

Kirk	Napolitano	Scott (GA)
Kline	Neal (MA)	Scott (VA)
Knollenberg	Neugebauer	Serrano
Kolbe	Ney	Sessions
Kuhl (NY)	Northup	Shaw
LaHood	Norwood	Shays
Langevin	Nunes	Sherman
Lantos	Nussle	Sherwood
Larsen (WA)	Obey	Shimkus
Larson (CT)	Olver	Simmons
Latham	Ortiz	Simpson
Leach	Osborne	Skelton
Lee	Otter	Slaughter
Levin	Owens	Smith (NJ)
Lewis (CA)	Oxley	Smith (TX)
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Smith (TX)
Lewis (KY)	Pascarella	Smith (WA)
Linder	Pastor	Snyder
Lipinski	Payne	Sodrel
LoBiondo	Pearce	Solis
Lofgren, Zoe	Pelosi	Souder
Lowey	Pence	Spratt
Lucas	Peterson (MN)	Stearns
Lungren, Daniel	Peterson (PA)	Strickland
E.	Pickering	Stupak
Lynch	Pitts	Sullivan
Mack	Platts	Sweeney
Maloney	Pombo	Tanner
Manzullo	Pomeroy	Tauscher
Markey	Porter	Taylor (MS)
Marshall	Price (NC)	Taylor (NC)
Matsui	Pryce (OH)	Terry
McCarthy	Putnam	Thomas
McCauley (TX)	Radanovich	Thompson (CA)
McCollum (MN)	Rahall	Thompson (MS)
McCotter	Ramstad	Thornberry
McCrery	Rangel	Tiahrt
McGovern	Regula	Tiberi
McHenry	Rehberg	Tierney
McHugh	Reichert	Turner
McIntyre	Renzi	Udall (CO)
McKeon	Reyes	Udall (NM)
McKinney	Reynolds	Upton
McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Van Hollen
McNulty	Rogers (KY)	Visclosky
Meehan	Rogers (MI)	Walden (OR)
Meek (FL)	Rohrabacher	Walsh
Meeks (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Wamp
Melancon	Ross	Wasserman
Menendez	Rothman	Schultz
Mica	Roybal-Allard	Watson
Michaud	Royce	Watt
Millender-	Ruppersberger	Waxman
McDonald	Rush	Weiner
Miller (MI)	Ryan (OH)	Weldon (FL)
Miller (NC)	Ryun (KS)	Weldon (PA)
Miller, Gary	Sabo	Weller
Miller, George	Salazar	Westmoreland
Mollohan	Sánchez, Linda	Wexler
Moore (KS)	T.	Whitfield
Moore (WI)	Sanchez, Loretta	Wicker
Moran (KS)	Sanders	Wilson (NM)
Moran (VA)	Saxton	Wilson (SC)
Murphy	Schakowsky	Wolf
Murtha	Schiff	Woolsey
Musgrave	Schmidt	Wu
Myrick	Schwartz (PA)	Wynn
Nadler	Schwarz (MI)	Young (FL)

NAYS—31

Barton (TX)	Jones (NC)	Ryan (WI)
Boustany	Kucinich	Sensenbrenner
Castle	LaTourette	Shadegg
Costello	Marchant	Shuster
DeFazio	Matheson	Stark
Duncan	McDermott	Tancredo
Flake	Miller (FL)	Velázquez
Franks (AZ)	Oberstar	Waters
Green (WI)	Petri	Young (AK)
Hefley	Poe	
Johnson, E. B.	Price (GA)	

NOT VOTING—10

Berman	Fortenberry	Paul
Boswell	Hall	Towns
Cardin	Harris	
Feeney	Holt	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1305

Messrs. RYAN of Wisconsin, SHUSTER and DEFAZIO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in the family, I was unable to vote on the conference report for the fiscal year 2006 Transportation-Treasury-Housing appropriations act. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 605 today, the vote on H.R. 3058, Making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, I was present for the debate but unintentionally did not record my vote. Had my vote been recorded, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

NOVEMBER 18, 2005

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 18, 2005, I was unavoidably detained due to a death in my family and thus missed rollcall votes Nos. 602, 603, 604, and 605. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on all four votes.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), amended by Public Law 108-375, and the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy:

Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado.

And, in addition, Mr. Hansford T. Johnson of Virginia

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1610

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 307. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4133. An act to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for carrying out the national flood insurance program.

The message also announced that the Senate requests a further conference relative to the bill (H.R. 3010) “An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, and appoints Mr. SPECTER, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GREGG, Mr. CRAIG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. INOUE, Mr. REID, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BYRD, to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 563 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 563

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of November 18, 2005, providing for consideration or disposition of any of the following measures:

(1) A bill or joint resolution making general appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, any amendment thereto, or any conference report thereon.

(2) A conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3199) to extend and modify authorities needed to combat terrorism, and for other purposes.

(3) A bill or joint resolution relating to flood insurance.

(4) A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 563 waives clause 6(a) of rule XIII that requires a two-thirds vote to consider a

rule on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee against certain resolutions reported from the Rules Committee; applies a waiver to any special rule reported on the legislative day of November 18, 2005 providing for consideration or disposition of any of the following measures:

First, a bill or a joint resolution making general appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, any amendment thereto, or any conference report thereon; second, a conference report to accompany the bill H.R. 3199, to extend and modify authorities needed to combat terrorism and for other purposes; third, a bill or a joint resolution relating to flood insurance; and finally, fourth, a bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 563 that the Rules Committee reported in order to ensure that we are able to complete the work of the American people in a timely and a proper manner before the Congress adjourns for Thanksgiving. In the following week, Members from both sides of the aisle will return to their districts to spend Thanksgiving with their families and with their constituents. However, before doing so, there remains important work to be done; and, Mr. Speaker, this rule will ensure that it gets done.

