

operates three exploration projects elsewhere in Colombia, and, in 1998, swapped its holdings in the Philippines and Malaysia for Shell Oil's interests in several producing blocks of Colombia.

Worldwide holdings: Russia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Qatar, Oman, Ecuador, the Gulf of Mexico, the United States (Texas, California and Alaska).

Worldwide reserves: 2.17 billion barrels of oil.

Worldwide annual production: 461,000 barrels of oil per day.

Colombia annual production: 34,000 barrels of oil per day in 2002, up 79 percent from the year before.

LABOR CONDITIONS

In addition to sabotaging the physical structure of Occidental's Caño Limón Pipeline, Colombia's rebel groups have attacked, kidnapped and murdered company employees. Employees also have often been caught in the crossfire between the rebels and the military. Not unlike other multinationals in Colombia, Occidental makes it clear with its employees that it will not pay ransom in the event of their kidnapping. With few exceptions, the company hires Colombians from distant cities to work in the danger areas because they are less likely to be knowledgeable about military troop locations or security measures should they fall into the hands of guerrillas. Prospective contractors are rigorously screened by Occidental's psychologists to ferret out spies; workers must show identification cards at a half-dozen security checkpoints; and palm-reading devices restrict access to executive offices. Still, Colombia's rebels have succeeded in breaching the multinational's security on a number of occasions.

Watchdog groups have ranked Occidental poorly on human rights after the company pursued a protested oil exploration project in Colombia's cloud forest, home to 5,000 members of the U'wa tribe. In 2000, three children were killed after Occidental called on the military to break up a nonviolent U'wa blockade of the road to the drill site. After years of public pressure protesting Occidental's exploration on ancestral lands, the company announced in May 2002 that it was canceling the project. The company blamed its withdrawal on technical and economic factors, but many believe Occidental caved to negative publicity.

Occidental's stand on human rights in Colombia was also tainted after a 1998 air raid of the village of Santo Domingo near the Caño Limón Pipeline. That year, three American pilots of AirScan (a Florida-based security firm that Occidental uses to protect its oil interests from rebel attacks) marked hostile targets for the Colombian military in an antiguerilla operation. The pilots' assistance mistakenly led to the killing of 18 civilians, including nine children. Survivors from the village said the aircraft (U.S.-donated) attacked them as they ran out of their homes to a nearby road with their hands in the air. The Colombian government is still investigating.

OCCIDENTAL INFLUENCE ON CAPITOL HILL NOT NEUTRAL

Between 1996 and 2000, Occidental spent more than \$8.6 million lobbying the U.S. government, including for U.S. military aid to Colombia. In the 2000 election cycle, the company gave hard and soft money totaling about \$551,000, with about 60 percent going to Republican candidates and political action committees. The CEO of Occidental's chemical subsidiary, J. Roger Hirl, raised more than \$100,000 in support of George W. Bush's bid for the presidency.

Occidental also has maintained links to the Democratic Party for many years, pri-

marily through former Vice President Al Gore's father, the late Al Gore Sr., who after leaving the Senate took a \$500,000-a-year job with an Occidental subsidiary, then served on the company board for 28 years.

When the younger Gore joined Clinton's ticket in 1992, Occidental loaned the Presidential Inauguration Committee \$100,000 to help pay for the ceremony. And after Gore took office, the company gave nearly \$500,000 in soft money to Democratic committees and causes. In late 1997, the former vice president championed a \$3.65 billion sale to Occidental of the government's stake in Elk Hills Oil Field (California), representing the largest privatization of federal property in U.S. history. In 1998, when his father died, Gore inherited about \$500,000 worth of Occidental stock.

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.)

COMMUNIST CHINA

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

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, one of our greatest Presidents was Harry Truman. And one of the reasons President Truman was held in such high regard by people, including my own father, was that he had the courage to go against conventional wisdom, especially in the area of foreign relations.

It was President Truman who had the moral courage to tell the American people that our World War II ally the Soviet Union was no longer our friend and had become a threat to the very liberty that our people had helped advance throughout the course of that conflict. This was not a message that the American people were particularly expecting. In fact, there were many who decried President Truman's analysis at the time. One of them was George F. Kennan, who is, unfortunately, often remembered as the father of the containment policy.

In fact, when faced with the rise of the Soviet Union as a strategic threat and rival model of governance, it was Mr. Kennan's position that the Soviet Union could be managed, that we should constructively engage them, that their ideology meant nothing to them, and that, in fact, they were but a different variation of the traditional Czarist order within Russia. And, besides, Mr. Kennan concluded, what did it matter? Eventually the two systems of communism and our free Republic's democratic system would merge into one.

President Truman was not as educated as Mr. Kennan. He was not as sophisticated as Mr. Kennan. And President Truman took the Soviets at their word that they were in fact communists. He took them at their word

that they meant they were going to put in practice their intrinsically evil ideology. And Mr. Truman dissented from Mr. Kennan and said that the fundamental goal of the United States foreign policy to defeat the intrinsic evil of communism will be the advancement of liberty throughout our world where and when we can achieve it.

Recently I came across a picture that I had ordered from a friend of mine in the District, Mr. Doug Brown. It was from one of Mr. Truman's return trips to St. Louis. He was meeting a gentleman from his old World War I Artillery Battery. And a picture that struck me the most was this: The MC of the event that night for President Truman in Missouri was an entertainer named Ronald Reagan. And in that crystalline moment, it was clear for me to see the link in the Cold War's victory between the foundation President Truman courageously laid and the way that President Reagan courageously won it ultimately.

