staff of over 80 people. He had very strong ties to the George Herbert Walker Bush Administration. Very strong personal and political and policy ties to Condoleezza Rice. More importantly, Philip Zelikow was running the case study program at Harvard which took millions of dollars from the Central Intelligence Agency over a ten year period to write case studies on the CIA, to establish a record that was essentially untrue with the facts about the work of the CIA. Of course, the classic case study that Philip Zelikow chaired, along with Ernest May, who was his patron at the Harvard Kennedy School, was the case on the Soviet Union, how the CIA got it right. You know, the politics of getting it right. Of course, as we all know, one of the greatest disasters of politicization of intelligence that occurred even before the Iraq war was over the politicization of intelligence on the Soviet Union. Who did Philip Zelikow bring into the staff structure as a team leader on his staff? None other than Douglas MacEachin, who was serving a tour up at the Harvard Kennedy School. Who was Douglas MacEachin? Douglas MacEachin was the head of the Soviet analysis job during the 1980s . . . responsible for most of the politicization of intelligence. Here you have Philip Zelikow from Harvard and the case study program, and Douglas MacEachin, as a team leader on Zelikow's staff, making serious decisions about the need for change within the intelligence community.

Omissions and Errors in the Commission's Final Report

Mr. PAUL THOMPSON: The 9/11 Commission claims it wasn't until 9:20 when Indianapolis communicated with the FAA command center and notified them that Flight 77 was missing, and then the information started to get out to other command centers, but still, NORAD wasn't notified. We are talking over half an hour later, the plane has been missing, still no one notifies NORAD, until finally 9:34, three minutes before the plane crashes, and then it was only mentioned inadvertently in passing when talked about with something else.

In order for this to be true, the 9/11 Commission is making the claim essentially that the Indianapolis flight control center and the local FAA center that they contacted were in complete lack of contact with the outside world during this time, that they were unaware, unlike the tens of millions of people who had been watching CNN, that there was an ongoing crisis, that planes had crashed into the World Trade Center, two planes. They are saying that all the way until 9:20, there has been over half an hour now where this has been the breaking news, that nobody in this entire Indianapolis flight control center or the FAA center had any idea that any of this had been happening.

We know that just isn't true. In fact, there was one news report saying that other centers such as theirs had been notified of the crisis long before the first plane even crashed into the World Trade Center. What we see is an account coming from the 9/11 Commission that in my opinion is just frankly impossible.

Mr. JOHN NEWMAN: An FBI team working with cell phone numbers provided by Indian intelligence uncovered a new smoking gun. They learned that the chief of the ISI, Mahmood Ahmed, had ordered Saeed Sheikh to send \$100,000 of the kidnapping ransom to Mohamed Atta a month before the 9/11 attacks. This ugly detail emerged when the FBI team ran traces on Saeed Sheikh's cell phone number beginning in July; the ISI chief's number was among the regular people that Saeed Sheikh communicated with. On October 7th, President Musharraf sacked Ahmed for this notorious act. This story was widely covered in the press around the world, not covered here in the United States . . . It's hard to imagine a revelation more damaging than the fact that Pakistan's intelligence service and most powerful Army commanders were behind the 9/11 attacks and the paymaster, a known terrorist who had been able to carry out his mission because the U.S. and U.K. had set aside justice for his crimes . . . that a sovereign government and supposed ally was so directly involved in the 9/11 atrocity must have stunned and deeply embarrassed the American Administration . . . The story of Saeed Sheikh and the generals are only lightly covered in western media, and only one American newspaper, the Wall Street Journal, carried it on October 10th.