From making appropriations that keep this government running to ensuring that law enforcement has the tools it needs to keep this country safe, to insuring Americans against floods, to finally strengthening the economy while cutting the budget, this rule gives the House an opportunity to move forward on an important legislative agenda, though difficult choices have and will continue to have to be made for the sake of the American people, and for the sake of an agenda of which all Americans can be proud. Mr. Speaker, I want to encourage all of my colleagues to support this resolution and the underlying legislation for which it provides.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

I thank my friend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me, before I begin, let me ask my friend from Georgia, does his leadership plan to amend this martial law rule in any way to add any other issues besides the ones that have been listed?

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Massachusetts, yes, we will have an amendment to the rule, which I will present at the end of the debate.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Could the gentleman just tell me generally what the topic is going to be?

Mr. GINGREY. The amendment would basically say, "A resolution relating to United States forces in Iraq."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very sad day in the House. This House, I think, is about to embark on a process that should dismay every single Member of this House. The only way keeping us from going down this road is I think to vote down this martial law rule.

While I have many strong objections, and many of us on this side have strong objections, to martial rules in general, we have been accommodating in the past when they come to matters like important conference reports or emergency pieces of legislation that we need to get done before the recess. But this matter on Iraq does not qualify in that category. In fact, we just received a copy of the resolution just a couple of minutes ago about what they plan to bring up here.

This is not about a debate on Iraq. This is about politics, clear and simple. I will go further to say that I believe this is a deliberate effort to attack a Member of this House and his views because the majority is afraid of this man and afraid of his views and afraid of his words, so they believe that somehow he has to be attacked, that we need to take some quick action here on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, we should have a debate on Iraq. We should have had a debate on Iraq a long time ago. But what we are about to have is not a debate on Iraq. This will not be able to be amended, there be a limited amount of time for Members to be able to express their views, and, quite frankly, it is demeaning to this institution, it is demeaning to our soldiers, and it is demeaning to those who have raised questions about the war in Iraq. It is demeaning to the American public who now overwhelmingly have questions about this war in Iraq. They want us to take this issue seriously and not just play politics with it.

The fact of the matter is that from the very beginning, the efforts of this leadership have been geared toward covering up all of the facts about the war in Iraq. We were presented faulty intelligence. When we found out there were no weapons of mass destruction, we wanted a full investigation to figure out what actually went wrong, whether any of that intelligence had been manipulated. We were told we cannot have that investigation, we cannot have that discussion.

The fact of the matter is that we have had no formal investigations and no formal oversight of this war in Iraq. We sent a bunch of our soldiers off to war without proper equipment, without the proper body armor and Humvee protection, and this in spite of the fact that a few months before we went to

war, we passed a defense authorization bill which essentially ordered the Pentagon to provide our soldiers with all the necessary equipment that they would need if they should ever go into war. Why did not that materialize? Where was the oversight into that?

Tens of billions of taxpayer dollars have been lost in this war in Iraq. We do not even know where it has gone, and nobody can give us an answer, and there is no investigation, there is no oversight, there is no debate.

The fact of the matter is this Congress has been complicit with the White House in covering up the facts. The situation at Abu Ghraib prison, I would argue that that instance probably more than anything else has been responsible for poisoning the hearts and minds of so many people in Iraq and the region. And rather than getting to the bottom of it, rather than making sure it never happens again, what has this Congress done? Covered up. Sweep it under the rug. Make believe it never happened.

You want a debate on Iraq? We should have a debate on Iraq, but not this bit of political theatrics. There are Members who believe that we should end this war immediately. I am one of those. There are Members who believe we should add more troops to the ones we already have in Iraq over there. All of us should have the opportunity to be able to debate this in a serious way.

Do you want to respect our troops? That is how you do it. You make sure we are doing our job. We have not been doing our job, and there is no objective person in this House, even those of you who staunchly support this war and advocate continuing staying the course, who can tell me things are going the way they were planned.

There are none of us in this Chamber who are going to fight in this that war, none of us are going to put our lives on the line, and, with very few exceptions, none of our kids are going to be fighting in that war. So it takes absolutely no courage for anybody in this chamber to wave the American flag and to say, "Stay the course."

This is not about a debate on Iraq, this is about political cover for you. This is about finding a way to not answer the tough questions. This is about a way to cover the administration's backside at a time when we should be demanding questions.

Congress should be doing its job, and this process, this process is a disgrace. We owe the people of this country, we owe the troops who are fighting bravely at our request over in Iraq, we owe them much more.

So, Mr. Speaker, this martial law rule needs to be defeated.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment does not attack any Member of this body. This amendment follows the rules of decorum of this body.

The gentleman from the other side just listed a litany of complaints in regard to Iraq. Members on his side of

the aisle even have what is known as the "Out of Iraq Caucus." I do not know if the gentleman from Massachusetts is a part of that membership or not, but we have, this side of the aisle, have heard repeatedly from Members on their side of the aisle, and not just one high-profile ranking member with strong defense credentials. Oh, no. No. We have heard every night of the first session of the 109th Congress from the 30-something Group, several Members on their side of the aisle, pounding this President, coming within an inch or less, Mr. Speaker, of accusing the President of lying, of out and out lying, repeatedly accusing the President of misleading the public about Iraq, demanding the immediate pullout of our troops.

Mr. Speaker, they are going to have the opportunity today on the floor of this House to vote yes or no, do they want us to immediately pull our troops out of Iraq, and that is all this amendment is about.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, anybody who believes that what we are doing today is not in response to the comments by one single Member of this Congress, a Member who is highly respected by both sides of the aisle, a Member who is a decorated Vietnam War veteran, a Member who is an expert on military and defense issues, anybody who believes we are not doing this in response to that, quite frankly, defies credibility. This is a personal attack on one of the best Members of this House, and it is outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how dare you. How dare you. Yesterday, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the ranking Democrat on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, a 27-year marine, a veteran of, I believe, three tours in Vietnam, a well-known conservative hawk, announced that he was introducing a resolution that was meant to stimulate a thoughtful and profound debate on how we salvage a failed policy in Iraq. That resolution was meant to stimulate the kind of hearings that Bill Fulbright ran during the Vietnam War, hearings which could bring in the best military minds and the best experts on the Middle East to try to help us find a new direction to American policy in Iraq.

The reaction of the Republican leadership of this House is nothing short of disgraceful, and, in my view, that reaction dishonors the traditions of this House and this democracy.

