here and the Republican leadership does not want to provide the proper oversight. It is a waste of taxpayer dollars which goes to the interest on the debt, which we have to borrow from the Chinese and Japanese, which allows them to fund their economy.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. In my last 2 minutes, I am bouncing back to you to give the Web site address out, but I just want to make sure that we have a moment of clarity here. Mr. Speaker, we are not pointing these issues out as though we have not tried to stop these runaway majority borrow-and-spend Republicans here in this House.

□ 2300

For the RECORD, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I must add, not the Democratic Congressional Record, but the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Democrats have repeatedly tried to reinstate the pay-as-you-go philosophy. On March 30, 2004, Republicans voted 209 to 209 against Democrats, which killed the motion that was offered by MIKE THOMPSON of California to instruct conferees on recommendations as pay as you go. All right, that is the first example.

The second one, May 25, 2004, Republicans voted 208 to 215. Republicans voted 215 to reject a motion by DENNIS MOORE, another Democrat that voted on the pay-as-you-go principle.

November 18, 2004, Republicans took another vote to block former Member Stenholm's amendment to stop the debt limit from being increased. Time after time after time again. You can go on to our Web site. The Members can get this information. We have tried to stop this Congress. The only way you can stop this Republican Congress from doing what they are doing is make sure that we have more Democrats here in this House.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Www.housedemocrats. gov/ 30something. All of the posters that we had up tonight you will be able to access on the Web site.

Again, I think that is an important point. Democrats have consistently tried to put fiscal restraints on this runaway spending that the Republicans have been doing over the past few years here, trying to balance the budget here so we can get back on the right track and get back the surpluses. We have got our hands full. Housedemocrats. gov/30something.

Happy Valentine's Day to all the sweethearts out there.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Happy Valentine's Day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MEEK. We would like to thank the Democratic leader, Mr. Speaker; and, with that, it was an honor addressing the U.S. House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOHMERT.) The Chair must remind Members to use proper forms of address. The gentleman, for example, from Massachusetts is properly referred to as the gentleman from Massachusetts or Mr. DELAHUNT. It is not proper under the rules to use first names, and remarks should be directed to the Chair not in the second person.

BALANCED BUDGET PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for the time remaining before midnight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as was stated earlier, I do consider it an honor and a privilege to come to the floor of this House to address you, Mr. Speaker, and to carry this message across the waves to the American people.

I would first take up the issue of a balanced budget, and I would submit that we can balance this budget, Mr. Speaker, and we do not need to do so by raising taxes. We need to do so by fiscal responsibility.

I raised an issue today, I testified before the Budget Committee here in the House of Representatives, and I laid out a scenario by which we can balance this budget for this year. And I also acknowledge that it is quite painful. It is not realistic from a political perspective, but I think it is important that the Budget Committee produce a balanced budget so that we can measure the pain to so many of the programs that would have to be cut.

But a simple version, and it is a quick version, it is not the thing that I would propose as a balanced budget, Mr. Speaker, but it is one the ways that we can easily understand the magnitude of the budget situation we have.

First of all, if you would reinstate the Bush tax cuts and calculate those back into the revenue side, it almost does not show at all on the bottom line as to whether we are running a deficit or a surplus in our spending; and I have a calculator in my computer that allows me to do that. It almost does not show on the graph when you calculate that.

But if you look what the Bush tax cuts have done, they have grown this economy and they have grown this economy at 3 percent or better growth each quarter for at least the last 10 consecutive quarters, and that is a growth rate that has been met or exceeded since the early Reagan years. And I would point out, Mr. Speaker, those early Reagan years were the years when we had high interest and high inflation. So this is a real growth in a very low inflation environment with a low unemployment environment with unemployment rates below 5 percent.

It is a very, very good economic time, Mr. Speaker; and it is as good a time as one could ask for. It is the best economic run that we have had in a long, long time. It eclipses any economic run in the last 2 decades, and it also is a controlled growth. It is a growth that has not gotten out of hand, Mr. Speaker. It is a growth that grows from 3 to 4.7 percent quarter after quarter, with an inflation rate that is 2 percent or less and unemployment rates that are in the 5 percent and less range. That is where we want, not too hot and not too cold, a nice steady accountable growth.

And I would point out this that growth that we have in our economy is growing in spite of the fact that 3.5 percent, perhaps, of our GDP is going off the top to the litigation that goes on in this country. We have to overcome that and still grow at a rate of about 3 to 3.5 percent to match a targeted growth rate that will deal with population growth and to deal with inflation and help us develop our infrastructure in this country to accommodate the future as our infrastructure depreciates. That is what it is going to take to grow.

And what it is going to take to balance the budget, should we have the will to do that, would be to go into the nondefense discretionary spending. Recognizing that we have three large entitlements in our budget, and those are the spending that just goes on year after year that is growing at a rate of about 6.2 percent a year and that is aggregate, and that is Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. Those three entitlements are essentially, unless we change some of the parameters, Mr. Speaker, are the right now the untouchable budget items; and eventually this Congress will have to look at them. But those three entitlements will grow at about 6.2 percent of their aggregate. The interest rate will grow perhaps even faster than that in the outyears.

You add all those things up, and if you recognize that to make changes in that for this year is very difficult to do and also recognizing that we have defense spending that is critical to our national security and we need to take that off the table from a cut perspective and what is left is the nondefense discretionary spending. That is the items of all, everything else that we spend that I have not identified as being an entitlement of Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid defense spending, that nondefense discretionary spending. We will call that other.

