this seemingly unending cause. So I am requesting in this resolution, House Resolution 140, that they be taken off the streets and allowed to focus on a mission that would truly help bring about an end to this war once and for all.

Make no mistake, the job of hunting insurgents throughout Iraqi neighborhoods is noble, but this is a job for the Iraqis, not American troops who should be on their way home. The time has come for a new strategy, Madam Speaker, one that focuses on taking our troops out of harm's way and pressuring the Iraqi Government to finally take the mantle.

Once that government is up and running, they will be able to put the Iraqi military into action; develop a plan to ensure Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds benefit from Iraq's vast oil resources; create jobs; and do the numerous other things necessary to bring peace to that troubled land.

We must also consider the lives of millions of Iraqi civilians. Are the insurgents using our presence, the presence of United States troops, on the streets of Baghdad as an excuse to blow up neighborhoods? Would they be better protected if we significantly reduce our presence? I believe so, Madam Speaker, and it is another reason that the President and the Secretary of Defense should consider instituting this plan. This is a practical solution to that seemingly unsolvable problem.

The use of the Iraqis will reduce war expenses as well, lessening the burden on the American taxpayer and bring about a quicker conclusion to this conflict.

Madam Speaker, it is time to bring this war to a responsible end for the American people, for the Iraqis, and for our brave troops. And I will continue to do all I can to help make this a reality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## THE PROPOSED TROOP ESCALATION IN IRAQ

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia on his legislation, and I look forward to working with him on those efforts with many others here in the House.

When the American people and this Congress stand in unity, great change is possible. Last fall from every corner of our Nation, we spoke loud and clear to demand an end to the Bush administration's open-ended stay-the-course policy in Iraq and start a new direction. That unity has changed control of this very Congress, led to the departure of Secretary Rumsfeld, helped drive the bipartisan consensus behind the Iraq Study Group recommendations.

Yet the Bush administration, in response, proposes another escalation, a so-called surge. As I said last month on this floor, the escalation plan flies in the face of military experts, of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group, Democratic and Republican leaders in this Congress, and the American public. This Congress has a solemn duty to listen and take action.

Recently, the mother of a young soldier being deployed back to Iraq told me, Congressman CARNAHAN, I am one of those mothers who is against the war in Iraq. But my son volunteered to serve his country. Please be sure they get the support and equipment they need to come home quickly and safely.

That mother's heartfelt request is a powerful example of our national unity and resolve to support our troops and oppose the escalation policy that is not making the Iraqi Government more self-reliant, not making the Middle East region more stable, and not making our country safer.

Next week, after this Iraq war has extended longer even than World War II, this Congress will have an historic, long, and thorough debate about the escalation plan. I believe the result will be a bipartisan vote reflecting the reality that a fourth U.S. escalation is the wrong direction for our country.

When this Congress acts in unison with the American people, great change is possible. In the weeks and months ahead, I believe this Congress will undertake its constitutional responsibilities with all seriousness and dispatch to continue this solemn debate, to exercise detailed oversight, and to use the tools available to us to change the direction of the war, to support our troops, to de-escalate the war, and to escalate the political solution in Iraq.

Working together, great change is possible.

## THE WAR ON TERROR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Missouri would just suspend a moment before he leaves the floor.

I would like to have the privilege to address the subject matter that he raised and the issue of the Iraq Study Group. And it is somewhat of a long book to read through, but I had a conversation this afternoon with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and I have lifted some things out of the Iraq Study Group's report that are clearly part of the President's agenda in Iraq, ''The New Way Forward,'' and Mr. WOLF assures me that the entire strategy in Iraq is right from the Iraq Study Group.

So I point out to the gentleman from Missouri, and I would be happy to yield to him if he had a response, that the plan and the strategy of the President's for a new way forward in Iraq is not flying in the face of the Iraq Study Group. In fact, it follows directly down the path of the Iraq Study Group. If the gentleman from Missouri would care to engage, I would certainly be willing to yield.

I came here to talk about that subject matter, in fact, Madam Speaker. And as I listened to my colleagues in preparation for this 60-minute Special Order, I will just take from the top some of the notes that come to mind.

And one is, from the beginning, the gentleman from New Jersey spoke about ExxonMobil's highest corporate profits, the highest corporate profits, perhaps, ever in the history of the country, and the promise by this Pelosi Congress to provide energy independence. And then the gentlewoman from Ohio also spoke about ExxonMobil's profits, and the details of that were such that they have $40 billion in profits. Did they lower prices at the pump?

Well, yes. Prices at the pump are a dollar a gallon cheaper than they were when oil prices were up to $75 a barrel. In fact, the prices at the pump almost directly reflect the lowering of the prices and the cost of the barrels of crude oil.

And then, of course, the argument that there was a class action lawsuit against them for $3.5 billion. And one might take that as a concern until one sees that that, Madam Speaker, is Alabama. Well, Alabama is a venue shoppers' State of choice. Someone who has a lawsuit, and the attorneys across this country know this, when they want to bring a class action lawsuit, they look around and they say what State has favorable laws; what State produces favorable juries. Where is the class envy so focused and where they have a belief that you can put 12 men and women on a jury and they would lay out a punitive case against a company because they see a company as somehow or another an evil Big Brother.

That is how you end up with these $3.5 billion or maybe $9 billion punitive damages in a class action lawsuit.

