

This bill will not only help students in Wyoming with the financial burdens associated with education, but help Wyoming obtain the qualified pharmacists it needs.

SAY NO TO INVOLUNTARY
SERVITUDE

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 21, 2003

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the ultimate cost of war is almost always the loss of liberty. True defensive wars and revolutionary wars against tyrants may preserve or establish a free society, as did our war against the British. But these wars are rare. Most wars are unnecessary, dangerous and cause senseless suffering with little being gained. Loss of liberty and life on both sides has been the result of most of the conflicts throughout the ages. The current war, in which we find ourselves, clearly qualifies as one of those unnecessary and dangerous wars. To get the people to support ill-conceived wars the nation's leaders employ grand schemes of deception.

Woodrow Wilson orchestrated our entry into World War I by first promising in the election of 1916 to keep us out of the European conflict, then a few months later pressured and maneuvered the Congress into declaring war against Germany. Whether it was the Spanish-American War before that or all the wars since, U.S. presidents have deceived the people to gain popular support for ill-conceived military ventures. Wilson wanted the war and immediately demanded conscription to fight it. He didn't have the guts to even name the program a military draft and instead in a speech before Congress calling for war advised the army should be "chosen upon the principle of universal liability to service." Most Americans at the time of the declaration didn't believe actual combat troops would be sent. What a dramatic change from this early perception when the people endorsed the war to the carnage that followed and the later disillusionment with Wilson and his grand scheme for world government under the League of Nations. The American people rejected this gross new entanglement reflecting a somewhat healthier age than the one in which we find ourselves today.

But when it comes to war, the principle of deception lives on and the plan for "universal liability to serve" once again is raising its ugly head. The dollar cost of the current war is already staggering yet plans are being made to drastically expand the human cost by forcing conscription on the young men (and maybe women) who have no ax to grind with the Iraqi people and want no part of this fight.

Hundreds of Americans have already been killed and thousands more wounded and crippled while thousands of others will suffer from new and deadly war-related illnesses not yet identified.

We were told we had to support this preemptive war against Iraq because Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction and to confront the al Qaeda. It was said our national security depended on it. But all these dangers were found not to exist in Iraq. It was implied that those who did not support this Iraqi invasion were un-American and unpatriotic.

Since the original reasons for the war never existed, it is now claimed that we're there to make Iraq a western-style democracy and to spread western values. And besides, it's argued, that it's nice that Saddam Hussein has been removed from power. But does the mere existence of evil somewhere in the world justify preemptive war at the expense of the American people? Utopian dreams, fulfilled by autocratic means, hardly qualifies as being morally justifiable.

These after-the-fact excuses for invasion and occupation of a sovereign nation directs attention away from the charge that this war was encouraged by the military industrial complex, war profiteering, control of natural resources (oil) and a neo-con agenda of American hegemony with a desire to redraw the borders of the countries of Middle East.

The inevitable failure of such a seriously flawed foreign policy cannot be contemplated by those who have put so much energy into this occupation. The current quagmire prompts calls from many for escalation with more troops being sent to Iraq. Many of our reservists and National Guardsmen cannot wait to get out and have no plans to re-enlist. The odds of our policy of foreign intervention, which has been with us for many decades, are not likely to soon change. The dilemma of how to win an unwinnable war is the issue begging for an answer.

To get more troops, the draft will likely be re-instituted. The implicit prohibition of "involuntary servitude" by the 13th Amendment to the Constitution has already been ignored many times so few will challenge the constitutionality of the coming draft.

Unpopular wars invite conscription. Volunteers disappear, as well they should. A truly defensive just war prompts popular support.

A conscripted, unhappy soldier is better off on the long run than the slaves of old since the "enslavement" is only temporary. But on the short run, the draft may well turn out to be more deadly and degrading as one is forced to commit life and limb to a less than worthy cause—like teaching democracy to unwilling and angry Arabs. Slaves were safer in that their owners had an economic interest in protecting their lives. Life endangerment for a soldier is acceptable policy and that's why they are needed. Too often though, our men and women who are exposed to the hostilities of war and welcomed initially are easily forgotten after the fighting ends.

It is said we go about the world waging war to promote peace and yet the price paid is rarely weighed against the failed efforts to make the world a better place. But justifying conscription to promote the cause of liberty is one of the most bizarre notions ever conceived by man. Forced servitude with risk of death and serious injury as a price to live free makes no sense. By what right does anyone have to sacrifice the lives of others for some cause of questionable value? Even if well motivated it cannot justify using force on uninterested persons.

It's said that the 18-year-old owes it to his country. Hogwash. It could just as easily be argued that a 50-year-old chicken-hawk who promotes war and places the danger on the innocent young, owe a heck of a lot more to the country than the 18-year-old being denied his liberty for a cause that has no justification.

All drafts are unfair. All 18- and 19-year-olds are never needed. By its very nature, a draft

must be discriminatory. All drafts hit the most vulnerable as the elitists learn quickly how to avoid the risks of combat.