To balance the budget Mr. Speaker, we would need to simply cut the nondefense discretionary spending by 5 percent, a real 5 percent cut, and that would be $0.95 on the dollar. That would be asking Americans to get along with $0.95 out of every dollar that they have right now, today, not grow in relation to inflation and not grow with any kind of a COLA.

Now, if I were looking at this from a business perspective, I would advocate that we just simply balance our budget in that fashion, Mr. Speaker. But I am also aware that the votes on the floor of this Congress will not accommodate

for that. So I will be seeking to put together a budget that looks at some of the other components and gets us to the point where we can reasonably, practically and, in fact, part of the equation here is politically balance this budget. It cannot and should not be done by simply raising taxes. By doing so it would stifle growth, and it would get a reverse effect beyond in the opposite direction that my colleagues who just got finished speaking would say.

I am just going to go backwards, Mr. Speaker, through some of the remarks that I heard made over this past hour and address some of them. I certainly cannot address them all, Mr. Speaker.

But the argument that all of the money that was spent, all, this is a quote, all that money is wasted, meaning the money that was spent for reconstruction in Iraq, all wasted? With no oversight, no oversight, Mr. Speaker? I take exception to a statement such as that.

I went over to Iraq with three of my colleagues last August and returned here about August 20 with the very mission in mind to take a look at where the $18.5 billion that we allocated out of this Congress had been spent, where the practices were, where the projects were, how the money was being spent and what was the return on that investment. And Mr. Speaker, I brought a chart along with me, coincidentally, not knowing that would be the subject matter that was brought up here on the other side of the aisle this evening, a chart that illustrates where these project dollars have gone.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that these red dots on this map of Iraq represent 2,200, more than 2,200 completed projects in Iraq. And these projects will be road projects, they will be sewer projects, water, drinking water, potable water projects. They will also be some bridge projects and some pipeline work for the oil pipe lines that are there. You will see along on this border with Iran, the red dots along there, many of those are border defense stations. And what you will not see are the 250 planned border defense stations that are under construction or in planning around these other borders that we have. There is another 1,100 projects that are either in planning or under construction that do not show up yet on this chart, Mr. Speaker. I will have a chart that reflects the projects that are planned, the projects that are started.

Then this one reflects just the projects that are completed, over 2,200; and I visited a number of these. Of course, it would not be possible to visit them in their entirety, but I stopped up here in this region around Kirkuk and there went to the mother of all generators. I forget just how many kilowatts that generator does put out, but I remember what it weighed, 750,000 pounds, brought in on two large loads, and then the other loads would be the rest of the generating plant across about 10.7 kilometers.

Excuse me. It was more than that. It was a long stretch at least across the northern part of Iraq with that kind of a long trail of a convoy to deliver the generator and the turbine that drives that generator down to this location just south of Kirkuk.

□ 2310

And that being one of two huge generation plants that are now in a position where they are up and running in Iraq, this one is fed by a natural gas pipeline. Some of them are using different types of fuel; but up in this area around Kirkuk, there is so much oil that it actually seeps to the top of the ground in some places.

Where I come from, the area, we call it the prairie pothole region where we have these potholes of water that are collected because of the dips that are cut out in the prairie from the last glacier, well, the water that collects there reminds me of the oil; and certainly the oil is in smaller quantities that collects in the depressions within the desert up there around Kirkuk.

And that is not the largest oil location up around Kirkuk; but down here in the southern part, in the Basra region, there is far more oil. And I look at the system of collection, the well system, the collection system, the refinery system, distribution system. All of it is old, tired, dilapidated, has not been reconstructed or modernized in at least 35 years; and yet the oil production out of Iraq is greater than it was, Mr. Speaker.

We keep hearing, no, they are not producing as much oil now as they were then. Not true. The royalties that Iraq was receiving prior to the war were $5 billion a year. The royalties that are coming from the oil that is pumping today are $26 billion a year. That does not necessarily reflect that they are pumping five times as much oil, but it reflects that they are selling perhaps more oil than they did then and pumping more oil than they did.

The electricity that is being generated in Iraq is a number that is close to twice as much electricity at their peak days as it was on a standard day in Iraq at the beginning of the liberation back in March of 2003, Mr. Speaker. And as I measure project after project, benefit after benefit, it cannot be said that, and I will quote again, ''all that money is wasted.'' How could all that money be wasted when we have 2,200 completed projects, 3,300 projects altogether, people that have potable water that never had it before, people that have flush toilets that did not flush before, they did not have water to flush in them?

Looking at the infrastructure that is there in places in Baghdad where they had the sanitary sewer, and I would point out for the lay person listening, Mr. Speaker, that a sanitary sewer is not really all that sanitary. That is what you run your sewage through. And yet that sewer was an easy place for some people to pull a waterline through in those days before the liberation of Baghdad. So their drinking water in many areas was delivered through a black piece of plastic pipe that was pulled through the sewer itself, and they would pull it through, and then the distribution runs out to the locations where it was being used. And that is all fine as long as you keep your waterline in condition, and it does not ever get a leak in it, and you do not ever let the pressure go down.