We have dealt with this, Madam Speaker, in the Judiciary Committee in the years that I have been in this Congress, and we passed legislation out of the House, and not successful in the Senate, that would allow a company that operates in multiple States, in fact, maybe internationally, to be able to ask that a case that has been venue shopped and taken to a State where there is a minimal amount of economic activity but a maximum amount of punitive damages offered by the juries there, a State that has that kind of reputation, we have passed legislation here in the House that would allow

that to be changed to a Federal venue rather than a State venue so that we can eliminate some of this ghastly profiteering that is taking place and the punishment of some of our best corporate citizens that we have in America.

And I sat here tonight and listened to a handful of speakers, and two of them turned their focus on ExxonMobil, and they can't seem to understand that because we have large and successful oil companies in America that they are continuing to invest those profits into research and development and exploration.

The gentlewoman from Ohio lamented that they bought back $10 billion worth of their stock. Can she speculate that perhaps that gives them enough control now that they can invest more of their profits in exploration? And if they invest more in exploration, that means there will be more oil on the market, which means then, of course, this law of supply and demand, which I believe in, which everyone on the Republican side of the aisle believes in, which some of the people on the other side of the aisle believe in, that supply and demand will drive down our prices. And that is exactly what has been happening, Madam Speaker.

So I have to rise in defense of the companies that have provided cheap gas in this country, cheap oil in this country, and even still, whatever the price of gas is, milk is still more expensive. But not only that, the product that has been free all of my life, that product called ''drinking water'' and, in fact, now bottled water, is more expensive in the machine at the gas station per gallon than a gallon of gas is coming out of the pump right next to it by far. In fact, the last time I calculated that, it was a little over $9 a gallon to get your bottled water out of the machine at the gas station where gas was selling for about $2.15.

So we need to keep this in perspective. We cannot be punishing those companies that are out there exploring and putting this oil on the market so that we have the convenience of relatively cheap fuel and the mobile society that we have. If we did not have these companies and you pulled their expertise and their capital and their reserves off the market, we would be far, far more dependent upon Middle Eastern oil and much, much more of America's economy and the profits that we have would be skimmed off to go to the Middle East to fund the people who are lined up against us militarily and philosophically.

□ 1900

We are trying to get to energy independence. The Pelosi plan doesn't take us to energy independence. In the first 100 hours, one of those first six pieces of legislation, H.R. 1 through 6, pick your number, the one that addressed energy, went out and punished oil companies. It said, if you have leases, and particularly some leases that were perhaps profitable in the gulf coast, if you have leases that are deemed by the government to be profitable, we are going to require you, as a company, to renegotiate those leases. If you don't renegotiate, then we are going to forbid you, ban you, blackball you, black list you from a company that can negotiate future leases offshore, like, actually, I believe, domestically in shore on land and in the United States.

Now, what kind of a deal is it when you have a deal, and the Congress comes here and passes legislation that says a deal is not a deal. Yes, you had a deal. We signed it all in good faith, but we found out it was a good deal. So now we are going to take some of that profit ourselves. I have spent my life in the contracting business, and I have invested a little bit of capital, and I was able to add a little more to it and roll a little back in and work hard and take some chances and work smart.

Over a period of time, I was able to build a little capital up and get to the point where we could bid some projects that had some significant value. I have seen this kind of envy rise up when someone looks over and sees the industrious nature of their neighbor and decides they want some of that hard-earned profit. I have had it happen to me when I had a contract that I had significant profit in.

I can think of one in particular where I was able to purchase some materials because I negotiated. I played my cards right, I went and built those relationships with all the people that were involved. It was a string of people through bankruptcy and banks. In the process of doing that, everything had to come together just right. The timing had to be just right. I was at great risk if I was not successful in putting that all together so that I could buy a large quantity of dirt for a reasonable price and it was handy.

In fact, when I first talked to the banker about that piece of land, he said it would take $25,000 just to retain an attorney to represent me in negotiating the purchase of that. That gives you a measure of how difficult it was. But, in fact, I was successful purchasing that earth on that farm for the purposes of taking it into a project we were building, and, of course, I made some money.

If I had been wrong, if I hadn't been able to complete that purchase, then it would have cost me a lot of money. But when the time came, the owners sat me down, and the engineers sat me down, and they said, well, we see that you are making money here, and now we would like you to discount the work you are doing because we think you can afford to do that.

I looked them in the face, and I thought, well, why are you asking me to give some of my profit over to the owners? Isn't it all justly earned? And isn't it ethical, and didn't I bid this for a price, and was not it low bid? Not a no bid, but a low-bid contract? They said, well, yes, but we think that you have some to give, and so we are asking you to discount your work, do it more cleanly, because we think you can afford to.

Well, what principle are you basing that judgment on because someone can't afford to discount something? How can you ask them to do that in a free enterprise society? I asked that question of the engineers, and they said, well, again, we they think that you can afford to do that.

So let me ask you a question. If I had lost my shirt on this job, which I likely could have done, and maybe even lost my business, would you have stepped up and said things didn't go so well for you, here is some extra? They just smiled and snickered a little bit because they knew it was ludicrous to think that when things go bad that there is going to be anybody in there holding my hand or ExxonMobil's hands or Shell's or Chevron's or anybody else's. They suffer all of their losses, and they have to have a margin in the work that they do.