This resolution, which is now going to be offered as an amendment to this rule out of the Rules Committee, is nothing less than an effort to drive a stake through the heart of the Murtha resolution, without any effort to get at the facts with respect to Iraq.

For the House to be asked to vote on whether or not we ought to withdraw immediately from Iraq without having the benefit of those thoughtful hearings is a disgraceful abdication of our responsibility to think this issue through clearly and with judgment. I am absolutely appalled, I am absolutely appalled, at this action. It is a cheap political stunt that does a disservice to every serviceman and woman fighting in Iraq today, and whoever thought up this pipe dream should be ashamed of themselves. It brings incredible shame to this House.

If I have to choose between supporting the Murtha resolution, even without these hearings, and the failed, discredited policy that we are now pursuing in Iraq that dead-end nowhere-going policy, I would happily endorse as an alternative the Murtha amendment.

It is irresponsible of the House to be dealing with this in this manner. What this House ought to do is to set aside the cheap political tricks and to address the thought behind the Murtha proposal. This House, instead of politicizing this issue, ought to try to find a way for once to bring people in this institution together, instead of dividing them by phony, cynical, political, outrageously tricky and sneaky maneuvers like this.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that this amendment to the resolution basically says, "Resolved, that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the deployment of United States forces in Iraq be terminated immediately." It does not reference any Member whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the rule and in strong opposition to the underlying resolution. Our mission in Iraq is clear: Peace through strength, victory through resolve. Those who would have us retreat immediately have forgotten what appeasement does to the Islamic extremist madmen and murderers. Our goal in Iraq is honorable and wise. We must see this through to our victorious end. The choice is that simple, yet that important.

In his 2005 speech commemorating Veterans Day, President Bush affirmed that it is courage that liberated more than 50 million people from tyranny in the last century, and it is courage that will once again destroy the enemies of freedom.

As the stepmother of a proud Marine, Douglas Lehtinen, who, together with my future daughter-in-law Lindsay, is currently serving our Nation in Iraq, and as the wife of a decorated Vietnam veteran, I have witnessed this courage and this commitment to the mission of liberty.

In one of his e-mails from Iraq, Dougie asked that I remind the American people that it was not the United States who asked for this global struggle against Islamic extremists. It was the Islamic jihadists who targeted the free world and our Nation long before we entered Iraq. We cannot afford to yield the victory to the Islamic extremists by withdrawing now.

Dougie forwarded a piece to me just yesterday by Lieutenant General James T. Conway which best summarizes the opinion of many of our troops about the need to stay the course. Conway states: "Our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines realize that the biggest threat to mission accomplishment depends on what their fellow Americans do. The insurgents realize full well that the only choice they have of defeating the U.S. military is to weaken the will of the American population."

□ 1630

He adds, The insurgents in Iraq maim and kill the less protected Iraqis, but their real target is that portion of the American public that is shaped by the news media.

Let us heed the message from our men and women in our Armed Forces serving in Iraq. They are in the best position to assess what we need to do, and they are asking us not to pull out of Iraq at this juncture. Iraq is at one of the epicenters of the U.S. comprehensive strategy to fight terrorism worldwide.

Our ability to project major Armed Forces to the very heart of the Middle East provides the United States and our allies in the war against terrorism the ability to directly address the tactical and ideological challenges of Islamic extremists. Through the promotion of an incipient Iraqi democracy, we continue our concerted efforts to counter the root causes of Islamic extremists in the region. These radicals are fully cognizant that the emergence of a new and democratic Iraq will inevitably threaten their very survival because freedom threatens them. Democratic governments deny them the funds, the weapons, and the sanctuary that they need to survive. Democracy denies them the new recruits that they need.

As such, Mr. Speaker, we must continue to support the people of Iraq in their efforts to strengthen their emerging democracies whose pace of development has been astounding. In January, the people of Iraq turned out in droves to vote in their first free democratic elections. In October, they once again voted to approve their Constitution, and today they are busily preparing for elections in December that will continue Iraq in its transition from a brutal totalitarian state to a free democratic nation. It takes time. We will succeed.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentlewoman who just spoke, I

have to tell you, I am tired, I think we are all tired, of the rhetoric. You want to discuss this issue seriously, let us have a real debate, not an hour in which we will debate this resolution that cannot be amended. That is ridiculous. That is demeaning to this House of Representatives.

We are not doing our job. This is about war. We have troops in harm's way. We have lost over 2,000 Americans. We have members of our Guard and Reserves on double and triple deployments; and the best you can do to respond to what is going on, all the mess that has been created over there is to bring this up for 1 hour. This is a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) was a hero in Vietnam. The gentleman is a hero today.

We know that the Bush administration deliberately misled the American public about nuclear weapons in Iraq, about al Qaeda in Iraq. And now out here on the House floor, in a continuation of their deliberate misleading of the American public, they are refusing to have a debate on the Murtha resolution.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has called for a debate on the redeployment of troops consistent with protecting their security and the security of our country and maintaining over the horizon forces to protect our country, to promote democracy and diplomacy that will protect our country.

What this group of Republicans, what the Bush-Cheney White House is doing today is a continuation of the perpetuation of the fraud on the American public. This is not the debate on the Murtha resolution. This is an attempt to undermine the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), to continue their attempt to undermine any critic of their administration rather than having a real debate on the war in Iraq that serves the American people, the American fighting men and women, and every single person in the world.

I have known JACK MURTHA for nearly 30 years and I have enormous respect for his patriotism and his expertise on military matters.

I've heard JACK MURTHA speak about what is going on in Iraq and about the adverse effect that this war is having on our troops and our Nation's security. I agree with him that it is time for us to start bringing our troops home, and I support his proposal to do so.

This is a war that was based on false and misleading intelligence from the Bush Administration about Iraqi nuclear weapons, and which has been bungled at almost every stage by incompetence and mismanagement on the part of the White House and the civilian leadership at the Pentagon. Our brave troops deserve better than to be asked to continue risking their lives for a mistake. At this point it has become clear that our troop presence in Iraq is making the situation over there worse, not better. The Iraqi people need to know that the

U.S. is going to end its occupation of their country, and that they need to assume responsibility for their own security.