But both of those things invariably happen; and when that happens, the pressure goes down in your drinking waterline, and the sewage then is drawn into that drinking waterline, and it then pollutes the drinking water. That has happened in a number of areas in Baghdad. We are reconstructing that. We are providing them with clean new sanitary sewer systems and sewer plants to be able to handle their systems in a modern fashion and an environmentally friendly fashion. So the Iraqi people that were living without services now have services.

I will say that the electrical service that was up to 10, 11, perhaps even 12 hours a day in Baghdad at the beginning of the liberation is down to less than that now, perhaps even as low as 4 to 6 hours a day. But the rest of Iraq was getting 2 to 4 hours a day, and now they are up to 10, 11, 12 hours of electricity a day. The next wave is to increase the generation capacity and the distribution so that Baghdad can get back up again to a level that they were before.

But overall there is more electricity being provided into Iraq today than there ever was. The demand is perhaps twice as great as it was, Mr. Speaker, because you know what happens when people get electricity. They figure out a way that they can put another appliance to work and plug it into a wall and use it. Like air conditioners that did not exist in any significant numbers, now they are there in significant numbers, tapped into that electricity.

We also know that satellite televisions were against the law in March of 2003, and today Iraq is replete with satellite dishes on rooftop after rooftop. In fact, I did a survey from the air by helicopter over the top of a region up in Kirkuk where many homes were built in about the same style, and I had done so over the rooftops of Mosul in the fall of 2003; and there my survey showed that about two-thirds of the homes then already had satellite TVs, and now I am seeing that in some of the neighborhoods in Kirkuk there actually are more satellite dishes than there are roofs.

So you will see sometimes two or even three satellite dishes on a single roof that look like they are single-family dwellings from the air. Everyone in Iraq has access to satellite TV, which means access to the outside world. There is access to Internet, cell phones. Those things have grown dramatically. Landline telephones have grown dramatically. The number of newspapers

are up to over 175 newspapers in Iraq. Television stations up and running, communication is flowing, free enterprise is robust in the streets of Baghdad. People that are running shops out there, making furniture out alongside the streets, set it out on the side of the street and sell it.

And, yes, Mr. Speaker, a bomb goes off once in a while, and it is sad and it is tragic. But the people of Iraq clean things up and they grieve and they go back to work, Mr. Speaker, because they are optimistic about the future of Iraq. They are more optimistic about the future of Iraq than the surveys show people are in the United States of America. What went wrong here where people that we say do not have hope have more hope than those of us folks that have the great blessing of living in the United States of America with all of this hope that we take for granted and cannot apparently appreciate?

So the effort that has been put forth there, Mr. Speaker, it is not all that money that is being wasted, not by a long shot, Mr. Speaker: 3,300 projects, all of them worthy and worthwhile. And, no, they were not all cheap. There was money that was spent for security, and there were some projects that were sabotaged that had to be reconstructed again.

There is a project over here on the Tigris River south of Kirkuk where there were nine pipelines that went across the Tigris River, and those pipelines were cut in the liberation operations with the U.S. Air Force. And we went back to patch those pipelines together, did so. They were sabotaged again. They were put across the river on a bridge, and so we undertook the effort to put them all underneath the bottom of the Tigris River. They are backfilling that now, Mr. Speaker, and it is nearly completed; and those lines will be opened up and running by, I believe the target date is February 28.

So another big day to turn those valves on and get that oil flowing south into parts where it can be converted back to cash and be able to help the funding in the great country of Iraq, this emerging free Arab country that has now at least brought forth the name of a prime minister, and I do not think formally has elected him yet. But on that day that that happens and they seek this duly elected parliament, Iraq becomes the most representative Arab nation in the world.

When they sit down at the United Nations and their representative speaks on behalf of the Iraqi people, it will truly be a voice of the Iraqi people, quite unlike the voice of much of the rest of the Arab world where the voice that speaks for the countries that represent those parts of the Arab world in the United Nations often is the voice of a tyrant that would cut the tongues out of its own citizens if they spoke up in criticism of the regime that is there in many of those countries.

But this country can become the lodestar of a free Arab people, an inspiration to the rest of the Arab world, an inspiration that can cause the rest of them to see what Iraq is stepping into, what they are earning along with the coalition forces' efforts and sacrifice to be able to be that inspiration for the rest of the Arab world. And if that day comes, and I pray it comes, Mr. Speaker, we may well see freedom echo across the Arab world in the same fashion that it echoed across Eastern Europe when the Wall went down in Berlin November 9, 1989, on that glorious day that symbolized the end of the Cold War, a victory for the United States and the forces of freedom.

And the forces of freedom could not be stopped, Mr. Speaker. Almost bloodlessly they echoed across Eastern Europe, and we saw country after country be liberated.

□ 2320

Since that time, we have noticed that those who knew freedom the least hungered for it the most. The people on the east side of the wall stepped up to help all of our efforts, our coalition forces in Iraq, in greater numbers than the people on the west side of the wall.

The people on the west side of the wall had the privilege of living with freedom since the end of World War II. The people on the east side of the wall remember the days they weren't free. They remember the day of November 9, 1989, when they had that opportunity to grasp their own freedom, and within a couple of years that freedom did echo across Eastern Europe, and it needs to echo across the Arab world.

So, Mr. Speaker, I submit that there is a vision and mission in this overall War on Terror, and we need to do a far better job of articulating why we are in this war. I would point out that the loss of Americans on September 11 was right at 3,000 Americans. That is more Americans lost there than was lost December 7, 1941, in that day that would live in infamy.