We must have successful companies here operating out of the United States, and especially developing our domestic supplies of energy. If we fail to do that, then we are absolutely dependent upon middle eastern oil. If we are up to that 60 percent or so of our oil that is imported now, think what it would be like, Madam Speaker, if it was 100 percent.

So this effort to go down here and argue that we will see energy dependence under Pelosi's term here in Congress, I would submit that they have done anything but. They have changed the deal and said the Federal Government's word is not good, we want a tax, windfall profits. If we can find a way where we are jealous of your profit, we will find a way where we can take it and put it into the government coffers.

A company that will look at that is going to take their profits and decide why do I want to invest my profits in further exploration if the Federal Government is going to come in and cancel the deal, which they have done. I will submit that, perhaps, $40 million that may be available, and it is probably a lot more than that is available for exploration, that will continue to put oil supply on the market.

I would submit that it is more likely that exploration investment will go overseas to foreign countries, and perhaps even into the Middle East and places where we don't have such a stable environment, while we sit on massive supplies and energy here in the United States, not because the oil is not there, not because the natural gas isn't there, but because this Congress has become a jealous Congress. This Congress has become a vindictive Congress. This Congress has become a Congress that has decided that they are going to play legislative corporate class envy against companies that are providing an economic supply of energy to this country.

I have always had the view that if I didn't like the way someone was doing business, if I thought they were making too much profit, then that should say to the whole world, well, there is opportunity there. If Exxon is making all of this profit, and it has made so many people irate that out of six or eight speakers two of them come to the floor to speak about that very thing, then I would submit, go out and start your own oil company.

That is the American way. You have a chance to do whatever you want to do in this country. Go ahead and get an investor's group together, or go buy up a group of oil companies, put them together and go out there, and invest your capital, see how you do.

In fact, I welcome that. I think we need a lot of competition, and we need a lot of exploration, and we need to be developing our oil supplies more now than we ever have before. This is the time to push, because perhaps a generation from now we will have transitioned into a lot of other kinds of fuel and gas and oil will not be so important and will not be so relevant any longer. It isn't just the gas and the oil and the fuel that comes from our crude oil, but it is all the other energy supplies out there.

Now, I understand that the other side of the aisle and the Pelosi plan is going to include some things like conservation, and I suspect reasonable conservation measures. I think it is awfully hard to legislate. I think the markets do more for that than we could probably do with legislation. Conservation is a component. But I would ask to put in your mind's eye the idea that I call the energy pie. The energy pie, shaped like a clock, for example, but slices of that pie, pieces of the pie, or the components of it would come from all of the areas where we get energy.

So I would submit that a certain percentage of our overall BTU consumption in America is gasoline. Some is diesel fuel. Some is fuel oil. Then those hydrocarbons that come from crude oil, and then, in addition to that, we have a lot of our electricity, significant amount comes from hydroelectric and nuclear and coal fired, especially clean coal fired, and we also, then, out of that energy, then, in addition to that, we have our ethanol, our biodiesel. We have hydrogen. There is a whole list of sources for energy in America, and we need to look at that, like all the BTUs consumed in America, a big energy pie, and then reprioritize that. Let us change the size of the pieces and grow the size of the energy pie.

I want more BTUs on the market. I want a lot more energy on the market. I want to go everywhere we can to get that energy and pour it into the marketplace and do it so that we can supply more BTUs than we are using.

If we can do that, we can drive down the cost of all energy. We need to do that by adding it by component by component. The ethanol, the biodiesel, more coal, more wind, I left that out, the hydrogen, on the horizon, the cellulosic ethanol that is coming, piece after piece of this energy pie needs to be added together. Then we change the proportion of the pieces so that gasoline from middle eastern oil becomes a smaller piece, and diesel fuel from middle eastern oil becomes a smaller piece.

Ethanol becomes a larger piece. Biodiesel becomes a larger piece. Cellulosic down the line a half a decade from now can really start to take hold, and we can replace some of the electricity that is being generated by the natural gas with wind energy, and that is an environmentally friendly and conservation approach that is good for our environment.

All of these tools are at our disposal, but one of the tools we seem to use is we want to punish the corporations that are busily contributing to growing the size of the energy pie, and also diversifying some of their investments so they aren't just locked into the petroleum but adding the diversification out there, so that they can contribute also to adjusting the size of the pieces in this larger growing energy pie.

That is how this needs to be done. We need to be doing it by complimenting the companies that are competing in the open market, not by punishing them, not by defying the rules of free enterprise with Congressional action, not by changing the deal, not by jerking the rug out from underneath. I would suggest that there is a Chevron find in the Gulf of Mexico, I understand it is about 265 miles southwest of New Orleans, that may add as much as a 50 percent more to the overall reserves or the overall production of oil in the United States.

With that field opening up, and the necessity to open up in ANWR, we can, if we are aggressive, we can reduce dramatically our dependency on foreign oil, and then, of course, we add to that the renewable energies that I have talked about. We can get there. We will not get there if we scare our companies off, if we punish them for doing good and doing the right thing.

So I will move from that energy discussion and move to the discussion by the gentleman, Mr. ANDREWS, on Iran. I want to compliment him for the tone and the thoughtfulness and the constitutional discussion that he brought here to the floor. I have no doubt that he understands the Constitution, and he is correct when he says the power to declare a war is with this Congress constitutionally.

