

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

U.N. SANCTIONS AFTER OIL-FOR-FOOD: STILL A VIABLE DIPLOMATIC TOOL?

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2006

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I, the Ranking Minority Member on the House Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats and International Relations, delivered the following statement to the Subcommittee's hearing on "UN Sanctions After Oil-For-Food: Still A Viable Diplomatic Tool?"

I'd like to thank Chairman SHAYS for holding this hearing and providing Ambassador Bolton the opportunity to testify before this Subcommittee. We are in a critical moment for U.S. policy at the UN, especially regarding Iran. Just last Friday marked the Security Council's deadline for Iran to freeze all nuclear fuel enrichment, and the beginning of the inevitable struggle at the Security Council over what to do to contain Iran's nuclear ambitions.

We've seen this kind of struggle at the Security Council before. The U.S. spent much time in 2002 pressuring the Security Council to take action against Iraq to contain its supposed WMDs. Finally, on November 8, 2002, the Council approved resolution 1441, which imposed tough new arms inspections in Iraq, and promised "serious consequences," to be determined by the Security Council, if Iraq violated the resolution.

Even though Iraq did submit a weapons declaration, and began destroying its Al Samoud missiles as instructed to by UN inspector Hans Blix, serious consequences were imposed on the country anyway. It was the United States, however, and not the Security Council that determined those consequences for Iraq, when President Bush went to war against Iraq on March 20, 2003.

Experience in Iraq has proven that this administration will act unilaterally, outside the mandate of the Security Council, thereby rendering the work of the Council almost irrelevant. At the same time, however, experience has indicated that this administration will use the UN to make its case for war to the world community.

In the coming weeks and months, I think it's fairly predictable that we will see the United States' case for war against Iran unfold at the U.N.

I think it's highly probably that the administration has already made the decision to go to war against Iran. There are already U.S. combat troops inside Iran (REPEAT for emphasis). On April 14th, retired Col. Sam Gardiner related on CNN that the Iranian Ambassador to the IAEA, Aliasghar Soltaniyeh, reported to him that the Iranians have captured dissident forces who have confessed to working with U.S. troops in Iran. Earlier in the week, Seymour Hersh reported in the New Yorker that a U.S. source had told him that U.S. marines were operating in the Baluchi, Azeri and Kurd-

ish regions of Iran. On April 10, the Guardian reported that Vincent Cannistraro, a former CIA counter-terrorism chief, said that covert military action, in the form of special forces troops identifying targets and aiding dissident groups is already under way and that it had been authorized.

We also know from reports that the U.S. is supporting military activity in Iran by Iranian anti-government insurgent groups, some of whom are operating from U.S.-occupied Iraq, such as the terrorist group Mujahedin e-Khalq (MEK). An article published by Newsweek magazine on February 14, 2005 confirms cooperation between U.S. government officials and the MEK. The article describes how "the Administration is seeking to cull useful MEK members as operatives for use against Tehran." Furthermore, an article by Jim Lobe published on Antiwar.com on February 11, 2005 claims that according to Philip Giraldo, a former CIA official and a source in an article about this subject in the American Conservative magazine, U.S. Special Forces have been directing members of the MEK in carrying out reconnaissance and intelligence collection in Iran since the summer of 2004.

Even a statement attributed to Ambassador Bolton, and which I would like elaboration on today, seems to confirm that U.S. policy for Iran is war. According to an article published April 10, 2006 in the Guardian, Ambassador Bolton told British parliamentarians that he believes military action could halt or at least set back the Iranian nuclear program by striking it at its weakest point.

U.S. policy for Iran advocates regime change, not behavior change. We should expect that even if Iran decides to negotiate with the U.S. or other Security Council members over its nuclear program, U.S. policy promoting war in Iran will remain steadfast. When Iraq destroyed its missiles and submitted its weapons declaration, abiding by Security Council Resolution 1441, the Administration decided to unilaterally attack Iraq anyway.

This Administration is reckless and hungry for war. It is imperative that Congress exercise oversight on the Administration's plans for war with Iran before our country is immersed in another quagmire, with more U.S. casualties, diminished national security, and greater a financial burden. I thereby feel very privileged to have Ambassador Bolton with us here today. I have several questions for him regarding the Administration's plans for Iran, and I look forward to his candid answers. Again, thank you, Ambassador for being with us today, and thank you, Chairman SHAYS for holding this hearing.

ISSAQUAH NURSE SERVES OTHERS, DEDICATES LIFE TO WASHINGTON PATIENTS

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2006

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the important and essential role that nurses play in providing quality care. Nurses are intelligent, well-trained and highly skilled professionals who provide quality clinical and supportive care to patients and their families. In short, they are integral to our Nation's healthcare delivery system.

On behalf of the people in Washington's 8th Congressional District, I would like to specifically acknowledge Patricia Buchsel from Issaquah, Washington for her service on the Oncology Nursing Society Board of Directors and her role as a nursing educator at the Seattle University College of Nursing. She received her BSN from Seattle University and her MS from Seattle Pacific University. Patricia has worked tirelessly to develop, plan and implement countless cancer programs in Washington State.

Cancer is a complex, multifaceted and chronic disease and people with cancer are best served by a multidisciplinary health care team specialized in oncology care, including nurses who are certified in that specialty. According to the American Cancer Society, one in three women and one in two men will receive a diagnosis of cancer at some point in their lives, and one out of every four deaths in the United States results from cancer. This year approximately 28,330 people in Washington state will be diagnosed with cancer and another 11,440 will lose their battles with this terrible disease. Every day, oncology nurses see the pain and suffering caused by cancer and understand the physical, emotional and financial challenges that people with cancer face throughout their diagnosis and treatment.

I would like to once again acknowledge and thank Patricia Buchsel for her hard work and leadership on the Oncology Nursing Society Board of Directors. As a nurse and leader in the field, Patricia has made it her life's mission to help others and she should be applauded for all she has done.

IN RECOGNITION OF RICKY
WHITFIELD

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2006

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to stand before you today and recognize Ricky Whitfield for his outstanding service to both his high school and community.

Ricky Whitfield is a senior at Aubrey High School in Aubrey, Texas. He is a modern-day

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.