

not threatening anyone, we must come to terms with 3,000 American deaths and 23,000 American casualties. It is disconcerting that those who never believed the justifications given for our invasion and who, now, want the war ended, are still accused of not supporting the troops. This is strange, indeed.

Instead of questioning who has the best interest of our troops at heart, we should be debating which policy is best for our country. Defensive wars to preserve our liberties, fought only with proper congressional declarations are legitimate. Casualties under such circumstances still are heartbreaking, but they are understandable. Casualties that occur in undeclared, unnecessary wars, however, are bewildering. Why must so many Americans be killed or hurt in Iraq when our security and our liberty were never threatened?

Cliches about supporting the troops are designed to distract from failed policies, policies promoted by powerful special interests that benefit from war, anything to steer the discussion away from the real reasons the war in Iraq will not end anytime soon.

Many now agree that we must change our policy and extricate ourselves from the mess in Iraq. They cite a mandate from the American people for a new direction. This opinion is now more popular and, thus, now more wildly held by politicians in Washington. But there is always a qualifier. We can't simply stop funding the war because we must support the troops. I find this conclusion bizarre. It means one either believes the support-the-troops propaganda put out by the original promoters of the war, or that one actually is for the war after all, despite the public protestations.

In reality, support for the status quo and the President's troop surge in Iraq means expanding the war to include Syria and Iran. The naval buildup in the region and the proxy war we just fought to take over Somalia demonstrate the administration's intention to escalate our current war into something larger.

There is just no legitimacy to the argument that voting against funding the war somehow harms our troops. Perpetuating and escalating the war only serves those whose egos are attached to some claimed victory in Iraq and those with a determination to engineer regime change in Iran.

Don't believe for a minute that additional congressional funding is needed so our troops can defend themselves or extricate themselves from the war zone. That is nonsense. The DOD has hundreds of billions of dollars in the pipeline available to move troops anywhere on Earth, including home.

We shouldn't forget that the administration took \$600 million from the war in Afghanistan and used it in Iraq before any direct appropriations were made for the invasion of Iraq. Funds are always available to put troops in harm's way. They, likewise, are always available for leaving a war zone.

Those in Congress who claim they want the war ended, yet feel compelled to keep funding it, are badly misguided. They either are wrong in their assessment that cutting funds would hurt the troops, or they need to be more honest about supporting a policy destined to dramatically increase the size and the scope of this war. Rest assured, one can be patriotic and truly support the troops by denying funds to perpetuate and spread this ill-advised war.

The sooner we come to this realization, the better it will be for all of us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

CLEAN ENERGY ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I was pleased to cast my vote today for the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007.

Some of us have been urging energy independence for decades. In fact, President Jimmy Carter had it right over three decades ago when he said the Arab oil embargo was the moral equivalent of war. But America lost sight of his compelling vision for energy independence. We need to give birth to a new sustainable energy age that is bold and develops alternative energy supplies and the infrastructure to support it.

President Bush suddenly realized last year that we have become addicted to foreign oil, of course, most of it coming from the most undemocratic regimes in the world. But during his administration, we are importing 1 billion more barrels of oil from those very undemocratic places since he assumed office. Simply put, his rhetoric doesn't match reality.

I am pleased today that we took some important steps in shifting how Federal resources are dedicated, taking them away from preferential treatment to an oil industry with record profits and little social conscience. Instead, we must incentivize a domestically owned energy industry that has record potential, a shift that America wants and we must take.

While \$14 billion over 10 years is nothing to ignore, it is still far too little, especially since more than a third of this amount, a little more than \$5 billion, doesn't become available until the 10th year. According to the Government Accountability Office, this government has spent more than \$130 billion on subsidies to the oil industry over the last 3½ decades. So today's step forward is the first rung of the ladder to energy independence.

As this country spends billions on oil addiction, 75 percent of it being imported from the most undemocratic places in the world, I might repeat, consider an estimate by the Congressional Research Service which shows the recent increase in oil prices accounts for an additional \$60 to \$75 billion rise in our country's abysmal trade deficit.