We should get our troops out of Iraq as soon as possible, consistent with ensuring their safety. Instead of continuing this diversion, which has only harmed America's international reputation, we should refocus our nation's energies on capturing Osama bin Laden and disrupting and destroying the Al Qaeda terrorist organization that was responsible for the September 11th attacks.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE).

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a perfect time to talk about the very brave acts of our men and women who are serving to defend this Nation. I recently led an armed services trip to Iraq. The very first person that I met looked me in the eye and he said to me, Ma'am, do not worry about me. He said, I know what I am doing. He said I know what the threat to this Nation is; and if I have anything to do with it, we will never have another attack on our Nation. He picked up his gear. He said, So do not worry. Just pray for me. And he walked away.

The thing that I brought back from that trip to Iraq, and I realized it immediately, is that these men and women are true heroes. They volunteered to serve in our military and many of them have volunteered to serve in Iraq because they understand the threat that faces this Nation if we were to fail. But what they want to know, Mr. Speaker, is what is America saying and what is America thinking?

They watch C-SPAN. They watch the words that you say. And I was proud to be able to be there in Iraq and tell them the stories of America, about true Americans who value what they are doing who are at Sea World and stand and clap and cheer, the marines that walked through the airport in Ireland on our way back and everyone stood and everyone clapped for those marines.

The reason we are on this floor today talking about this is because the other side has made this an issue; and for the last several months, all we have heard is that we need to bring our troops home.

I do not know if you have seen the letter that has come from a-Zawahiri to al-Zarqawi. One of the quotes in this letter is: "Things may develop faster than we imagined. The aftermath of the collapse of American power in Vietnam and how they ran and left their agents is noteworthy."

When the speaker of the Iraq General Assembly came to Washington about 6 weeks ago, four of us went to hear him; and he repeatedly said, there is no other option. When Members of this body went on January 30 to the first election in Iraq, there were two things that they said to our Members: one, you cannot have purple ink on your

finger because you are not an Iraqi; and, two, do not abandon us.

Mr. Speaker, we are on the brink of a democracy and freedom in Iraq. If we were to cut and run like they expect us to do, then what is going to happen is the 2,000-plus Americans who have died and given their lives for freedom will be for naught.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we defeat this resolution on the floor today and show those men and women that are watching us on TV that we support what they are doing.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentlewoman, if she wants to honor our troops, then give us a real debate. Do not bring this piece of garbage to the floor with an hour left at the end of the day. This is not honoring our troops. We are doing them a disservice. You are politicizing this war, and it is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for me as an American, as a Member of Congress, to see that we have reached a point that those who want to be critical of the President's entrance into this war and how it is being conducted now have to be called cowards and we are cutting and running and we are not deserving of being called Americans.

The vicious attacks that are taking place by people who never served their country is really something that is really painful.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has earned the right to have an opinion. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has served this country. The gentleman has served not only in the Army but he served right here in this Congress. And what is he up against? Who are these people making these dirty, nasty remarks against his character and those who support him? They are people who say that we are going to stay in this war until we win; that we are going to fight and die in this war until we win; and we are not going to leave until we win and not one day sooner.

Fight who? Who is going to surrender? What are the conditions? If you can be critical of what the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) is going to say, how can you not be critical of the confused way in which we are getting involved in this war where we do not know what the enemy looks like, we do not know what flag they carry, we do not know who is going to surrender.

It is time for us to be civil. If you want to be concerned about our troops, you have to be concerned about why they are there. And for the President of the United States on Veterans Day, the day that all of us veterans hold so true

and that brings us together, to attack his political opponents on that day and then to send out with his tuxedo-clad Vice President as someone to attack other people, other Americans, this is a sad day.

But the bottom line is if you love these troops like the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) loves these troops, you will be supporting this legislation.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman on the other side complained about not having enough time to discuss this resolution. We will have a minimum, Mr. Speaker, of 3 hours. We are debating right now the same-day rule. Then we will debate the rule on House Resolution 571 and then have the debate on the resolution itself. So there will be plenty of time for Members on both sides of the aisle to express their opinions on this hugely important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that has a lot of passion; and when a lot of passion is embracing an issue, things are said that are very harsh and I think at times untrue.

Earlier we heard that there were quote/unquote dirty, nasty remarks against him, referring to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA). No one is saying that about the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA). The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has a great deal of respect on both sides of the aisle and across the Nation.

This resolution is very simple. It is expressing a sense of the House. It has three lines to it. It says: "Resolved, that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that deployment of United States forces in Iraq be terminated immediately."

We are in a war for the Free World, and I think part of what we have to do and understand is the enemy himself. Al Qaeda is not fighting for a religion. They are fighting for political power by using a religion. Their targets on Americans, Jews, secular Muslims, and other Islamists like Shiites and Sunni Muslims.

They have killed and maimed innocent men and women and children from many faiths and walks of life. Their goals are measured in steps that include Iraq and every country from Spain to the Philippines, all under one theocratic government.

They oppose the freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom to vote, women's rights, education for women, religious freedom. They oppose music, movies, even the right to choose your own clothing, your own education, even who gets to drive. They despise who we are and what we stand for as Americans. And it is spelled out on their Web sites, their videos, their cassette tapes. It is written in their material. It is on the laptops that we have captured, and it is undeniable.

Al Qaeda's goals are confirmed in a letter on July 9, 2005, from Ayman al-Zawahiri to Abu Musab Al-Zarqawi. Al-

Zawahiri is the number two man in al Qaeda, the spiritual leader of Osama bin Laden, his advisor. Al-Zarqawi is al Qaeda's director of jihadist attacks. He has been in Iraq since before Operation Iraq Freedom.

In this letter from al-Zawahiri to al-Zarqawi, al Qaeda's director of jihadist attacks, al-Zawahiri says, We have four goals. The very first goal is to expel Americans from Iraq.

