We will hear the limitations on these advancements, and we will also hear some distortions. But I come before you tonight with confidence; confidence in the science of stem cell research; confidence that the American people overwhelmingly support this legislation; confidence that tomorrow a great majority of my colleagues will once again vote in favor of the stem cell research enhancement act; and confidence that, one day, once all of our Nation's leaders will rally all around all types of stem cell research, and we will see big changes in the field of medicine and in the lives of so many people who are suffering today.

So tonight, I rise, I rise to help spread this message of hope and optimism to our constituents who are watching at home; for the 400,000 Americans who are living with MS; the 60,000 American family whose have faced the fear of a loved one's Parkinson's diagnosis this year; the thousands of Americans who have seen family members come to Alzheimer's disease; the 250,000 Americans who, like me, live with the constant challenges of a spinal cord injury, and so many others. To all of you, I say: Help and hope are on the way.

I want to thank my colleagues for giving me time tonight and being part of this 100 hours agenda debate, particularly, again, what you have done for enlightening the American people on our position of the war on Iraq and the new direction that we need to take in this country.

Thank you very much.

□ 2015

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We look forward to the debate tomorrow. I know Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ is going to give the e-mail address out, and then we are going to close out.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We want to thank the people in the chamber for listening, and encourage people to come to our Web site www.speaker.gov/30something, and we also look forward to having a graphic so we don't all have to make sure we remember the Web site. Thank you.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Life is getting better, Mr. Speaker, and we will get the tools necessary, visual aids as we usually have here on the floor. We keep the chart companies in business.

Mr. Speaker, it was good to come to the floor again, 30-Something Working Group. We will be returning back next week with some of our new members that have joined us. Once again, we want to thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have this hour.

Mr. Speaker, historic days in the Capitol. Tomorrow will be the same. Friday will be the same. We thank God for the opportunity to be in the majority.

THE DEMOCRATIC AGENDA AND THE PRESIDENT'S AGENDA ON IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAHONEY of Florida). The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to address you and of course all the Members here on this floor of the United States Congress. I would point out here in the beginning that it is about 8:15 here this evening, and the President will be giving his major address on Iraq at about 9:01 and so I intend to be asking for an adjournment just right before 9:00 so there is an opportunity to do that transition and that the President does have an opportunity to use this channel to speak to the American people.

To begin this presentation this evening, and we listened to the members on the other side of the aisle talk about supporting the 100-hour agenda, Mr. Speaker, I point out that this 100-hour agenda was a number just kind of picked out of the air or off the wall and it turned into a promise. And inside of that promise of 100 hours and to accomplish these five or six things within 100 hours are a whole series of other promises, and it appears as though the most important promise of all is we are going to do all this in 100 hours. The 100-hour promise. And not the promise for bipartisanship and not the promise for the most open Congress in history, and probably not the promise for the most ethical Congress in history. The jury is still out on that, Mr. Speaker, but this thing that preempts all, that trumps all is this idea of 100 hours.

Well, 100 hours to the American people might mean at midnight on December 31 when the ball dropped and hit the bottom in Times Square, the clock might start to tick on the 100 hours here in 2007, the new 110th Congress. But I don't take that position necessarily, Mr. Speaker. I take the position that when we gaveled in and went to work here, if you want to count 100 hours, that is fine; if you want to make a promise to get something done in 100 hours, that is also fine. But that 100 hours didn't start for the first week. It didn't start for the first week because we were voting on things other than the six things on the agenda to be accomplished in the 100 hours.

And so then the promise that it was going to be bipartisan and an open process, we found out, I guess after Congress began, this 110th Congress, that this open process couldn't be opened up until the 100 hours were over, or otherwise they couldn't get everything accomplished in the first 100 hours. So bipartisanship went out the window a victim of the 100-hour promise, and so did the open kind of a system. The bills didn't go through subcommittee. They didn't go through committee. They didn't go through rules. No amendments are allowed. And yet that was all decided before the 100-hour clock began.

So we set up a clock, a legitimate clock, one that actually keeps the time here that Congress is in session. From when we gaveled in this 110th Congress, we gavel in the morning, open with a prayer and the pledge, and we gavel out in the evening. That clock has got a tick on that. We are paying people here to work around this Capitol the whole time the 100 hours is moving.

