

□ 1930

And last year under President Uribe, they spent \$39 million providing body guards and special protection for labor leaders and labor activists. In fact, almost 2,000 labor leaders and activists have participated in this program, and it's been so successful that no labor leader who has requested the assistance has been denied because it's provided to those who are denied it, but also no one who has ever participated has ever been a victim of violence. It's been successful. And as the Washington Post noted, and you don't want to see anyone lose their life, but the murder rate for labor activists is actually lower than the murder rate for the average citizens of Colombia. And, again, it's safer to walk the streets of Bogota than it is in Washington, D.C. from the standpoint of being a victim of violent crime or, frankly, a victim of murder.

The International Labor Organization has recognized the progress Colombia has made. In fact, they have removed Colombia from its labor watch list. And Colombia has agreed to have a permanent International Labor Organization representative in Colombia.

Just a few weeks ago, this House overwhelmingly, with bipartisan support, ratified the U.S.-Peru agreement, and Colombia has agreed to every same labor condition that was demanded of Peru. Colombia has agreed to the same. So for those who demanded it, they should be proclaiming victory.

The bottom line is Colombia is a friend of the United States. And there are those who want to kill this agreement, those who want to turn their back on Colombia. Let's remember this agreement is good for Americans, it's also good for Colombia, but our best friend in Latin America is Colombia. They deserve a vote and they deserve a "yes" vote, bipartisan support, for the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement.

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

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

COLOMBIA AND OIL: GET IT WHILE YOU CAN

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration announced this week it will be sending to the Congress for approval the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. And the American people might ask, Colombia? Now? In 2008? What about the District of Columbia and getting gas prices lower here in our Nation's capital? Or what about more fairly priced student loans for the next

generation who are attempting to improve their opportunities for the years ahead? Or what about dealing with mortgage foreclosures in the United States, which are at epidemic levels in places like Ohio and Michigan and Florida and California? No. The President sends us something to help another country. "Colombia Free Trade," they call it.

Well, I would like to say to the American people tear the veneer off the agreement and look below it, and what you will find is crude. Oil. What this agreement really is about is more imported petroleum from one of the most undemocratic places in the world.

Colombia about 10 years ago was actually a net importer of oil. But today it is the fourth leading oil producer in South America. In fact, oil, rock/crude, has become Colombia's leading export product, and guess whom they send most of it to? You've got it right. The United States of America.

So what this Colombia Free Trade deal is all about is more imported oil, more dirty crude, more carbon emissions, more dependency of the people of the United States for energy, more living back in the 20th Century than embracing the 21st with energy independence here at home.

The oil picture in Colombia is clouded by rapidly declining production because of persistent attacks from people inside Colombia. What no one has mentioned, and the President didn't send it up here in his statement, is our country is already sending billions of dollars to Colombia to hold up the government. Why? To protect certain economic interests, including the rising export of petroleum.

This is a graph showing production levels of petroleum in Colombia back since the late 1980s, then up through 2000, when all of a sudden they started to decline because of unrest inside the country itself.

Now, it's no secret that there are 18 foreign oil companies in Colombia. Guess what. The majority of their headquarters is located right here in the United States. They have drilling operations in Colombia. California-based Occidental Petroleum launched an attempt to squeeze out of Colombia what oil remains with its discovery in 1983 of the Cano Limon field in the northeastern part of the country. The problem is that particular field produces less than a third of its total as recently as 4 years ago. Its production is going down.

British Petroleum, not to be outdone, has been drilling in the eastern plains in the Andes Mountains in the largest field in the country. However, that production has fallen by about two-thirds, and rather than 400,000 barrels a day, they produce about 170,000 barrels.

Faced with rapidly declining production, the Colombian Government has taken steps to improve the investment climate in Colombia and giving permission for foreign oil companies to own 100 percent stakes in oil ventures in

Colombia. The Government of Colombia also established a lower sliding scale royalty fee, now at 8 percent on the smallest oil fields, and that set of actions have attracted an estimated \$2 billion more in foreign investments since 2006. The oil industry is focusing heavily on this country.

Entering into the picture is the geopolitical position of Colombia because if we look at the United States having nearly half of their exports, Venezuela is number two, and we all know the difficulties with Venezuela. So there's a little strategic problem here related to the U.S. perception across Latin America. But it's important to tear the veneer off something called "Colombia Free Trade" and look at what is actually being traded out of Colombia.