The dollar cost of war and the economic hardship is great in all wars and cannot be minimized. War is never economically beneficial except for those in position to profit from war expenditures. But the great tragedy of war is the careless disregard for civil liberties of our own people. Abuse of German and Japanese Americans in World War I and World War II is well known.

But the real sacrifice comes with conscription—forcing a small number of young vulnerable citizens to fight the wars that old men and women, who seek glory in military victory without themselves being exposed to danger, promote. These are wars with neither purpose nor moral justification and too often are not even declared by the Congress.

Without conscription, unpopular wars are much more difficult to fight. Once the draft was undermined in the 1960s and early 1970s, the Vietnam War came to an end.

But most importantly—liberty cannot be preserved by tyranny. A free society must always resort to volunteers. Tyrants think nothing of forcing men to fight and die in wrongheaded wars; a true fight for survival and defense of one's homeland I'm sure would elicit, the assistance of every able-bodied man and woman. This is not the case for wars of mischief far away from home in which we so often have found ourselves in the past century.

One of the worst votes that an elected official could ever cast would be to institute a military draft to fight an illegal war, if that individual himself maneuvered to avoid military service. But avoiding the draft on principle qualifies oneself to work hard to avoid all unnecessary war and oppose the draft for all others.

A government that's willing to enslave a portion of its people to fight an unjust war can never be trusted to protect the liberties of its own citizens. The end can never justify the means no matter what the Neo-cons say.

BEST WISHES TO THOMAS J.
AIKEN

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 21, 2003

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to express warm thanks, congratulations, and best wishes to Thomas J. Aiken, upon his retirement as the Central California Area Manager of the Bureau of Reclamation (Bureau). Tom has done an outstanding job in a difficult position, and he deserves the appreciation of both his colleagues and the general public.

Born and raised in Colorado Springs, Colorado, Tom earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration from Colorado State University in 1964. At the same time, he was commissioned a Second Lieutenant in the Army. He served dutifully as a Unit Commander for the Military Advisory Corps in Vietnam.

Following his military service, Tom began his three-decade career with the Bureau. In 1974, he joined the Mid-Pacific Region as the Administrative Officer for the Auburn Dam Construction Office. After the Auburn Dam

project was stalled shortly thereafter, he became the region's Budget Officer for six years. Subsequently, from 1984 to early 1993, Tom was the Assistant Regional Director for Administration, overseeing such functions as personnel, budget, finance, procurement, and computer processing.

In 1993, Tom received his final and perhaps most challenging position with the Bureau—that of Manager of the Central California Area office. The area includes the Folsom and Nimbus Dams and the Folsom South Canal on the American River, New Melones Dam on the Stanislaus River, and Lake Berryessa located between Napa and Winters.

Mr. Speaker, many of the issues relating to the facilities and watersheds in the Central California Area have been controversial, yet Tom has constantly sought to serve the public's best interest. As a veteran of California's renowned water wars, Tom has frequently had to be a facilitator amongst numerous competing interests. Despite the challenging and often unpleasant nature of this position, he has weathered it with patience and a continuing willingness to stand on principle.

One such example that has been of special importance to me has been Tom's unwavering support of the Auburn Dam. For three decades, Tom has helped promote the need to build the Auburn Dam by championing its unmatched ability to provide flood protection, water supply, hydroelectric power, recreational opportunities, and environmental benefits. Tom rightly recognizes that the Auburn Dam is the only solution to the Sacramento region's water management needs, and he has been one of the few who has stood steadfast in that position despite the misguided opposition of those in the environmental community and from within the Bureau itself. Tom's commitment to the Auburn Dam is nothing less than a testament to his dedication to faithfully uphold the Bureau's mission of providing a reliable water supply to the West in the most efficient and effective way possible.

Tom has received several honors for his good work, including the National Administrative Support Units' Annual Award for Executive Leadership in 1991, Who's Who in Government Service in 1990, and the Interior Department's Meritorious Service Award in 1984.

As he retires from public service, Tom will be free to spend more time with his family, including his wife, Linda, his children, Joe and Me'Shay, his step-daughters, Jennifer and Lisa, and his five grandchildren. Also, he will have more time to pursue his oil painting and show his 1934 Ford hot rod. His family's gain is the public's loss.

Mr. Speaker, one thing is certain—Tom Aiken's expertise, cooperative attitude, clear thinking, and toughness will certainly be missed in California's water community.

THE SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 2003

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the Department of Defense Inspector

General's public report on Richard Perle, an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, and a clip from The Washington Times.

[Editorial from the Wall Street Journal]

PERLE'S VINDICATION

One obligation of editors is to distinguish phony political scandal from the genuine article. On that standard, any number of writers and editors owe Richard Perle an apology.

