

be determined by politics and not force. The formation of a permanent Iraqi government—one that will have the power, legitimacy and vision to assume primary responsibility for securing and governing the country—is a necessary precondition to ending the insurgency, preventing a civil war and allowing large-scale reconstruction to begin.

Consequently, our role in Iraq must become more political and less military; for if there is one thing that Iraqis of every ethnic, religious and political stripe can agree on, it is that they do not want foreign troops in their country indefinitely.

I support a responsible redeployment of our troops during the course of 2006 so that we are not drawn into sectarian conflict and so that Iraqis are forced to take primary responsibility for securing and governing their country. While the process of training Iraqi security forces has gone more slowly than many had hoped, recent reports have indicated that we are making progress and that every week more Iraqi units are capable of taking a greater role in combating the insurgency.

A responsible redeployment of American and coalition forces will have to be done in stages to build greater Iraqi sovereignty and control over security, not civil war. In the first phase of the redeployment, our forces should be gradually withdrawn from insecure urban centers and moved to smaller cities where reconstruction is supported by the local population, and to remote bases where our troops will be able to support Iraqi units if necessary. Over time, these troops will be withdrawn from Iraq altogether and redeployed outside the country, either in the region or back to the United States. We should publicly declare that the United States does not seek to maintain a permanent military presence in Iraq and I have co-sponsored legislation to prevent the establishment of permanent bases, which can only serve as a catalyst for the insurgency and for foreign jihadis.

Devising and implementing a successful endgame in Iraq will be difficult, but an open-ended commitment to remain in the country is untenable and unwise. The American people want Iraq to succeed, and for a representative government there to survive and lead to a better future for the Iraqi people. But it will ultimately be the Iraqi people who must decide whether they wish to live together in peace as one country or continue to murder each other in large numbers. We cannot decide that for them.

In the fight against the malicious Al Qaeda in Iraq, foreign jihadis bent on destroying a government chosen by the Iraqi people, we are in solidarity with the Iraqi people who want a better life for their children. But we will not stand as a shield between different Iraqi sects bent on killing each other. The new Iraqi prime minister and leadership have the next thirty days to form a strong unity government. We hope that they will be successful in this task. But our hopes in Iraq have too often led to disappointment, and the Iraqi leaders must understand that the patience of the American people is running out.

TRIBUTE TO AIR FORCE TECHNICAL SERGEANT WALTER MOSS, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay tribute to a native Houstonian, Walter Moss, Jr., who voluntarily served our Nation in Iraq and who died doing so. He was assigned to the 366th Civil Engineer Squadron, Explosive Ordnance Disposal, or the EOD, Flight as a noncommissioned officer in charge of the EOD Resources Element, Mountain Home Air Force Base in Idaho.

On March 29, 2006, Tech Sergeant Moss became the 200th Texas member of the Armed Forces killed in Iraq. Mr. Speaker, Texans are only 7 percent of the United States population, but make up 10 percent of the volunteers in Iraq and Afghanistan. Further, almost 9 percent of the military deaths in Iraq are Texans.

Additionally, Moss was the first airman from Sather Air Force Base in Iraq to be killed in action during Operation Iraqi Freedom. He was 37 years old. In his long military career, he specialized in the dangerous job of detection and removal of explosive devices.

□ 1945

He was killed while trying to defuse a makeshift bomb while conducting operations near Baghdad. The terrorists in Iraq use the improvised explosive devices, or IEDs, as a cowardly way of murdering Iraqi women, children, civilians and Americans. The terrorist use of IEDs is one of the most dangerous threats to our troops in uniform in Iraq.

Technical Sergeant Moss was the first line of defense between IEDs and his fellow military comrades. Since being deployed to Iraq in January, Sergeant Moss had responded to more than 200 calls. Those 200 calls meant that Moss had perhaps saved the life of an American or Iraqi civilian.

Born in Houston, Texas, Moss attended Aldine High School. He joined the Air Force upon graduation from Aldine and soon married his high school sweetheart Georgina.