While the United States continues to support the violent regime in Colombia, political unrest and political repression continue to cloud the discussion, and declining oil exports prove it. We can go back to 1988 when a car bomb outside of Occidental's nine-story Colombian headquarters in Bogota badly damaged that building. In October, 2000, a truck bomb nearly missed a bus filled with 40 Occidental secretaries and other company employees. And in April, 2001, rebels seized a bus filled with 100 Occidental oil workers.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to include in the RECORD lots of information about Occidental Petroleum, which is just one example of what's happening in Colombia, and also some of Occidental Petroleum's political influence here in Washington, in the Congress and in the White House.

OCcidental PETROLEUM CORPORATION

Occidental Petroleum Corporation is one of the largest U.S.-based oil and gas multinationals, with exploration projects in three states and nine foreign countries, including Colombia. It has operated in Colombia for more than three decades; in 1983, Occidental discovered Caño Limón, Colombia's second-largest oil field and one of only 50 billion-barrel-class fields in the world. Occidental's investment in Caño Limón paid off long ago, with its share of production yielding hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Even through years of rebel attacks and pipeline closings, Caño Limón Field continues to be a profitable venture for Occidental.

In recent years, Occidental has simplified its oil and gas operations by focusing its operations in the United States, the Middle East and Latin America. Despite drastic oil price declines in 2001, Occidental Petroleum had its second-best annual earnings ever.

Annual sales: \$14 billion

Annual net income: \$1.2 billion.

CEO and annual executive salary: Ray Irani, \$24 million (six-year average); Forbes Magazine ranked Irani the second-worst among executives who gave shareholders the least return on their investment compared with their own pay. In 2001, Irani's compensation package included free financial planning, country club dues and a \$2.6 million bonus.

Founded: 1920.

Stock: Publicly traded (OXY) on the New York Stock Exchange.

Corporate headquarters: Los Angeles.

Employees: 8,235.

Colombia operations: Occidental owns Caño Limón Field in the province of Aruaca,

operates three exploration projects elsewhere in Colombia, and, in 1998, swapped its holdings in the Philippines and Malaysia for Shell Oil's interests in several producing blocks of Colombia.

Worldwide holdings: Russia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Qatar, Oman, Ecuador, the Gulf of Mexico, the United States (Texas, California and Alaska).

Worldwide reserves: 2.17 billion barrels of oil.

Worldwide annual production: 461,000 barrels of oil per day.

Colombia annual production: 34,000 barrels of oil per day in 2002, up 79 percent from the year before.

LABOR CONDITIONS

In addition to sabotaging the physical structure of Occidental's Caño Limón Pipeline, Colombia's rebel groups have attacked, kidnapped and murdered company employees. Employees also have often been caught in the crossfire between the rebels and the military. Not unlike other multinationals in Colombia, Occidental makes it clear with its employees that it will not pay ransom in the event of their kidnapping. With few exceptions, the company hires Colombians from distant cities to work in the danger areas because they are less likely to be knowledgeable about military troop locations or security measures should they fall into the hands of guerrillas. Prospective contractors are rigorously screened by Occidental's psychologists to ferret out spies; workers must show identification cards at a half-dozen security checkpoints; and palm-reading devices restrict access to executive offices. Still, Colombia's rebels have succeeded in breaching the multinational's security on a number of occasions.

Watchdog groups have ranked Occidental poorly on human rights after the company pursued a protested oil exploration project in Colombia's cloud forest, home to 5,000 members of the U'wa tribe. In 2000, three children were killed after Occidental called on the military to break up a nonviolent U'wa blockade of the road to the drill site. After years of public pressure protesting Occidental's exploration on ancestral lands, the company announced in May 2002 that it was canceling the project. The company blamed its withdrawal on technical and economic factors, but many believe Occidental caved to negative publicity.

Occidental's stand on human rights in Colombia was also tainted after a 1998 air raid of the village of Santo Domingo near the Caño Limón Pipeline. That year, three American pilots of AirScan (a Florida-based security firm that Occidental uses to protect its oil interests from rebel attacks) marked hostile targets for the Colombian military in an antiguerilla operation. The pilots' assistance mistakenly led to the killing of 18 civilians, including nine children. Survivors from the village said the aircraft (U.S.-donated) attacked them as they ran out of their homes to a nearby road with their hands in the air. The Colombian government is still investigating.

