

We are hearing a plea for reinforcements from the NATO forces, from U.S. troops on the ground. And what is the President's reaction? Remember the President, "Osama bin Laden, dead or alive; dead or alive, we are going to hunt him to the ends of the Earth"? He does not talk about that anymore, does he? The Taliban, Afghanistan. He is totally focused on his failed policies in Iraq, where there was no al Qaeda, where there were no weapons of mass destruction, where there was no Osama bin Laden.

□ 1530

And now the President, as part of an attempt to paper over his failed strategy yet once again and pretend there is possibly a military solution, he is going to take U.S. troops out of southern Afghanistan and send them to Baghdad, despite the warnings that the one-eyed Omar and the Taliban intend to try and retake Kandahar against the pathetic NATO troops that are defending that region, hobbled by extraordinarily restrictive rules of engagement.

There is a possibility that there will be a new sanctuary and there will be a resurgence in place for the terrorists to go, but it is not Iraq. The President, in his blind obsession with Iraq, is failing to see the real threats against the United States of America. The President should not, and this Congress should not, support an escalation of the war in Iraq, sending 21,500 troops in Iraq, some of whom are vitally needed in Afghanistan who will be displaced as part of that number because we have taxed our military so heavily.

This is wrong policy for Iraq, wrong policy for America, and wrong policy for the much-touted war in Iraq. We must refocus our efforts on Afghanistan, and we must work more broadly for a solution in Iraq, following many of the recommendations of the Hamilton-Baker report rejected by the President in favor of doing the same thing again and again and again.

This is not a change in policy. It is the same failed policies of the past.

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

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

PANCHO VILLA RIDES AGAIN

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I bring you news from the second front: the border war continues.

Ninety years after his example, Pancho Villa would be proud knowing that armed banditos from Mexico con-

tinued to invade the United States border to harass U.S. citizens, and the U.S. Government won't do what is necessary to stop this invasion.

The Associated Press reports on January 3 of this year: gun-toting Mexican outlaws encountered U.S. National Guard troops along the U.S.-Mexico border near Sasabe, Arizona. After supposedly bringing drugs into our land, these outlaws were headed back home to Mexico when they overran this Arizona National Guard "outpost."

Make no mistake about it. These criminals were not "undocumented migrant workers" who daily cross the U.S. border illegally, but fierce outlaws armed with AK-47 automatic rifles. They were taking full advantage of our weak border rules of engagement policy, or shall I say non-policy.

According to the National Guard, the gunmen defiantly approached our border troops in what was described as an "aggressive manner." But instead of holding steady against this threatening approach, our Guardsmen fled. That's right, they retreated. Why? Because it is the policy that the National Guard may not fire their weapons unless fired upon or in danger of serious bodily injury and can only fire if no civilians are in close proximity.

In other words, when approached by armed intruders, the National Guard must flee. With these restrictions, the hostility left troops with the only choice they had, follow the retreat when confronted policy.

An ongoing investigation into the January 3 threat is being conducted by the U.S. Border and Customs Patrol. A spokesman for the U.S. Customs and Border Patrol stated, "The exceptional job of these agents and troops is angering drug dealers, and that is probably the reason that they were so bold, and that heightened frustration may be connected" with the incursion on January 3 and overrunning the outpost.

These narcoterrorists act as if America is their country and the National Guard are the intruders. Our government must allow our troops to engage the criminal invaders. If they come onto our land armed, we should fight, not flee from the scene. The war on the border is escalating. Ignoring these attacks only encourages Mexican drug dealers to be more aggressive in their criminal enterprises.

Homeland security begins at home by protecting our borders from these illegal invaders. In the days of Pancho Villa, banditos encroached upon the border on horseback. But U.S. soldiers and Texas Rangers fought back and took control of our border. Now these banditos come across by any means necessary: in Humvees, in the backs of trucks, on foot, and they are saddled with deadly fire power. They traffic drugs, illegal aliens, and they are armed while doing it.

In 1916, our government ordered thousands of National Guardsmen to protect the borders and to protect U.S. citizens. General John J. Pershing did

that. He defended our borders, and he chased banditos back to Mexico.