But, also, the commander in chief of our military is the President of the United States, and that is clear, and that is a constitutional principle that should not be challenged by this Congress. He is the commander in chief.

There is nothing in the Constitution that says Congress shall have the authority to declare a war and then micromanage every little operation of that war. Simply when Congress declares war, they say we send a message to all sovereign nations in the world that we are at war with whichever sovereign nations may be the subject of that declaration.

That declaration shows the commitment of Congress to support our troops and their mission. I will say that again, to support our troops and their mission, and the lead troop is the commander in chief, the President of the United States, George W. Bush, who does call these shots.

Our founding fathers understood you cannot fight a war by committee, and you can't put your finger into the wind and ask the public to poll and ask how you should go about fighting a war. If we are going to sit here and say, well, the public polls say that the support for the operations in Iraq, the battleground of Iraq, which is a battleground in the broader global war on terror, if we are going to take the position that this Congress can steal the polls and make military recommendations or pass edicts here or take the budget and squeeze down our support for our troops or shut it off like they did at the end of the Vietnam War, that we can micromanage a war from the floor of the Congress?

It is a ridiculous concept, and it was a ridiculous concept for the President of the United States during the Vietnam War, to micromanage that war. President Johnson should have turned that over to his military personnel at the joint chiefs of staffs, who would have relied upon their commanders in the field. If they were not satisfied with those results, they would have changed them. It is the prerogative of the President to remove generals and appoint new generals.

Of course, the Senate confirms those higher appointments, as we saw happen a little over a week ago, with the confirmation of General David Petraeus.

Now, we find ourselves in this odd dichotomy here, this odd contradiction, where Congress has, and I am speaking, I should say specifically, the Senate has unanimously endorsed the President's choice to be the commander of all operations in Iraq, General David Petraeus.

Personally, I would put into the RECORD that he is the singular most impressive individual that I have met in a military uniform in my lifetime. I do not believe that there could be another choice. I do not believe that there could be a better choice to head up these operations in this new way forward in Iraq than General David Petraeus.

□ 1915

Not only does he understand the overall strategy, he has written the book on counterinsurgencies. He spent years in Iraq. I first met him over there in October of 2003 where he commanded the 101st Airborne that had gone in and liberated the region about three provinces and in the region of Mosul. And there, as I sat and received a briefing from him, I will tell this little anecdote about General Petraeus, that is, he started to give a briefing.

And it was in a way, a classical Powerpoint slide show, but a slide show of pictures, the reality of what had taken place there. And he had a cordless microphone.

Now I do not get very many briefings that last an hour and a half, unless I happen to be the one that is delivering them. But General Petraeus spoke for about an hour or a little more, and the battery went dead on his microphone. The moment before the battery went dead, he had picked up another microphone that was laying there, and without even breaking stride, laid the one down, picked the microphone up with the fresh battery in it, and proceeded to complete that briefing that lasted about 90 minutes.

He had the solution sitting there waiting for the problem. He used every single minute of the 90 minutes extraordinarily effectively. Not only did he talk about politics and tactics and the military deployment that they had there, the difficulties that they had faced, he talked about how he had called for elections in Mosul.

Mosul was liberated in late March 2003. They had elections there in May of 2003. And at the table later on the next day, I met with the new governor of Mosul and the vice-governor of Moss, one a Shiia, one a Kurd. One might have been a Sunni and the other was a Kurd. But regardless, he had representatives from two different sectarian factions there, and then a business leader at the table who was proficient in English.

You could tell by the eye contact of those three men, they were a team that was working together. General Petraeus understood the military and the tactics, understands them better today than he did then, and he understood them very well then. He understands the politics. He understands the economics. And he studied this. It has been his focus, it has been his life. He loves his soldiers. I am looking forward to a completion of this mission in Iraq that will be I believe a successful mission.

Mr. ANDREWS spoke about Iran. I digressed a bit before I get to that point. I support his constitutional conclusion that Congress alone declares war. But I would submit, in addition to that statement, that the Commander in Chief calls the shots. We declare war, if that is what the situation calls for.

And then Congress shall not get in the way and micromanage the operations. No war by committee, Madam Speaker, and no interference here on the part of these Members of Congress, except if they have an issue then they can do, behind-the-doors oversight. They can have those conversations. The President's door is open to the leadership of this Congress. We know that.

If they have those kind of issues, they want to discuss, we have classified briefings here. There are plenty of opportunities for oversight. If not, you can ask for opportunities for oversight. But to set up this Congress and to use the committees and use the committee chairs and the ranking members to somehow configure a away to bring in motions and micromanage a war is a guaranteed military debacle. There has never been a successful committee operation fighting a war in history, and there is no way that you can set a precedent here out of this Congress, especially as divided and as defeatist as it is on the majority side of the aisle.

It seems to me that the will to win this war runs a successful clear distinct victory that would be written by the historians as a distant victory, is not really something that is loved and anticipated by the people on the other side of the aisle. And this is not a stretch that comes out of my imagination, Madam Speaker. But it is simply an observation from in this Chamber, when the Commander in Chief gave his State of the Union Address last month, now when he spoke about committing to victory in Iraq, one-half of this Chamber stood in a thunderous standing ovation, and the other half of the Chamber, Madam Speaker, sat on their hands in silence, disgraceful silence.

