

There was no objection.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to tell a little story.

This week, a wonderful family from my district in Ohio brought to Washington a little sketch that they left with me. It is a scene from inside a home, and a little boy is standing at a window holding what looks like a prayer book. He is looking out this window into a sunlit day, and outside the window are these beautiful, beautiful apple trees.

You do not realize as you are looking at this child, who may be 4 years old or so, looking outside his window, you do not realize that what is walking by his window are bayonets pointed straight up, because in the way the artist has drawn the picture, the gun butts parallel the trunks of the apple trees.

You look at this picture and it causes you to pause, and in the distance in the sky, you see a small bird flying, a bird of peace.

As I watch what is happening in the Middle East and the carnage that comes over our television screens every evening, I cannot help but ask myself, what is wrong with humankind that we cannot stop the killing? Is the United States of America so strong militarily that it also cannot be strong morally and stand up and say to those involved, Cease fire? Cease fire on all sides, now, now. Would the world not stand with us? Why should the United States not just be silent but step away, step away for all the thousands and thousands and thousands of young people whose futures are being destroyed, whose countries are being leveled?

In the Palestinian Authority, in Israel, in Lebanon, I say to myself, what is it about human nature that makes us as creatures so marauding and so hateful and apparently so incapable of saying drop the bayonets, just for a day, just to see if peace is possible?

I am just appalled at what is happening. I look at our world, I look at all of its leaders, I look at all of our material wealth, all of the arms, the bunker-buster bombs that are on their way, and I say to myself, I thought the 20th century was the century of utter destruction and that we had finally contained those forces in the world that were so harmful to human life, and that when we turned the new page on the new millennium, we would usher in a millennium of peace, and now this.

□ 1645

I would urge the President of the United States to not just look at the military side of the equation but to deeply consider both political and diplomatic efforts, initially through back channels. No country should be isolated, whether it is Lebanon or Syria, or Jordan or Iran. Because out of isolation, even in a marriage, comes an icy standoff and no resolution. It is no different with countries. You cannot have that kind of icy standoff and think the world will be at peace.

I can tell you that the southern part of Lebanon that is the object of the invasion right now is an area where development was not allowed to occur, where the west literally backed away and allowed the forces of Hezbollah to gain greater and greater footing. And we are yielding the policies of isolation that allowed this to occur.

So I would say to my colleagues, I would say to people of good conscience everywhere, now is the time to stand up to stop the killing on all sides in a part of the world where the soils are blood drenched from Bethlehem to Gaza to northern Israel, and Haifa now, to southern Lebanon again. Haven't we had enough of killing one another?

I would urge the Secretary of State, the President of the United States, the Members of this Congress who are going to be leaving Washington tomorrow in this House and I guess next week in the other body, to devote your August to thinking how we can all be voices to stop the killing and to call for a ceasefire on all sides for the sake of the world. Surely we are destroying a part of the earth that will take generations to restore, and we every day are watching young people and innocence killed by the hundreds and thousands. Can't the world do better than this?

I think about the drawing of the little boy looking out the window at a beautiful sky and apple trees with the bayonets walking by.

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

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

U.N. OIL FOR FOOD SCANDAL

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, recently in a Manhattan Federal Court, we saw the first conviction worldwide in the Iraqi Oil-for-Food scandal. Billions of dollars illicitly passed between one of the world's most notorious dictators, Saddam Hussein, over 2,200 companies worldwide, and top officials of the U.N. Now, more than 3 years after the scandal was brought to light, Tongsun Park, a Korean national, is now the only individual who has been tried for those gross crimes.

Mr. Park is a familiar player in the game of corruption, having been heavily involved in the 1970s Congressional bribery scandal known as Koreagate. In that case, he saved himself from prison by turning States evidence, but instead of taking this near miss as a lesson, 20

years later, he became involved again in a decidedly more devious scheme that kept a murderous dictator living in high style with his millions of dollars from Saddam Hussein to take care of his "expenses" and his "people," as he called them.