We cannot forget September 11. We cannot forget that we were attacked without cause. We didn't provoke anyone who attacked us. They attacked us because they hate our way of life. They attacked the very center of western civilization.

And no amount of negotiation, understanding, no amount of sitting around and talking, is ever going to resolve this disagreement. These people want us dead. They have demonstrated that, and we saw the celebrations in the streets in other parts of the world as the Twin Towers fell. That should tell us that they will give us no quarter.

If anyone doubts that, take a look at Israel. Take a look and see the circumstances there when the Israelis thought they could trade land for peace, and yet they are still attacked. Hamas won the election there. That means the terrorists, the people who are sworn to annihilate the land of Israel, are running the government of the region that may or may not be a nation called Palestine.

That is a chilling concept, but it also should tell us that there is no negotiated settlement, we must defend ourselves. The Israelis have had to guard every theater, every bus stop, every hospital, every school, every synagogue, and still the infiltrators come in and detonate their bombs and blow their women and children to pieces.

That happens out of a deep hatred that we don't understand in this country, and I don't claim to understand it. But I know that hatred is directed at us. We saw it September 11. We saw it on 18 to 20 other attacks, including the USS *Cole*. We saw it in the U.S. embassy bombings in Africa. We have seen the first attack also on the Twin Towers, in other efforts shut off by good intelligence work in this country.

We cannot rest. Our choices though are guard every theater, every bus stop, every school, every hospital, every church, every synagogue and pull back into the shores of the United States and somehow think that we can protect every center in this country, and we won't be able to, and we will see the attacks come, and we will see our women and children and our men blown into pieces.

Or we can take this battle to them, we can fight this war where they are. But going out just to kill the enemy, Mr. Speaker isn't enough. It is not a solution. It is something that has to be done in certain areas of the world and under those circumstances where there are training camps and active leaders that are plotting and planning to attack and kill Americans, that must be done, Mr. Speaker.

But to go out and think that we could kill all of our enemies is the equivalent of realizing that we had a lot of flies on our porch and in our kitchen and then go out to the barn with the fly swatter and think we are going to take care of all those flies in the barn with the fly swatter. No. You can swat flies in the barn all day every day, and you will never accomplish the task. You have got to change the habitat that breeds that many flies. You have to clean the barn, Mr. Speaker, and you need to leave an environment in there that doesn't breed those flies, and then they will leave you alone on the porch and in your kitchen as well.

So I submit that the plan of the United States and the mission that has been laid out by our Commander-in-Chief President Bush is to create a new habitat, to promote a new habitat in the region. This is a habitat called freedom. We happen to know that where there is freedom, there isn't a habitat that breeds terrorists. We have never gone to war against another free people. It has never happened in the history of this country, and I don't think it has actually happened in the history of the world.

So to the extent that freedom can be promoted and we give people that opportunity to reach out and grasp and earn their own freedom, is also the extent to which we can be safer as a people, western civilization can be safer,

and the people in that part of the world can learn some tolerance for Christianity, for Judaism, for capitalism, for free enterprise, for this whole idea of western civilization that they seem to take such exception to. There are good people in that part of the world, Mr. Speaker, and those good people need to be empowered and we need to be supportive of them.

The allegations that were made here on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, about corruption in Iraq with millions of U.S. dollars, we don't know that. And I won't tell you that you can go into an environment with a $18.5 billion mission and spend every dollar that would be competitive with a project in the United States, because I know that some of that money had to go for security, and some of that money had to go for a high price to get the work done, because who would go into that environment and do that work? But, Mr. Speaker, that work was necessary. And to the extent that anyone has defrauded this government, yes, we need to search that out. We need to have oversight.

But Democrats in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, are not absolved from that responsibility. I did not hear a single solution come out here on the other side of the aisle, not one. All I saw was complaints, lamentations, objections, because all things that go wrong are all Republican responsibility according to the other side of the aisle, and, of course, if they were just in power, then everything would be all fine.

But we don't know what they would do, because they haven't proposed a solution, not a single specific solution. They are absolutely without an agenda. But they have enough energy, they have enough air velocity in their lungs to every night come down here and beat up on the people that are out here trying to move America ahead.

One statement was said that I will agree with, made by the gentleman from Florida. He said, ''I am so glad that I am not a member of the majority.'' Well, to the gentleman from Florida, I want to say I am so glad you are not a member of the majority as well, and so are the majority of the American people who have seen to it that there is majority in charge in this Congress.

We do have our work to do, Mr. Speaker. I won't shirk that responsibility. I step up to it gladly. But we need to have our eyes wide open. We need to promote a responsible budget, and I will be promoting a balanced budget and a path we can get to a balanced budget in a way that we can get the votes in this Congress to get it done. If we do that, we can ensure financial security for our children and our grandchildren. But that financial security that can come with fiscal responsibility here in this Congress and a solid pro-growth tax policy isn't security if we have to be continually under attack from an enemy that the other side of the aisle would not have the will to challenge.

This President, our Commander-in-Chief, Mr. Speaker, has had the will to challenge. He has had the will to lay out the vision and he has had the commitment to stand in the face of a tremendous amount of criticism.

