Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her yielding and

for her work on the issue and thank the majority party for their work.

We're involved in a very serious discussion here.

I was in the Air Force in 1970, in Reese Air Force Base in Texas in

pilot training, and the Shah of Iran's son was in the class right

behind me. I didn't know much about the Shah of Iran, coming from

Hobbs, New Mexico, but we began to watch and began to visualize as he

left training, and those Iranians who were in the training class with

me left and went back home to Iran, what their life was like flying

jets in the Middle East. And then in 1979, the Shah was suddenly out of

power, just like that. The ayatollah came to power and instituted a

tremendous repressive regime that continues to this day.

Now, the question that our friends on the other side of the aisle

fail to ask is what is their plan to see that our friends in the Middle

East have stability because, in fact, they're balancing the terrorists

in their own countries every day. They're balancing them using our

force and our will and our promise to help.

So what do our friends in Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Kuwait, Qatar, UAE,

what do they do? When I went to Israel earlier this year, Israel simply

said they fall. If you leave Iraq, those nations fall.

Now, it's an uncomfortable truth, but somehow we're not going to talk

about some uncomfortable truth these days. It's an uncomfortable truth

that the entire Middle East is facing a problem of stability. If the

entire Middle East faces a problem with stability, the entire world has

a problem of stability because, if the Middle East exports about 25 to

30 percent of the world's oil, which it does, then the world oil market

becomes destabilized, the world economy becomes destabilized, and in

the end, the terrorists win because they have destabilized the world

rather than defeat any of the forces in the world. That's been their

long-term plan, to export instability, and they have been doing a very

good job of it.

Now, the President after 9/11 said we're going to fight a war on

terror that simply does three things: we're going to take away the

training camps, we're going to choke off their funding, and we're going

to take the fight to them. Now, you can agree or disagree that Iraq is

a place of combat with the terrorists, but it looks like to me that the

terrorists from all over the world are coming in there. Iran is

providing terrorists and weapons, Syria, other nations; and so whether

or not it appears that the war is there, our soldiers believe that

they're actually fighting al Qaeda.

So the President's plan has definitely uprooted the training camps.

We've begun to squeeze off the funding to the al Qaeda troops, to the

terrorists worldwide, and we have taken the fight to them. But now

then, when we retreat, when we come home, the question that has failed

to be asked by our friends who have this resolution calling our troops

home, it fails to ask what do we do for world stability at that point.

It is a serious omission. It's not accidental.

I appreciate the gentlelady for yielding.

I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are told today that it's time to refocus on the war

on terror. Yet as I read this bill, and I would encourage each one of

you to go online and read H.R. 2956, I see no refocus on the war on

terror.

I see nothing in H.R. 2956 which describes the threat from radical

jihad. I see no plan.

We are told that we need to communicate with the White House, that we

need to send a bold message to the President. I am sorry, he's right

down the street. It's the people who are causing terror, worldwide

terror, that the communication needs to be sent to.

Now, I can't tell you exactly what our troops are feeling as we

debate these measures.

I can tell you that I was in Vietnam flying missions in Vietnam at

the time that Jane Fonda gave aid and comfort to our enemy, and a time

that this Congress was withdrawing support from that war. And I can

tell you what soldiers at that time felt. They felt dismay. They felt

betrayal. They felt like we had been led down a path.

If this were really an attempt by our majority party to deal with the

situation that they are concerned about, it should have an immediate

withdrawal date. But it lacks that because it's a political tool rather

than an attempt to refocus on the war on terror.

I can tell you that it does not ask key questions, key questions

like, how will unilateral withdrawal prevent al Qaeda, Hezbollah and

other terrorist operatives already in Iraq from establishing robust

training facilities from which to plan and execute additional strikes

against the United States?

It fails to answer the question that both Israel and Jordan have

asked when they said that unilateral withdrawal, much like the

Democrats' plan, would have a devastating consequence on their

countries and the region as a whole.

What impact will our unilateral withdrawal from Iraq have on the

safety of regional allies, such as Israel, Jordan, Saudi Arabia,

Kuwait? Those questions go unasked and unaddressed in H.R. 2956,

because this is not a plan to refocus the war on terror. This is a plan

to withdraw and hope that we can retreat home without anyone following

us.

It just won't happen that way. The terrorists will come with us as we

retreat.

I urge defeat of H.R. 2956.