entire campaign in Iraq, and he got a unanimous vote in the other legislative body. That says an awful lot of people had to vote for him to get a unanimous vote over there.

Also, as I recall, it was just not so long ago that the Democrat party, who's in charge of both the House and the Senate, made the request that in September General Petraeus would come before the legislature and would make a report as to what the findings were, would let us know how things were going. Many people were very skeptical about the reorganization, the restructuring of our war in Iraq, around the idea of the surge, but people trusted General David Petraeus. They trusted him because he has an excellent reputation and record as a soldier, but he also is a straight shooter. He doesn't sugarcoat things. He explains it the way it is.

And so it was with some sense of alarm and a little bit, I have to say, with a sense of frustration that we saw in the New York Times this calling General Petraeus where they say ''General Betray Us.''

What we're doing is taking somebody that before we thought they had good credibility, we're going to guess what they may say to us, we think we may not like what he has to say, so now we're going to try to destroy his reputation. I think that's a shame.

My son has served over in Fallujah. As you have mentioned, I also am on the Oversight Committee.

□ 2030

One of the things that has been consistent with every witness, week after week over a period of months, every witness we could scrounge up, conservative, Republican, liberal, Democrat, you name it, the one thing those witnesses said was, first of all, they said if we pull out of Iraq rapidly, there is going to be a huge bloodbath there.

The second thing is that the whole region will be destabilized. Everybody agreed to that. Now, some people said, well, there is nothing we can do about it, so we ought to pull out now and cut our losses. Other ones said, no, there are some things we could do about it. But everybody agreed that a rapid drawdown of troops is not what we should be doing in America.

After listening hour after hour to all these experts, I came to the conclusion of this simple fact, and that is, it is the least-cost, most logical best alternative for us to just go ahead and win the war in Iraq.

We are more than halfway, and trying to turn around and back out, make excuses and try to lose is just going to be much more costly than moving forward and doing a good job.

That's what the general has outlined today in very credible testimony. I was very thankful that he is here. I am thankful that you took the time to help us to be able to talk about this very important subject about how we proceed and the sense of good news. There is a little light at the end of the tunnel is what it seems like to me.

Mr. GINGREY. Light at the end of the tunnel, indeed. The gentleman is right on target.

As we conclude this Special Order hour, I want my colleagues to take a good look at this ad that ran today in the New York Times.

I know it's hard for the Members to actually see the text, or you can see the picture; but, basically, what it says, the caption is: ''General Petraeus or General Betray Us?'' With a big question mark. Then under that: ''Cooking the books for the White House.''

The first and last paragraph, I will quote, let me read this to you, this is what MoveOn.org, a political action committee says.

Mr. AKIN. Isn't MoveOn.org generally associated with the Democrat Party?

Mr. GINGREY. I hope not, I say to the gentleman from Missouri. I think if you look at their funding trail though you would find that they haven't contributed probably too much support in any way, shape, or form to Republican Members.

But hears what they say about General Petraeus: ''General Petraeus is a military man constantly at war with the facts. In 2004, just before the election, he said there was 'tangible progress' in Iraq and that 'Iraqi leaders are stepping forward.'

''And last week Petraeus, the architect of the escalation of troops in Iraq, said 'We say we have achieved progress, and we are obviously going to do everything we can to build on that progress.' ''

Then their final paragraph, I skipped the middle one, they say: ''Most importantly, General Petraeus will not admit what everyone knows: Iraq is mired in an unwinnable religious civil war. We may hear of a plan to withdraw a few thousand American troops.

''But we won't hear what Americans are desperate to hear: a timetable for withdrawing all our troops, General Petraeus has actually said, will need to stay in Iraq for as long as 10 years.''

Finally, they say, MoveOn.org, today, before Congress and before the American people, General Petraeus is likely to become General Betray Us.

In conclusion, as the majority leader said a few minutes ago, before we walked out on the steps, to commemorate and honor the American people on the sixth anniversary of that tragedy of 9/11, we did that in a bipartisan way. This is not a political argument that we bring to the floor tonight, and this business, if we are winning in Iraq, the Democrats lose. If we are losing in Iraq, the Democrats win. If we are winning in Iraq, the Republicans win. This is not about who wins politically. This is for the American people.

We are going to win. We are going to let victory have a chance. We are not just simply blindly staying the course.

In regard to this surge, this is exactly what the Iraq Study Group, Lee Hamilton and former Secretary James Baker, recommended to the Congress; and this is what the President has done.

I commend him for it. I think we are making progress; but there is, indeed, as the gentleman from Missouri said, light at the end of the tunnel, a bright light. We need to give victory a chance.

IRAQ AND THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as I said a number of times in the past, it remains a tremendous honor to step here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and address you about how this dialogue that we have across America is a great big national conversation, 300 million people, many of them talking about the very subject matter that my colleagues in the previous hour have discussed, and that being the issue of the global war on terror.

Particularly, because of the hearing today, the joint hearing between the Armed Services Committee, and it used to be the International Relations Committee, and now it's the Foreign Affairs Committee, many of our colleagues in the room of the 435 Members of Congress, over 100 in the room and many others were watching television in offices and in gatherings around this Hill. There was a national conversation going on and taking place here.

As we move forward with our discussion, one of the things that happens is, as talking members of the 300 million people of America carry on their conversation, a consensus forms. As a consensus forms, it works that the constituents across the country call up and write letters and send e-mails to and stop in and see their Members of Congress and their staff.

As that goes on, if the American people are informed, if they are informed honestly and objectively, if they can get there, they can get their eyes and their hands and their ears on the facts, the American people often come to an appropriate and proper conclusion.

But it happens to be a fact that nearly every week that we have been in session in this 110th Congress, now into September, having gaveled in here in January, nearly every week, there has been at least one bill on the floor, that was a bill, I believe, sought to undermine our efforts in this global war on terror.