While the oil companies manipulate the market, they continue to rake in billions. During President Bush's tenure, their profits have been record. From 2001 until the first quarter of 2006, ExxonMobil, alone, made \$118.2 billion. Now, in the bill today we talk about \$14 billion over 10 years. They made \$118.2 billion over the last 3 years. Shell has earned \$82.3 billion. Shell, one company. BP has made \$67.8 billion. Our bill today had \$14 billion over 10 years. Chevron Texaco has made \$43.1 billion, and Conoco Phillips made \$31.1 billion.

We are talking \$14 billion over 10 years, with \$5 billion in the very last year. Recognizing that those companies' profits were beginning to infuriate the public, does it surprise you that gasoline prices just happened to drop 75 cents a gallon during the run-up to last year's election for Congress?

As we consider this bill today, prices across our Nation, conveniently, are dropping. Imagine, in a place like Toledo, Ohio, they dropped from \$2.40 a gallon to \$1.75 a gallon. Isn't that strange during the week that we considered this bill?

Imagine an industry earning so much in profits it can manipulate the world and manipulate every single person in our country. Imagine the jobs we could create if we were to dedicate \$14 billion, not over 10 years, but each month, rather than spending that money on oil wars in far-flung places, invest it in solar, in wind, in geothermal, in photovoltaic energy, in fuel cells and hydrogen and clean coal production and distribution. Imagine the jobs we could create if we had vision.

These accomplishments that we seek will require not just real imagination, but real leadership. Hopefully this bill today offers a glimmer. America will, at long last, at long last, take seriously what President Jimmy Carter envisioned. He was right then. He remains right today: America must become energy independent. Our people want it. Why shouldn't this Congress deliver it?

□ 1915

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SUTTON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

PEACE NOT APARTHEID: MORE
FICTION THAN FACTS

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

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, in today's Washington Post, former President Jimmy Carter defended his book, "Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid."

President Carter wrote, ". . . most critics have not seriously disputed or even mentioned the facts . . ."

But after reading the book, I have become a critic and today will only correct the facts that he purports in his book. Regarding our policy towards Israel, there is little room for mistakes, let alone outright misstatements of fact.

For that reason, I want to present to the House eight factual inaccuracies found in President Carter's book.

Error number one, on page 62, President Carter quotes Yasser Arafat as telling him, "The Palestinian Liberation Organization has never advocated the annihilation of Israel." No evidence is provided, and the book does not contain a single footnote.

Fact check, article 22 of the PLO's charter states, "The liberation of Palestine will destroy the Zionist and imperialist presence." Yasser Arafat supported this charter, and he directly lied to President Carter.

Error number two, on page 57 President Carter writes, "The 1947 armistice demarcation lines became the borders of the new nation of Israel, and were accepted by Israel and the United States, and recognized officially by the United Nations."

Fact, the 1949 armistice lines were never accepted as the official borders of Israel, United States or the United Nations. The error reflects a very poor attention to detail in the book.

Error number three, on page number 127, President Carter writes that there was "a surprising exodus of Christians from the Holy Land."

Fact, Israel is one of the only Middle Eastern nations where the Christian community has grown in the last half century. But Christian communities and other faith communities like Bahá'is have dropped in size in many Muslim nations.

Error number four, on page 152 President Carter writes, "It was later claimed that the Palestinians rejected a 'generous offer' put forward by Prime Minister Barak with Israel only keeping 5 percent of the West Bank. The fact is no such offers were made."

Fact, according to President Clinton's lead negotiator, Ambassador Dennis Ross, Prime Minister Barak accepted President Clinton's proposal, offering to withdraw from 97 percent of the West Bank, to dismantle isolated settlements, and to accept the Palestinian state with Jerusalem as its capital. Arafat rejected this proposal, and a quick call between President Carter and President Clinton would have corrected this error.

Error number five, on page number 148 President Carter presents two maps he claims were considered at Camp David, one of them labeled "Israel's interpretation of Clinton's proposal."