The 9/11 Commission report which carries Mustafa al-Hawsawi as the paymaster and Sheikh Saeed as the al-Qaeda CFO, has dodged the issue, and does not say if the two are the same or not. Thus, technically, even if the Commission staff knew the truth, they have not told a bald lie. The Administration officials speak on terms of anonymity and were told that the Justice Department had pressed the National Security Council to have Saeed Sheikh extradited. One might be justified in asking the question why would the National Security Council have to be pressed to extradite a murderer of U.S. citizens? By late February [2002], the issue was moot. Pearl was murdered, and Musharraf swore he would personally hang him [for Pearl's murder] before turning him over to the Americans, unlike Khalid Shaikh Mohammed and Ramzi bin al-Shibh, whom he did turn over. Of course, they had not been western penetrators of al-Qaeda . . . We can no longer say we are protecting sources and methods about a story known to the rest of this planet. We are now mocked for our ignorance about this story, and even members of Britain's Parliament poke fun at us. It is long past time to come clean about Saeed Sheikh.

9/11 in Historical Perspective: Flawed Assumptions

Ms. LORETTA NAPOLIONE: . . . we need to implement a forward looking anti-terrorist policy, one which predicts the enemy's next move. . . . a forward looking anti terrorist financing policy should look at the situation in Congo, isolated as a potential area where terrorist financing could take place. In order to prevent that, it should dismantle this business of smuggling gold . . . Of course, a forward looking approach in the fight against terrorism will require the full participation of the private sector, and a multilateral policy. One country alone, not even if it is the United States, can actually fight this war on terror alone. Among other things, this policy, if implemented, will then cut the link between crime and terror. Terror will not any longer be a very profitable partner for crime. Breaking the link between crime and terror would already be a step forward, which you have not yet made.

Ms. ANNE NORTON: Neoconservative foreign policy centers on a fear of world government and the international institutions that might lead to it, most notably, the United Nations, a rejection of multilateralism, and as they say, above all, the ability to distinguish friends from enemies. . . . Europeans regard neoconservatism with special skepticism, and they do so, as you might have already realized, because they know its progenitors all too well, the desire for the combination of traditional values, the desire for an expansion of executive power, the ambition to create a new world order, and the identification of a providential enemy are all parts of a very familiar past, the shadows of German national socialism and 19th Century European empires fall very heavily on the neo conservative project. As the Administration responded to 9/11, this influence became increasingly evident.

Mr. PETER DALE SCOTT: The 9/11 report describes Ali Mohamed as "a former Egyptian Army officer who had moved to the United States in the mid 1980s, enlisted in the U.S. Army, and became an instructor at Ft. Bragg, as well as helping to plan the bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Kenya." In fact, Ali Mohamed was a very important al Qaeda agent who, as the 9/11 Commission was told, "trained most of the al Qaeda's top leadership, including persons who would later carry out the 1993 World Trade Center bombing." Ali Mohamed clearly enjoyed U.S. protection. In 1993, he was detained by the RCMP in Canada, and a single phone call to the United States secured his release. This enabled him to play a role in the same year in planning the bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Kenya in 1998. Eventually, he was allowed to plea bargain and receive a secret sentence. We don't know what the sentence is . . . The amazing thing, although he was named as a conspirator in that bombing, he was not an indicted conspirator, which itself is evidence of something going on behind the scene. Congress should determine the true relationship of the U.S. Government to Ali Mohamed, who was close to Bin Laden and above all, al Zawahiri, who has been called the main player in 9/11. This is very important, I think, whereas the report focuses almost uniquely on Khalid Shaikh Mohammed and Ramzi bin Al Shibh. Many other sources independently say the main figure and the top brains in al Qaeda was al Zawahiri, who Ali Mohamed was clearly close to.

Mr. NAFEEZ AHMED: In April 1991, according to a classified U.S. intelligence report, then head of Saudi Intelligence Services, Prince Turki al Faisal, struck a secret deal with Bin Laden, despite his being under house arrest for his opposition to the presence of U.S. soldiers. Under this deal, al-

though the regime would publicly disown him, Bin Laden was permitted to leave Saudi Arabia with his funding and supporters. Moreover, the regime would continue to fund his activities on the condition that he does not target the Saudi kingdom himself. Posner's accounts of a secret agreement between Bin Laden and Saudi intelligence is significant because he argues this was known to U.S. intelligence, this wasn't something that we didn't know. Levivier also interviewed a CIA analyst about the role of the Mujahedin. This CIA agent said "The policy of guiding the evolution of Islam and of helping them against our adversaries worked marvelously well in Afghanistan against the Red army. The same doctrines can still be used to destabilize what remains of Russian power, and especially to counter the Chinese influence in Central Asia." When I read this, I was quite surprised. Could this really be possible?