It has been a disappointment to me, Mr. Speaker, to hear that criticism. When I go to the hospitals and visit our wounded soldiers, when I visit our soldiers in the field in Iraq and over in the Middle East, when I stop at Landstuhl at the hospital there and land at Ramstein and go over to Landstuhl, Germany, to visit wounded in the hospital there, where I have been three times; when I go to Bethesda Naval Hospital to visit the wounded, generally the wounded Marines and the corpsmen that are there; when I go to Walter Reed to visit the wounded soldiers that are there, and I listen to them talk to me, Mr. Speaker, and there has been a certain Member of Congress from Pennsylvania that has gotten a lot of press relating to the public criticism that he claims comes from wounded soldiers, I have never heard a word of that kind of criticism from a single soldier that I visited, and I do not let a quarter go by without being to one of those hospitals to visit our wounded, and I will always go in an visit. As long as there are soldiers that need to be visited, I will visit them.

I have never heard one soldier tell me that he regretted volunteering for the United States militarily or that he regretted serving or he didn't believe in this mission or in this cause. Not one.

I had dinner a couple of weeks ago with a nurse who spent a year-and-a-half at Landstuhl and dealt with hundreds of wounded that came through. Most all of the wounded come through from Iraq into Landstuhl in Germany and then come to the United States.

I asked her if she had heard any of that sentiment about wounded soldiers regretting serving their country or not believing in this mission. And her answer was, no, she had never heard a single soldier utter such a thing. In fact, she said, almost all of them feel guilty that they were wounded and they can't be back with their troops. They want to take that responsibility of going back with their troops into the theater, back to Iraq, to finish their tour of duty. That is the kind of patriotism and dedication that comes with our military. And these are people that some of them have been burned badly, some of them have very severe wounds, some of them are amputees.

I have had more than one amputee tell me, ''I am going to make the military my career. I am going to get this prosthetic, get my leg up and going, I am going to take the therapy, and I am going make a career out of the military. I have come this far.''

I had one tell me, ''This wound where I lost my leg isn't going to change my life in any way except I am going to start a family now.'' That level of vision, that level of commitment, Mr. Speaker, is what we have out there.

Perhaps the best quality people that have ever gone to war for a country are the people that are out there defending our freedom today, and we owe them everything we have, all the support we have, all the best training, all the best equipment. But we owe them a voice of support here on the floor of the United States Congress, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2330

We owe them that voice in our national media. We owe them that voice in our schools, in our town squares, in our town halls, in our coffee shops, in our churches. Everywhere across this land we owe them a voice of support.

And I would point out that Clausewitz, the great writer, his philosophy on war, and I believe that was his work, ''On War,'' stated that the object of war was to destroy the enemy's ability and will to wage war. Destroy their ability and their will.

But we are at war, Mr. Speaker. And our troops are over there in harm's way. And they are actively destroying the enemy's ability to wage war. And as they lose their ability, it destroys their will.

But what, Mr. Speaker, puts the energy back in our enemy? What gives them back their will as their will is destroyed on the battlefield in Iraq, that is being destroyed because their ability is being taken away from them? Their will is being replaced by the voices of some of the people that are quasi-leaders of the United States of America that make such statements as, and I will quote Howard Dean, the chairman of the DCCC, he said the idea that we are going to win in Iraq is just plain wrong. Well, how wrong can that be? How wrong can that be to encourage the enemy, discourage our military, to make that statement over and over again? And that voice comes out of people from the other side of the aisle day after day after day, a constant drum beat of despair.

It has been a constant drum beat of despair over here for the previous hour before I came to the floor, and it will be a constant drum beat of despair every single night that they have an opportunity to have this platform here on the floor of the United States Congress, Mr. Speaker. A constant drum beat of despair that encourages our enemy, discourages our own troops, and works to be counterproductive.

Clausewitz said the object of war is to destroy the enemy's ability and will to wage war. Well, the key to this, they are both tied together. Ability and will are tied together. If you have a lot of ability, you also have enough confidence to have the will.

As your ability diminishes, if you lose your munitions and if your troops are being destroyed, you do not have so many tools to work with anymore so you begin to lose your will; you lose your self-confidence.

But I would submit that it is even simpler than Clausewitz said. It is this simple, Mr. Speaker: war is never over

until the losing side realizes that they have lost. It is that simple. When the enemy understands that they have lost, that is when they will give up, not before. They have to realize that they have lost. That requires us to destroy their ability and their will to wage war.

But if their will is weak, and if their will is utterly weak, it does not matter how much ability they have, it does not matter how many tanks they have, how many IEDs they have, how many guns, how many soldiers. If they do not have the will to use them, the war is over.

So if we can win a war simply by sending a letter to the enemy that says, why do you not quit now, because we will not, and we have the ability and we have the will, so you need to have the understanding that it will not pay for you to fight, at that point the war could be over. If we convinced the enemy that they could not win, they would lose their will to fight.

Well, part of that will to fight comes from the voices here on this side of the Atlantic Ocean. And I point out, Mr. Speaker, that on an evening, as I was in the hotel in Kuwait, I was watching al Jazeera TV. On that television show came Muqtada al Sadr. I think we know who he is: Bushy beard, rotten teeth, leader of a militia that has been attacking Americans. He is a Shiaa rather than a Sunni.

And he was saying into the al Jazeera camera, 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. That should tell us what is going on in the minds of the enemy. They have been encouraged by the incidents of Vietnam, by pulling our troops out of Lebanon, about pulling out of Mogadishu. They think that Americans will pull out.