Except for last week, there wasn't one. Yet, the commitment that was made on the part of the request to Congress, and on the part of our military and the President, was to deliver a report here to Congress by September 15, on or before September 15, that would be an objective update on the operations in Iraq, which I will stipulate again is the most centralized, the most contested battleground in this global war on terror.

We all knew this report was coming, and today we received that report. That report was delivered here to Congress in written form and verbally by General Petraeus and by Ambassador Ryan Crocker.

Well, it's interesting that when the date of this report became something that was published and people were aware of, that's when the debate began.

We started to see an intensity of the different amendments and the resolutions that came before Congress. There are no resolution to unfund the war and call our troops home, but resolutions to try to do that without having to admit that that was the effort. As each one of those resolutions came up, by my view, each one of them one way or another failed with the American people. The argument was continuing. The debate was continuing.

The people that were invested in, let me say, cut-and-run policy and tactics in Iraq, those people thought that they were going to win this argument with the American people, before General Petraeus brought his report before Congress. That's why those resolutions came to this floor every week, in my view, and that's why the media was delivered, message after message, that there was a failed effort in Iraq.

That's also why I and many of my colleagues went to Iraq during that period of time. I made my fifth trip over there on the last weekend of July with a number of my colleagues in codel Burgess. On that fifth trip, it's hard to say, even when you go back to the same place, what was different. Because you will see sometimes different people, and you get a bit different report.

But one thing you do is get briefings, internal briefings, classified briefings, from our top officers that we have and compare the information that comes from General Petraeus and General Odierno and Ambassador Crocker and Admiral Fallon. Those people that are at the front of this that are in the lead that are calling the shots from the highest levels, all the way down through the ranks, when you walk into a mess hall and simply say is there anyone here from Iowa, pretty soon you have a table full, know their hometowns and know some of the people that they are related to and know that there is an instant contact there. We compare notes Iowan-to-Iowan and then compare those notes with the briefings that we receive from our top officers.

Close the door and have an intense, classified discussion with General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker, then come back here to this Congress and listen to the debate and watch the effort here on the other side of the aisle, the effort that I believe was invested in defeat. I will say even a significant number are still invested in defeat.

But, yet, they thought they could win the debate and convince the American people that the cause was lost in Iraq. They thought they could win the debate before General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker delivered their report to this Congress that it would be a moot point. Whatever it was that General Petraeus might offer today, they wanted to have the American people convinced. A majority number of Members of Congress were convinced that it was a lost and failed effort in Iraq.

Well, enough information came out from that part of the world; enough Members went over and saw for themselves. Enough Members like myself went into al Anbar province that, according to General Petraeus today, was politically lost a year ago. It was a hopeless case a year ago.

As I was there the last of July, every single tribal area in al Anbar province, and I would remind the body, that that is one-third, Anbar province is one third of the geographical area of Iraq. It represented over half the deaths and violence of Iraq. It was the center of al Qaeda in Iraq. Ramadi was the center of death for the country.

Still, every single tribal area in the entire province of that one-third of Iraq was, a year ago, controlled by al Qaeda. Hamas was preaching an anti-U.S., anti-coalition, anti-Iraqi defense force message.

But as I match the maps, as the tribal zones change and the sheikhs, the tribal leaders, got together, the they made a commitment to come together to kill al Qaeda with coalition forces and with Iraqi defense forces. Every single tribal zone, every sheikh in all of al Anbar province came over to the coalition side, to the side of freedom, and to the side of a free Iraqi people.

When that happened, there was a dramatic sea change in al Anbar province. If you looked at the map of the tribal zones, it was already a year ago painted red because that was al Qaeda. Today, every tribal zone in al Anbar province is green, meaning they are on our side now, they are with us. They said they want to come kill al Qaeda with us. That was their message.

When you see that kind of briefing, and you hear the briefing that came from General Petraeus today, but some of this information came out piece by piece, week by week, as there was an effort to undermine our effort in Iraq, came to a head today. Those who were invested in defeat had to make a case today that there was something weak about this military effort, something weak about the security effort, that there was something disingenuous about the delivery, about the report that was delivered today.

What I saw today was truly two highly intelligent people with worlds of experience in the Middle East, Ambassador Crocker and General Petraeus.

As I saw them with their delivery and their presentation and the facts that they laid out carefully, completely, objectively, with caution about those parts that aren't going so well, brought out before we heard the good news about the parts that are going well, this was a stellar report that the American people can take to the bank. We don't have all the problems solved in Iraq. There is a ways to go, and maybe a long ways to go. It's not going to be easy, but it looks far better today than the news media has characterized it to be.

So there is much to be said about this momentous day today, this watershed day today, the records that were accumulated from General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker. As I watched my colleagues listen to that delivery and ask their questions and probe, I can only reflect that the people that came out of this thing with their integrity intact were the ones delivering the report. The ones who were their critics were silenced in the end. That's the conclusion that I think an objective media will be reporting tomorrow.

But at this point, I recognize the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. ZACH WAMP.

Mr. WAMP. It's a privilege and an honor to come back down to the floor tonight. I want to talk on two fronts, really. The one is about Iraq and the other is the threat of radical Islam, Islamofascism, as some people call it; but I think it's important here right on the cusp of the sixth anniversary, tomorrow of 9/11, to remind our colleagues and our fellow countrymen that we are not only not out of the woods, but that these threats are grave. They are grave this week.

It's easy for everyone in this country to get lulled back into complacency or look for the comforts of our living room and shopping malls, but we face a huge growing and imminent threat from the terror itself here on our homeland.

We come, as members of the Republican Policy Committee tonight, we just left a briefing downstairs from a Lebanese Christian named Brigette Gabriel, who wrote a book called ''Why They Hate Us.'' Some would ignore her, but, frankly, coming from that world and able to go on Internet chat rooms and read Arabic and know what's going on out there, we should listen. We should listen very carefully to what's happening in the world of radical Islam.

□ 2045

I think it is very ironic that some of the very people who may have said a few months ago, ooh, let's embrace the Iraq Study Group's recommendations today would say, no, too late. We even heard that today from distinguished Democrats, some of them, too late. Too late. Too late for what?