So I set up this clock so the American people can keep track of what the hours are, and I point out this: When we started this morning, we were at 31 hours that ticked away since. And these are just business hours. It is not a stretch; it is not 24 hours a day. It is the hours that this floor is in operation. In fact, yesterday, it was scheduled to be at 10:00, so a lot of people made their plans to be here at 10:00. It didn't work on Monday because of the football game. And I will just reserve my opinion of that tonight, Mr. Speaker. But the 10:00 time to start got moved back to 10:30, got moved back to noon and then got moved back to first votes at 5:30 yesterday afternoon. So some of that is not taken into account here, but as of about now, this 100 hours has clicked up to 42 hours, Mr. Speaker, have ticked away. And there have been a couple of things that have been passed, and some will claim that to be an accomplishment. And I don't intend to take up that issue either tonight, Mr. Speaker. But I would point out to the American people that we are at 42 hours and counting.

If you can't count time, you also can't count dollars or people. And it is important to understand the cost to the United States of America and the taxpayers that fund it. And we will be doing some of these tallies after hours tonight to come back with some better numbers tomorrow, and I will bring this chart then to the floor every day until the 100 hours ticks over, and we can make this 100-hour promise something that goes into the dust bin of history.

But this 100-hour promise has trumped the other promises. It has been more important than an open system of government. It has been more important than allowing anyone to offer a single amendment to any bill that has come forward here, and each one of those bills are going to change the destiny of America. Maybe a little bit, maybe a lot. But each one will change the destiny of America some. And the people I feel sorry for, all of those new freshmen Democrats, the ones that were elected to office having promised that they were going to represent their constituents here, they would have a voice, they would be effective. They bring with them the vitality of America. They bring the new ideas into this Congress, the fresh blood. The best responsiveness to constituents that you ever will see on average comes with the freshmen. We are glad when they come here every new Congress because it adds new vitality.

But that large crop of Democrat freshmen and that smaller crop of Republican freshmen I think have gotten their eyes opened up a little bit. I think they believed they would come here and they would be able to come to

a subcommittee and do a markup on a bill and offer an amendment to improve the bill and see it go over to full committee, offer an amendment, improve the bill and bring it to the floor, where amendments would be offered and the bill would be improved and perhaps perfected and passed out of this Chamber, on over the Senate, where we would have negotiations working with them and they would have done the same thing.

The sad news for those freshmen is that they don't have a voice in this process. Not a single freshman had an opportunity to offer amendment to engage in debate in a subcommittee, to engage in debate in a committee; didn't have an opportunity to go before the Rules Committee and make their argument as to why their amendments should be made in order. None of that was allowed to the freshmen. And, in fact, the small little group of people that put together this policy didn't consider the wisdom of Congress; they considered the wisdom of the people within that room, and I guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, that didn't include the freshmen, either the Democrats or the Republicans, who now have to reassess what kind of a system they thought they had gotten elected to.

And I hope this 100 hours ticks away, and I hope it can be put away into the dust bin of history, and I hope those other promises can be rejuvenated and brought back to life, those promises about having an open system, a system that is bipartisan and a system that allows for amendments so that we can improve the legislation that comes.

We are at 42 hours, Mr. Speaker, and the clock will start again. Actually, it will shut off when we adjourn here about 9:00 and it will take up again tomorrow morning when we gavel back in.

But, Mr. Speaker, I come here to talk about a big subject. It is a subject that has been consuming the thoughts and the prayers of the American people since September 11, 2001, and that subject is a subject the President will take up here in a little more than 35 minutes. It is the subject of this global war on terror, and primarily the battleground, the main battleground, which is Iraq, in this global war on terror.

I have certainly been involved in this since the beginning of the operations in Iraq. I have been over there four times. I have traveled into Afghanistan as well. Each time I go over there, I always stop at Landstuhl in Germany and visit our wounded troops there. And the last time I was over was over Thanksgiving, just a little over a month ago, when I ate Thanksgiving dinner with wounded troops in Landstuhl at the hospital in Germany, and that was the most meaningful Thanksgiving I have ever had in my life. I don't expect to ever top that for a moving Thanksgiving where one can really be in awe of true courage, true patriotism and true sacrifice.

And I believe we are going to hear a speech from the President in a few minutes from now that is going to be, I think the tone of it could have been written by those people that have sacrificed the most, our soldiers and Marines and airmen that have perhaps given a limb, perhaps been wounded and crippled for life. I have not yet met a wounded soldier who said to me, ''This is a lost cause.'' They believe in the cause. They want to get back to the fight. They want to get back to the people they feel responsible for, and they want to complete the mission.

The wounded troops will stand with the President in the speech he is about to give and the families of those who have given the ultimate sacrifice, the Gold Star families, the families that have traveled across America and been here in Washington, D.C., a number of times and were in my office a week before I went over to Iraq. Some of those Gold Star families, those that have lost a son or a daughter over in Iraq or Afghanistan, some of them have also traveled over to the Middle East, also traveled into Iraq and got to visit the Iraqi people. And one of the fathers who lost his son killed over there in Iraq said to me: ''We cannot pull out of there. It is different now. We are committed to that cause. Lives have been lost. The soil in Iraq is now sanctified with American blood. It is not so simple that we could just walk away. We cannot. We must stay. We must prevail. We made the commitment to go there; we are invested in it; we must prevail.''