So the voice of the people here on the floor of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, echoes through al Jazeera, and in seconds it goes through the satellite dishes that are on the tops of nearly every one of those houses in Iraq, and down into the insurgent's homes, and they will hear the English voices, probably will not understand it, and it will come out in Arabic subtitles, and it will say wrong war, wrong place, wrong time. The idea that we are going to win in Iraq is just plain wrong.

Those kinds of quotes that we know from the other side have encouraged our enemy over and over again, and our enemy makes more and more bombs, extends this conflict longer and longer, and it costs American lives. That is the bottom line.

Our job is to convince them that they cannot win, destroy their will. And when they understand that they have lost, that is when they will quit, not before, Mr. Speaker. So it is imperative that we stick together on this. We had a debate in this Congress. It was a significant majority that endorsed the President's authority.

We are there. We are committed. And we cannot pull out. And we are winning. And the statistics are good. You know, we do not wage war by body count anymore, so we do not ever hear the casualty rates that are actually being inflicted on the enemy in Iraq. The numbers that I am about to give are numbers that are several months old. I have not been briefed on those numbers since prior to Christmas sometime.

But I will tell you that the Iraqis themselves on a monthly average for about a 3-month average were losing about 200 of their uniformed soldiers that were killed and most of them killed in action every month, Mr. Speaker, about 200. They were losing about 400 civilians every month.

The enemy was losing, between those killed and captured, taken out of the battlefield, about 3,000 a month. I also point out that the overall casualties of those killed, those numbers that were up there that added up to a number of more than 650 a month on our side, our coalition side with Iraqi civilian, coalition troops and Iraqi troops, that number that was around 650 a month then, now has diminished dramatically, and those casualties are down to around 50 a month.

So big progress is being made. The sad part is statistically that is not showing up in American casualties; they are still suffering a greater proportion of these casualties. Progress is being made, though, Mr. Speaker; and there is great light at the end of this tunnel.

It has almost moved out into the dawn. It has always been a three-component operation going on in Iraq. And the first component has always been the military component, liberation, provide first regime change. Get Saddam out of power, and then provide security in the country.

And that has been an ongoing battle. It has been difficult. I do not think anybody predicted how difficult it would be. But the American soldiers and marines have persevered. And now the second phase of this, and think of them really as intertwined efforts, but the military security effort first.

The second effort that needed to come along behind that and partially intertwined with it is the political solution. If we just have a military security solution and a political solution, that does not get Iraq where they need to go. They need to have an economic solution as well.

So the phases of this, we are nearing the end of the phase of the security military solution, where more than 237,000 Iraqis are now in uniform defending Iraqis, where more than 30 bases have been handed over to the Iraqis to man and maintain and take care of and operate out of.

Those things are happening. That transition is taking place. It is all consistent with a plan that has been in place for more than a year. And so the military solution is coming along. Remember, within a 12-month period of time, Iraq had three elections. They pulled off three elections.

They elected an interim parliament, they brought forth a Constitution and ratified the constitution and under that constitution they elected seats for a new parliament, and just now promoted the nomination for a new prime minister. That is a great long stride into the political solution, coming right intertwined with and intermixed with, but on the heels of the security solution that comes from the military side.

And now I hope that the Iraqi people, once they have the formal election, they elect a prime minister, I hope they sit down and go to work. I hope one of the first items on their agenda is the item that says look at this country that we have. Look at all of this oil up here around Kirkuk. We have got all of this oil down here around Basra. We have got all of these resources that have been producing $26 billion in royalty revenues in oil from this dilapidated structure that we have. We need to find a way to inject foreign capital in here and punch new wells down into the desert and bring that oil to the top of the ground and run it through refineries and down pipelines and out into the gulf and onto tankers that are sitting down here off the gulf in that area, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2340

They need to realize that that is their economic solution. So I would submit the plan that I would submit would be to have a competitive bidding process. Bring in the large oil companies in the world. Give them a chance to come in and bid and have them pay royalties for the oil that they would take out of the ground. And if they need cash up front to continue their reconstruction effort, and they do, I would ask that those bids come with upfront money so they would be adequate, that Iraq could continue their reconstruction efforts and still open up the oil fields and get this cash coming.

This $26 billion a year, I will not say it is a drop in the bucket, that is a lot of money, Mr. Speaker, but it can be a lot more money, and it needs to be a lot more money.

As this situation unfolds and the Iraqis provide for more and more of their own security and the political solution comes into place where it is on the cusp of having a ratified parliament seated with a prime minister, a voice in the world that is credible and a voice in the world for a sovereign Iraq that really represents the people in Iraq, will be controlling their own destiny, and an oil revenue that gives them a measure of financial independence and can actually make them a very wealthy country, then you will see some of these other things happening.

For example, about the only thing being exported from Iraq right now are dates, and the date exports have been

cut perhaps in half as to what they were prior to the liberation of Iraq. That can come back. A number of other industries can come back and a dynamic free enterprise, the economy that you see that all over the streets in Baghdad and around the country can be rejuvenated.

