

months. The instability could also spread to Saudi Arabia's Eastern Province, which is traditionally Shiite but dominated since 1913 by the anti-Shiite Wahhabis.

If the petroleum production of Iraq, Iran and Saudi Arabia was put offline by a vast regional conflict that involved substantial terrorism and sabotage, the price of oil would skyrocket. Only 80 million barrels of petroleum are typically produced daily in the world. Much of that is consumed by the producing country. What is special about the countries of the Gulf is that they have relatively small populations and little industry, and therefore export a great deal of their petroleum. Saudi Arabia produces 9 million barrels a day, and can do 11 in a pinch. Iran produces 4 million. Iraq could produce 3 million on a good day without sabotage. If nearly 20 percent of the world's petroleum supply became unavailable, and given ever increasing demand in China and India and political instability in Venezuela and Nigeria, the price could rise so high that it would throw the world into a Second Great Depression.

The old dream of James Schlesinger and Henry Kissinger that the United States could in such an emergency simply occupy and secure the Saudi oil fields has been shown to be a dangerous fantasy. Petroleum is produced in a human security environment. Where the political structures are felt by a substantial portion of the population to be illegitimate, they can and will simply sabotage the petroleum pipelines and refineries.

The US cannot risk this scenario, which while a little unlikely, is entirely possible as a consequence of its withdrawal from an Iraq that it radically destabilized.

The United Nations force put into Iraq should be a peace-enforcing, not a peace-keeping, force. That is, its rules of engagement should allow robust military operations to prevent the parties from massacring one another, and UN troops should always be permitted to defend themselves resolutely if attacked. Further, the United States should lend the United Nations forces close air support upon their request.

Moreover, the UN must at the same time enter into serious negotiations with the warring parties (Kurds, Shiites, Sunni Arabs) to seek a political settlement.

Satish Nambiar writes: "It is a matter of record that it is not possible to have successful peacekeeping without a determined and successful peace process. Peacekeeping and peacebuilding activities are not self-sustainable, they have to be nurtured by a process of negotiations, or peacemaking, during which the parties to the conflict are made to redefine their interests and develop a commitment to a political settlement. The fact that most successful missions in the last decade, or even the partially successful ones—Namibia, El Salvador, Cambodia and Mozambique—were the result of years of negotiations, in which many third-party international actors, including the USA, participated, is no accident. Although the wars in these areas went on for a long time, they illustrate that it is better to take the time to get the details of a settlement right, than to initiate a peacekeeping process that is flawed in its concept and content, as so glaringly made apparent in the inadequately planned and prepared United Nations deployment in the former Yugoslavia and Somalia. It takes firm political resolve and unified concerted action from outside actors to make the parties to the conflict come to terms with one another, and work towards a negotiated settlement."

All Iraqis would see the United Nations as having more legitimacy than the United States. The UN would be much more likely to be able to negotiate a settlement among

the Sunnis and Shiites than is the US. And, the world has more troops than the US does. (The Europeans are over-stretched, so the force would mainly come from the global South. Iraq does not want neighbors involved, so South and Southeast Asia seem likely providers of troops.)

Would the Iraqi government accept a United Nations military mission? Almost certainly. Grand Ayatollah Ali Sistani has often attempted to involve the UN, and would welcome such a development. The Sunni Arabs would also much prefer to deal with the UN than with the US.

Would the United Nations be willing to take it on? It would be a very hard sell. But remember that if the members of the military mission succeeded, they would have gained enormous good will from the Iraqi government, which would soon be able to pump 5 million barrels of petroleum a day. That is, participation could be worth billions in future contracts. The US could also provide substantial incentives. For countries like Pakistan, India, and Malaysia, such benefits could prove decisive.

Would the Americans be willing to cede Iraq to the blue helmets? It is not impossible. US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld appears to want to draw down US troop strength in Iraq on a fairly short timetable, and even he must realize the need for a replacement. Of course, the Bush administration may well resist this move right to the end. But that makes this plan an ideal platform for the Democratic Party in 2006 and 2008. Instead of Kerry's vague multilateralism, let us specify an UNTAC-like mission for the UN. The entire world depends on Gulf petroleum; the entire world should step up to ensure security for Iraq and the region. The US will continue to have to bear a significant share of the costs, but these would become bearable if several allies shared them.

