

appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### 34TH YEAR SINCE THE INVASION AND OCCUPATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 34th year since the invasion and occupation of the Republic of Cyprus. Since 1974, Turkish military forces have illegally occupied the northern part of the island republic. The Turkish occupation forcibly divides peaceful communities and deprives a sovereign nation the exercise of democratic independence in all of its territory.

The Turkish invasion divided Greek-speaking and Turkish-speaking Cypriots into two physically distinct communities for the first time in the island nation's history. The unlawful occupation of 37 percent of the territory of Cyprus continues unabated to this day. There are currently 43,000 Turkish troops garrisoned in the occupied areas, and Turkey has resettled over 100,000 mainland Turkish citizens into those areas.

The continued Turkish occupation of the island republic subverts the indigenous effort to establish a democratically free and culturally unique Cypriot nation. All that stands in the way of Cypriots celebrating their unique and diverse national heritage within the expanded borders of the European Union is the presence of the Turkish occupation forces.

Today, thousands of Cypriots continue to be refugees in their own land, blocked from the homes and the communities they inhabited for generations. Some have been marooned in tiny enclaves trapped by the occupation forces, cut off from the outside world and basic human rights. A new generation of Cypriots has inherited the terrible displacement that military occupation brings.

In the face of all this, the Republic of Cypress has struggled and succeeded in building a strong society, one whose economic progress, development of democratic institutions and capable governance led to membership in the European Union in May 2004. Sadly, until there is an end to the occupation, the occupied areas of Cyprus will be denied the full benefits of EU membership.

For the United States, there is a clear imperative to resolve the situation in Cyprus as a matter of justice and the rule of law, principles we hold dear. But beyond that, achieving reunification of the island is critical to the strategic interests of the United States. The Cyprus problem pits American allies against one another. The strategic interest in facilitating a negotiated settlement is significant for the region, but also for the world. Cy-

prus can either fester as a potential flash point or become a starting point for reconciliation.

Reconciliation talks are now underway between the leadership of the two Cypriot communities. The opportunity for reconciliation is real. Since Cyprus' entry to the EU, many checkpoints along the infamous green-line have been opened. After nearly 30 years of complete separation, there have been more than 13 million bi-communal crossings without any serious incident.

Everyday Cypriots of the Turkish-speaking community cross into the free areas of the Republic of Cyprus to go to work. Indeed, nearly 3 percent of the Turkish-speaking Cypriot community is employed in the free areas of the Republic of Cyprus, and more than 35,000 have applied for and received passports from the Republic of Cyprus.

The Cypriot people want an end to the division of their island. Their efforts to negotiate reconciliation through the good offices of the United Nations must be free of Turkish interference. It is no secret that successive Turkish governments and, in particular, the Turkish military, use Cyprus as a shibboleth to rouse extremist and nationalist sentiment to enhance their own domestic standing.

We, in the House of Representatives, should heed the political storm engulfing Turkey. Today, in Turkey democratic expression is challenged at every turn. Today, in Turkey religious and ethnic minorities live in a state of credible fear and harm of persecution. Today and for more than 80 years, the Turkish military holds itself out as the primary political actor existing beyond the bounds of democratic accountability.

Mr. Speaker, the United States should not yield to violations of human rights and the rule of law by the government of Turkey or the Turkish military. The United States, and its allies, particularly the European Union, must stand in solidarity with all Cypriots and support their commendable efforts to reconcile their differences and establish a bi-communal, bi-zonal federation.

With the support of this body, it should be made clear to Turkey that perpetuating the status quo on Cyprus hurts its relations with the United States and the rest of the world. Worst of all, it forecloses Turkey's prospects for accession to the European Union.

I ask my colleagues to support the reconciliation efforts now underway, and demand from our Turkish ally that it refrain from interfering in the reconciliation efforts now underway. With a truly concerted effort by this body, next year we will commend the Cypriots on their courageous reconciliation, instead of observing the 35th year of Turkish military occupation.