I want to also point out an interesting experience, and that is they asked if I would give a speech to the Baghdad Chamber of Commerce. Of course, I always say yes if anyone gives me any speech time, Mr. Speaker, so I said I would if we could fit it in the schedule. I believe it was at three o'clock on a Thursday afternoon. So we came rolling into Baghdad, and we hustled into the Al Rasheed Hotel. They were starting to introduce me, and I was not ready because I had not identified the interpreter. I said, Just a minute. Before you introduce me, I would like to know who the interpreter is so I can speak to the interpreter and I will know how to interact with him. And they said, You will not need an interpreter. I said, Well, I do not speak a word of Arabic. They said, You will not need to. These people, there are about 56 or 57 members of the Baghdad Chamber of Commerce, you will not need to have an interpreter and you will not need to speak Arabic because this group of people speaks English. And I thought, This is sweet.

I spoke English to them for 30 minutes or so. They reacted. They smiled at the right times, frowned at the right times, clapped occasionally. They got up and asked questions. It was like being at home in Iowa.

I thought, if they can pull off this English here in Baghdad, we ought to be able to handle this in most of the places in the United States of America. They have got a great start on their economy there, and it has been a very rough time for them, but we are committed, and we will stay there.

Mr. Speaker, to the people from Iraq who will one day look up this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of perhaps tonight or tomorrow, they need to know that there is a broad, solid core of support in this Congress. We took a vote on whether to stay with them or whether to pull out, and this Congress voted 403 to 3 to stick with you in Iraq. We will be there, Mr. Speaker, and we will be there until this is done. And they are picking up this on their own.

I want to say a few words then about the necessity. While they are providing more energy coming out of Iraq, how come it is so important for us here in the United States to have a better energy policy than we have? We passed a couple of energy bills last year, neither of which was I satisfied with, and I voted for them both because they move us down the road a little ways. They did not get enough done. I want to see more done, Mr. Speaker.

We sit here with a shortage of energy in this country, and Hurricane Katrina certainly illustrated that. The shortage of energy that was shut off when Katrina hit in the Gulf drove gas prices up over $3 a gallon. In some places, gas was not even available. In places like Pennsylvania I think diesel fuel was not available, and there were trucks parked there, and I believe there were also trucks parked in places in Georgia. But it shut down this fuel down, and prices went up, and we understood how vulnerable we were to losing that supply of fuel that comes up from the Gulf Coast and Louisiana area.

It is not just that. It is the fact that we have not produced energy to keep up with the increase in our consumption. So we import more and more foreign oil. The last number that I saw that I had confidence in was 61 percent of our oil comes from overseas. I see that number published sometimes significantly higher than that, and sometimes it is predictions. Sometimes they say it is a real number.

Regardless, Mr. Speaker, we need to be less dependent on foreign oil; and I am certainly more concerned about the oil that we purchase from countries who have leaders who take positions that are just contrary to that of the United States.

Hugo Chavez down in Venezuela has often given public statements that have been very, very critical to the United States. He leans towards Marxism. He is agitating for those kind of governments in South America. There have been elections in South America that leaned a number of countries in that direction. Hugo Chavez has allied with Castro.

The direction that has taken place in the Western Hemisphere because of the politics of the people that we are enriching by purchasing natural gas and oil from them causes me to ask, why are we enriching the people who would position themselves to be our enemies? Why are we losing the fertilizer industry in the United States? The cost of nitrogen fertilizer, 90 percent of that cost is the cost of natural gas that it is produced from. We have watched those fertilizer prices go up 4 and 500 percent in the last few years. We have watched natural gas prices go from $2 to $15. They dropped back down some in the last several years as well but peaked out at $15 here within the last couple of months.

We cannot produce fertilizer with natural gas prices like that. Farmers cannot afford to buy the fertilizer. So what is happening is our fertilizer industry is going offshore, and it is a real industry that is being built down in Trinidad Tobago. Also the fertilizer industry coming from Venezuela and Russia, Russia where their natural gas is 95 cents, ours was $15. You can see that we cannot compete with that. One day we will see a fertilizer cartel in the hands of the people that are positioning themselves not to be our friends, Mr. Speaker.

It is important that we have that kind of independence for our food supply. It is important that we have independence for our energy supply. It is important that we develop the natural gas reserves that we have in this country, 38 trillion cubic feet of natural gas on the north slope of Alaska, sitting there, waiting to be run down to the lower 48 States in a pipeline. A few political glitches in the way from building that pipeline, Mr. Speaker. I think that should have been done a long time ago.

I am not as concerned about that any longer as I am about our ability to drill on the Outer Continental Shelf like they do offshore in Texas, like they do offshore in Louisiana, like they do not offshore going around Florida and up the East Coast and up the West Coast as well. The Outer Continental Shelf, comparing the fertilizer inventory on the north slope of Alaska, which is 38 trillion cubic feet, with 406 trillion cubic feet of natural gas offshore. And that is what we have a pretty good idea of without going out to inventory that natural gas. A tremendous amount.

It is sitting next door to the distribution system off the Louisiana coast. We could just drill our way on around Florida on up the coast. We need to do that. We need to drill for that gas where the market is, where the population centers are. Yes, I am told that Florida plans 33 generation plants coming up within this next year or two, and 28 of them plan to be natural gas and they will not let us drill a single well, not even 199 miles offshore of Florida, anywhere, because someone on a tall tower with a powerful telescope could somehow see the top of that derrick over the curvature of the Earth. And somehow someone would find out about that and they would not go to Florida to sit on the beach when there has never been any kind of environmental negative impact with natural gas anywhere in the world. It just simply vaporizes and goes off in the air, Mr. Speaker.