The noted defense intellectual voluntarily resigned in March as chairman of the Pentagon's Defense Policy Board Advisory Committee after his enemies pumped up a few anecdotes into allegations about "conflicts of interest." The Pentagon's Inspector General has been investigating those charges and last week issued a report absolving Mr. Perle of even the "appearance" of impropriety.

The accusations, fanned by Michigan Democrat John Conyers, had received especially prominent coverage in the New Yorker magazine and the New York Times. They boiled down to the all-purpose Washington smear that Mr. Perle has exploited his position for personal financial gain. But Pentagon investigator Donald Horstman concluded in a letter to Mr. Perle that "all of your activities with respect to those private entities complied with statutory and regulatory standards." There were no "quid pro" offers or attempts to leverage his (unpaid) Pentagon access.

In Washington, of course, people are often run out of office merely for the "appearance" of a conflict of interest. But Mr. Horstman says he also examined that "more elusive issue" and concluded that Mr. Perle's "activities did not create such an appearance" under the "perspective of a reasonable person with knowledge of the relevant facts." Mr. Perle's accusers knew all the facts, so the only conclusion is that they are not "reasonable persons," which will not come as news to most of our readers.

Mr. Conyers is now trying to compound his political felony by proposing to close what he claims is a "loophole" that requires someone to work more than 60 days a year before certain, more stringent Pentagon ethics rules apply. But this would essentially bar anyone with private expertise from advising Defense officials even in a voluntary, unpaid capacity. How this would enhance U.S. national security is not obvious. Then again, U.S. security was the last thing on the mind of Mr. Perle's critics.

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 20, 2003]

WASHINGTON-STYLE POLITICS

I beg to differ with Greg Pierce's recent item "All-purpose smear" (Inside Politics, Nation, Tuesday), claiming that charges levied against former Defense Policy Board Advisory Committee Chairman Richard Perle were an "all-purpose Washington smear."

A close reading of the inspector general's report would indicate that Mr. Perle's conduct raises real conflict-of-interest issues. There is no doubt that Mr. Perle had an important role in shaping our nation's defense policy and heavily influenced the mobilization of our war machine in Iraq, along with all the defense contracts and profits that follow. The IG's report confirmed that while guiding this effort, Mr. Perle benefited financially by working for firms with major business before the Department of Defense.

The report notes that Mr. Perle appears to have represented Global Crossing and Loral in matters pending before the Defense Department, but escaped violations of the conflict-of-interest laws by virtue of the fact that he was considered to be in the board's employ less than the required 60-day period.

Mr. Perle went so far as to sign an affidavit claiming that his position as chairman of the Defense Policy Board gave him a "unique perspective on and intimate knowledge of national defense and security issues." The fact that the offending language subsequently was removed from the affidavit doesn't change the reality of the assertion or the awkwardness of the conflict.

My legislation responds to the loopholes highlighted by the IG's report by merely ensuring that persons such as the chairman of the Defense Policy Board are treated as if they worked for the government for 60 days.

This would ensure that persons awarded with the public trust through prominent public positions do not use that trust to feather their own nests financially. At a time when we are asking our soldiers to make so many sacrifices, I hardly think it is too much to ask the chairman of the Defense Policy Board to refrain from representing clients with financial interests before the Defense Department.

ALL-PURPOSE SMEAR

"One obligation of editors is to distinguish phony political scandal from the genuine article. On that standard, any number of writers and editors owe Richard Perle an apology," the Wall Street Journal says. "The noted defense intellectual voluntarily resigned in March as chairman of the Pentagon's Defense Policy Board Advisory Committee after his enemies pumped up a few anecdotes into allegations about 'conflicts of interest.' The Pentagon's inspector general has been investigating those charges and last week issued a report absolving Mr. Perle of even the 'appearance' of impropriety," the newspaper said in an editorial. "The accusations, fanned by Michigan Democrat John Conyers, had received especially prominent coverage in the New Yorker magazine and the New York Times. They boiled down to the all-purpose Washington smear that Mr. Perle has exploited his position for personal financial gain. But Pentagon investigator Donald Horstman concluded in a letter to Mr. Perle that 'all of your activities with respect to those private entities complied with statutory and regulatory standards.' There were no 'quid pro' offers or attempts to leverage his (unpaid) Pentagon access. 'Mr. Horstman says he also examined that 'more elusive issue' and concluded that Mr. Perle's 'activities did not create such an appearance' under the 'perspective of a reasonable person with knowledge of the relevant facts.' Mr. Perle's accusers knew all the facts, so the only conclusion is that they are not 'reasonable persons,' which will not come as news to most of our readers."

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL DIABETES MONTH

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 21, 2003

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, this November, we recognize National Diabetes Month and renew our commitment to preventing and eradicating diabetes. Just last week, the Department of Health and Human Services announced that the number of Americans with diabetes rose to an all-time high. According to their report, an estimated 18.2 million Americans now have diabetes, more than 6 percent of the population.

Even more alarming is the fact that many Americans are unaware that they may be at