If this resolution were to pass today, it would be headline news on al Jazeera TV. They would declare victory in al Qaeda, and it would jeopardize every American across the face of the globe. We have to decide where this battle is going to take place. Is it going to be in Iraq where every American carries a gun, or will it be on the streets of New York and Washington, D.C.

I say we vote this resolution down for the safety of our troops and our citizens.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if people do not like this resolution, they can vote against the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the ranking member on the House Intelligence Committee.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule.

Earlier today, the Democratic members of the House Intelligence Committee issued a letter to the chairman of our committee protesting his decision to shut down a bipartisan investigation into the intelligence failures that led us into war. Failure to learn from the mistakes of the past is an abdication of our responsibility to the American people and dangerous for our country. If we do not learn lessons, we will repeat mistakes.

It is likewise the responsibility of this House to conduct rigorous oversight over our policy in Iraq. There is now broad consensus in the country that we need to change course.

□ 1645

Many of us have offered thoughtful suggestions to do just that.

Let me be clear, it is not our troops who have failed. They are performing heroically, as are our intelligence personnel. A month ago, on my most recent visit to Iraq, I had dinner with troops from California who are part of Task Force Baghdad. They are doing an outstanding job.

Reasonable people can differ on whether we should redeploy troops in 6 months or 16 months and what events should drive that redeployment, but today we stand united that a change of course is urgently needed. We stand united behind the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), our colleague, a 37-year veteran who has had his patriotism attacked by the White House, but who is not backing down, and we stand united that the Republican leadership should not use a stunt like this to score political points.

In case anyone missed it, the terrorists do not care whether we are Democrats or Republicans. They are not

going to check our party registration before they blow us up.

I take a back seat to no one in my efforts to craft bipartisan solutions to problems. Iraq policy is failing, and it is time for this House to be bipartisan as the Senate was earlier this week, and it is way past time for this White House to give us a serious strategy and to clarify its intentions with respect to no permanent bases, no design on Iraqi oil, and a plan to help build true power sharing among the ethnic factions and true operational capability in the Iraqi security forces.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule. This resolution is intended to divide us, to put partisanship in the way of patriotism.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker I yield 2¾ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I must say, Scoop Jackson must be spinning in his grave. The late Democrat Senate leader would be shocked to see his party has now been taken over by Michael Moore and Cindy Sheehan and the radical extremists on the left who do not like George Bush so much that now they are going to put danger to our troops by siding with the terrorists that it is time for an immediate pullout.

I plan to vote "no" on the Democrat resolution for immediate pullout. I think it is irresponsible, and it definitely sends the wrong message to our troops.

I represent the 3rd Infantry Division. I am proud to represent the 3rd Infantry Division. I know many of these soldiers. I have dealt with them. I have gone to their funerals. I have gone to their services, and I would like to quote what the leading General said, General Webster, yesterday, who is in charge of the 3rd Infantry, the troops on the ground, and I am proud to say is a friend of mine, and I am proud to say is an extremely thoughtful and patriotic, brave American. General Webster said, in response to the Democrat call for immediate withdrawal, "Setting a date would mean that the 221 soldiers I've lost this year, that their lives would have been lost in vain."

He continued to say that Iraq's armed factions would likely take a cue from a timetable for a U.S. withdrawal to lie low, gathering their strength and laying plans for renewed conflict as soon as Americans leave. In fact, the Democrat Party now seems to be taking their cue from France: Lose, leave and wait.

The Democrats seem to want to cut and run and dishonor the sacrifices of those who are doing such a great job already. The President has said, and as much as the Democrats hate sometimes, it appears, the President's policies, he said, "Our strategy is to clear, hold, and build."

What have we done is we have rounded up 116 al Qaeda rulers. A number of tips from the indigenous folks on the ground have risen from 442 in February

to 3,341 today. That is cooperation by the Iraqis themselves. We have trained 210,000 Iraqi security forces, and we have more than 20 operating bases that are ready that they are doing a good job of. We have rebuilt 3,404 schools, 304 water and sewer treatment facilities, 257 fire/police stations, and 149 health services. This is progress.

Mr. Speaker, they just overwhelmingly passed a resolution adopting a new Constitution October 15, and in December, they are going to have their own elections for their own government. That is progress. Do not cut and run. Stand firm with our troops.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The gentleman from Georgia just referred to this as a Democratic resolution. I would like to inquire of the Chair if he knows who introduced this legislation.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman stated a parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman from Massachusetts has stated a parliamentary inquiry. The chair can only identify the Member who introduced the legislation, which was Congressman HUNTER.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Congressman HUNTER, a Republican?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I have served in this House for 22 years, all of them on the House Armed Services Committee, and my esteem for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the wisdom he has accrued over defense and military matters has increased every year. He is a real American. He is a patriot. He is a marine. He is the best embodiment of Semper Fidelis that I have ever known.

He made a proposal yesterday that I, myself, do not fully agree, but I have profound respect for the man who made it, and I watched the pain that he experienced as he agonizingly laid out what the conclusions were that he had come to. To take this proposal and trash it, trivialize it is outrageous. To treat JACK MURTHA this way, a great American, a wonderful patriot, is beneath contempt.

This resolution takes a profound issue we face, whether and when we wage war, and makes it another cheap pawn in the political process. You present a resolution that purports to be a facsimile or proxy of JACK MURTHA's resolution when it is nothing of the kind, nothing of the kind, and then you dare to call it something it is not, a Democratic resolution.

This is outrageous, Mr. Speaker, and all I can say is, at long last, have you no shame?

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

I believe it is imperative in this body that we have an open and frank dialogue on issues that are of concern to us. I am disturbed and disappointed, frankly, by some of the rhetoric I have heard, because we are judged and we are acquitted and/or we are found guilty by those words, but the luxury we have is they are simply words here.

The impact of those words, though, on the other side of the ocean, in the AOR, in Iraq and Afghanistan, is that in this small world, not only do our friends but also our enemies watch, and they do not understand our concept of openness, of tolerance, of free speech and spirited dialogue.

Indeed, sometimes remarks that have been made in this Chamber have been used for the recruiting of suicide bombers. I think that one thing, and I would have to say quite candidly, is in our oversight: It is also important that we have oversight on our own words.