From the beginning of his military career, Moss stood out as a leader. His motivation earned him a coveted spot assisting the United States Secret Service. During his 16-year military career, he guarded the likes of former President George H. Bush and the First Lady.

While stationed in Guam, he disposed of 12,500 pounds of hazardous World War II munitions and supported the Secret Service again in protecting Hillary Clinton. In 1997, he and his family were stationed at the 31st CE Squadron, Aviano Air Force Base, Italy. He was handpicked from his unit to provide EOD support during the Middle East peace talks where he ensured then-Secretary of State Madeleine Albright's safety.

Moss had two children, Andrew, 13, and Veronica, 9. A military traveling family, they had already lived with their father in Guam, Italy and Turkey.

Technical Sergeant Moss was deployed in support of Operations Southern Watch, Allied Force, Desert Strike, Northern Watch and Iraqi Freedom. He was awarded the Meritorious Service Medal, the Air Force Commendation Medal with three oak leaf clusters, and the Air Force Achievement Medal with one oak leaf cluster.

Even though he was in the Air Force, the Navy and Marines honored him with the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, and he will be awarded the Bronze Star with Valor and the Purple Heart.

I attended Technical Sergeant Moss' funeral in Spring, Texas, and I talked to his father Walter Moss, Sr. Walter told me he was proud of his son, proud of the life he chose, and proud of the country he served. At the funeral there were a great number of Air Force personnel, strangers, citizens, family, and even a motorcycle group carrying large American flags.

I would like to extend my prayers and condolences to his father Walter, his mother Rebecca York, his brother Brian, his relatives and friends in Idaho and Texas, his wife Georgina, and his children Andrew and Veronica. He died as he lived: Protecting Americans.

Our hearts are filled with gratitude for the brave airmen such as Technical Sergeant Walter Moss. He sought out danger so others would not face danger. He was a father, a husband and a brother. His unyielding courage was an inspiration to his fellow airmen and his family. He was an American patriot, and he was a cut above the rest of us.

And that's just the way it is.

#### URGING ACTION ON THE ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, everyone is talking about gas prices. This morning President Bush presented the Nation with, he said, a "plan to lower gas prices."

A little over a year ago on June 6, 2005, energy was \$2.09. I use that date because that was the date that the President of the United States signed his energy bill that he hailed would be a great improvement for energy and energy prices here in America. \$2.09. Today in Chicago it stands on average a little over \$3 in the Chicago area. Over a little less than a year ago when the President signed his energy bill, the one that this Congress delivered to him, energy was \$2.09 a gallon. Today in Chicago gas is \$3.32 a gallon.

In the year in which we debated the energy bill, the oil and gas interests spent \$86 million lobbying this Congress and got \$14.5 billion in taxpayer subsidies. They spent \$86 million lobbying the House of the American people, and they got a \$14.5 billion gift.

You cannot get that type of return on Wall Street. That was about a 10 percent return. You cannot get a return like that on any other investment where you give \$86 million to influence the people's House and get \$14.5 billion of hard-earned taxpayer money, and energy is trading at \$75 a barrel.

I understand if you want to help the oil and gas companies at \$17 a barrel, \$25 a barrel to help them drill for energy. At \$75 a barrel, I would expect Exxon and Mobil and Chevron and Phillips, all who are making not just good money, historic record prices, would actually be able to go on their own and drill without the taxpayers having to pay for it.

So not only are we paying a record amount of \$3.50 a gallon, not only are they making record profits, but at \$75 a barrel, the taxpayers are paying them \$14.5 billion. So the American consumer pays more at the pump, and they pay more on April 15 because of what this Congress did. Over the last year, in less than 1 year, energy went from \$2.09 to \$3.30, but that is only one example.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMANUEL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that we are drilling for oil in Texas, California, Oklahoma, and Nebraska. How did the gentleman vote when we wanted to drill in the ANWR, which is 3.5 times the size of Texas? We could have gotten almost 2 million barrels of oil a day, and it would have helped these prices.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I voted against that; and I vote against giving them \$14.5 billion because I do not believe there is a worse example of corporate welfare, only to be followed by the prescription drug bill and the corporate tax bill that was a \$5 billion problem. You all handed out \$145 billion to corporate interests. Only in Washington do you try to resolve a \$5 billion problem that cost you \$145 billion, and it still did not resolve the original \$5 billion problem.