Stuff it to say in conclusion, this is a phenomenon I have discovered to be paraded throughout many regions in the Middle East and Central Asia. It is a very worrying phenomenon. It fundamentally challenges the whole paradigm of the war on terror. If we are allying ourselves in some manner with al Qaeda in this rather direct way, how can we fight a war and win? It just doesn't make any sense.

Foreign Policy: Immediate Response and Recommendations

Mr. WAYNE SMITH: The 9/11 Commission report says that the United States should engage its friends to develop a common coalition approach toward the detention and humane treatment of captured terrorists. New principles might draw upon Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions on the law of armed conflict. That article was specifically designed for those cases in which the usual laws of war did not apply. In other words, these cases in which our Government tells us the Geneva Conventions don't apply. The minimum standards are generally accepted throughout the world as customary international law. What does Article 3 call for? Well, among other things, it prohibits outrages . . . upon personal dignity, in particular, humiliating and degrading treatment. All these practices of stripping the prisoners naked, putting women's underwear or perhaps even men's underwear on their heads, is degrading treatment. It is prohibited by international law. . . . I'm not ageless, but I have lived a long time, and I don't remember ever having been ashamed of what we were doing to foreign prisoners. In World War II, we treated prisoners well, let's say soldiers. Even German spies arrested in the United States were not treated in a degrading manner . . . This is not an intelligent way to proceed in our struggle against terrorism. We ought to get back to full respect for international law, and fully humane treatment of all prisoners, without any exception.

Mr. ROBERT MCILVAINE: I had an unbelievable opportunity to go to Bogota. I haven't flown since 9/11. Not that I'm necessarily afraid, but I just won't fly. I've learned too much about the shoe bomber. I'm just not going to leave the country. Bogota, they have an international conference on violence and terrorism, and they called me to speak down there. I decided to do it. There were probably about 2,000 people in the auditorium, the first two rows were all victims. 13 year olds with legs missing. Burn victims. I had dinner with one burn victim, 75 percent of her body, an African/Colombian. She lost her three children and her husband. I said, I feel sorry for myself sometimes. That woman could sit there and laugh with me, because you have a bond with people who have suf-

fered. That is what we have to think about. It's the civilians, the 25,000 civilians in Iraq that have died, and 500,000 people in Iraq that have died in the 1990s. What is this foreign policy that we have? We talk about Pax Americana. In Latin, does that not mean American peace? Have we perpetrated peace in this world? Have we, since 1945? I think not.

Domestic Policy: Immediate Response and Recommendations

Ms. ELAINE CASSEL: Four years since September 11th, almost four years, and one year since the 9/11 Commission's report, critical infrastructures and resources are unprotected, and protections are unplanned, as far as I know. Co-Chair of the panel, Lee Hamilton, mentioned that this morning in a press briefing. He was very frustrated by that, and he mentioned these are difficult tasks to take on. Yes . . . it's hard to try to assess the risk to our critical infrastructure and to intervene and prevention . . . It's easy to open a file on demonstrators against the Administration's policies and conduct surveillance on the ACLU and Greenpeace, as the Washington Post reported last week. I seriously doubt that the ACLU and Greenpeace are terrorist organizations. In fact, if they were, the Government would have shut them down. Why are we paying the FBI's counterterrorism unit to amass thousands of files on these organizations and individuals?