Could they not know that our troops in the field have televisions in real time over there in Iraq and in Afghanistan, and in other parts where our troops are today, supporting our troops that are in the front lines? Could they not know that our commanders all the way down the line to the privates are watching this disgraceful lack of support? Their lives are on the line, and they will hear Members from this side of the aisle to a man and to a woman say, I support the troops. I support the troops. I support the troops.

And the question to follow is, what about their mission? Do you support their mission? And that is when you cannot get a question answer from hardly anybody on the Democratic side of the aisle. In fact, the Speaker herself declined to say yes to that point blank question sometime in December of last year.

She said it was not a matter of victory, it was a matter of managing. Well, they want to manage their way out of there, and I will submit that the rule of warfare is, victory goes to the side that is occupying the territory at the end of the war. You cannot lift people off with helicopters off a U.S. embassy in places like Saigon, and say, well, we really won the war, we tactically won the war, we did not lose a battle, we won, we left because we wanted to, it was kind of an asterisk that those things happened down there.

We tactically did win every battle. And our U.S. military performed courageously, heroically, and gloriously. And they need to be honored by every generation from here on out. But we did not win the battle of who stood on the terrain at the end.

And these enemies that we have in the Middle East are a philosophical enemy that goes deep back into history. And before I go deep back into history, I will speak again to the Iranian issue of Mr. ANDREWS, which is, he criticized the regime of Iran. I agree with him. It is an unstable leader that they have. And they have some mullahs that seem to be directing the action of that unstable leader. So that cabal in the middle appears to me to be, from our view, from our Western civilization view, an irrational group of leaders.

He said the regime must never have a nuclear weapon. I agree, Mr. ANDREWS, 100 percent, they must never have a nuclear weapon. And yet we cannot go forward. He said we cannot go for a reckless premature action against Iran. I agree with that as well. It cannot be reckless, it cannot be premature.

But does anybody really think that we can make nice enough, talk nice enough, be reasonable enough and take our case to the Iranians and say somehow can we just put out an olive branch here, and have an open discussion and find out what our disagreements. Does anybody really think that Ahmadinejad or the mullahs would just then peacefully come to the table, and they could be reasoned into a position of giving up their nuclear weapons?

I mean, they came out yesterday, and their announcement was that they will continue to develop their nuclear weapons, and they say they have a right to do so. But does anybody believe that they can be talked out of them? I am wondering what it is about human nature that I see this so clearly that they have gone down this path, they will not let go, they will not give up.

Why does anybody on that side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, think that they can debate Ahmadinejad into giving up his nuclear missiles and his nuclear technology and ability, when I would ask them, how long has it been since you have seen anybody in this Congress change their mind because of the shear force of a debate?

I mean, these are not so momentous a decision that we make, but we come down here on the floor. And how often can anyone point to a single time that they have said something that was so profound, so honest, so insightful that another Member said, I did not know that. I am on your side, I will switch my position, change my vote, I will be with you because you made sense.

It is so utterly rare in this Congress, why would the gentleman believe that we could send negotiators over to Iran, and they would say, well, it makes sense to me. We will just demolish all of that nuclear capability. We want to sign a peace treaty with you all. We will start trading and it will be a wonderful world again.

The reason that we have a problem there is because we have a fundamental philosophical disagreement and misunderstanding. This began in Iran when President Jimmy Carter's belief in supporting religious fundamentalists caused him to support the return of the Ayatollah and the demise of the Shaw in Iran.

And when that happened in 1979, that was the beginning of the hostile Iran. And it did not take very long before we saw 444 days, 52 American hostages paraded regularly in front of our television trying to humiliate the United States. And some believe that Ahmadinejad was part of that group, they think they have pictures that show him there, a kidnapper of American diplomats.

I do not know. I do not know if that is true or if it is not true. But he certainly was not opposed to that that we know. He is for the annihilation of Israel, the annihilation of the United States, these dictators tell us what they think, and often they follow through on the those actions.

And so, no, I do not trust the Iranian leadership, I do trust a lot of the Iranian people. And I would trust the Iranian people to capture their freedom if given the chance. I would paint this image in the mind's eye, Mr. Speaker, of all who might be contemplating this.

In the map you will see Iraq to the west and Afghanistan to the east. And right in the middle, linked together bordering the two countries is Iran.

Now, I will argue that Afghanistan today is a free country. And our troops were on the ground guarding the polling places. The first time ever in the history of the world that since Adam that there had been any votes that took place on that soil.

Today it is a fledgling democracy. It has its problems. Certainly it will. We had our problems in the early years. We have our problems today. It is never pretty. It is always difficult. But it is always worth the effort. But Afghanistan is a free country. Iraq is technically a free country today.

The part that diminishes that freedom is the 80 percent of the violence that takes place in Baghdad and within 30 miles of Baghdad. But Iraq, much of Iraq is peaceful, it is pacified and it is becoming prosperous. I went over there the last time, over the last Thanksgiving, I actually spent my Thanksgiving Day eating dinner with a good number of wounded troops in Landstuhl, Germany, at the hospital, and encouraged by their courage.

That was the most monumental and profound Thanksgiving that I have ever had or ever hope or expect to have. And from there, I traveled over to Iraq where I did spend a couple of days in the Baghdad area, and then I went to a camp, a forward operating base just out of Baghdad, and then on up into Erbil in the north, in the Kurdish area in the north.