#### THE 73 PERCENT MAJORITY, A PLAN FOR INDEPENDENCE

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, in our country, Americans debate, argue and discuss all types of issues. And because of the type of people we are, we seldom agree on everything. Almost any issue you bring before the American public, it is evenly split on most issues, about 50/50, sometimes a little more than others.

But today, 73 percent of all Americans believe we ought to drill offshore. That is a phenomenal number. 73 percent of Americans don't really agree on hardly anything, but they agree on drilling offshore because the American public gets it. They understand we need more crude oil, Mr. Speaker. And the only way we can get gasoline is from crude oil. And the offshore drilling ban by the President has been lifted.

The only thing standing between us and energy independence offshore is Congress. Congress has handcuffed the American public's will to drill offshore.

This map shows where we drill currently, Mr. Speaker. The section down here in the Southeast, where the blue markers are, now, I represent part of the State of Texas, and proud to do so. But we only drill in this country off the shore of Texas, Louisiana, parts of Mississippi, and parts of Alabama.

But yet, you see all of this red section, off of our shores, and in all of those areas there are places where there is crude oil on the bottom of the ocean. But yet, Congress won't let us drill there. There are a lot of reasons for that. They are all political, and they are all nonsense because there is oil out there.

Seventy-three percent of the American public say we ought to drill. We need help. Gasoline prices are too high. We can't afford to go to work. And even in California, 53 percent of the people who live on the West Coast in California say, for the first time in recent memory, that we ought to drill off that coast as well because there is crude oil out there in the Pacific. But because of political reasons and reasons that really don't make much sense we are not taking care of ourselves.

One argument is that we can't drill safely, that those oil rigs out there in the Gulf of Mexico and off the east and west coast will cause environmental damage because there will be pollution from that crude oil that would seep from those oil rigs. That is not correct, Mr. Speaker.

Give you the best example. In 2005, two hurricanes came blasting through my congressional district in Southeast Texas. Their names were Katrina and Rita. They came from Louisiana and Texas. Hundreds of offshore rigs in this area where we do drill were damaged or completely destroyed. But yet, we didn't hear 1 word about those rigs causing pollution from crude oil seepage from the bottom of the Gulf of Mexico, and the reason was it didn't

happen. Those massive valves that sit on the bottom of the Gulf of Mexico called Christmas trees, that are made in Houston, Texas, by the way, they shut down. That crude oil was not allowed to escape and there was no environmental damage.

But still we hear this hue and cry. We can't drill safely. There is pollution. Crude oil will pollute our shores. Let's look at some facts instead of hysteria.

Pollution from crude oil. Here is where it comes from off our shores. Mother Nature is the biggest culprit. 63 percent of the pollution of crude oil that comes a shore is from Mother Nature.

The second is boating, 32 percent. Tankers cause 3 percent. And if you look at that little bitty line over there on the end, Mr. Speaker, 2 percent comes from offshore drilling. Mother Nature is the culprit, not offshore drilling. We can drill offshore safely.

We need to take care of ourselves. If we allow the opening of the Outer Continental Shelf, two good things will happen. Those oil companies will have to pay a lot of money for the right to drill offshore. That brings revenue into the Federal Treasury, to the taxpayers. And we ought to let States that do allow offshore drilling, no matter which State it is, get a portion of that offshore lease revenue, and let them use it in their states for whatever they wish, like education, transportation, health care, whatever they wish.

Secondly, thousands, literally thousands of high-paying jobs will be created if we allow offshore drilling, plus we will have the crude oil, then the gasoline and be able to reduce the price. That is not the only answer, offshore drilling, but it is one of the answers.

And we are not doing anything. Like my grandfather used to say, when all is said and done, more is said than done. And we haven't done anything this week. We could be 1 week up on offshore drilling if we just took the handcuffs off of America and allowed offshore drilling.

\$425 million dollars a day goes to Saudi Arabia from the American taxpayers to buy crude oil. \$425 million. That money needs to stay home. We need to take care of ourselves.