As I looked him in the eye, I know what kind of pain he has been through, that soaked in with me, Mr. Speaker. And so I traveled over there in the aftermath of their trip, and as I went alone this time, I didn't go with a congressional delegation, I just went alone, and I had an opportunity to sit down with General Abizaid and close the door and talk and ask questions and probe a line of reasoning and then take on another line of reasoning. I had the opportunity to do the same thing with General Casey, although staff was in the room for that one. I also sat down with General Corelli and did the same thing. I had two meetings with Ambassador Khalilzad. And then each time I walked into a mess hall, or I would just holler out, ''Is anybody here from Iowa?'' And invariably there would be Iowans there. And there is an instant connection between you and someone from your State. You know where they are from. You know what they believe in. You have an understanding about their background and where they come from. You know what sports teams they support, or at least you can find out quickly, and we have those little arguments, Mr. Speaker. But when I index the things that I hear from our top officers that are in the field and what I hear from the people on the ground, and as I talk to people through all ranks and travel across Iraq and also Afghanistan in this last trip, put back together a kind of strategy and come to a conclusion as to where we need to go and what we need to do.

And let's look at this thing, Mr. Speaker, from two broad perspectives. One of them is the idea that I am hearing over here on this side of the aisle, and this is not a new idea from the people on that side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker; they slipped language into the Department of Defense appropriations bill that would have by now prohibited all operations in Iraq. And that was Mr. MURTHA's language that went in there that prohibited any basing rights negotiations in Iraq, which would have meant, had that language prevailed that when our agreement on any of our bases in Iraq had expired, we couldn't negotiate a new one. So, over time, we would have had to give up base after base after base until we had to pull our troops completely out of Iraq.

That is not a lot different than the amendment that came out of an appropriations bill on this floor, Mr. Speaker, back in 1975 when a large Democrat majority took over and decided that they would take us out of the operations in Vietnam, and they introduced legislation successfully that forbid a single dollar from being used to support the South Vietnamese military. Not a dollar that can go for a bullet, for food, for a helmet, for a pair of khaki uniforms, no air cover, and nothing could go on offshore in South Vietnam either. So they shut down their operations in South Vietnam. And the South Vietnamese had defended their own country for 3 years, but when their resources dried up, their military collapsed.

□ 2030

Some of those things are being maneuvered right now, and I can hear this come out of the debate on the other side of the aisle.

But here are the scenarios: One scenario is listen to the people over here, Mr. Speaker, who would say, well, let's unfund this operation. Let's bring our troops home now. Let's get out of there because it is sectarian strife and you can't resolve a civil war and it is just brother fighting against brother and why do we want to get involved in a family feud? All of that that substitutes for rationale.

But what they are really looking at is if they get their way, the reality in Iraq is different than their perception, I believe, and I would like to have them pay a little more attention, maybe go over there with a real intention to learn.

But a year ago in Iraq there was violence over most of the entire country scattered around. And the argument I heard from this side of the aisle over here was, well, let's get out of there right now, get the Americans out because, after all, they are the targets and Iraqis just want to have their own country. They object to Americans walking on their soil. So if we would leave, there would be nobody for them to shoot at, and then peace would

break out all over Iraq, and the government would take over, and everything would be peaceful and fine. That was their argument then. Well, it was flawed, of course. But there was violence over most of Iraq.

A year later, now, most of the violence is confined to Baghdad. Eighty percent of the violence is in the Baghdad area. So peace has broken out over most of Iraq. And if you talk to the soldiers that have been over there that are running missions and convoys and doing patrols, they will tell you that most of Iraq seems very, very normal, that you go down the street and off on the road and the Iraqi kids come out and wave and the Iraqi people are open and friendly. The men are open and friendly. The women are a little more shy and a little demure. That is their culture. But they travel where they want to go, and the only thing that makes them realize that there is a war is when an IED goes off. So we are getting there, and the Baghdad area is the area that needs to be controlled and pacified. The rest of the country is pretty good.

If we pulled out now or if we pulled out in the near future, the involvement and the interference that comes from Iran would be imposed on the Shiia section of Iraq, which is actually a little more than the southern area of Iraq, which has got most of the oil in it. It would be Baghdad and some of the areas to the north of there and all the way south down to Basra, into the hands of the influence of the Iranian Shiia, who are right now funding and training, equipping and arming terrorists in Iran and sending them into Iraq and supporting some of the militia personnel there like Muqtada al Sadr.