During this time that he was on Saddam Hussein's payroll, Park met 20 times with U.N. Secretary General Boutros-Ghali at his personal residence. Apparently, despite his corrupt past, his friendship and guidance were sought by Boutros-Ghali and his Under Secretary, Maurice Strong.

The Oil-for-Food program was the brain child of Boutros-Ghali and Strong. And shortly before the program was finalized, Strong took nearly \$1 million from Park. A payment that Strong forgot until he was shown the check. Mr. Strong went on to serve Kofi Annan in a high-ranking capacity as his personal envoy to the Korean peninsula, where he was advised on North Korean issues by Park.

In all likelihood, Park, at 71 years of age, will serve extensive prison time for his crimes. Further trials for his co-conspirators are scheduled for this November.

Unfortunately, the U.N. continues to protect some of the most egregious offenders, including Oil-for-Food Director Ben Sevan, who allegedly took some \$147,000 in payoffs. Sevan has claimed that he is innocent, but he has fled to Cyprus to avoid extradition. The innocent defend themselves in the court of public opinion or the court of law, but Mr. Sevan, instead, chooses to hide, living off his illicit gains.

Hundreds of other individuals inside and outside the U.N. were involved in the kickbacks and payoffs of the Oil-for-Food scandal, so I applaud the work of the Federal prosecutors who will continue to bring down indictments, but they need full cooperation of the U.N. if they are to bring justice to those individuals who contributed to Saddam Hussein's reign of terror.

Now, despite the fact that the corruption reached the highest levels of the U.N., the U.N. has yet to take up important reforms that would prevent such problems in the future. Reform, though badly needed throughout this organization, has been stalled by a group of countries that include some of the worst human rights offenders in the world, those who daily ignore the lofty goals of the U.N. If the U.N. is to fulfill its mandate to be an organization that promotes peace, freedom, and prosperity, then it must set an example of clean ethnics and not of dirty corruption that keeps men and women around the world in poverty and slavery.

The Oil-for-Food scandal completely undermined the work of the sanctions against Iraq and provided the means that, in all likelihood, continue to fuel the work of terrorists in Iraq. There must be justice for Saddam's victims, and the U.N. should not stand in the way of that justice being administered.

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

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

OIL COMPANIES REPORT RECORD PROFITS

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to replace Mr. EMANUEL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, today was a big day on Wall Street. The oil companies, the three biggest oil companies, have reported record profits. They are up an average of 30 percent over this quarter last year. They are making \$200 million a day in profit.

Now, you would think if the price of crude oil went up, it might squeeze their margins a little bit. No, they are working hand in glove with OPEC and the other producers around the world, and they actually get a premium. For every dollar a barrel it goes up, they add on a little bit more at the pump.

They have closed down a large number of refineries across America at the recommendation of the American Petroleum Institute. They had a memo 10 years ago that they sent out to all their members in the oil industry saying there are too many refineries; the profits aren't there. If you close down some of these refineries, you could claim there was insufficient capacity and you could drive up your profits dramatically.

In the last year, profits for refineries are up 60 percent in 1 year. Now, that is \$200 million a day out of the pockets of American consumers, American business, stifling our economy, causing families to cancel vacations or change their plans, and people are having a hard time filling up their tank that live in rural areas in my district just to get to work.

But the oil company execs and their stockholders, why, they are doing just fine. Exxon Mobil has so much cash on hand they don't know what to do with it; over \$20 billion of cash. They are not investing in new production, new sources of energy, or new refineries. Hey, they like it the way it is with the so-called refinery shortage. It is a good excuse to gouge people at the pump.

No, they are just plowing it back into their execs pockets and hanging onto cash and then buying back stock to drive up the value of their stock options. The recently retired CEO of Exxon Mobil, Lee Raymond, just retired a couple of months ago, they gave him a \$400 million retirement. And now, Mr. Raymond, Americans are struggling to fill up their gas tanks; right? It is hard to afford 50 bucks if you are driving an SUV.