The comments that were made yesterday by a man with a distinguished military record, who I do not fault one bit, fly in the face of the comments of hundreds of soldiers, ranging from junior enlisted personnel across the AOR to my West Point classmates who are commanding brigades on the ground and disagree categorically, based on the phone calls that I got last night, including one from the commander of America's premier counterterrorism organization, who asked what in the world was happening here to make those kind of comments to encourage our enemies.

However, remarks irresponsibly given, not based on facts, simply do this: They place policy over politics while our young men and women are on the front line and unwittingly cooperates with and emboldens our enemies.

Liberal leadership has stated that they do not have a policy on Iraq, as one of your leaders said yesterday, but will have one in an appropriate time, I am sure in time for the 2006 election.

Because we are accountable for our words, I urge a yes on this rule to bring this resolution to the floor so the time for tough talking will end, and there will be accountability. If people want to make hard statements, they can be accountable for their words because of this. Because of our words, our troops are going to endure the consequences of those statements, and I urge all of you to be accountable for the statements that have been made.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule, and I do so because it does not seem to me reasonable to bring us into a debate over a very serious issue where our young men and

women are in harm's way without hearings, without giving it any thought, without any careful thinking or examination, but thrusting it, thrusting us into voting on a resolution that is, as the gentleman from Georgia said, three lines long.

In Texas we have saying that "this dog don't hunt," and it does not hunt. This political strategy speaks to an observation that was made to us in a hearing recently by General Kelley from the Army. He said, We are a Nation at war. We are a Nation at war except in Washington, DC. We are not a Nation sharing the sacrifice. Nothing exemplifies his testimony better than the so-called debate here on this rule.

In August, we honored four soldiers that are recipients of Purple Hearts, and one of the sergeants told me, Congressman, does anybody in Washington understand that we have a flawed strategy where we are being subjected to a mentality of "The Charge of The Light Brigade?"

So I went back and I looked up "The Charge of The Light Brigade" by Lord Tennyson, and I will just read a portion of it:

Half a league, half a league,
Half a league onward,
All in the valley of Death
Rode the six hundred.
'Forward, the Light Brigade!
Charge for the guns!' he said:
Into the valley of Death
Rode the six hundred.
'Forward, the Light Brigade!
Was there a man dismay'd?
Not tho' the soldier knew
Some one had blunder'd:
Their's not to make reply,
Their's not to reason why,
Their's but to do and die:
Into the valley of Death
Rode the six hundred.

Every day our men and women are riding convoys into that valley of death. Shame on us for this resolution. Vote against it.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, my Democratic colleagues are coming down here and accusing us of slandering our friend and fellow Member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), and that is absurd. It is not about him, and it is not about any of us. It is about foreign policy and national security, and, quite frankly, this idea on the left that we can and should immediately withdraw is not only a bad idea, it is dangerous. How do you tell a 19-year-old American, fighting, bleeding for their country, that it is all pointless? How dare you do such a thing?

You may not agree with the way things are being managed, but do not minimize the importance of what we are doing in Iraq. You all on the left opened up this debate. I think they have been itching for a fight for a long time from the way their comments have sounded, and now they would like

to sneak out of the room and avoid this topic.

The left in Congress wants a debate on the idea of immediate withdrawal, and since they have been wanting it, we are going to have it. The left wanted to go out. They wanted to talk about this with no regard for the big picture, with no regard for constituents, who have families, who are fighting. Well, now, we are going to have to stand here, they are going to have to stand here. And they are going to take the heat and take the debate.

We are fighting because we do not want our kids living in a world dominated by terrorism. We are fighting for freedom.

□ 1700

The left works real hard to isolate Iraq from the Middle East and from the global war on terrorism. The left actually thinks terrorists separate Iraq from the war on terrorism.

We know that is not true. We know it is not true.

I do not believe America is willing to give up on what is the war for the Free World. I do not think they are willing to give up on the war for the Free World.

The left wanted the debate. Let us have the debate. They are going to lose the debate. The American people have stronger backbones than the radical left.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentlewoman who just spoke keeps on talking about how the Democrats want to call for immediate withdrawal without providing for the safe and orderly withdrawal of our troops and the protection of our troops. Only Mr. HUNTER, the Republican from California, has called for that in his resolution. None of us have called for that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Pennsylvania spoke with courage and conviction about the war in Iraq, and there is no one in this body who knows more about our national defense and has devoted more of his life to our troops and our security than Jack Murtha. But evidently his speech has prompted this stunt that the Republicans are pulling here to force a vote on a resolution never considered by any committee.

Well, I must tell the Members that like the intelligence that led to war, the resolution before this body is a fake. Republicans are describing this resolution as a Murtha resolution, but it is not his language and differs in key ways from his proposal.

One of the points Mr. MURTHA raised yesterday was the misuse of intelligence on Iraq. He called the war a flawed policy wrapped in illusion. Like Mr. MURTHA, I voted for that war. And like him, I have profound concerns about the intelligence, that it was warped and twisted to justify an invasion.

My concerns are deeply personal. I voted for the war resolution because the President said Iraq would soon brandish nuclear bombs; and like millions of Americans, I was misled.

I raised concerns about the nuclear intelligence in a letter to the President on March 17, 2003, before any bullets were fired and before the war started, and I am going to attach this letter to my statement, but I want to read a part of it.

I wrote: "Dear, Mr. President, in the last 10 days, it has become incontrovertibly clear that a key piece of evidence you and others in the administration have cited regarding Iraq's efforts to obtain nuclear weapons is a hoax. The evidence in question is correspondence that indicates that Iraq sought to obtain nuclear material from an African country. For several months this evidence has been a central part of the U.S. case against Iraq. It has now been conceded that this evidence was a forgery. Even more troubling, the CIA, which has been aware of this information since 2001, has never regarded the evidence as reliable."

"The implications of this fact are profound. It means that a key part of the case you have been building against Iraq is evidence that your own intelligence experts do not believe is credible. It is hard to imagine how this situation could have developed. The two most obvious explanations, knowing deception or unfathomable incompetence, both have immediate and serious implications."