I happen to have his picture here. This fellow has been a nemesis for a long time. And I put the date down here. That was the date that I was sitting in a hotel in Kuwait City watching Al Jazeera TV. Muqtada al Sadr, the head of the Mahdi militia, came on Al Jazeera TV, and as I watched that he said in Arabic with the English crawler underneath: ''If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu.'' Muqtada al Sadr.

Now here he is being supported by the Iranians, funding his militia, helping to train his militia, and paying some of them to plant IEDs and attack Americans. Iran is conducting a proxy war against the United States from the sanctuary of their sovereign nation of Iran and sending in the munitions and the militia and the insurgents to attack Americans there, and this man is their surrogate, and he must go.

It is more complicated than the people on the other side of the aisle would say. They would argue that it is just Shiia and Sunni that are fighting each other. There are six to eight different factions fighting each other there. Sadr is one. The Badr Brigade is another. Al Qaeda is another. There are Sunni criminal groups that are fighting. There are other groups, the former Baathists, that are fighting.

You can add these pieces up, Mr. Speaker, but in the end it is more complicated than just simple sectarian strife. It is a power struggle, a power to provide security and safety within some areas of the community, the effort on the part of Muqtada al Sadr and others to drive some of the Sunnis out of Sunni sections of Baghdad so that they can have their internal hegemony within the city of Baghdad.

But this all happened because there was somewhat of a vacuum there and we didn't go in and take this man out when we needed to do that. And he has been to some degree protected by Prime Minister Maliki, who this afternoon made a statement that essentially puts Muqtada al Sadr on notice. He tells the Shiite militias to give up.

''Prime Minister al-Maliki has told everyone that there will be no escape from attack,'' said a senior legislator who is close to Maliki. ''The government has told the Sadrists,'' Muqtada al Sadrists, '''if we want to build a state, we have no other choice but to attack armed groups,''' this being the armed groups, Mr. Speaker.

So I will say there are two main points that I want to hear the President address tonight, and one of them is militias must be taken on and taken out and they are getting an opportunity to surrender right now because Prime Minister Maliki has put them on notice. They must be taken on and taken out if they don't surrender. This is the lead that has got to go.

The second one is Iran must cease and desist from their proxy war against the United States from the sanctuary of the sovereign nation of Iran by sending in insurgents who are trained, equipped, funded, and armed by the Iranians.

And, by the way, IEDs that are being detonated that are blowing up Americans and killing Americans are being made in Iran and smuggled into Iraq. If we pull out of Iraq now without a successful safe country there, the result will be Iran will control the Shiia section of Iraq. They will control most of the oil in Iraq. They control the Straits of Hormuz now. They would control the outlet, the mouth of the Tigris and Euphrates River, the Umm Qasr ports, the export area for Iraq's oil. They would have a stranglehold on 40 percent of the world's oil, which is a death grip on the world economy.

They would be in a position to continue to enrich themselves, and their money chest would be pouring over. They could then accelerate their nuclear weapons development. They could either build more and build them faster or buy them where they could get them, perhaps from North Korea, and you would see Iran much more quickly become a dominant nuclear power with an ability not just to put a nuclear missile into Tel Aviv but the ability to do so into Western Europe and within just a few years the ability to do so clear into the United States of America with a death grip on the oil and the world, 40 percent of the oil, which controls the market, Mr. Speaker.

That is what we are looking at if we pull out of there. The stakes are too high, and that is why the President rejected, I will say politely ignored, the Iraq Study Group's recommendations.

But we should keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that there was a million dollar appropriation here that went to the United States Institute for Peace and out of that came the Iraq Study Group. Now, why, if we wanted to figure out how to win a war, would we go to the United States Institute for Peace and ask them to give us some advice? That makes about as much sense as going to the Syrians or going to the Iranians and saying, can you help us solve this problem? Why don't you give us some constructive recommendations?

It is not in their interest to give us constructive recommendations. It is in the interest of the Iranians and the Syrians to undermine our effort there so that they can get us out of the Middle East and they can impose their influence on Iraq, not the other way around. We will not get constructive advice from Iran or from Syria any more than we got advice on how to win a war from the Iraq Study Group because I believe that they thought that their charge was how do we get out of this? Let's figure out how to get out of this. Not how do we win?

But the President, to his credit, went to the Pentagon and said, I don't want to hear from you how we get out of Iraq. I want to see a strategy for victory.

I wish he had done that a couple years ago, but I am glad he did it now. I am looking forward to his speech; and, as I said, I will be sure we adjourn here before the President's speech that will happen right at 9 o'clock.