Let me tell you, this is not good news. We're at war. There is no good news. But this is positive news from the battlefield. And I think it's very ironic that in Anbar, and now spreading from Anbar originally out through the tribal groups and the provinces, where we're making real progress is among the moderates, which is kind of

the Iraq Study Group's recommendation, is convert the moderates to allies. Work to get them to stand against the radicals; work to get the tribal leaders to say, al Qaeda is the enemy and we're now with the Americans and our allied forces. That's happening. But I'll bet you some people don't want to hear that positive news. That's the reality on the ground. That's important.

I would also say, though, in a macroscale, where some of the Iraq Study Group's recommendations can be very instructive today for all of us is we need to engage moderate Islam, not just in country, in Iraq, but throughout the world, because just the sheer numbers of growth within Islam, if you read the demographics, for instance, in Mark Steyn's book, ''America Alone'' it's overwhelming; 5 years out, 10 years out, they swamp us in population. If you think Americans or Europeans are growing as a population, we're shrinking. We are shrinking. There's fewer and fewer of us every decade and millions and millions more Muslims.

And if the moderates within Islam won't stand against the radicals, that's why I reach out to the gentleman from Minnesota here in the House. Man, if there are freedom-loving people within Islam, where are they? They need to speak out. They need to be aggressive, and more and more of them in Iraq are because their relatives have been killed by al Qaeda. And once they kill your relative, maybe you're going to speak out. But they're intimidated; they're squashed.

Let me give you an example. Mark Steyn just tells us recently of a book that was published called ''Alms for Jihad; Charity and Terrorism in the Islamic World.'' A guy named Jay Millard Burr wrote it. Great research in Saudi Arabia where all this oil money, and we heard this downstairs from Brigette as well, using the Saudi Arabian oil money to promote terrorists around the world, period. It's happening. This documents, ''Alms for Jihad,'' how they're funneling through charities. A man named Sheikh Khalid bin Mahfouz heads it up. The charity is called the Khalid bin Mahfouz or Blessed Relief Foundation. Millions of Saudi oil dollars into this charity that funds al Qaeda directly. This book exposes the whole thing. So you need to go to Amazon.com or Barnes and Noble to get the book. But guess what? You can't get it. It vanished. It was bought up, taken out of circulation, financially, they took the book off the market.

Let me tell you, folks, in this country, from Dearborn, Michigan to right here in Virginia, Falls Church, Virginia, oil money from the wahabis in Saudi Arabia training up young people in this country, under a global Shari'ah, Islamic law, bringing them up against America in this country today.

Listen, this, to me, at the sixth anniversary of 9/11, is a call to action for Americans who've been lulled into complacency thinking that somehow this conflict is about Iraq. If we would just leave Iraq, all of our problems go away.

I'll say to you tonight, Mr. Speaker, this is not about Iraq. Iraq is the venue, it's the theater, it's where al Sadr is, it's where the Iranians and the Syrians have come, it's where they've recruited, it's where the fight is, but it's not about Iraq. It's about us and radical Islam at war. That's the theater. But let me tell you, it could just as easily be here tomorrow. God forbid it, but it could be just as easily here.

They have virtually taken some parts of Europe in terms of public opinion. They've challenged laws of countries and states in their courts, challenging Islamic law should take precedence, and that's what they would like to see here.

You may say, oh, he's wild; he's off the reservation. Not true. This is the way it is. They're using our very porous borders to come at us. And we're not secure. We're ignoring the threat.

Let me tell you what the Wall Street Journal editorial said last week. It said, the world's most political and religious pathologies, combine with oil and gas, terrorism and nuclear ambitions. In short, unlike yesterday's Vietnam, the greater Middle East, including Turkey, is the central strategic arena of the 21st century as Europe was in the 20th century. This is where three continents, Europe, Asia and Africa, are joined. He goes on to say, so let's take a moment to think about what would happen if the last Black Hawk helicopter took off from Baghdad International. And he goes on to talk about Iran's influence in Iraq, emboldening Iran.

Clearly, Ahmadinejad said less than 2 weeks ago he can feel the United States in retreat in Iraq, and we've lost our will. And that when we leave because they force us out, Iran is prepared to fill the vacuum. That's what he said 2 weeks ago. We can ignore it if we want to. But let me tell you, a precipitous withdrawal that the left in this country is asking for, a forced withdrawal from Iraq today, will lead to the most destabilization in the world that we have seen.

And let me tell you, this threat we face, nobody wants to hear this, is greater than the threat of Nazi Germany. And if people say we had no business in Iraq, then we had no business storming the beaches of Normandy because the Germans didn't attack us. But we knew it was our obligation, as the leader of freedom in the world, to go and save Europe from Nazi Germany. We did that. We're doing it again, and it's uncomfortable.

As I said in the previous hour, my nephew's over there. Specialist Jeffrey Watts is fighting in Iraq for us tonight. I'd love for my nephew to come home, but not until we can leave in victory; not until we leave an Iraq and a Middle East that's more secure than they were yesterday; not until we can assure the American people that Iran is not going to rise up and seize control with nuclear weapons in the Middle East, unless you want to accept Armageddon.

I actually know how the story ends. I know the Bible from cover to cover, and I'm prepared to go on across that river at any time. But I've got to tell you, unless you're willing to just accept those ramifications, that's how high the stakes are in Iraq.

This is not George Bush's war. This is America's fight. We committed it together. Some people would like to blame it on others now and not accept the responsibility. But this is America's fight against radical Islam, and it will go on for years to come, even when Iraq is over. And there'll be a time where Iraq is not the central theater. I'm concerned we're going to be fighting radical Islam all the days of my life.

The question is, are we going to stand up, as generations before us have, and defend freedom. Are people like my nephew going to be willing to go and stand between a real threat in our civilian population, because that's what this is. And don't think for a second that it's all about Iraq. Some people dressed in pink would have you believe that. It's not true. And I'll tell you, what some of them are doing is downright un-American, and 50 years ago they'd have run them out of here on a rail.