Fact, there were no maps at Camp David. The map President Carter labeled as Israel's interpretation is a copy of a map that was created later by Dennis Ross for his book, "The Missing Peace." Ambassador Ross's map is a representation of an offer agreed to by Prime Minister Barak and rejected by Arafat. President Carter violated Ambassador Ross's copyright of the map.

Error six, on page 197 President Carter writes, "Confessions extracted through torture are admissible in Israeli courts."

Fact, the Israeli Supreme Court banned the use of torture in interrogations in a decision handed down by the court on September 6, 1999, by Supreme Court President Barak.

Error number seven, on page 188 President Carter writes, "Kadima had been expected to gain 43 seats based on its pledge of a unilateral expansion of the 'great wall.'"

Fact, Israel's Kadima Party ran on Prime Minister Sharon's platform of disengagement, a pledge to dismantle settlements and unilaterally withdraw from territory.

Error number eight, on page 215 President Carter writes that the one option for Israel is "withdrawal from the 1967 border as specified in U.N. Resolution 242."

Fact. The U.N. Security Council Resolution 242 does not define a border.

Madam Speaker, these errors, in fact, diminish the credibility of President Carter's book. President Carter is entitled to his own opinions, but not to his own facts. The errors I present here are only a sampling of the other errors included in his book.

Now, in the twilight of his career, with many at the Carter Center resigning from their posts, President Carter should recall the book and hire competent assistants to assure that his future work does not reflect such poor scholarship.

I want to thank, especially, Dr. Mitchell Bard and the Committee for Accuracy in the Middle East Reporting in America for helping compile this list of errors.

SEED DEMOCRACY IN CUBA

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, there is one nation in the world where seeding democracy right now might take root. It is Cuba. It is only 90 miles away from our shores, but we are using the same sort of wrong-headed thinking regarding Cuba that we are using in international affairs around the world with equally dismal results.

Today the Bush administration has draconian travel restrictions in place

for any American trying to visit family members in Cuba. It is their idea of promoting democracy by punishing the people we are trying to befriend. It makes no difference if a relative is well, sick or dying in Cuba. You get one chance every 3 years to visit Cuba legally. If an American visits a relative in Cuba and that relative is stricken by a heart attack the day after you leave, you cannot go back for 3 years.

The administration thinks that by cutting off families in Cuba from loved ones in the United States, they will encourage the overthrow of Castro.

When will we ever learn? This policy plays right into the hands of those who want to portray the United States as an arrogant bully willing to use innocent people as a wedge against a regime we don't like.

Our policy regarding Cuba is hurting innocent people here and there, not the government we have been trying to overthrow for a generation. It has hurt one of my constituents, an Iraq war hero, who came to the United States from Cuba 15 years ago risking his life coming on a raft floating in the ocean.

Sergeant Carlos Lazo made national headlines last year when he tried to get to Cuba to visit his teenage sons. Carlos is a man who joined the Washington National Guard to give service to his new country.

As a combat medic in Iraq, he risked his life to save others, and for his heroism he was awarded the Bronze Star. I had the honor to pin that medal on him in a ceremony in Seattle last year.

Carlos is an American citizen, a decorated war hero, and he is barred from boarding a flight to visit his family in Cuba. That is not how you promote democracy in Cuba or anywhere else for that matter. And the fact is, there are countless stories just like Carlos. It makes no diplomatic or strategic sense. We hurt U.S. interests by hurting U.S. citizens who reach out to family in Cuba.

Who could possibly be a better ambassador representing the United States than the blood relative of someone living in Cuba? The most powerful statement we could ever make to the people of Cuba is to let them interact with Americans who are related by blood or marriage.

Are the Cubans more likely to listen to U.S. propaganda or to a son or to a daughter? The answer is obvious, and it should be just as obvious that the U.S. needs to revise its travel ban to Cuba.

As it stands now, we are separating families. Instead, we should be reuniting loved ones. We don't promote freedom by denying it to innocent civilians, and we don't make new friends anywhere when an American citizen is denied the ability to visit a dying mother in Cuba. Imagine the propaganda of a press release, Americans barred from visiting mother on death bed in Cuba. A story like that can and will be used against us all over the world.

We don't gain from a policy that forces separate families, and it is time