I made that request 2½ years ago, and I am still waiting for an answer. The President has never explained how forged evidence could become a cornerstone in the case for the war on Iraq.

Yesterday, the gentleman from Pennsylvania spoke with courage and conviction about the war in Iraq. There is no one in this body who knows more about our national defense—and who has devoted more of his life—to our troops and our security than JACK MURTHA.

His speech has prompted this stunt by the Republicans to force a vote on a resolution never considered by any committee. Like the intelligence that led the Nation to war, the resolution before this body is a fake. Republicans are describing this resolution as the Murtha resolution. But it is not his language and differs in key ways from his proposal.

One of the points Mr. MURTHA raised yesterday was the misuse of the intelligence on Iraq. He called the war "a flawed policy wrapped in illusion."

Like Mr. MURTHA, I voted for the war. And like him, I have profound concerns about how the intelligence was warped and twisted to justify an invasion.

My concerns are deeply personal. I voted for the war resolution because the President said Iraq would soon brandish nuclear bombs. And like millions of Americans, I was misled.

I raised concerns about the nuclear intelligence in a letter to the President on March 17, 2003—before any bullets were fired and before the war started. I ask unanimous consent to introduce this letter into the RECORD.

I wrote:

Dear Mr. President: . . . In the last ten days, it has become incontrovertibly clear that a key piece of evidence you and other Administration officials have cited regarding Iraq's efforts to obtain nuclear weapons is a hoax. . . .

The evidence in question is correspondence that indicates that Iraq sought to obtain nuclear material from an African country, Niger. For several months, this evidence has been a central part of the U.S. case against Iraq. . . . [I]n your State of the Union address, you stated: "The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa."

It has now been conceded that this evidence was a forgery. . . . Even more troubling, . . . the CIA, which has been aware of this information since 2001, has never regarded the evidence as reliable. The implications of this fact are profound: it means that a key part of the case you have been building against Iraq is evidence that your own intelligence experts . . . do not believe is credible.

It is hard to imagine how this situation could have developed. The two most obvious explanations—knowing deception or unfathomable incompetence—both have immediate and serious implications.

I made that request 2½ years ago. And I am still waiting for an answer. The President has never explained how forged evidence could become a cornerstone of the case for war in Iraq.

And this body has been part of the cover-up. We've averted our eyes and shut down our oversight committees. The Washington Republicans who run this body are afraid to ask questions and embarrass the President. They have abrogated their solemn constitutional obligations to hold the executive branch accountable for its abuses.

As the ranking Democrat on the House Committee in charge of oversight and investigations, I have requested hearings to review:

(1) The way intelligence was manipulated by people in this administration. On my website—www.reform.democrats.house.gov—there is a report of 237 misleading and inaccurate statements made by the President, Vice President, Secretary of State and Defense and the National Security Adviser, based on what they knew at the time and not what we learned later.

(2) An investigation of prison treatment by the U.S. after Abu Graib.

(3) An investigation of the outing of CIA agent Valerie Plame for political purposes, even though it jeopardized our national security.

(4) An investigation of the secret meetings Vice President CHENEY had with energy executives regarding our energy policy.

The Republicans should do the work required under our Constitution—do the oversight to provide the checks and balances to avoid a concentration of power in an imperial and out of touch administration.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2003.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing regarding a matter of grave concern. Upon your order, our armed forces will soon initiate the first preemptive war in our nation's history. The most persuasive justification for this war is that we must act to prevent Iraq from developing nuclear weapons.

In the last ten days, however, it has become incontrovertibly clear that a key piece of evidence you and other Administration officials have cited regarding Iraq's efforts to obtain nuclear weapons is a hoax. What's more, the Central Intelligence Agency questioned the veracity of the evidence at the same time you and other Administration officials were citing it in public statements. This is a breach of the highest order, and the American people are entitled to know how it happened.

As you know, I voted for the congressional resolution condemning Iraq and authorizing the use of force. Despite serious misgivings, I supported the resolution because I believed congressional approval would significantly improve the likelihood of effective U.N. action. Equally important, I believed that you had access to reliable intelligence information that merited deference.

Like many other members, I was particularly influenced by your views about Iraq's nuclear intentions. Although chemical and biological weapons can inflict casualties, no argument for attacking Iraq is as compelling as the possibility of Saddam Hussein brandishing nuclear bombs. That, obviously, is why the evidence in this area is so crucial, and why so many have looked to you for honest and credible information on Iraq's nuclear capability.

The evidence in question is correspondence that indicates that Iraq sought to obtain nuclear material from an African country, Niger. For several months, this evidence has been a central part of the U.S. case against Iraq. On December 19, the State Department filed a response to Iraq's disarmament declaration to the U.N. Security Council. The State Department response stated: "The Declaration ignores efforts to procure uranium from Niger." A month later, in your State of the Union address, you stated: "The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa." Defense Secretary Rumsfeld subsequently cited the evidence in briefing reporters.

It has now been conceded that this evidence was a forgery. On March 7, the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Mohamed ElBaradei, reported that the evidence that Iraq sought nuclear materials from Niger was "not authentic." As subsequent media accounts indicated, the evidence contained "crude errors," such as a "childlike signature" and the use of stationery from a military government in Niger that has been out of power for over a decade.

Even more troubling, however, the CIA, which has been aware of this information since 2001, has never regarded the evidence as reliable. The implications of this fact are profound: it means that a key part of the case you have been building against Iraq is evidence that your own intelligence experts at the Central Intelligence Agency do not believe is credible.

It is hard to imagine how this situation could have developed. The two most obvious explanations—knowing deception or unfathomable incompetence—both have immediate and serious implications. It is thus imperative that you address this matter without delay and provide an alternative explanation, if there is one.

The rest of this letter will explain my concerns in detail.

USE OF THE EVIDENCE BY U.S. OFFICIALS

The evidence that Iraq sought to purchase uranium from an African country was first revealed by the British government on September 24, 2002, when Prime Minister Tony Blair released a 50-page report on Iraqi efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction. As the New York Times reported in a front-

page article, one of the two "chief new elements" in the report was the claim that Iraq had "sought to acquire uranium in Africa that could be used to make nuclear weapons."