I bring this all up for one simple point: For the last 5 years, this is supposed to be the people's House, and when that gavel comes down, it is supposed to open the people's House, not the auction house. And from the prescription drug legislation to the energy legislation to the corporate tax bill, you have sold off America's interests. Billions of dollars have been spent lobbying the people's House, and it shows when you go from product to product, from line to line. That is what has happened here.

Now all of a sudden everybody is worried about how we are going to deal with the energy problem. When you had an energy bill, you hailed it as a great victory for the American people. Since that time energy has gone up more than a buck a gallon at the pump.

But that is also an example of what has happened with the corporate tax

bill and the pharmaceutical bill. People have used their influence. I do not bemoan what the energy companies have done. I do not bemoan what the pharmaceutical companies have done. I do not bemoan what the HMO industry has done. I do not bemoan what corporate interests have done to influence this Congress. What I bemoan is what the Congress has done for that money and what they have done to the American people's interests. And what is happening here, because now this week I think it is ironic we are all talking about energy, this Congress is going to bring up a lobbying bill. That piece of legislation has become the incredible shrinking legislation. It does nothing. The Washington Post called it "a watered down sham. Simply a joke."

USA Today writes, "Congress still doesn't get it. After more than a year of negative headlines about political corruption and money-soaked alliances with lobbyists, House leaders are weakening their already anemic excuse for reform."

It doesn't deal with an independent Office of Public Integrity. It does not ban gifts from lobbyists. It does not close the revolving door for Members who leave here. It does not deal with disclosure of lobbyists' solicitation of campaign checks.

The lobbying legislation we are dealing with is exactly the energy legislation we dealt with. The two are the same pieces of legislation. Those who have given and they are giving their checks because all that is left on K Street is checks. There are no checks and balances left in this system.

---

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5020, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

Mr. PUTNAM, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-438) on the resolution (H. Res. 774) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5020) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

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

---

#### THE SITUATION IN IRAQ

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, with mounting sectarian tensions and unabated insurgent violence, I rise today to discuss the deeply troubling situation in Iraq and its implications for the national interests of the United States.

Sometimes it is harder to know how to end a war than to start one. Just as it is important to think through the "why" of committing troops to a conflict, we must also think through the "why" of ending an engagement. Timing is a key element of both considerations.

Perspective is always difficult to bring to bear on events of the day. Developments of this week, however, could provide Washington with a seminal opportunity to stimulate a rethinking about the philosophical basis for a war that we initiated, with the goal of assessing how a great power can and should disengage.

Many people have noted analogies between America's involvement in Vietnam and the U.S. intervention in Iraq. My sense is that a number of these analogies are quite frail. But the one I am most concerned about relates to America's extraordinary difficulty in disengaging from Vietnam.

A key problem for Washington in trying to wind down its commitment in Vietnam was how to develop a mutual accommodation with the other side that would lessen the prideful pitfalls that often occur when political figures are forced to reassess policies. In the end it was the Paris Peace Accord which facilitated the withdrawal of American troops.

A negotiating avenue in a third-country capital does not appear to lend itself to a resolution of the Iraqi situation at this time. Nonetheless, I find it remarkable that in an autobiographical tome Henry Kissinger wrote that in December 1968, shortly after Richard Nixon had asked him to be his National Security Council Director, he met with the President-elect to discuss the direction of the new administration's foreign policy. They determined together, he noted, that their policy would be to get out of Vietnam.

After reading this passage I asked him years later at a Library of Congress symposium why they did not just proceed to do that. Kissinger looked at me for a moment and then uttered words I will never forget. "Young man," he said, "we meant with honor."

I then asked him if honor required escalation. "Absolutely," he responded.

In the Iraq circumstance, the executive branch has provided three broad rationales for American intervention. First, it hinted that there was an Iraqi connection to the attacks on 9/11. Then