I'd be happy to yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his delivery. And I reflect that General Petraeus' last part of his prepared testimony said, in closing, it remains an enormous privilege to soldier again in Iraq with America's new Greatest Generation. Our country's men and women in uniform have done a magnificent job in the most complex and challenging environment imaginable. All Americans should be very proud of their sons and daughters serving in Iraq today.

He also said that he believes that this is perhaps the most professional military to ever take to the field. And I recall a discussion that we had in Baghdad just about 5 or 6 weeks ago, and the statement was made that this is not only the most professional but the best military that's ever been put into the field, that's ever gone to war.

And one of the remarks they made, in addition to well-trained and brave and dedicated and well-equipped and patriotic and all of those adjectives that we use, one of the other ones was and the most perceptive. The most perceptive.

And that caught me off guard, Mr. Speaker. I didn't expect that. But I understood what that meant; to have the perception to know the difference on when to shoot and when not to shoot, when to be the ambassador and when to be the soldier. That's one of the hardest things, and sometimes a decision has to be made in a split second. And that's what they meant by the

most perceptive military to be sent off to war.

And again, much was said today, much will be said about today. But at this point, I'd be happy to yield as much time as he may consume to the chairman of the Policy Committee from Michigan, Mr. THADDEUS MCCOTTER.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I just want to touch on some points regarding strategic basis of the surge and some of the goals, some of what we've heard today. Your indulgence. Just touch upon some of the general themes that our Nation faces in the war for freedom.

Mistakes in the past in Iraq have been rectified under the Petraeus plan. As I have said and many here have said on our side of the aisle, in the early days of the problems of reconstruction, we believed that you could not impose democracy from above in a top-down approach, but you could unleash liberty so that it could rise up, much as the American Revolution did, to take its own shape as the Iraqi people were emancipated from the shackles of Saddam's oppression.

What General Petraeus is doing, in conjunction with Ambassador Crocker, is they are going into the towns, they're going into the tribes, they are going into the bedrock of the population of Iraq, and with the surge, providing the security to protect these individuals in these towns from the collective and systematic terror of the enemy, so that average Iraqis can make the local political shift to liberty and away from the insurgency. This is being done not simply through the utilization of military force. In fact, the success on the ground in the local levels and in the provinces and in our cooperation with the tribes is built upon and hastened by this political shift among the population.

In any counterinsurgency operation, the critical element is to separate the population from the insurgency. This can be reasoned, if we look back at some of the statements of the grand guerilla warrior, Chairman Mao. When asked about how his guerilla operations and insurgencies against the nationalist Chinese would work, he said, our people will be as the fishes amongst the water of the people. What you have to do is separate the fish from the water. This is why the critical testimony I believe we heard today was that every single Iraqi, everyone in Anbar Province and elsewhere where we are seeing progress is being given the ability to make the free, conscious decision to reach for their liberty. They are not being terrorized because of the valor of our troops and the plan and the reconstruction efforts that are flowing into these areas that show they have a transactional benefit in this transformational change. And this is hastening the local political shift which I believe undergirds our chances for victory in Iraq. This is also what undergirds the good news that we had today, at least the welcome news that, because of the local shift amongst the population and the improved security that is concomitant to it, General Petraeus has proposed a reduction of 4,000 troops by the end of the year and a reduction of 40,000 troops by July.

Even if our Nation is so divided that we cannot unite in the cause of victory in Iraq, at least let us unite with the welcome news that 4,000 now and 40,000 of our fellow Americans citizens are going to be returning from harm's way to their loved ones.

□ 2100

To have individuals derive this as a token gesture is to accuse General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker of what the accusers themselves are doing, which is to play politics with the lives of our troops. We have seen, despite all evidence, despite what the military's assessment has been, repeated calls for the immediate withdrawal of the United States forces from Iraq. This would be irresponsible not only to our troops in the field but to the people of the region, especially the Iraqis themselves, who would be slaughtered.

When one decides to engage in a strategic withdrawal in the face of enemy, military experts generally concur that this is one of the most dangerous maneuvers forces in the field can attempt because your numbers are getting smaller as the enemy is becoming emboldened and encroaching ever closer to you. The wholesale withdrawal on a date certain, which is an arbitrary dictate from politicians in Washington, for those who believe that this is a proper course of action, I ask them to check into how the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan went, and they might reach another decision.

Further, to call this a token gesture not only belittles the sacrifices that our troops have made to reduce the security problems in these areas and to help get this local political shift, it also diminishes and belittles in a callous way the true joy these troops' families are going to feel when their loved ones come back.

To me that is something that is not a token. That is something that relieves the painful anxiety of every waking minute these families spend wondering if their loved one will come home. I highly doubt that the military mothers in my district or throughout America are ever going to consider any troop coming home from accomplishing their mission as being a token gesture.

Be that as it may, it is also critical that we understand, in this period of time, that ours is the latest generation duty bound to defend freedom in its hour of maximum danger. Thus we must ever remember, through this crucible of liberty, our course is tough but our cause is just.

The enemy is the sire of tyranny; we are the children of liberty. By heinously invading our Nation on September 11, 2001, and killing 3,000 innocent American souls, the enemy announced we cannot co-exist. In consequence, it is clear a world condensed by an Internet cannot endure half slave and half free. Yes, many times in the life of our free Republic, we have been called upon to face danger and to defeat it, and we have always done this and secured it by advancing a simple elemental truth that has served us well: to ensure our own liberty, we must ensure liberty to the enslaved.

Thus in this trying time, it is imperative that we demonstrate that our devotion to liberty transcends their obsession with death. And united amongst ourselves and other free people, with prudence, we can, we must, and we will, for the sake of our children and the generations of Americans yet unnamed, we will win and we will walk our path, and we will widen the cause of human freedom.

I thank you for allowing me the chance to address you.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the Policy Committee, for the insights he has shared with us tonight.