And that's just the way it is.

#### SETTING A FIRM TIMETABLE FOR IRAQ REDEPLOYMENT

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, support is growing, finally, for setting a timetable for the responsible redeployment of American troops and military contractors from Iraq. Iraqi Prime Minister Maliki supports a timetable. A majority of the Iraqi Parliament supports a timetable. Both Houses of Congress have voted for a timetable. There

is growing evidence that the majority of the Iraqi people support a timetable. And the American people certainly support a timetable.

Even the administration, which has spent more than 5 years turning a deaf ear to the American people, can finally hear the steady drumbeat of support for a timetable. Last week the administration agreed to what it called a general time horizon for meeting aspirational goals in Iraq. This kind of statement is actually better than "stay the course," which we have heard like a broken record from the White House for years. And it represents a victory for those who have been demanding a new direction in Iraq.

But the administration's position still falls far short of what is needed. A general time horizon for meeting aspirational goals is far too vague. When would the time horizon be reached? Nobody knows.

What is an aspirational goal? Nobody knows.

I believe the fuzzy wording is deliberate. It is obvious that the administration wanted to say something that sounds like a withdrawal but isn't a withdrawal. The loopholes in the administration's position are big enough to drive a truck through. I am afraid that a general time horizon for meeting aspirational goals may just be another way of saying "permanent occupation."

Mr. Speaker, we need clarity in our policy. We need to set a firm timetable for redeployment and a firm date for complete redeployment. These dates should be set in a way that ensures the safety of our troops and guarantees that the redeployment will be orderly and responsible. And we need a clear statement that there will be no permanent U.S. bases in Iraq.

A firm timetable for redeployment will accomplish many important goals. It will return full sovereignty to the Iraqi people. It will give the Iraqis incentives to step up the pace for political reconciliation. It will hasten the day that the Iraqis are capable of taking full responsibility for their own security. It will take an enormous strain off our own military, which has been stretched to the breaking point by the occupation of Iraq. It will relieve the strain on our overburdened military families. It will help to stabilize the Middle East, and help the United States to be a more effective broker in peace talks between the Israelis and Palestinians.

□ 2000

It will allow us to focus on a solution for Afghanistan, a solution that can win the hearts and minds of the Afghan people. It will allow us to take billions of dollars that are being spent on the Iraq occupation and use that money instead for domestic needs and to help the American people deal with current hard times.

It will open the door for regional and for international partners to come into

Iraq and to help with the reconstruction of that shattered nation. It will restore America's moral leadership in the world, and it will make us a more credible leader in the fight against terrorism. It will send a signal to the rest of the world that America is ready to be America again. That means a nation which respects the rule of law, that has compassion of the people of the world and that prefers peace over war.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's time horizon isn't enough. After more than 5 years of occupation, the only thing that should be on the horizon is a firm timetable for redeployment. That's what the American people and the Iraqi people want.

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

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

#### OIL EXPLORATION AND PRODUCTION IN AMERICA

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the Third Congressional District of California. It is in the Greater Sacramento area. I live in a wonderful community called Gold River along the American River, near the site of the finding of gold in the 1800s, which began the great gold rush in California.

When I was home in my district over the last several weekends, I had an opportunity to speak to a number of people in that district, and the issue that they were most concerned about was that of energy.

This is of some interest to me, not only because of the legitimate concerns of the people of my district—the problems that are besetting them as a result of the higher and higher prices of energy, particularly with respect to gasoline, the embedded transportation costs and many other things, such as food—but because, before I moved to that area some now 20 years ago, I for most of my life lived in Long Beach, California, and I'd had the privilege of representing that area and the adjoining areas for 10 years in this Congress during my first tenure here. Although I was not involved in the energy industry nor were my parents nor were other members of my family, I did go to school with a number of people who were either involved or whose parents were involved in that industry.

The community of Signal Hill is completely surrounded by my hometown of Long Beach—Signal Hill, one of the longest producing oil fields in the United States. As I grew up, I saw