As recently as the 1950s, President Dwight Eisenhower still saw the United Nations as a noble project essential to the welfare of the United States, and he denounced the 1956 invasion of Egypt by Britain, France and Israel for endangering the UN ideal. Ironically, the Bush administration's attempt to do a unilateral end run around the United Nations could afford the American Left the opportunity to make international cooperation and international law popular again with the US public. The alternative for Americans is to continue to squander blood and treasure on a task too big for one country, even the world's sole superpower.

45 DEAD, DOZENS WOUNDED IN GUERRILLA ATTACKS

The Associated Press reports that a guerrilla wearing a bomb belt walked into a restaurant near the Green Zone in downtown Baghdad that was popular with Iraqi police and soldiers, and detonated his payload, killing 23 and wounding 45. Patrick Quinn writes: "The Baghdad bomber detonated his explosives-laden vest at the Ibn Zambour restaurant, 400 yards from the main gate of the heavily fortified Green Zone—U.S. and Iraqi government headquarters. The cafe was popular with Iraqi police and soldiers. The dead included seven police officers. The bodyguards of Iraqi Finance Minister Ali Abdel-Amir Allawi and 16 other police were injured, police and hospital officials said. The minister was not in the restaurant."

Quinn's details make me wonder if the finance minister sometimes did eat at Ibn Zambour, and if the guerrillas thought he might be there. At the very least, wounding a man's bodyguards is a pretty obvious threat against his person. Allawi is related to current Vice Premier Ahmad Chalabi and to former interim Prime Minister Iyad * * *

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMAN of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

APOLOGIES NEEDED

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, it is one of the first lessons we are taught as children, how and when to apologize for doing something wrong.

Our capacity for saying I am sorry is part of what makes us a functioning and civilized society. My parents always said I should apologize for hurting someone. But they never insisted that I apologize simply for pointing out when someone else was doing something bad or wrong.

Yet, here in Washington all of the sudden every time a Democrat uses strong rhetoric to condemn the policies of the Bush administration, there is a relentless pressure from the Republicans for an apology.

Maybe my memory is failing me, but I just do not recall any apologies when opponents of the Iraq war had their patriotism questioned. Now with a new poll showing that 63 percent of the American people want the troops to come home in the next year, maybe the right wing message machine owes an apology to nearly two out of three Americans. The fact is their apology demands on Democratic dissenters is just a convenient way to change the subject, to avoid any kind of question about the merits of the Iraq war and the way it has been managed.

And why do they want to avoid that discussion? Because the American people have completely lost confidence in the administration's Iraq policy. Instead of apologizing for words, it is time we started demanding apologies for deeds. Where, for example, is the apology for the deaths of more than 1,700 Americans? Not only is there no apology; Secretary Rumsfeld could not be bothered to personally sign condolence letters to their families.

Where is the apology for sending young men and women to war without the proper protective armor on their bodies and their vehicles? Where is the

apology for pinching pennies on veterans health benefits when these brave soldiers return home? Where is the apology for the immoral doctrine of this preemptive war? And where is the apology for the gross deceptions used to justify it, for the missing weapons of mass destruction, for the cooked intelligence, for the phony al Qaeda-Sadam link?

Where is the apology for wasting more than \$200 billion of taxpayer money on this mistake? Where is the apology for the poor leadership that led to torture and prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo? Where is the apology for committing our troops and our Nation to this mission without a post-war plan to secure the peace? And where is the apology for the arrogance that squandered international good will toward America and damaged our relationships with our closest allies?

There is something wrong with our moral compass if we have to apologize for speaking bluntly. But our leaders can commit the biggest foreign policy blunder since Vietnam and get away without apology or accountability.

Actually, an apology would not be enough for everything they have done. An apology, after all, is just more words. It is time for action. It is time for accountability. It is time for a tangible admission that the Iraq war was immorally conceived and has been incompetently managed. It is clearly time to end this war and bring our troops home.