So I contend that on energy we need to do a number of things, all in the context of grow the size of the energy pie. If you think of all the energy as a pie, and that would include our nuclear, our coal, our gas, our diesel fuel, our ethanol, our bio-diesel, our wind, our hydrogen, and a number of other components of energy that we use and produce, that can all be laid out now. The percentage of each would dictate the size of the piece of the size of the overall pie.

We need to look at that. That is the finite amount of energy that we are producing in this country. We need to grow that. We need to expand the amount of energy that is available to the consumers in America, and we need to change the proportion of those slices of the pie. So, for example, why do we use natural gas to generate electricity when it is becoming a more scarce product that we need for fertilizer, for example?

So I would submit that we would change the overall size of that to more fertilizer, less electrical production. We probably hit the limit that we can

build hydroelectric dams in order to generate electricity.

□ 2350

The limit has been the environmentalists' limit that we would hit there. We need to go back to nuclear and generate a lot more electricity with nuclear. There is a clean coal concept that can be used for baseline, coal-fired plants, and that can be used almost all over this country to produce a tremendous amount of electricity.

All those things need to happen, and as the President said in this chamber just the last day of January, that we need to expand the use of ethanol, and he is very credible when he says that, Mr. Speaker, because a fellow that comes from the oil patch, that is promoting ethanol and renewable fuels, is a person that you know believes in it.

In Iowa, and the congressional district that I have the privilege and honor represent, they will be at nine ethanol production facilities there by the end of this year, perhaps even one more. That will take us to the position where we are producing from corn all of the ethanol that we have the corn to supply. It means we can cannot use all of our corn for ethanol production. We can perhaps use 25 percent of our corn for ethanol production, and ethanol is, of course, going all over the country to be blended with gasoline.

Our markets in Iowa are voluntary. When people go in and pull out the pump and the nozzle and put it in their tank, they choose ethanol 81 percent of the time. It was 42 percent just a few years ago. So it has almost doubled, and that is a voluntary usage because people understand that it is economical, it is environmentally friendly, and it reduces our dependence on foreign oil.

So the President has advocated that within 25 years we reduce our dependence on foreign oil by 75 percent. I think that is a doable goal, especially with some of the technology that is out there, making ethanol out of cellulose. So that would be wood fiber and chips and even weeds and switch grass, and yet corn stalks and all of that kind cellulose that grows up out of the ground is all renewable. We can be energy independent if, in fact, we had to be. It would not take us very long to get there, Mr. Speaker.

We need an overall strategy to grow the size of the energy pie to change the proportions of the size of those pieces so that we use more of certain kinds of energy, and I will advocate, as I said, nuclear and coal and ethanol to be three of those that I would advocate we use a lot more of. We can do some things with solar panels. That is an emerging technology, but change the proportion of the size of the pieces of the energy pie so that we have a prudent, long-term policy that can reduce and, one day, eliminate our dependence on foreign oil.

It also includes not just drilling for oil and gas on the Outer Continental Shelf, not just bringing a pipeline down from Alaska to deliver the natural gas from Alaska, but it also includes drilling for oil in ANWR. That stretch up there, Mr. Speaker, that is 19.6 million acres. Out of that we are going to tap into 2,000. Only 2,000 acres, .01 percent of that region, used to tap into the oil that we know is there. That could bring 1 million barrels or more of oil down to the lower 48 or actually down to Valdez and out on the tanker. That could happen in a very short period of time if we would just step up here on the floor of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, and have the people in the other body do the same thing. The President would sign the bill, and we would be one huge step closer to energy independence.

All of these things need to happen in a country that should be able to plan its future, in a country that should be able to debate its future and take action on the floor of this Congress.

We have stepped forward and taken on quite a task in this overall war on terror. This place called Iraq is not the war on terror. This is a battlefield in the overall global war on terror, but our military has stepped forward and done their job. We need to stand with them. We need to know and realize that we are in a time of war and that means that we need to tighten our belt. That requires sacrifice. That sacrifice needs to let us find the will in this Congress to move towards a balanced budget, a balanced budget that makes the Bush tax cuts permanent because that fixes this growth rate in place so it has a sense of permanency and a sense of predictability. We need to put those tax cuts in place, move towards a balanced budget, and provide a sense of financial security so that this continuity of this long period of 10 consecutive quarters of growth can go on another 10 consecutive quarters.

I would go further with the taxes, Mr. Speaker. Given the time that is allowed here tonight I will simply tie this back with the energy side of this. So, if good things are happening in the overall war on terror, if we control our spending on this budget, tighten our belt and if we sacrifice the way our military sacrifices, we can keep funds and resources going to them so they can do their job. If we provide for more energy, grow the size of the energy pie, we have laid out a destination for America's future that is an economic and a security destiny, and without going into the social side of this, the constitutional aspects of it, that is most of what we need, Mr. Speaker, to get this country where it needs to go.

So I want to thank the Speaker for the privilege to address this House of Representatives.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HINCHEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and February 15.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.

Ms. WOOLSEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of the death of his father.

Mr. GIBBONS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of travel delay.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mr. WAMP (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness 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 Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. HERSETH, for 5 minutes, today.

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

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

Mr. DEAL of Georgia, for 5 minutes, February 15.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, February 16.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, February 16.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and February 15.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today and February 15 and 16.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and February 15 and 16.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today and February 15.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, February 16.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on February 9, 2006, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.