And we get those insights on a fairly regular basis here, and it is quite interesting to track the intellect of Mr. MCCOTTER and causes me to reflect upon the constitutional limitations that this Congress has, Mr. Speaker. And in spite of the bill after bill, resolution after resolution, and policy piece after policy piece that have been brought forward here by almost an average of one a week the entire 110th Congress, there are only just a few things that we have the constitutional authority to do when it comes to war, Mr. Speaker. And the first thing that Congress can do is raise an army and a navy, and that is constitutional, and by implication, an air force. It's clearly a constitutional responsibility of the Congress. And the second thing we can do is we can declare war, and that is constitutional responsibility also that is clearly defined in our Constitution. And the third thing we can do is fund the war.

But there is no provision in this Constitution for micromanaging the war. That goes outside the bounds of our constitutional authority. The management of the war and, in fact, the micromanagement of the war lies within the authority, the constitutionally invested authority, of the Commander in Chief. That is why that is drafted in the Constitution in that fashion. It gives the authority to the Commander in Chief because our Founders went through a difficult Revolutionary War period. They were the Continental Congress. They were essentially a confederacy that had gathered together because of a common cause. And the Continental Congress raised the Continental Army, and the Continental Army was an army that was driven by consensus. And they understood the difficulties in fighting a war if you had

to reach a consensus before you could move forward and make a decision.

They knew you had to have a Commander in Chief, a Commander in Chief who could evaluate all the information, gather his officers around him, gather the information, and then make a definitive directive to be able to give an order to take bold action with intelligence, with military action, both offensively and defensively. They understood that. They learned some bitter lessons during the Revolutionary War. You can't fight a war by consensus. You have got to have a Commander in Chief at the top. That's why the Constitution is drafted in the fashion it is, and that's why the Constitution prohibits us from micromanaging a war.

And yet the effort continues, an effort by this Congress, to micromanage this war that's going on. I recall the Speaker and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee sitting over there in Syria negotiating with a person whom we have declared to be a state sponsor of terrorism, and the chairman of that committee announced we have a new Democrat foreign policy. Well, I would like to think that when you pledge an oath to uphold this Constitution, you also are obligated to read it and understand it. And in that are the limitations that say to us, Congress, you can raise an army and a navy and by implication an air force and you can declare war and you can fund them, but you can't micromanage that war and you can't conduct foreign policy. Both of those things are forbidden by the Constitution. They are vested in the Commander in Chief, our chief executive officer, because we have got to speak with one voice and we have got to fight with one effort. It can't be a divided effort, and it can't be an effort to undermine our military.

I would be happy to yield to the fast-thinking, slow-talking gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me before he yields to the gentleman from New Mexico, because as I join this hour Special Order and I am hearing from my colleagues, some of the brightest minds and best speakers on our side of the aisle, I don't think I could stand to go behind all four of them. So I am happy to have the opportunity. But it's awfully tough following my colleagues of the likes of the chairman of the Policy Committee and part of our leadership.

But I wanted quickly, Mr. Speaker, to again pay tribute to General Petraeus and also Ambassador Ryan Crocker. I just want to point out, in regard to Ambassador Crocker, I was reading his bio before they testified before our two committees today, the 6½- to 7-hour testimony, physically an ordeal, but Ambassador Ryan Crocker, I think a lot of people, Mr. Speaker, don't know his bio, and I don't have time to read it all. But suffice to say that in September 2004 President Bush conferred on Ambassador Ryan Crocker the personal rank of career ambassador, career ambassador, the highest rank in the foreign service. This is the character of the man and the men that presented this report to us today.

And, basically, we cut right to the chase, and what they said is, now is not the time to quit, and give victory a chance. You can slice it and dice it any way you want to, but that is basically what they said to the 111 members of those two committees, the House Armed Services Committee, the House Committee on Foreign Relations.

And so I just want to make three points, though, Mr. Speaker, that I have thought about and that I have heard in the last couple of weeks on reasons that I have heard Members give for wanting to give up and not give victory a chance.

One of them was this business of, well, you know, it has been too great a strain and stress on our forces. We don't have enough troops back home. What if some other conflagration, war, would break out somewhere in the world in the next year, 2 years, 5 years? We don't have enough troops. We need to bring them home.

Well, Mr. Speaker, retired General Jack Keane, the Vice Chairman of the United States Army, Vice Chief of Staff, spoke to us last week as well, and he also spoke on Saturday morning on Washington Journal. I hope some of my colleagues saw that. But what General Keane said, and I agree with him so much, is, You mean to tell me that you want to accept defeat? You want to lose the war, a war of this magnitude, as the gentleman from Tennessee pointed out, and what all is at stake in regard to the Middle East in this global war on terror? You want to give up that war so that you can bring the troops home and then restock and get ready for the next potential conflict and that's a good trade-off? I don't think so.

And I want to say another thing, Mr. Speaker, that I have heard a lot of people say: We can't afford this war. We cannot afford to spend $750 billion, almost $1 trillion and counting, on this war because we need to rebuild our infrastructure in our country. We need to shore up our bridges. Obviously, that was in the news because of the tragic occurrence in Minnesota. Or we need more money for Head Start, or we need more money for K–12 education, or we need more Pell Grants, or we need to have more money for the food stamp program and the farm bill or whatever you can come up with.

Let me tell my colleagues, if you don't spend the money to protect the American people, what good do all these other things do us when you see what can happen and did 6 years ago today on 9/11 when over 3,000 were killed and the economic blow to this country was over $2 trillion? You talk about destroying some infrastructure. That's what it's all about when you let your guard down and you don't stand up and be secure in this country.

And last but not least, I have heard many say, well, you know, our troops are coming home injured and many of them are suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder or syndrome. That's where you wake up at night, having nightmares, and maybe for the rest of your life you can't get over the mental trauma that you have gone through in a time of difficult war.