CHUCK HAGEL, the senior Senator from Nebraska, a decorated Vietnam hero and a member of the President's party, recently had this to say about the war, "Things aren't getting better. They are getting worse. The White House is completely disconnected from reality. It's like they're just making it up as they go along. The reality is that we are losing Iraq."

I ask you, are they going to ask CHUCK HAGEL for an apology? After all, he has done the worst possible thing in the eyes of the administration: he has told the truth.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

There was no objection.

WOMEN AND SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-

LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak about women and Social Security reform.

President Bush is exploring different ways to save Social Security for future generations. And as the mother of two young daughters, I realize that we must tackle this inevitable reform of Social Security now and not defer the debate to future generations. I applaud the President for his strong leadership and his vision.

Women have a particularly large stake in Social Security reform; and I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE), for her leadership on this issue, and we will hear from her later tonight. Social Security may be actually reflecting a bygone America where most American women worked at home and received a spousal benefit based on their husband's earning.

Today, according to the Government Accountability Office, nearly 60 percent of American women participate in the labor force which helps make America the most productive economy in the world. Not only are more women working than when Social Security was formulated; they are working in ways that the framers of this program could not have imagined. The GAO has also found that women are more likely to work part time and work intermittently as they may take time out of the labor force to rear children or care for their elderly parents.

However, Social Security as currently formulated penalizes many of these working women. For example, a homemaker can receive a higher spousal benefit than a woman working in a low-wage job receives based upon her own earnings. In some cases, the household benefit from Social Security is no greater than if these women had never worked at all.

The fact is that under the current system, Social Security earnings cannot be transferred or shifted should a woman unfortunately become a widow. Sadly, this occurs all too often and a woman's total household income can be greatly reduced if she was receiving benefits based on the earnings while her husband was alive, compared to a widow whose benefits are based solely on her husband's earnings. So Social Security should not penalize women in their old age because they decided to join the workforce rather than stay at home.

Social Security must be reformed to better protect women and the invaluable roles that they play in our economy and in our society. We should reward those women who try to balance work in the home and work in the labor force and not ask them to choose one or the other. By reforming Social Security to include private accounts, we can ensure that women receive all of the benefits that they earn in the workplace as well as being entitled to

those that their husbands have earned once they have passed on. Forty percent of elderly women in America rely on Social Security for 90 percent of their income.

I join President Bush in assuring elderly women that Social Security reform will not impact their benefits by one penny. At the same time, the reforms that President Bush has envisioned will safeguard Social Security for those women's grandchildren and for all of our children and grandchildren. If we do not reform it, Social Security will be a pay-as-you-go system which is doomed to fail.

In the 1940s, as we have heard many times when Social Security was designed, there were 41 workers paying into the system for every person who was receiving benefits. Today there are only about three workers for every one person receiving benefits. By the year 2042 when workers who are currently in their mid-20s begin to retire, the system will be bankrupt. If we do not reform Social Security, those of us who are drawing or who will draw benefits will be doing so at the expense of our offsprings' future.

Without reform, we would also continue to penalize our daughters and our grandchildren for mixing a career in the workforce with a dedication to family life. Also, 2.3 million Hispanics receive Social Security benefits and 41 percent, a majority of them women, depend on it as their full source of income.

As the first Hispanic woman elected to Congress, I am committed to ensuring that all women are protected and all are afforded every opportunity. Remember, we are talking about American women here, not Republican women, not Democrat women, but American women. Social Security reform is too important an issue to be left to partisan politics.

SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY FIRST

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, today some Members of the Republican Party, House and Senate, unveiled a proposal to use a surplus in the Social Security trust fund for private accounts. And they said that in their words, we are going to keep the Social Security surplus Social Security.

Well, that is interesting. For the last 3 years my colleagues on the other side said there was never ever a surplus in Social Security; there were no accounts in Social Security. In fact, just a month ago or a little more than a month ago, the President of the United States went to West Virginia, unveiled an old filing cabinet, if I am using his words correctly, and said, look at it. That is the Social Security surplus. As I quote him, and this is the President, "There is no Social Security trust fund. Just IOUs stacked in a filing cabinet."