In 2007, the U.S. Government has once again called the National Guard to protect and defend. But the U.S. engagement policy is beneficial only to the intruders by not allowing the National Guard to defend themselves or our sovereignty with their weapons.

How is the National Guard to shield our country from this invasion when they can't capture armed bandits? Or should they be called "undocumented firearm enthusiasts"? If our National Guard is on the border, they should be allowed to protect our country from hostile invaders using any means necessary. After all, they are the National Guard, not national bird watchers. Let's not send our National Guard or border agents to perform a task with a no-detain or no-shoot policy. Otherwise, how can they protect America?

Armed renegades attacking our borders are invaders and should be treated as such. Mexico refuses to crack down on their criminals encroaching on U.S. land. In fact, they encourage this intrusion.

Has our Nation lost the moral will to protect our border? We protect the border of other nations. We protect the Korean border. We protect the Iraqi border. Let us protect our own border. A line must be drawn in the sand ordering these desperados to leave or the U.S. Calvary will deal with them like General Pershing did 100 years ago.

And that's just the way it is.

PRESIDENT HEADED IN WRONG DIRECTION

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last night we heard from a President who plans to continue in the wrong direction, believing that our military can solve a political quagmire; but every day that we are there, our military presence makes the situation worse.

Mr. Speaker, sending more troops will only fuel the insurgency. We don't belong there, and our brave and capable troops need to come home.

I ask you: How can we believe a President who had already sent troops to Baghdad before his speech and he didn't mention it? Unbelievably, he is sending troops, and of course he didn't mention this, that don't have the most advanced armor.

But, Mr. Speaker, while the President was giving his remarks, the U.S. military was attacking the Iran consulate, the consulate in the Kurdish region of Iraq. As yet, their consul has not heard why from the United States. The President didn't tell us about that attack.

It is troubling and it is sad that the President has misrepresented so many facts about Iraq. It seems he can't distinguish between what he wants to believe and what is real. What he is calling sectarian violence is really civil war.

He supports the Iraq Government against the death squads when he knows full well that the death squads are embedded in the Iraqi Government. He claims that he is following the Iraq Study Group's recommendation to get a win when the study group has said there is no way to win and that the only question is how to best leave.

The President wants a win. To that end he is sending 20,000 more Americans into harm's way and spending \$100 million a day to get that win. In 3 months, don't kid yourself, he will be asking for more to get a win. This is immoral.

What the President doesn't realize is that America wins when we follow our ideals, which means we fight for freedom when our freedom is at stake and we only ask American troops to lay down their lives when our country is in danger, not to give the President a win.

Again, Mr. Speaker, let me repeat, there is no military solution to this political problem. The United States is not going to determine the fate of Iraq; only the Iraqis will determine their fate.

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

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

ESCALATION IS HARDLY THE ANSWER

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, a military victory in Iraq is unattainable, just as it was in the Vietnam War. At the close of the Vietnam War in 1975, a telling conversation took place between a North Vietnamese colonel named Tu and an American colonel named Harry Summers. Colonel Summers said to Tu, You know, you never beat us on the battlefield. And Tu replied, That may be so, but it is also irrelevant.

It is likewise irrelevant to seek military victory in Iraq. As conditions deteriorate in Iraq, the American people are told more blood must be spilled to achieve just such a military victory. 21,000 additional troops and another \$100 billion are needed for a surge, yet the people remain rightfully skeptical.

Though we have been in Iraq for nearly 4 years, the meager goal today simply is to secure Baghdad. This hardly shows that the mission is even partly accomplished.

Astonishingly, American taxpayers now will be forced to finance a multi-billion dollar jobs program in Iraq. Suddenly the war is about jobs. We export our manufacturing jobs to Asia, and now we plan to export our welfare jobs to Iraq, all at the expense of the

poor and the middle class here at home.

Plans are being made to become more ruthless in achieving stability in Iraq. It appears Muqtada al Sadr will be on the receiving end of our military efforts, despite his overwhelming support among large segments of the Iraqi people.