I have been to most corners of Iraq over the last few years. I try to get there as often as I can to get a feel for what is going on. I do not think it is possible to understand that operation over there without going there. I was encouraged by the level of peace and the growing prosperity, especially that that I saw in Erbil and up in the Kurdish area.

You get out of the plane there, take off your flack jacket, toss your helmet in the back, and walk across to the parliament. I sat down with some members of parliament there. And then they cooked also a turkey Thanksgiving dinner that was something that I have not seen done as well in this country. Gregarious hosts and wonderful people. That is how I find most of the Iraqi people.

I do not accept a 60-percent number that was delivered here by the gentleman from Georgia, that 60 percent of the Iraqis believe it is good or okay to be attacking Americans. I do not know where that poll would come from. Maybe if you polled the terrorists you would get a number like that.

But I do not believe, Madam Speaker, that that is the sentiment of the Iraqi people. The Iraqi people are grateful that the United States has stepped in to liberate them. There is a bit of a power vacuum, especially in Baghdad.

The President's plan is to go in and fill that power vacuum. Muqtada al-Sadr has done a job in filling that power vacuum. And he has been supported and funded and armed by Ahmadinejad's people in Iran. Iran is fighting a proxy war against the United States within Iraq.

You also have Syria fighting a lesser effective but to a lesser degree a proxy war against the United States in Iraq. When the President came out shortly after September 11, he said if you harbor terrorists, fund terrorists, train terrorists, you are a terrorist and we will treat you as a terrorist state.

□ 1930

Iran is one of those countries. Syria is one of those countries. I know of no example in the history of the world where an insurgency that could go back and hide and have sanctuary in a sovereign state has ever been defeated. You have to take your battle where the insurgency is. And if they have got a sanctuary you have to go to their sanctuary.

That doesn't mean that we need to take on Iran. It means that we have got to eliminate sanctuaries. And we cannot delude ourselves into believing that we can negotiate a nuclear capability away from Iran. It would be just utterly ineffective because they have a goal and they have a vision.

And from that point I would submit that the background here of United States history, American history, instructs us on what has been historically, and is relevant to today. Madam Speaker, I would submit that back in 1783 would be the period of time when the new United States made peace with Great Britain. And at that time, we had an American Merchant Marine that was sailing the world and trading. We have always been a very effective seafaring nation. And as our American Merchant Marine sailed and traded to the world and they went into the Mediterranean, up until 1783 they had the protection of the British Navy because we were, up until 1776, at least a colony of the British, and so we are now rectified of their Navy.

But when we were recognized by Britain and began to fly the American flag, and were not under the protection of the Union Jack, 1783, America made peace with Britain; and then, 1784, the first American ship was captured by pirates from Morocco. Thus began the Barbary wars where we took on the Barbary pirates. From 1784 and on up until about 1815, the United States was engaged sporadically and periodically, but actually almost continually in a war again the Barbary pirates along the Barbary Coast.

And before I go into that, Madam Speaker, I need to give a little bit more of the history of that region. Barbary pirates in that region had been raiding the Mediterranean shoreline, especially the European side of that, for years. And I will submit that they had been raiding the shoreline for almost 300 years at that point in 1784 when they captured the first American vessel.

Beginning about 1500, 1502, 1503 is when the Barbary pirates began an active and aggressive pirating of merchant marines that were sailing into the Mediterranean. And their goal was, capture the ship and the cargo and the crew. And the most valuable portion of that was all too often the crew, because they were pressed into slavery, Madam Speaker. And they brought back European slaves to the Barbary Coast where they pressed them into slavery.

And they built many of the edifices that you see there today, the old architecture from the 1500 era and on, clear on into the early 1800s, about 1830; much of that work was done by Christian slaves that were pressed into slavery by Muslim masters. And, in fact, there is a book written by a professor at Ohio State University called Christian Slaves and Muslim Masters. And he has gone back and studied the coastline, the European coastline of the Mediterranean and old church records and other family records and old family Bibles and put together a credible history of the slave trade by the Barbary pirates as they moved in with their corsairs and took over the merchant marine, the merchant ships from Europe.

The Barbary pirates raided the shoreline all around Greece and Italy and France and Spain and all the way up the coastline of France and the Atlantic into England and on over as far north as Iceland. In fact, there is a fairly detailed commentary about 400 Icelanders who were pulled from their beds at night just near the shore of Iceland, pressed into slavery and sailed back down to the Barbary Coast on the north shore of Africa.

And of all of the slaves that were captured along all of that coastline, from Greece all the way up to Iceland, these Icelanders survived the least, and they perished the most. They got the least amount of work out of them and they died the most quickly. And that happens to be some remarks that are written into the historical documents.

Some say it had to do with the climate change. Some say it had to do with the work they pressed them in. Some say it had to do with their hearts being utterly broken that they were pressed into slavery, and they just lost their will to live. But there is very little, if any, genetic remnant of those slaves today because the men that were pressed into slavery, and it was almost all men, they were never allowed an opportunity to do anything but walk in their chains and row the corsairs, or else do their slave labor, building the buildings and doing the kind of construction work that built those cities.

They didn't have an opportunity to procreate, so you don't see their genetics in the faces of the people that live on that part of the continent today. Occasionally, I am told that there are some blue eyes that pop up that look like they might be the descendants of the women who were captured aboard ship or offshore, who were pressed into, I will say concubinery.