But, at this moment, I would very much like to yield to my friend from Tennessee, Mr. ZACH WAMP.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

And I just want to open by saying how encouraging it is to see a Member like yourself take such a hands-on interest in the affairs of the Middle East, and I think anyone here tonight or watching these proceedings would understand your perspective and how informed it is. Plus you approach it from the purity of an Iowan. And I am very grateful for your due diligence and for the work that you have done and the way that you understand these threats.

I was reminded, as you were speaking, that just a couple of years ago you and I were in Africa together talking about these threats and how we were concerned that Africa was also at risk with some of the areas like Somalia, which is in the news again this week, where these international terrorist networks are, frankly, looking for another sovereign nation from which to

operate, as they had with Afghanistan, and how global this threat really is.

I did not come, Mr. Speaker, to the floor tonight to in any way alienate or accuse anyone here or the other party in this case, because if ever there was a time in my life where we need Democrats and Republicans to come together on an issue of national/international importance, it is this issue. This is where I hope that there are never partisan motives attached to anyone's position on matters of war and peace.

I want to go back to the very time when we voted in the House and the Senate to remove Saddam Hussein by force and remind everyone that over half of the Democrats in the Senate voted to do so and almost half of the Democrats in the House voted to do so. And they can say now, oh, but we didn't have good information or whatever their rationale is for wanting to pull out abruptly now, but the truth is we are where we are and this situation is as it is and we are in it together. And if ever there was a time where Americans need to meet again at the water's edge, it is now.

I don't want to preempt what the President says tonight. The President is in a very difficult place because the war has not gone well. We have made mistakes. We have not implemented certain policies to the best of our ability. And I think it is important for him to recognize those flaws and those shortcomings with the mission to this point because, in my opinion, all great leaders at some point say we are on the wrong road and we need to get to this road or we have made this mistake or that mistake and if you will join me, we can rectify this problem. Because the stakes are enormous, as you said.

The great football coach Vince Lombardi, and football is just meaningless compared to these matters of war and peace and life and death, but he said once that fatigue makes cowards of us all. We need to remember that as a people, as a Nation, because we are all tired of this. I mean, I am weary of attending funerals in my district. I attended one with my wife again Monday, another one of a young soldier who died in Iraq over the holidays. His son was born the day after he died. We are all sickened by this sacrifice and this loss. But I have got to tell you if that collectively causes us to lose our passion for freedom or our will to carry on our way of life, it will be a tragedy in American history, and these are the decisions of the moment.

Now I know that our friends from time to time quote people, but one of the people, ironically to me, that serves as kind of the conscience of some of these international issues is Senator LIEBERMAN of Connecticut, who ran against, with my fellow Tennesseean Al Gore, the President and the Vice President. He just returned from this area and he came back in support of not only continuing our efforts until we can prevail in Iraq but, if necessary, and I am not endorsing increased troops tonight and I think the President is going to make his presentation and he has got a long way to go to convince the country and the Congress that this is necessary, so I am not endorsing that. But I am saying that Senator LIEBERMAN came back and effectively endorsed, in order to control these areas of insecurity particularly within the 30-mile radius of Baghdad, increasing troop strength and he talked about ''greatly advancing the cause of moderation and freedom throughout the Middle East and protect our security at home.'' And I am very concerned that if we retreat into the 1990 style complacency that 9/11s will continue.

One of the problems is that we did not have enough troops on the ground, and one of the expressions I wish hadn't been uttered was ''Mission Accomplished'' because there were many difficult days ahead of us following that unfortunate time. We didn't have enough troops to secure the area in and around Baghdad, and that is where 80 percent of the violence is taking place.

□ 2045

Sending more troops to Iraq will not help unless it is coupled with a concrete and feasible plan and a new strategy that requires the active participation of the Iraqi government. And the goal should be clear, an Iraq run by, secured by and governed by the Iraqi people.

Frederick Kagan from the American Enterprise Institute wrote this week that, ''The real choice we face is this: Is it better to accept defeat than to endure the pain of trying to succeed.''

I will say it again. ''The real choice we face is this: Is it better to accept defeat than endure the pain of trying to succeed.''

I don't think we can accept defeat. I don't think we can be seen as in retreat, and I want to explain why. For one, all of those troops that have given their lives that I have been with the families of say to me, We must prevail. We must continue on. My son, my husband, my father, believed very much that this was a just cause and the right thing to do, and we must succeed. They have suffered great loss, and they believe that it is the right thing to do.

But I want to say this, this cannot be George W. Bush's war. This must be America's fight. We must see people in a bipartisan way come together around a plan. I don't know if 20,000 troops is the right number, or 5,000 or 100,000; but we need to come back together because we are where we are and it is what it is, and if we are ever going to bring troops home in victory in 18 months or 24 months, we may have to put our foot down in the short run. Senator LIEBERMAN believes so. The President believes so. And I hope that the case is made clearly so that more and more Americans understand this.