It is interesting to note that one excuse given for our failure is leveled at the Iraqis themselves: they have not done enough, we are told, and are difficult to train. Yet no one complains that the Mahdi or the Kurdish militias, the Badr Brigade, the real Iraqi Government, not our appointed government, are not well trained. Our problems obviously have nothing to do with training Iraqis to fight, but instead with loyalties and motivations.

We claim to be spreading democracy in Iraq. But al Sadr has far more democratic support with the majority Shites than our troops enjoy. The problem is not a lack of democratic consensus; it is the antipathy among most Iraqis.

In real estate, the three important considerations are: location, location, location. In Iraq, the three conditions are: occupation, occupation, occupation. Nothing can improve in Iraq until we understand that our occupation is the primary source of the chaos and killing. We are a foreign occupying force strongly resented by the majority of Iraqi citizens.

Our inability to adapt to the tactics of fourth-generation warfare compounds our military failure. Unless we understand this, even doubling our troop strength will not solve the problems created by our occupation.

The talk of a troop surge and jobs program in Iraq only distracts Americans from the very real possibility of an attack on Iran. Our growing naval presence in the region and our harsh rhetoric towards Iran are unsettling. Securing the Horn of Africa and sending Ethiopian troops into Somalia do not bode well for world peace, yet these developments are almost totally ignored by Congress.

Rumors are flying about when, not if, Iran will be bombed by either Israel or the United States, possibly with nuclear weapons. Our CIA says Iran is 10 years away from producing a nuclear bomb and has no delivery system, but this does not impede our plans to keep everything on the table when dealing with Iran.

□ 1545

We should remember that Iran, like Iraq, is a third world nation without a significant military. Nothing in history hints that she is likely to invade a neighboring country, let alone do anything to America or Israel.

I am concerned, however, that a contrived Gulf of Tonkin type incident may well occur to gain popular support for an attack on Iran. Even if such an attack is carried out by Israel over U.S. objections, we will be politically

and morally culpable, since we provided the weapons and dollars to make it possible.

Mr. Speaker, let's hope I am wrong about this one.

OIL INDUSTRY MAIN BENEFICIARY OF IRAQ WAR

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the American people have not received very much information about a major issue in and around the Iraq war, and the oil industry would like to keep it just that way. Fortunately, investigative journalism is still being practiced, and I want to share information uncovered by a reporter for AlterNet, in the United States, and a major Sunday story this week in *The Independent*, a newspaper in the United Kingdom.

The number one Iraq story for all of 2006 on AlterNet, which is an Internet-based news and opinion site, was a two-part series by a reporter, Joshua Holland, entitled: "Bush's Petro-Cartel Almost Has Iraq's Oil."

Last Sunday, *The Independent* carried stories with these headlines: "Future of Iraq: The Spoils of War, How the West Will Make a Killing on Iraqi Oil Riches." And "Blood and Oil: How the West Will Profit from Iraq's Most Precious Commodity."

Members of Congress are limited in how much information we can enter into the record at one time, so I will enter into the record *The Independent* story. I will also encourage every American to seek out and read the complete AlterNet story, which is available online.

These investigative reports paint a disturbing picture and raise troubling questions about big oil's attempting to steal the oil wealth and resources of the Iraqi people. From the beginning of the Iraq invasion, more moderate voices, especially overseas, questioned whether the ulterior motive behind toppling Saddam Hussein was a grab for Iraqi oil. In this scenario, democracy is a by-product of oil production, not the real reason for military action in Iraq.

Gaining access to the oil wealth of Iraq has had oil industries salivating for years. Gaining control of that oil wealth would be a prize beyond compare for the oil industry. Iraq has the third largest oil reserves in the world, and there are many oil geologists who believe that vast additional oil reserves are just waiting to be discovered in Iraq's western desert. They call it the Holy Grail, and some believe the untapped riches could propel Iraq from third to first place in the world's oil reserves.

An estimated 115 billion barrels of oil reserves are under Iraq. Today's price is \$53 a barrel, and that is an 18-month low. The American people are still suffering from the oil price shocks and