What we see today now is a repeat of history where we have two paths we can take. We can take the path of Mr. Kennan and the detente crowd of the Kissingerites and others that says we can manage the rise of Communist China, that we can engage them and barter with them and engage in structural diplomacy, all the while the oppression of their own people's God-given rights to rights to life, liberty, and dignity are repressed, while Tibet suffers under their yoke, while the Burmese and Sudanese regimes are propped up, and while they continue their stealth assaults on our national security with sleeper cells, and I could go on. Or we who profess to be the heirs of Ronald Reagan, especially within the Republican Party, can follow the path of President Truman and understand that you cannot barter with butchers. You cannot constructively manage evil nor engage it. But what you can do is unleash the liberty of people yearning to breathe free where and when you can.

The reason I bring this up is not merely the Beijing Olympics. I'm on record as opposing our President's attendance at the games. I believe it would be a betrayal of our free Republic's commitment to liberty. But I was struck by a statement in this regard by our current Secretary of State, ironically enough herself a Sovietologist. I will not make the joke that a Sovietologist is often considered diplomacy's equivalent of a Latin teacher for this has relevance. She said, "It is important for the Chinese people to see that the United States supports their emergence onto the world's stage."

I fundamentally differ with that assessment. I remain a Reaganite. I remain my Truman Democratic father's son. The United States, and my party in particular, exists to put communism in the ash can of history, not to usher communism onto the world's stage. If my party, as it has strayed from principle in the past, does not understand

the emancipation imperative that runs through Abraham Lincoln to Ronald Reagan and to today, we are in a sad state. I trust we wake up while there is still time.

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY 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 Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. TANCREDO 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 gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO 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 gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas 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 gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California 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 gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY 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 gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WESTMORELAND 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 gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of South Carolina 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 gen-

tleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

□ 1945

OUR ONGOING MILITARY AND DIPLOMATIC MISSION IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to talk about the ongoing military and diplomatic mission in Iraq and to discuss the recent testimonies given to Congress by General David Petraeus and Ambassador Ryan Crocker. Make no mistake, the situation in Iraq is the most significant issue that we, in Congress, face today. Our troops on the frontlines of the battlefield, our constituents back home, and the world look upon the actions and the debates in this body to determine our resolve.

First, let me thank the men and women serving in our Armed Forces, the diplomatic corps who are serving in that country, and our Foreign Service officers on the ground who all serve so nobly under difficult circumstances. They make our Nation great. And we owe them a debt of gratitude that can never be adequately repaid.

There are three observations that I have that drive my views and understanding of the current efforts being made in Iraq. First, the plan that was implemented about a year ago is working. General Petraeus and Ambassador Ryan Crocker are leading an effort to bring stability into Baghdad and areas throughout Iraq because they have the flexibility and the necessary resources to respond to changes on the ground. This plan is more than just simply 30,000 troops in country. The troops are placed strategically.

And we also have civilian personnel and diplomats on the ground working to help build up the political institutions from the ground up as we work with the central government so that hopefully as the two meet, we will end up with a stable Iraq that has sovereignty that can protect its borders and that can build institutions on its own and that can protect minority rights. Second, America can complete this mission successfully. Given the appropriate support and guidance, our troops and diplomats will succeed. And third, clearly, challenges remain. Both General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker outlined these challenges.

The positive trends as a result of this plan continue from last summer, and we will highlight those. But we understand many challenges remain before us, and clearly these challenges were outlined by these two gentlemen before Congress. I want to mention that fail-

ure in Iraq would have serious repercussions and dire consequences for U.S. foreign policy as well as for global security.

Most importantly, our efforts to stop terrorist organizations would be hindered. Secondly, the ability for us and others to deal with the Israeli-Palestinian peace process will become much more difficult. Thirdly, efforts to minimize Iran's dangerous mischief in this region will be diminished. And finally, stabilizing the broader Middle East will be exceedingly difficult if we fail in Iraq. Clearly, the cost and the consequences of failure are far too high.

As Members of Congress, we must listen to the professional judgments of the American leadership we have currently serving in Iraq and work with them to create and support policies that will successfully complete our mission.

Congress has a serious responsibility here. These two gentlemen and the work that they have done in Iraq has been outstanding and should be applauded. And we need to support them. And we need to have a serious debate here in Congress on what steps we need to take to continue to support this effort so that we are successful in Iraq.

Tonight, my colleagues and I will offer our thoughts on the situation there in Iraq, our reflections from recent trips and how we have moved forward. I want to encourage everyone who is listening to seek out and read the testimony of General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker. Read it carefully because it is very thoughtfully put together. They have provided an unvarnished account of what is happening on the ground, and it is the most accurate assessment of the situation. And that is what policy should be based upon. This House now has the responsibility to the American people to truthfully assess their testimonies.

At this point, I would like to pause and introduce my good friend from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY). He is a member of the Armed Services Committee. He heard the testimony this afternoon, and he'll make some comments.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana, my friend, my classmate of the Class of 2005. I am glad to be with you tonight. I did sit today through General Petraeus' testimony, as well as Ambassador Crocker's testimony, and then later in the afternoon, we heard from both General Richard Cody, as well as General Robert Magnus, Army Vice Chief, and the Marine Corps Vice Chief respectively, on the status of our current forces. And I would like to talk about kind of a combination of those conversations that we heard today.

Ambassador Crocker was asked, what does success look like in Iraq? We ought to know both sides of the equation, both sides of the coin of success and failure. He described "success" in Iraq as an Iraq that is developed into a