Over the last few days, Zawahri, who is now the commander effectively of al Qaeda in the Middle East, has encouraged these terrorists to go to Somalia, as I said earlier, in northern Africa to fight the fight. The truth is this: If we were out of Iraq tomorrow, this threat continues. This threat did not just happen. September 11th was not the beginning of this. It was the culmination of them attacking us and our interests around the world and our sovereign land around the world, at our embassies. The same people, the jihadists, the extremists.

Read the book ''Hatred's Kingdom'' about wahabism, Qutubi and Azzam. In the 1950s, they began indoctrinating people on this unbelievably radical element in Islam to oppose anyone who did not believe as they believed, and that is the Hezbollah foundation out of Iran, as you say.

When people say these connections were not in place before September 11th, these connections with these terrorist elements have been in place for years. Don't deny that. You are burying your head in the sand. Read ''Londonistan'' and how they have infiltrated London. Read ''While Europe Slept'' and how they have infiltrated Europe. Read ''America Alone'' or ''Looming Towers'' and understand that these threats are our generation's call to courage, and we cannot grow weary such that we retreat. Too much is at stake.

The President is trying to get us back on the right road. One speech is not going to do it. Tonight is not going to do it. But I am hopeful for our country's sake, not my party's sake, not the Democrat's sake, but for our country's sake so we can find a path forward together. This cannot be the President's war. It has to be our country's fight against the jihadists wherever they go, and Iraq is one theater, and they want to fight us, and we need to defeat them. Let's meet together and send them back to their caves or into eternity so that our way of life is carried forward to the next generation.

This is a generational challenge. We can't deny from time to time in history you have to step up and these brave sons and daughters have done just that, and they have volunteered to serve. We honor their sacrifice, but please, House and Senate and country, come together and find a path forward as one Nation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his commitment to this country and the passion that he brings to everything he does. I point out, that meeting in Africa, we arrived from different locations and almost by coincidence, by providence, we arrived at the same location to address the things we were concerned about in South Africa at the time. I also note that Mr. WAMP shows up to address these issues spontaneously on occasion. I very much appreciate your leadership, ZACH.

As we sit here tonight, I will review some of the things that Mr. WAMP addressed. He listed a number of books that he recommended that we read.

Among them was the book ''While Europe Slept'' by Bruce Bawer, and that is, I think, one of the most profound reads I have ever gone through. It tells the story how the author has traveled from New York City into Holland to make his life there, and realized he could never become a Dutchman in Holland the same way you can become an American in the United States. So he moved to Norway to become a Norwegian and found out that although he could develop his language skills and understood the culture and history of Norway, he would never be a Norwegian because they don't have a system of assimilation that we have or at least had in the United States.

So he traveled throughout the countries in Europe and gathered anecdotes and data and studies and compiled an understanding of what is happening with the ethnic enclaves that have been created in Europe, those enclaves that are Muslim enclaves.

Our idea has been in this country to promote assimilation. Everybody can become an American. That, we have considered to be multiculturalism. But the multiculturalism in Europe is different. That is, let us create an ethnic enclave here, and look at us. We are no longer this blue-eyed, blond society, or whatever it happens to be in the Scandinavian north or whatever the complexion might be in some of the other areas in Europe. We now have multiculturalism by ethnic enclave, and the ethnic enclaves being primarily Muslim have not integrated into the rest of society, and they have brought more and more from their home country and grown their enclaves to the point where Bruce Bawer's analysis comes down to that skepticism that France will ever be French again within the next generation, and that the takeover that takes place without the assimilation by rejecting the host country's culture and importing the culture of the newly arriving immigrants transforms these countries and explains why you can see second generation British of Pakistani descent setting off bombs in the subways in London.

It explains that, and it shows what is happening to the culture in Europe because they have opened up their borders and not promoted assimilation. When it is done, Bruce Bawer's analysis comes down to the choice for Europe will be either one of two things: total capitulation or mass expulsion. That is what Europe is faced with, and I am not optimistic that Europe will recover and come back to being a partner for the free world again because the people that are in those countries that are slowly by birth rate taking over don't believe in the freedoms that we believe in, Mr. Speaker. They reject them. They reject Western civilization and our Christian culture. The reject the Judeo-Christian belief system. The wahabists that Mr. WAMP talked about, they believe they have an obligation or at least a right to annihilate those who don't believe like they do.

That is the enemy that we are up against. And this geopolitical dynamic needs to be understood by the Members of this Congress, and I am thinking the best way they can understand it is when the American people study it and get their voice into the ears of their representatives, the 435 here in the U.S. States House of Representatives.