And so there are some descendants from that, but it is very little, from remnants. But all together, Professor Davis documents about 1.25 million Christian slaves that were pressed into slavery by the Barbary pirates, and this period of time would be from about 1500 on to about 1583.

Well, it continued from that point forward, and Europe built a practice of paying tribute to the pirates and seeking to purchase back their most valuable citizens. And it would be those men and women of substance. If they had a wealthy family, then they would try to go and pay tribute to get that member of the family back. That went on for hundreds of years.

There was a pattern there. It was a business that was being run. And when the United States found themselves sucked into that in 1784 when our first ship was captured by the pirates from Morocco, that began the long conflict that lasted until at least 1815.

And one will remember that the United States took a posture eventually; we paid tribute here, Madam Speaker, out of this Congress to the Barbary pirates. And some of those line items that I have seen were as high as $250,000 to pay tribute to the Barbary pirates, but that would be just one line item. And, in fact, that was a line item that was refused. But we paid more than that on an annual basis, and that tribute, that bribery got so high that it became as high as 20 percent of the entire Federal budget to pay off the pirates in the Barbary Coast.

And so we decided that we couldn't afford this any longer, and we had two alternatives. One was to outfit a Navy and a Marine Corps and send them over there to punish the Barbary pirates and get them to back off of any vessel that flew the Stars and Stripes. So we sent our best diplomats over there to negotiate with the Barbary pirates; and I don't know that we have diplomats of that standing today, but historically they will stand very high in the mind's eye of Americans, Madam Speaker.

And so in 1786 Thomas Jefferson, who was then the ambassador to France, and John Adams, who was the ambassador to Britain, met in London with, and I don't have this name memorized, met in London with Sidi Haji Abdul Rahman Adja, the ambassador to Britain from Tripoli. Our American ambassadors, Jefferson and Adams, ambassadors to France and Britain respectively, asked Adja why his government was hostile to American ships, that even though there had been no provocation, his government was hostile to American ships. The ambassador's response was reported to the Continental Congress, and is a part of the permanent record today that can be reviewed over in the Library of Congress.

The response from Sidi Haji Abdul Rahman Adja, the ambassador to Britain from Tripoli, I will repeat, was this, and I quote, ''It was founded on the laws of their prophet, that it was written in their Koran, that all nations who should not have acknowledged their authority were sinners, that it was their right and duty to make war upon them wherever they could be found and to make slaves of all they could take as prisoners, and that every Musselman,'' and that is the term for a Muslim today, ''who should be slain in battle was sure to go to paradise.''

Sound familiar, Madam Speaker, to some of the things that we hear today?

And Jefferson's analysis, his comments upon that valiant effort at diplomacy, an effort that has been suggested by Mr. ANDREWS here this evening, Jefferson's analysis was this, and I will paraphrase and summarize and not quote, but it is hard to reach common ground, it is hard to negotiate with people whose profound religious belief is that their salvation is from killing you.

1786; 2006–2007. We think we have come a long way; we may have not gained a single inch in this disagreement, just had some interim conflicts and relative periods of peace. I think the American people need to understand this.

And so out of the failure of that diplomatic effort, that valiant diplomatic effort, the United States Navy was born, March 1794. The Marine Corps joined with the Navy and they went to the shores of Tripoli. And that is today in the Marine Corps anthem, ''From the halls of Montezuma, to the shores of Tripoli.''

And our Navy was fitted, and they designed frigates for Americans, and these frigates had superior speed and superior maneuverability, very much an American thing. That was the first time that Americans went to war after the ratification of their Constitution, and they went to war with the most modern frigates that had a tactical advantage because the technology that was developed by the innovative nature and the inventiveness of American shipbuilders. And today we are off in space with that same kind of innovation.

The Marines, when they went to the shores of Tripoli, they knew what they were up against to some degree.

And Madam Speaker, we have all heard Marines called Leathernecks. Most don't recall, Marines got the nickname Leathernecks because they put leather collars around their neck, thick leather collars when they went into battle to reduce the chance that they would be beheaded by the enemy. That is how Marines got the nickname Leathernecks. They got that nickname over 200 years ago, and it is part of their history and part of their lore. And the shores of Tripoli are engraved on their Iwo Jima monument over across the Potomac River.

And so we need to go back and revisit history, Madam Speaker, and understand that this enemy is driven by the same philosophy. They still believe their path to salvation is in killing us. There are passages in the Koran that support this almost verbatim that I have happened to have read.

Thomas Jefferson had a Koran. I understand that Koran came to this Congress to be used in a swearing-in ceremony. Some say that he leaned towards Islam because he owned a Koran. I will submit that Thomas Jefferson also studied Greek, and he had a Greek Bible; he wanted to be able to understand the passages in the Bible from the perspective of the Greek, rather than relying on the translations from Greek into an English version.

Thomas Jefferson was perhaps the preeminent scholar of his time, maybe the preeminent scholar in our history. He took his work seriously. Of course he needed to understand ''nosce hostem,'' which is Latin for ''know thy enemy.'' And that would absolutely be the reason why Thomas Jefferson acquired a Koran, so he could understand that enemy that said that it is written in their Koran that all nations who should not have acknowledged their authority were sinners, that it was their right and duty to make war upon them wherever they could be found, and to make slaves of all they could take as prisoners, and that every Muslim who should be slain in battle was sure to go to paradise.