Well, let me tell you something my colleagues, as a physician Member of this body. You talk about post-traumatic stress syndrome. You think a lot of them are coming back with that now? You think that that is a tragedy? Well, you just wait and see the numbers that come back with mental illness and post-traumatic stress syndrome and nightmares and a life of anxiety when they have to come back knowing that their comrades in arms have died in vain, their buddies in the foxhole have been blown to smithereens by some improvised explosive device and they have to come home a loser. And we are not going to let that happen, and I think that is what General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker were telling us today: let's give victory a chance.

With that I will say, finally, as I conclude, who wins politically? Who cares. The American people lose if we lose in Iraq. That is what is important. This is not about the next election; this is about giving victory a chance.

□ 2115

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. And I appreciate your passion and the rapidity with which you speak tonight, Mr. GINGREY.

I would be happy to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Thank you, Mr. KING. I appreciate the work that you're doing on this issue on the eve of 9/11.

It behooves us all to remember exactly what happened. It behooves us all to remember the loss of that 1 day, and like my friend from Georgia says, over $2 trillion in loss from America's asset base that day, and even worse, the 3,000 lives that were lost.

I went to Iraq on Thursday evening. We left after votes on Thursday, flew all night long, and ended up in Iraq on Saturday and Sunday. And we spent the night in Baghdad on Saturday night and Sunday visiting with the troops and visiting with Iraqis.

I was struck by the cautious optimism that General Petraeus related to us today, a very cautious optimism that the trend lines are favorable, that we're seeing some lessening of violence, and that's the sort of things that I found there from the troops in the country. I wanted to visit with our soldiers one on one. I had the opportunity to ride into Baghdad with troops who were going for the first time. I sat across from a Captain Serrano from Chicago and was able to talk to her about the 2-year-old daughter that waits at home for her. Her husband,

who is engaged in going through sheriff's training to hopefully work for the sheriff's department there. And we're asking the sacrifice of young men and women daily to be there and stand in the gap to stand between the terrorists and ourselves.

I have one of my friends who says, I hear America is at war. He said, America is not at war, America is at the mall, our military is at war. I think if we've made a mistake since 9/11, it's in failing to accept our responsibility individually, every single one of us, our responsibility to be engaged in this problem, because we are literally fighting for the future of freedom throughout the world. The terrorists who hate us hate our way of life. They hate our freedoms. They hate the films that come out from the West. They think they're corrupting their young people. They think that our society is decadent and that we're corrupting their cultures, so they simply want to annihilate us. That's the difference between a democracy or a republic and the tyrannical states of radical jihad that say that we will annihilate the West and we will annihilate America and Americans.

I remember, on this eve of 9/11, President Bush's three goals. It was very simple. He said, first of all, if you harbor a terrorist, you are a terrorist. But then he said we're going to do three things: We're going to uproot the terrorist training camps that exist throughout the Arab world. We're going to stop the training and the production of new radicals. The second thing he said is we're going to stop the funds that flow from supposedly legitimate compassionate organizations when actually they're funding terrorists. So we're going to uproot the training camps, we're going to stop the funding of terrorists, and finally, we're going to take the fight to the terrorists.

Now, there are many on the left who say that Iraq is not about the terrorists. The terrorists are coming in from Syria, they're coming in from around the world, they're coming in from Iran. This is the site where we are fighting terrorists. Now, maybe it began that way, maybe it didn't begin that way, but it's the way it is now. And if we walk away from that country, the general consensus is that Iraq will fall within days to the terrorists, to the terrorist state of Iran.

After Iraq falls, we're going to see difficulties in Egypt and Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, UAE, Qatar. And pretty soon you can see that every one of our friends in the Arab world is at risk. And there are people who ask me, well, how could those countries fall? Just remember back to 1979 when the shah of Iran was making great progress in westernizing that country, and in a matter of days was thrown from power, his whole government collapsed. We stood by, President Jimmy Carter stood by and did not lift a finger for our friends. And that's exactly how the falls will occur at this state.

The difference is that now we import over 60 percent of our oil, and most of it comes from the Middle East. If those countries fall, the terrorists have said they're going to cut the supply of oil off to the world. They will plunge the world economy into chaos. And that's how they're going to create the economic destruction of the United States and of the West.

I went to Israel earlier this year. They said if you leave Iraq, you will allow us to fall, because they saw the same scenario that I'm repeating, that all of our friends in the Middle East will fall, and then ultimately Israel says ''we will fall.'' Now, my personal belief is that Israel is our first line of defense against terrorists. They've been fighting since their inception against radical jihads in the Middle East. They are our first line of defense, and if they fall, what calamity and what terrors await for us in this country? There are many who say that it's just a fabrication, that it's not true, and yet we see the signs all around us.

As I visited with our troops in Iraq over this past weekend, I conveyed one message, that we thank you. We thank you for your service and we thank you for your sacrifice. We thank you for serving your country honorably, and we thank you for serving your country well. As the gentleman from Iowa mentioned, this is one of the messages of General Petraeus, that this may be the best military the United States has ever had.

I do not believe the terrorists can win. I do believe that there are those in this Congress and those in this country who can cause this magnificent military to fail. And if they fail, I don't know where the hope for humanity comes. I don't see any other country in the world willing to fight for freedom and to fight to resist the radical jihad that threatens us all; to fight to resist and to fight to retaliate from circumstances like 9/11/01.

So that's what we're doing today is remembering those events 6 years ago, remembering what our responses were and what our anger was on that evening as we contemplated the events of the day. Both sides, Democrat or Republican, in those days were of the same mind, that we need to get to the terrorists before they get to us. I'm not sure where we came off of the rails and where we've lost so much consensus. It's not good for the United States and it's not good for the world because we're still in a very difficult circumstance fighting a very difficult battle, one that General Petraeus today said is going to be awfully hard.

It's going to be a long struggle, and it's a struggle that will be up and down. He believes our young military men and women are sufficient to the task. I do also. So I would yield back to the gentleman from Iowa by saying thanks to our troops. I hope that we all keep them in our thoughts and prayers.

God bless you to the troops, and God bless America. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico, a veteran and a C–130 pilot himself, and now a passenger in C–130s over in Iraq, year to year picking up firsthand information, veterans, active-duty personnel, just this last weekend. That's the level of involvement that you see here on the part of a lot of Members of the United States Congress, Mr. Speaker.