But to take on a little more of this, I would point out that a major question needs to be asked and answered, and I hope the President has asked the question and I hope he has answered the question, and that is: Can we live with, here in the United States, a nuclear armed Iran? That is part of this overall equation. It isn't just confined to Iraq.

As I spoke earlier, Iran is conducting a proxy war against the United States in Iraq by training and funding and harboring terrorists and sending them munitions and equipping them and also making IEDs and other munitions that go into Iraq that are being used against Iraqis of all stripes and being used against Americans. That has to stop.

But can we tolerate a nuclear-powered Iran, an irrational nuclear-powered Iran that has Ahmadinejad who is fuming and making allegations about the annihilation of Israel and the annihilation of the United States.

All we have to do is listen to these tyrants and believe what they say. Every action that they make makes it clear that they will develop a nuclear bomb. They will develop more than one. They are developing the means to deliver it now, as they are developing a bomb now. Why would we disbelieve them? Why would we think that we could talk them out of it? When you go into negotiations, you never get something for nothing. You have to have something to offer.

I ask the President, and I hope he will tell us tonight, that he has put the cross hairs on Iran, and directly on their nuclear capability and sent through a back-channel message to Ahmadinejad and the mullahs that run him that Iran's nuclear days are numbered and that there is a decision that has already been made that they will not have a nuclear capability. And if they cease and desist from their proxy war against the United States that they are conducting within Iraq, then they will be allowed, perhaps, enough negotiation time that they can save some face before they dismantle their nuclear endeavor.

Should they proceed, then the decision needs to be made whether to take out Iran's nuclear capability. We saw 4 days ago, there was intelligence or I will say a press leak that came out of Israel that they have a contingency plan to take out Iran's nuclear capability with limited tactical nuclear weapons. If they have to do that, I am afraid there is an all-out conflagration in the Middle East, and all Arab countries will descend upon Israel. If somebody has to do it, it is better if we do it. It is better if Ahmadinejad dismantles his nuclear capability.

That is where I would start: Cross hairs on Ahmadinejad, put the cross hairs on their nuclear capability, and then if they back out of Iraq, then we can have a peaceful Iraq. We still have to remove Muqtada al-Sadr and some other militia leaders. If those two things happen, that shuts off the money, the munitions and the operations of violence that are there. As long as there is money there, somebody is going to set an IED. I can see that. But most is controllable by the Iraqis.

I have watched as thousands of Iraqi troops have been trained, lined up in ranks. I first saw them and reviewed those troops in October 2003. Those troops were trained by General David Petraeus. He headed up the Iraqi military training operations when he was over there during the last deployment, and now he has been appointed to command all military operations within Iraq. He is the most impressive military person I have met in my life. If anyone can run this operation in Iraq successfully, it is David Petraeus. He has the love and respect of many of the Iraqis, the Kurds and Sunnis and Shias. And in Mosul, where the 101st Airborne, which he commanded when they went in to liberate Iraq, there in Mosul, they went in and liberated Mosul in the latter part of March 2003. By the end of May 2003, General Petraeus had held open elections in Mosul in those three provinces there, and elected a governor and a vice governor, and I also recall a business representative at the table in those discussions that we had. That was an impressive means to win the hearts and minds of the people, and also from a military tactical perspective.

But to give you an understanding of how effective General Petraeus has been, there is a sign, and I have a picture of it as a street sign on a broad street in the city of Mosul in Iraq, and it said: 101st Airborne Division. They misspelled ''airborne'' and ''division'' so I was pretty sure that it was a sign put up by the Iraqi people in appreciation for the 101st Airborne led then by General Petraeus who will be taking over and commanding all military forces within Iraq.

We can win this. We must win this. We do not have a tactical threat against us. We can and will prevail. The American people need to stand together. Mr. WAMP said that, and I agree with him.

□ 2100

We need to stand with our Commander in Chief. It isn't really up to the President to convince the American people that we should move forward on this, but it is up to us to support our military. And if we are going to support our military, we must support their mission, Mr. Speaker.

So I look forward to the President's speech. It is a pleasure for me to have the honor and privilege to turn over, I will say this network, to the President of the United States as he lays out a

plan for victory in the battlefield of Iraq, which will take us on to a final victory in the overall global war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), who was the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for yielding.

In a few minutes the President will address the Nation about his plans for Baghdad and the fact that he needs reinforcements, some of them to go to Anbar Province, some of them to work on a three-to-one basis with the Iraqi forces, three Iraqi battalions in each one of these sectors in Baghdad for each American battalion standing behind them.

The President has asked for reinforcements, and it would be outrageous if the Democrat leadership in this House denied this country reinforcements for a military operation in a shooting war which continues to this minute.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HUNTER. I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 4 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

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 Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. Norton, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COHEN, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. KUHL of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KELLER of Florida, for 5 minutes, January 11.

