

property, telecommunications, procurement, and e-commerce. Establishing a level playing field helps U.S. businesses to compete. Concurrently CAFTA-DR will help strengthen the rule of law and promote transparency against all sectors. In doing so, it would help deny criminal elements and other unsavory characters of the corrupt structures that they could manipulate for anything from money laundering to terrorist financing.

As such, CAFTA-DR also serves to promote democratic governments, thus advancing stability and consolidating freely elected governments that are our allies in the war on drugs and the international war on terror.

By strengthening our allies, our neighboring countries, we are helping to stabilize and strengthen our own Nation. In passing CAFTA-DR, we are helping to ensure that the countries it includes will have the opportunity to fight threats to their democratic institutions that feed off discontent, poverty, and disenfranchisement.

On the other hand, failure to pass CAFTA-DR in Congress will only serve to cripple our efforts in freezing out narcoterrorist gangs and others who threaten our hemispheric stability.

Finally, CAFTA-DR would also allow Central America to thrive by exporting goods through trade rather than exporting people through illegal immigration. Opportunities would also increase access to new technologies and educational opportunities that are going to afford small and medium businesses the ability to expand and diversify. It would open the door to more private investment, to a qualitative and quantitative improvement in the job market, and higher economic growth, government revenue and increased social spending.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, adoption of CAFTA-DR will not only advance our own economic objectives, further our efforts to combat the war on terror and narco-trafficking, but also will strengthen our mission of strengthening and spreading democracy.

I look forward to the passage of CAFTA-DR. A vote for CAFTA-DR is a vote for our U.S. national security.

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

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

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### PLANNED WITHDRAWAL FROM IRAQ

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate my colleague from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) on the 100th occasion of speaking on this very important subject.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) has maintained a drumbeat of truth on one of the most important issues, probably the most important issue, facing our Nation. It is a most important moral issue. It is the most important political issue also. It is moral because human life is sacred, and too many souls have already been destroyed in this war on both sides, on all sides.

The insurgent fanatics who seem to be growing unlimited are not really that powerful. Insurgent fanatics do not have the support of the majority of the people. A clearly articulated plan for withdrawal will drastically decrease the clusters of support that the fanatic killers have. If people could see the movement towards some progress in resolving this problem, they would abandon the fanatics at a faster rate.

Let us propose a plan. And I do not disagree with any of the plans and proposals that have been made by my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) in her 100 presentations, or plans that have been made by my other colleagues. I think that we have enough brainpower in America with our think tanks and our various academic circles, et cetera, to come up with a plan which really can work.

I want to just add that in that plan should be some more open discussion and honest discussion of oil, the oil wealth of Iraq. Too little is being said about the oil wealth of Iraq and what is going to happen to the oil wealth of Iraq. The people of Iraq, the different factions, I think, would begin to react differently if they heard from America a clear statement of how we propose to fairly divide the oil wealth of Iraq.

□ 2015

First, they will want to hear that we are not going to take a disproportionate amount in investment returns and technical assistance fees, et cetera. That is the first thing they want to hear. But the biggest things for the Kurds, the Sunnis, and the Shiites is how will the oil well be divided as they draw boundaries for sectors or provinces or states or whatever they are going to do in their constitution to divide up the nation.

I think we ought to put on the table, tell the Sunnis, the Kurds, and the Shiites that the oil wells will be fairly shared by all revenue benefits being assigned on a per capita basis, regardless of ethnicity or geographic location; that the revenue, the profits, are going to be divided equally on a per capita basis. So if one area of the country oc-

cupied by the Kurds has a certain population, they will get according to the population their share of the oil no matter where the wells are located. No matter where the oil wells are located, those who live in Baghdad, whether Shiite or Sunnis, their particular sector would get a share of the oil revenues also.

I think it is also important because it is necessary to draw some boundaries in this constitutional process, and they will be drawing boundaries. Whether by state or by provinces or whatever, there are going to be boundaries; and there is a need to have some kind of understanding that concentrations of ethnic groups or concentrations of religious affiliations need to be respected. So there will be a necessity to draw some sectors that have a majority of Sunnis, necessity to draw boundaries which have a majority of Shiites, et cetera with the Kurds.

This nation was held together, I think, partially due to the principle that it was divided up into states so that many different kinds of personalities and groups could express themselves through a state process when the states were more independent and the national government was less of an entity. I think the same process would hold in the case of Iraq. We should have a chance for groups to express themselves for local decision-making to be maximized in those areas, in those sectors.

But, overall, they should understand they are not going to be starved for revenue, that the riches underneath the Earth in Iraq are going to be available to every group no matter where they are located.

I think it is up to us to have that kind of honest discussion. There is too little talk about exactly what we are going to do about the oil in Iraq, and too many whispers and too many rumors about our having some kind of hidden agenda that is not to the benefit of Iraq. Let us tell the people of Iraq what we are going to do with the oil.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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