One of those other individuals who has had a high level of involvement is an individual who led codel Burgess in the last weekend of July over to Iraq, a number of stops, Bayji, Balad, Baghdad and Ramadi, those places come to mind. And I very much appreciate the leadership and the initiative it took to put that together and to lead that trip over there.

I would be happy to yield all but the last 3 or 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and the notation made of the exception of the last 3 or 4 minutes, and I will do my best to accommodate that.

I get asked by a lot of people, why in the world did you make this sixth trip to Iraq in July. You knew what was going on there. What did you expect to see that was going to be different? But I knew we had today's hearing coming up. I knew it was coming down the pike at us fairly fast. I knew the news hadn't been good out of the country of Iraq for about the 10 months before July. I had been in Iraq in July of 2006, had thought there was some measure of success that was beginning to be felt then, but then we had August, September and October, pretty rough months by anyone's estimation. And so I will admit, I was significantly pessimistic when we made that trip back in July.

But I knew we were going to hear from General Petraeus today. And I knew that every time I had been to Iraq before I came away learning something that I hadn't seen on CNN or even Fox News. There was information that can only be available to you by going for yourself and looking for yourself, feeling, touching, smelling the situation on the ground.

Now, I get a lot of concern from people when I go back home in the district who say, yeah, that's all great what we're doing for Iraq, but we don't know that we care that much about the Iraqis. I will tell the citizens of this country, it is in America's best interest that we succeed. Where we cannot be successful in Iraq, and you've heard other people talk about it this evening, let's be honest, it's not a political party that loses a car, it's not a Congress that loses a war, it's not a President that loses a war, it is a country that loses a war.

And again, I reiterate, it is in America's best interests that we be successful because an Iraq that is stable, an Iraq that is able to participate in its own security, an Iraq that is able to act as an ally or partner for peace in

the Middle East, what a difference 20 years from now looks like with that scenario compared with an Iraq where we leave prematurely, descends into chaos, is enveloped by Iran, Syria, Saudi Arabia, you name it. And the chaos that has been evident in Iraq in the past suddenly envelopes the entire Middle East, with a country like Iran emerging as the victor.

Now, the surge or the reinforcements that we talked about really since January of this year, I think it's probably worthwhile to just touch on the timeline that we've been through this year. Remember, it was January 26, not that long ago, that General Petraeus was unanimously confirmed by the Senate, sent off with a pat on the back out the door, and no sooner had the door closed behind him when the Senate began sniping and criticizing his activity. He hadn't even gotten into the country yet.

Ambassador Crocker. You heard my friend from Georgia talk about the wonderful resume of Ambassador Crocker. Many of us who were here in the spring of 2003 remember Ambassador Crocker as one of those stalwarts who came at 10:30 every morning and briefed us in the Armed Services Committee room, whether we were members of the committee or not, came with General McCrystal and briefed us every morning as to what was going on on the ground in Iraq. And I was really very grateful to Ambassador Crocker for having taken the time to do that so meticulously when the active combat phase was going on.

On May 26, we finally passed the emergency funding and Bush signed it into law. Mid-July, we took a trip over to Iraq. Again, I didn't know what I was going to see. I was prepared to accept bad news if bad news was all we were going to find. But the reality was the city of Ramadi, which was absolutely off limits to me in July 2006, that's the first place we went. After we landed in Baghdad, we got on the Black Hawk helicopter and immediately went to the city of Ramadi, had a briefing by the Second Marine Expeditionary Force, had a briefing by Colonel Jacobsen there on the ground. After the briefing, instead of just shaking hands and parting ways, we went downtown. We went to the market. We walked through the market. We talked to children in the market. We saw things for sale in the market. We talked to a man who was concerned that one of our JDAMs fell on his building. And I will tell you, it doesn't do much to drive up a deal if that happens to your building.

But nevertheless, we had a very one-on-one, close-up discussion with Iraqis on the street in Ramadi. And a year ago, no one in their right mind would have taken a Member of Congress to Ramadi; it was far too dangerous.

Now, you can imagine how gratified I was. We got back. We got a call from the White House, and we were invited down to present our findings. I even tried to downplay it a little bit; well, there's some good news, but we've got to be careful because we've had nothing but bad news out of Iraq. And then a week later, two guys from the Brookings Institution, a place that I don't normally agree with, two guys from the Brookings Institution come up with an op-ed that says, this is a war we just might win.

Throughout all of that, for the last week we have seen the steady drumbeat of efforts to undermine the credibility of General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker prior to their hearing today.

Today, we did have the House hearing, tomorrow there is going to be the Senate hearing. Arguably, there was not a whole lot new that was discussed because everything had been leaked in the New York Times in the weeks leading up to the hearing. And General Petraeus did say that he expected there was a possibility he would bring one of the Marine units home before the end of September, and that there was reason to be optimistic if things continued on this course, there was reason to be optimistic that other troops could be brought home early, beginning in December, much prior to fulfilling the 15-month rotation that was originally posed to them.

□ 2130

That would be good news. I hope he is correct in that. I hope he is successful.

The data collection that went on leading up to this briefing, always for the last year you can pick data points out of the air wherever you want to make them. But the discipline to evaluate the trend lines is what is so critical. Today we saw those trend lines established and the data meticulously collected before those trend lines were established. Not all of them showed good news. But a preponderance of them show a positive effect that has happened in Iraq since our reinforcements arrived.