OCCIDENTAL INFLUENCE ON CAPITOL HILL NOT NEUTRAL

Between 1996 and 2000, Occidental spent more than \$8.6 million lobbying the U.S. government, including for U.S. military aid to Colombia. In the 2000 election cycle, the company gave hard and soft money totaling about \$551,000, with about 60 percent going to Republican candidates and political action committees. The CEO of Occidental's chemical subsidiary, J. Roger Hirl, raised more than \$100,000 in support of George W. Bush's bid for the presidency.

Occidental also has maintained links to the Democratic Party for many years, pri-

marily through former Vice President Al Gore's father, the late Al Gore Sr., who after leaving the Senate took a \$500,000-a-year job with an Occidental subsidiary, then served on the company board for 28 years.

When the younger Gore joined Clinton's ticket in 1992, Occidental loaned the Presidential Inauguration Committee \$100,000 to help pay for the ceremony. And after Gore took office, the company gave nearly \$500,000 in soft money to Democratic committees and causes. In late 1997, the former vice president championed a \$3.65 billion sale to Occidental of the government's stake in Elk Hills Oil Field (California), representing the largest privatization of federal property in U.S. history. In 1998, when his father died, Gore inherited about \$500,000 worth of Occidental stock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.)

COMMUNIST CHINA

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

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, one of our greatest Presidents was Harry Truman. And one of the reasons President Truman was held in such high regard by people, including my own father, was that he had the courage to go against conventional wisdom, especially in the area of foreign relations.

It was President Truman who had the moral courage to tell the American people that our World War II ally the Soviet Union was no longer our friend and had become a threat to the very liberty that our people had helped advance throughout the course of that conflict. This was not a message that the American people were particularly expecting. In fact, there were many who decried President Truman's analysis at the time. One of them was George F. Kennan, who is, unfortunately, often remembered as the father of the containment policy.

In fact, when faced with the rise of the Soviet Union as a strategic threat and rival model of governance, it was Mr. Kennan's position that the Soviet Union could be managed, that we should constructively engage them, that their ideology meant nothing to them, and that, in fact, they were but a different variation of the traditional Czarist order within Russia. And, besides, Mr. Kennan concluded, what did it matter? Eventually the two systems of communism and our free Republic's democratic system would merge into one.

President Truman was not as educated as Mr. Kennan. He was not as sophisticated as Mr. Kennan. And President Truman took the Soviets at their word that they were in fact communists. He took them at their word

that they meant they were going to put in practice their intrinsically evil ideology. And Mr. Truman dissented from Mr. Kennan and said that the fundamental goal of the United States foreign policy to defeat the intrinsic evil of communism will be the advancement of liberty throughout our world where and when we can achieve it.

Recently I came across a picture that I had ordered from a friend of mine in the District, Mr. Doug Brown. It was from one of Mr. Truman's return trips to St. Louis. He was meeting a gentleman from his old World War I Artillery Battery. And a picture that struck me the most was this: The MC of the event that night for President Truman in Missouri was an entertainer named Ronald Reagan. And in that crystalline moment, it was clear for me to see the link in the Cold War's victory between the foundation President Truman courageously laid and the way that President Reagan courageously won it ultimately.

What we see today now is a repeat of history where we have two paths we can take. We can take the path of Mr. Kennan and the detente crowd of the Kissingerites and others that says we can manage the rise of Communist China, that we can engage them and barter with them and engage in structural diplomacy, all the while the oppression of their own people's God-given rights to rights to life, liberty, and dignity are repressed, while Tibet suffers under their yoke, while the Burmese and Sudanese regimes are propped up, and while they continue their stealth assaults on our national security with sleeper cells, and I could go on. Or we who profess to be the heirs of Ronald Reagan, especially within the Republican Party, can follow the path of President Truman and understand that you cannot barter with butchers. You cannot constructively manage evil nor engage it. But what you can do is unleash the liberty of people yearning to breathe free where and when you can.

The reason I bring this up is not merely the Beijing Olympics. I'm on record as opposing our President's attendance at the games. I believe it would be a betrayal of our free Republic's commitment to liberty. But I was struck by a statement in this regard by our current Secretary of State, ironically enough herself a Sovietologist. I will not make the joke that a Sovietologist is often considered diplomacy's equivalent of a Latin teacher for this has relevance. She said, "It is important for the Chinese people to see that the United States supports their emergence onto the world's stage."

I fundamentally differ with that assessment. I remain a Reaganite. I remain my Truman Democratic father's son. The United States, and my party in particular, exists to put communism in the ash can of history, not to usher communism onto the world's stage. If my party, as it has strayed from principle in the past, does not understand