But Mr. Raymond, well, he isn't too worried about that. He is out buying

oil fields and gas fields in the Middle East and in Africa. An individual, one guy, got so much money from ExxonMobil from them bleeding extortionate profits out of the American people, that he can afford to buy his own oil and gas fields. And certainly, I am sure, he will sell the capacity to his former employer, ExxonMobil, who will then mark it up handsomely, and they all come out ahead. The only losers are the American consumers.

We need both a short-term and a long-term plan. We need a short-term plan to stop the profiteering and price gouging. We need to regulate oil trading like we do other commodities. We need to put a windfall tax on these companies unless they are investing their ill-gotten gains, their excess profits in new refinery capacity, in new production, and in alternate fuels.

And then we need a long-term plan to make America energy independent and energy efficient. The so-called Bush energy plan will have us importing more oil from the Middle East. Imagine that, more oil from the Middle East 10 years from today than we are today. That is a great place to be dependent upon.

The Iranians are profiting tens of billions of dollars from these high prices. Aren't they part of the axis of evil? The Bush policy is facilitating billions of dollars to the mullahs in Iran.

It is time for America to get smart, and it is time for our government to lead the way to energy efficiency, energy independence, and clamp down on big oil. But we know that won't happen, because 85 percent of the contributions of the oil and gas industry went to the Republican Party. And they were incredibly generous to the President in his last election. And, of course, both he and DICK CHENEY are from that industry.

But with a change in Congress and a change in direction, all those things could happen here and, hopefully, they will, in the interest of our country and not a treasured few of the President's friends.

CHANGING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I might speak for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing Camp Lejeune Marine Base and also Cherry Point Marine Air Station, and for 3 years this House of Representatives, in a bipartisan way, has offered and accepted and passed legislation that would create the opportunity to rename the Department of Navy to be Navy and Marine Corps.

I do not need to speak today on the history of the great Marine Corps, just like the United States Army, the United States Navy, and the United

States Air Force, but, Mr. Speaker, I will say that I am hoping this year in the conference between the House and the Senate that the Senate will accept the House position.

Let me just take a couple of moments to read a comment. Again, this bill has been introduced for 3 years and the bill number has changed for 3 years, but this statement I want to read is from the Honorable Wade Sanders, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Reserve Affairs from 1993–1998. This is what the Honorable Wade Sanders said.

“As a combat veteran and former Naval officer, I understand the importance of the team dynamic, and the importance of recognizing the contribution of team components. The Navy and Marine Corps team is just that, a dynamic partnership, and it is important to symbolically recognize the balance of that partnership.”

Mr. Speaker, there has been an Internet site that has been established, not by me or by my office, but by an independent entity. Today, I went on that Internet site and I want to read, again for the record, a statement from First Lieutenant Marine Corps Retired General Merna.

He said, “I am one of five brothers who served in the military: Three Marines, all Korean War veterans; I am also a Vietnam veteran; two Navy brothers, one a Korean War veteran and the other paid the supreme sacrifice in World War II when his LST-577 was sunk by a Japanese submarine. Our uncle was a World War II Marine, and even our Dad spent a brief time in the Army Air Corps in World War II. It may be difficult for non-Marine families to understand why this long overdue legislation is such a burning issue for Marines; it is of paramount interest to our community of Marines.

The reasoning for this legislation comes close to explaining why this needs to be done. Simply put, Marines have earned the right to their own identity, while loving and recognizing our brothers and sisters in arms from all of the military services who already have this distinction.”

The point that he was making is, if you think about it, we have a Department of Army and a Secretary of Army. Think about it, we have a Department of the Air Force with a Secretary of the Air Force. You think about the Department of Navy, which the Navy and the Marines are a team, and yet it is a Department of Navy and a Secretary of Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I have to my left orders for a citation of a Silver Star for a Marine that was killed in Nasiriyah during this war in Iraq.

□ 1700

And it is so ironic to me that this Marine, who gave his life for this country, when his family received the letter from the Secretary of the Navy, what does it say at the top, Mr. Speaker, but the Secretary of the Navy, Washington,