None of us can predict what is going to happen beyond the end of this year. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, as we sit here tonight on the eve of the anniversary of 9/11, I am terribly concerned about what might even happen tomorrow. None of us knows what tomorrow holds. Didn't we learn that lesson Monday, September 10 in 2001 when it seemed like there just wasn't much happening in the world? We have another tape from Osama bin Laden. We are told there is another one out there. What does all this mean? None of us knows for sure. But I reiterate that we are living in a very dangerous time. Now is the time for us not to show weakness and retreat from Iraq. Now is the time for us to redouble our resolve, make certain that we are successful, and for every one of us to give thanks that we have leaders like General Petraeus and Ryan Crocker to lead us in this perilous time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas. Again, I thank him for leading a codel over there. That was one of the most meaningful that I have been on. I picked up a lot in watching the observations of my colleagues and listening to their questions, as well. It is fresh information and helped fill in a lot of the blanks we might have had going into this hearing that we had today.

I would, again, be happy to recognize the chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee, Mr. THADDEUS MCCOTTER, for the balance of the time this evening.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Thank you. The gentleman from New Mexico, the good doctor from Texas and other speakers have touched upon a fundamental point. I wish to stress what General Petraeus said in terms of what an American victory would look like and then ask a question of those who would support an immediate withdrawal.

In his own letter to the troops, General Petraeus said that what we need is for the Iraqis to become solely responsible for their own security. That means a very small footprint, if at all, of the United States in Iraq militarily. Secondly, it will depend upon the local reconstruction, reconciliation, and security of the average Iraqi which will then drive the national reconciliation. Between those two pillars of local reconciliation and security will come a stable and free Iraq that no longer creates terrorists, but captures them instead.

But as we are the children of liberty, as we are a Nation that proudly proclaims it is conceived in liberty, that since every human being has an unalienable, God-given right to breathe free, to have the right to pursue life, liberty and happiness, I ask my fellow Americans who support the immediate withdrawal this: If we betray our fundamental commitment to liberty to the people of Iraq and watch them be slaughtered in the sands, what will we ever be able to offer them again to turn them from the enemy and towards us? If we betray our own profession of the desire to liberate them, to let them share in their God-given rights the same way we have, we will be ideologically disarmed in the war for freedom.

I assure you we will rue the day that we betrayed not only them but the inherited legacy that we have received from the greatest generations of Americans who preceded us and allowed us to live in the majestic America that we know today.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. He poses a question that is a difficult one for those who want to withdraw from this operation, the simple cut-and-run version, to answer. It is left for those to answer, Mr. Speaker.

I would point out also that yesterday I did a memorial dedication at Charter Oak, Iowa, for all of the military personnel that have come from that area since the beginning of the conflicts, since that area was settled. It starts with the Mexican-American War, goes to the Civil War and on up to today.

They placed out in the field there by the memorial 4,200 flags representing the lives of the Americans that have been sacrificed in this global war on terror in this quest for freedom. It also represents 50 million people that live free today that didn't at the beginning of this global war on terror.

I looked back at the dedication and the sacrifice of all of them, and I added to that dedication another sacrifice, a sacrifice that we hear very little of, and that is those over-5,000 Americans who gave their lives during a time of peace during the period between Desert Storm and the beginning of this global war on terror, 510 a year, Mr. Speaker.

I thank you for being recognized. I thank all the speakers here tonight that have spoken up for freedom.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BOYD (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today, the balance of the week, and the week of September 17 on account of official business.

Ms. ESHOO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. LYNCH (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. PLATTS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of an official delegation trip to visit American military and civilian personnel in Central Asia and the Persian Gulf, as well as humanitarian efforts in Africa.

Mr. SESSIONS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. WESTMORELAND (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of official business.

Mr. BONNER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

Mr. EVERETT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of official business.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of official business.

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. PAYNE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

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

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, September 17.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, September 17.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 11, 2007, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3233. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Witchweed Quarantine Regulations; Regulated Areas in North Carolina and South Carolina [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0170] received August 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3234. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibition of the Use of Specified Risk Materials for Human Food and Requirements for the Disposition of Non-Ambulatory Disabled Cattle; Prohibition of the Use of Certain Stunning Devices Used To Immobilize Cattle During Slaughter [Docket No. 03-025F] (RIN: 0583-AC88) received August 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3235. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Designation of the State of New Mexico Under the Federal Meat Inspection Act and Poultry Products Inspection Act [Docket No. FSIS-2007-0023] (RIN: 0583-AD29) received August 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3236. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Selenium Yeast [Docket No. 1998F-0196] received August 8, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3237. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Residues of Quaternary Ammonium Compounds di-n-Alkyl (C8-10) dimethyl Ammonium chloride, Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0572; FRL-8146-7] received September 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3238. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on U.S. military personnel and U.S. individual civilians retained as contractors involved in supporting Plan Colombia, pursuant to Public Law 106-246, section 3204 (f) (114 Stat. 577); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3239. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Kentucky: Volatile Organic Compound Definition Updates [EPA-R04-OAR-2006-0650-200705(a); FRL-8464-2] received September 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3240. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans North Carolina: Mecklenburg County Regulations [EPA-R04-OAR-2005-NC-0004-200704(a); FRL-8465-4] received September 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3241. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Hampshire; Revised Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Nashua [EPA-R01-OAR-2007-0497; A-1-FRL-8463-6] received September 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3242. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment, Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Ohio; Correction [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0046; FRL-8464-3] received September 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3243. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Update of Continuous Instrumental Test Methods: Technical Amendments [EPA-HQ-OAR-2002-0071; FRL-8448-9] (RIN: 2060-A009) received September 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3244. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Service Rules for the 698-806 MHz Band and Public Safety Spectrum Requirements [WT Docket No. 06-150 CC Docket No. 94-102 WT Docket No. 01-309 WT Docket No. 03-264 WT Docket No. 06-169 PS Docket No. 06-229 WT Docket No. 96-86 WT Docket No. 07-166] received September 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3245. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Telecommunications Services Inside Wiring Customer Premises Equipment Implementation of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992: Cable Home Wiring Clarification of the Commission's Rules and Policies Regarding Unbundled Access to Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers' Inside Wire Subloop [CS Docket No. 95-184 MM Docket No. 92-260 WC Docket No. 01-338] received September 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3246. A letter from the Chief, Policy Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matters of Review of the Emergency Alert System; Independent Spanish Broadcasters Association, the Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ, Inc.,