Mr. C. WILLIAM MICHAELS: I still do not think the case has been made that civil liberties of any sort must be compromised so we can get to the bottom of what terrorist conspiracies may or may not be operating within the United States. All of this plus the scope and approach of the 9/11 Commission recommendations, which deal with everything from the FBI, passports, driver's licenses, airline passengers, brings me to the final points. And that is the effect we may be seeing as these varied parallel developments, including, of course, the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, the situation in military commissions in Camp Delta, Guantanamo Bay, which continue to unfold as we dispense with the legal preliminaries, and U.S. citizens held as enemy combatants, come to a single point, which should be considered as we continue with this national debate as what might be on the horizon at that point. Here they are, 12 common characteristics of a national security state:

1. Visible increase in uniformed security personnel.
2. Lack of civil accountability for the actions of law enforcement and security personnel.
3. Reduced role of the judiciary and executive treatment of suspects.
4. Secrecy of ruling authority and momentum of the threat.
5. Media in the service of the state.
6. Public and national resources called to service against security threat.
7. Patriotism moving to nationalism.
8. Lack of critical response by religious denominations.
9. War time mentality and permanent war economy.
10. Targeted individuals or groups.
11. Direct attack against dissent.
12. Increased surveillance of citizenry.

Intelligence Reform: Immediate Response and Recommendations

Mr. DAVID MACMICHAEL: The quote I want to give you is from a book written by a very interesting man, now deceased, Arthur Macy Cox, who was George Kennan's principal assistant when George Kennan, post World War II, was head of the State Department's Planning Office . . . His book is called *The Myths of National Security, the Peril of Secret Government* . . . published by Beacon Press in 1975:

"The drafters of the Constitution provided us with an ingenious system of Government based on machinery to check and balance the use of power, but they did not anticipate the problem of secret Government, nor has that problem been dealt with in subsequent constitutional amendments. Despite a lack of safeguards, a large consensus of the American public since World War II, has granted to succeeding presidents extraordinary secret powers to protect the security of the nation. The people felt that in matters of national survival, the President should be given total trust. He should be allowed to make decisions in secret to protect our national security, but democracy and secrecy are incompatible and it has now become clear that secret powers should never have been delegated without guarantees of accountability to the people's representatives in the Congress."

Mr. JOHN NUTTER: As I listened to David, I was struck by the various documents that I've read in my scholarship, documents like the Tower Commission report on Iran Contra, the Church Committee, the Pike Committee, and its recommendations, the Taylor Committee, which some of you may recognize as the postmortem on the Bay of Pigs . . . One could very easily take the recommendations from any of those reports, cut and paste them into the 9/11 Commission, and you wouldn't be able to tell the difference.

Closing Remarks

Rep. CYNTHIA MCKINNEY: I would just like to say after we have heard all of the testimony that has been presented to us today, there is one thing that is very clear, and that is that we must know what our Government is doing in our name. The American people have to inform themselves, despite the failure of the corporate press, to investigate the information in the public domain that provides answers to our questions. Today is a very special day because we have brought truth to Capitol Hill.

INCREASING THE AUTHORIZED PERIOD OF STAY FOR THE GUAM VISA WAIVER PROGRAM

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 26, 2005

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to increase the period of authorized stay for the Guam Visa Waiver Program to mirror the period of authorized stay established in law for the nationwide Visa Waiver Program. I have introduced this bill at the request of both the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor of Guam.

The Guam Visa Waiver Program was authorized by the Omnibus Territories Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-396). This program was established to largely complement the nationwide Visa Waiver Program, which was permanently authorized by Congress in 2000 (Public Law 106-396), and to strengthen economic and cultural ties with nations in East Asia and the Pacific Rim.

Today there are currently 27 countries participating in the nationwide Visa Waiver Program, while an additional ten countries are authorized to participate in the Guam Visa Waiver Program. These ten countries, admitted into the program as participants through the State Department rulemaking process, are as follows: Brunei, Indonesia, the Republic of

Korea, Malaysia, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, Taiwan, the possessions of the United Kingdom, Vanuatu and Western Samoa.

Under current law, nonimmigrant visitors arriving in the United States, including Guam, through the nationwide Visa Waiver Program are permitted entry for business or pleasure for a period not to exceed 90 days. However, nonimmigrant visitors arriving in Guam from any of the ten countries currently participating in the Guam Visa Waiver Program are permitted entry for business or pleasure for a period not to exceed 15 days. The bill I have introduced today would increase the period authorized for stay in Guam under the Guam Visa Waiver Program from 15 days to 90 days, a period equal in length to that established in law for the nationwide Visa Waiver Program.