Mr. ADERHOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 11, 2007, at 10 a.m.

BIENNIAL REPORT ON THE APPLICABILITY TO THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OF FEDERAL LAW RELATING TO TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT AND ACCESS TO PUBLIC SERVICES AND ACCOMMODATIONS

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,
Washington, DC, January 4, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Section 102(b)(2) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA), 2 U.S.C. 1302, requires that, ''Beginning on December 31, 1996, and every 2 years thereafter, the Board shall report on (A) whether or to what degree the provisions described in paragraph (1) are applicable or inapplicable to the legislative branch and (B) with respect to provisions inapplicable to the legislative branch, whether such provisions should be made applicable to the legislative branch. The presiding officers of the House of Representatives and the Senate shall cause each report to be printed in the Congressional Record and each such report shall be referred to the committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction.

The Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance is transmitting herewith the Section 102(b) Report for the 1091h Congress. The Board requests that the accompanying Report be published in both the House and Senate versions of the Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses are in session following receipt of this transmittal.

Any inquiries regarding the accompanying Notice should be addressed to Tamara Chrisler, Acting Executive Director of the Office of Compliance, 110 2nd Street, S.E., Room LA–200, Washington, D.C. 20540.

Sincerely,

SUSAN S. ROBFOGEL,
Chair of the Board of Directors.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,
Washington, DC, December 21, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC

DEAR SPEAKER HASTERT: Pursuant to section 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act, I am pleased to announce that the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance has completed its biennial report. Accompanying this letter is a copy of our section 102(b) report for the 109th Congress.

The section 102(b) report and its incorporated recommendations are an integral part of the Congressional Accountability Act. As a principle function of the Board, this report provides insight into the ever-changing climate that exemplifies the working environment of the legislative branch. As such, the Board views the submission of this report as the primary method of keeping the Act alive beyond its inception. With this submission, the Board presents its prior recommendations and specifically makes recommendations concerning the need for additional tools and mechanisms to increase the Office's efforts to ensure continued safety and health of legislative branch employees and visitors; as well as the need for regulations in the legislative branch for veterans entering and returning to the workforce.

With more than ten years of experience living with congressional accountability, the Board and the Office are committed to the recommendations we outline in this report. As the sixth such report to Congress, we are seeking appropriate time for review, consultation, and action in the 110th Congress.

On behalf of the Board of Directors, I submit this important document for you review and attention.

Sincerely,

TAMARA E. CHRISLER,
Acting Executive Director.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE SECTION 102(b) REPORT, DECEMBER 2006

This is the sixth biennial report submitted to Congress by the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance of the U.S. Congress, pursuant to the requirements of section 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act (2 U.S.C. 1302 (b)). Section 102(b) of the Act states in relevant part:

Beginning on December 31, 1996, and every 2 years thereafter, the Board shall report on (A) whether or to what degree [provisions of Federal law (including regulations) relating to (A) the terms and conditions of employment (including hiring, promotion, demotion, termination, salary, wages, overtime compensation, benefits, work assignments or reassignments, grievance and disciplinary procedures, protection from discrimination in personnel actions, occupational health and safety, and family and medical and other leave) of employees; and (B) access to public services and accommodations] . . . are applicable or inapplicable to the legislative branch, and (B) with respect to provisions inapplicable to the legislative branch, whether such provisions should be made applicable to the legislative branch. The presiding officers of the House of Representatives and the Senate shall cause each such report to be printed in the Congressional Record and each such report shall be referred to the committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction.

Bracketed portion from section 102(b)(1).

INTRODUCTION

Prior to the enactment of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA), Congress recognized the need to legislate many aspects of the workplace, and it did so by passing laws to address workplace rights and the employment relationship. These laws, however, were not applicable to Congress. Congress had excluded itself and other instrumentalities of the legislative branch from the requirements of these laws. Passage of the CAA, with nearly unanimous approval, in the opening days of the 104th Congress, reflected a national consensus that Congress must live under the laws it enacts for the rest of society.

The CAA is not meant to be static. The Act intended that there be an ongoing, vigilant review of federal law to ensure that Congress continue to apply to itself—where appropriate—the labor, employment, health, and safety laws it passes. To further this goal, the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance (''Board'') was tasked with the responsibility of reviewing federal laws each Congress to make recommendations on how the CAA could be expanded. Since its creation, the Board has duly submitted biennial Reports to Congress, starting in 1996, detailing the limited and prudent amendments that should be made to the CAA. There was also an Interim Report in 2001, regarding Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. In past reports, the Board has taken a broad