What a promise to make. And when that is a profound religion, it is impossible to negotiate with. So what we did, we went to war against them, and over time put them in a position where they needed to sue for peace.

And I will submit also that Algiers came under attack from the British twice and the French once. And they didn't cease their attacks on Western Europe—I will say Western civilization and the shipping industry within the Mediterranean as a piracy approach, as a government policy. They didn't cease those attacks until 1830 when the French went in and occupied Algiers.

And so here we are today with an enemy, globally, in the world, which is a segment of Islam. And I certainly respect and appreciate moderate Islam. I

ask them to step forward and be our allies. I believe they are a peaceful people and a good-hearted people. And the more I travel and the more people I meet, the greater my respect and admiration for the goodness of humanity is.

But there is an element within Islam that is radical Islam, the jihadists, the Islamists, as Daniel Pipes has named them. That element is a significantly large element and there are maybe 1.2 to 1.3 billion Muslims in the world. And according to Daniel Pipes, our Benazir Bhutto, 10 percent, and according to Pipes, perhaps as many as 15 percent, are inclined to be supportive of al Qaeda.

Now, if it is 10 percent you are looking at 130 million. If it is 15 percent, add half again to that. That is a huge number of people who philosophically believe that their path to salvation is in killing us, and that they don't really take a risk with their destiny when they attack us because if they are killed in the process, they will surely go to paradise.

□ 1945

That is the enemy that we are against, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Eight minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And so here we are today with a Congress that wants to micromanage a war, and a resolution or two or three over in the Senate that undermine our troops, and a resolution promise to come to the floor of this House next week that undermines our troops. As I have submitted, you cannot win a war by committee. You cannot fight a war by committee, but you can undermine the mission and you can put your troops at risk by doing so.

We have top-notch commanders in the field, Madam Speaker. They have demonstrated their ability. We have the best military ever put into the field. Their morale is strong, their technology is there, their training is high. Their sense of mission and duty and sacrifice is strong and is profound. They want to complete their mission.

I traveled over there with a lieutenant colonel who said to me, Don't pull us out of this. Don't save me. Don't save me. I volunteered. I am willing to take this risk. I want to take this burden off of my children. That is my duty to my country and to my family. I want to take this burden off my children. Don't try to save me.

I had some Gold Star families in my office a couple of months ago, shortly before I went to Iraq, Gold Star families who have lost a son or a daughter in combat over in either Afghanistan or Iraq. As I listened to them, they just intensely pleaded with me, Do everything you can to promote a successful mission. We have heard much of the dialogue, but to look them in the eye and understand that intensity. And then, one of the bereaved fathers from California, his first name was John, said to me, It's different now. Our children have gone over there and fought and died on that soil. The soil in Iraq is sanctified by their blood. They paid their price for the freedom of the Iraqi people. You cannot walk away and leave that now. That is the vision of the Gold Star families. That is the commitment of our military.

I can't find people in uniform in Iraq that don't support the mission, that aren't committed to the cause. But they ask me, why do we have to fight the enemy over here, the news media over in the United States, and the people that are undermining us in the United States Congress? It is an undermining. And I will make this prediction, Madam Speaker, that before this 110th Congress is adjourned, there will be an amendment or a bill that comes to this floor that seeks to unfund our military, one that is written off the pattern of the one at the end of Vietnam. And if that amendment comes and it is successful and it shuts off funding and our troops are forced by a defeatist attitude in Congress to pull out of Iraq, you will see a human suffering like this world has not seen since World War II.

The price for failing to succeed will be cataclysmic. I don't have enough minutes to go into the description of all of that.

But I will submit that we either succeed victoriously and leave Iraq a free democratic Iraq that can stand on its own two feet and defend itself and be represented by its people, we either do that, or the last battle in Iraq won't be fought over there, Madam Speaker. It will be fought here on the floor of this Congress through an appropriations bill that will seek to jerk the rug out from underneath our sacrificing military. And it would put this country in utter disgrace if that were to happen.

So I have introduced a resolution, a resolution that supports and endorses our troops, one that recognizes the circumstances that we are in, the constitutional power and authority of our Commander in Chief, and stands up and defends our troops and our military all the way down the line. It says, in fact, the bipartisan Iraq Study Group says on page 73 that it could support a short-term redeployment or surge of American combat forces to stabilize Baghdad or to speed up the training and equipping mission if the U.S. commander in Iraq determines that such steps would be effective.

General Petraeus has written the plan. He has determined it would be effective; it is consistent with the Iraq Study Group, page 73. Look it up. General Petraeus has endorsed the plan, as I said. And on top of that, the cochair of the Iraq Study Group, former Secretary of State James Baker III, came back to this Congress and said: The President's plan ought to be given a chance. He wants us to support the Iraq Study Group, and that is the President's plan. That means a free and liberated Iraq, not a cut and run.

Honor the troops for their service and honor their mission, and in fact honor their sacrifice. And I will fight this battle here where it is at greatest risk, Madam Speaker. And I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I look forward to the debate next week and the open dialogue, and I hope that there is a rule that is offered here under the promise of this new and open Congress that would allow for amendments to be brought to the floor so that resolutions of this type actually have an opportunity to be debated in this Congress.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 4:00 p.m.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ELLISON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANDREWS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CARNAHAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, February 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, today.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the