I believe that establishing consistency in the authorized periods of stay under both programs will improve the administration of the Guam Visa Waiver Program. Additionally, extending the period of authorized stay for the Guam Visa Waiver Program could potentially boost tourism for Guam.

Tourism is a key sector of Guam's economy, and the Guam Visa Waiver Program has been central to increased international travel to Guam since its implementation in 1998. I believe this program can be strengthened with an increased authorized period of stay.

This bill has been co-sponsored by the Chairman and the Ranking Member of the House Small Business Committee, Mr. MANZULLO and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, respectively. Their support is especially appreciated given the fact that this bill will support many small businesses in Guam which are a part of the visitor industry. Additionally, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. FARR are original co-sponsors of this bill. I look forward to building more support for this bill in the 109th Congress and to working with the leadership of the House Judiciary Committee on this issue.

CONGRATULATING THE CHICAGO WHITE SOX ON WINNING THE WORLD SERIES

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 27, 2005

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the players, owners and staff of the Chicago White Sox on their tremendous victory in the 2005 World Series. Loyal White Sox fans across Illinois have been waiting 88 long years for this moment and it is every bit as satisfying as any of us could imagine.

Not many picked the Chicago White Sox to win the World Championship when the season started. After all, they had not won a playoff game in more than a decade, they did not have a group of high-priced superstars on their roster, and they are from the city of Chicago—which had not even seen a World Series game in nearly half a century. But this team never stopped believing in itself and quickly showed the experts and the Nation that championships are won through tireless effort, consistent teamwork, and a spirit that says anything is possible.

History will record that the 2005 Chicago White Sox marched through the season with a 99-63 record, the best in the American League. It will further show that this team went on to dominate in the postseason with an 11-1 record that included an unimaginable World Series sweep. But no historic record can convey the excitement this team created in a city desperate for a baseball championship, or the joy felt in the hearts of White Sox fans everywhere. And it certainly cannot capture the pride felt throughout our state in having this tremendous group of young men represent us in the World Series.

It is my honor to congratulate owner Jerry Reinsdorf, General Manager Kenny Williams, Manager Ozzie Guillen and the White Sox players for this extraordinary accomplishment. From the first day of this season, you have conducted yourself with class on and off the field and truly exemplified what it means to be a champion. In the process, you have set a standard of excellence for others to follow and provided cherished memories that so many dreamed of, but feared impossible.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL WILLIAM E. POTTS FOR FAITHFUL SERVICE TO STATE AND NATION

HON. LINCOLN DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 27, 2005

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, during a ceremony on November 11, 2005 in Columbia, Tennessee, the late Major General William E. Potts will be recognized for his service to his state and nation. The Veteran's Plaza on the grounds of the Maury County Courthouse will be named the Major General William E. Potts Veterans Memorial Plaza, with a plaque placed as a permanent memorial to his memory.

General Potts was born December 9, 1935 in Nashville. He later moved to Columbia with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Madden Potts. General Potts graduated from Columbia Central High School and Vanderbilt University. Having played football in high school and college he helped his Commodores defeat Auburn in the 1955 Gator Bowl.

Upon graduation from Vanderbilt in 1958, General Potts was commissioned a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army. He studied Turkish at the Army's language school and graduated from both the Command and General Staff College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. He also earned a master's degree in public administration from Middle Tennessee State University.

General Potts was company commander of the 801st Maintenance Battalion, 101st Airborne Division, served as an adviser in Vietnam and Army Attaché in Ankara, Turkey, and battalion commander of the 702nd Maintenance Battalion, Second Infantry Division in Korea. After being assigned to the Pentagon he was made Deputy Commanding General for research and development, Army Missile Command, Redstone Arsenal in Huntsville before assuming command of the Army's Ordnance Center and School at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland.

General Potts passed away February 29, 2004 at Walter Reed Army Hospital, and was