This evidence subsequently became a significant part of the U.S. case against Iraq. On December 7, Iraq filed its weapons declaration with the United Nations Security Council. The U.S. response relied heavily on the evidence that Iraq had sought to obtain uranium from Africa.

For example, this is how the New York Times began its front-page article on December 13 describing the U.S. response:

"American intelligence agencies have reached a preliminary conclusion that Iraq's 12,000 page declaration of its weapons program fails to account for chemical and biological agents missing when inspectors left Iraq four years ago, American officials and United Nations diplomats said today.

"In addition, Iraq's declaration on its nuclear program, they say, leaves open a host of questions. Among them is why Iraq was seeking to buy uranium in Africa in recent years."

The official U.S. response was provided on December 19, when Secretary of State Colin Powell appeared before the Security Council. As the Los Angeles Times reported, "A one-page State Department fact sheet . . . lists what Washington considers the key omissions and deceptions in Baghdad's Dec. 7 weapons declaration." One of the eight "key omissions and deceptions" was the failure to explain Iraq's attempts to purchase uranium from an African country.

Specifically, the State Department fact sheet contains the following points under the heading "Nuclear Weapons": "The Declaration ignores efforts to procure uranium from Niger. Why is the Iraqi regime hiding their uranium procurement?" A copy of this fact sheet is enclosed with this letter.

The Iraqi efforts to obtain uranium from Africa were deemed significant enough to be included in your State of the Union address to Congress. You stated: "The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa." As the Washington Post reported the next day, "the president seemed quite specific as he ticked off the allegations last night, including the news that Iraq had secured uranium from Africa for the purpose of making nuclear bombs."

A day later, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld told reporters at a news briefing that Iraq "recently was discovered seeking significant quantities of uranium from Africa."

KNOWLEDGE OF THE UNRELIABILITY OF THE EVIDENCE

The world first learned that the evidence linking Iraq to attempts to purchase uranium from Africa was forged from the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Mohamed ElBaradei. On March 7, Director ElBaradei reported to the U.N. Security Council: "Based on thorough analysis, the IAEA has concluded, with the concurrence of outside experts, that these documents—which formed the basis for reports of recent uranium transactions between Iraq and Niger—are in fact not authentic. We have therefore concluded that these specific allegations are unfounded."

Recent accounts in the news media have provided additional details. According to the Washington Post, the faked evidence included "a series of letters between Iraqi agents and officials in the central African nation of Niger." The article stated that the forgers "made relatively crude errors that eventually gave them away—including names and titles that did not match up with

the individuals who held office at the time the letters were purportedly written." CNN reported: "one of the documents purports to be a letter signed by Tandjia Mamadou, the president of Niger, talking about the uranium deal with Iraq. On it [is] a childlike signature that is clearly not his. Another, written on paper from a 1980s military government in Niger, bears the date of October 2000 and the signature of a man who by then had not been foreign minister of Niger for 14 years."

U.S. intelligence officials had doubts about the veracity of the evidence long before Director ElBaradei's report. The Los Angeles Times reported on March 15 that "the CIA first heard allegations that Iraq was seeking uranium from Niger in late 2001" when "the existence of the documents was reported to [the CIA] second- or third-hand." The Los Angeles Times quotes one CIA official as saying: "We included that in some of our reporting, although it was all caveated because we had concerns about the accuracy of that information." The Washington Post reported on March 13: "The CIA . . . had questions about 'whether they were accurate,' said one intelligence official, and it decided not to include them in its file on Iraq's program to procure weapons of mass destruction."

There have been suggestions by some Administration officials that there may be other evidence besides the forged documents that shows Iraq tried to obtain uranium from an African country. For instance, CIA officials recently stated that "U.S. concerns regarding a possible uranium agreement between Niger and Iraq were not based solely on the documents which are now known to be fraudulent." The CIA provided this other information to the IAEA along with the forged documents. After reviewing this complete body of evidence, the IAEA stated: "we have found to date no evidence or plausible indication of the revival of a nuclear weapons programme in Iraq." Ultimately, the IAEA concluded that "these specific allegations are unfounded."

QUESTIONS

These facts raise troubling questions. It appears that at the same time that you, Secretary Rumsfeld, and State Department officials were citing Iraq's efforts to obtain uranium from Africa as a crucial part of the case against Iraq, U.S. intelligence officials regarded this very same evidence as unreliable. If true, this is deeply disturbing: it would mean that your Administration asked the U.N. Security Council, the Congress, and the American people to rely on information that your own experts knew was not credible.

Your statement to Congress during the State of the Union, in particular, raises a host of questions. The statement is worded in a way that suggests it was carefully crafted to be both literally true and deliberately misleading at the same time. The statement itself—"The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa"—may be technically accurate, since this appears to be the British position. But given what the CIA knew at the time, the implication you intended—that there was credible evidence that Iraq sought uranium from Africa—was simply false.

To date, the White House has avoided explaining why the Administration relied on this forged evidence in building its case against Iraq. The first Administration response, which was provided to the Washington Post, was "we fell for it." But this is no longer credible in light of the information from the CIA. Your spokesman, Ari Fleischer, was asked about this issue at a White House news briefing on March 14, but

as the following transcript reveals, he claimed ignorance and avoided the question:

Q: Ari, as the president said in his State of the Union address, the British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa. And since then, the IAEA said that those were forged documents—

Mr. Fleischer: I'm sorry, whose statement was that?

Q: The President, in his State of the Union address. Since then, the IAEA has said those were forged documents. Was the administration aware of any doubts about these documents, the authenticity of the documents, from any government agency or department before it was submitted to the IAEA?

Mr. Fleischer: These are matters that are always reviewed with an eye toward the various information that comes in and is analyzed by a variety of different people. The President's concerns about Iraq come from multiple places, involving multiple threats that Iraq can possess, and these are matters that remain discussed.

"Thank you [end of briefing].

Plainly, more explanation is needed. I urge you to provide to me and to the relevant committees of Congress a full accounting of what you knew about the reliability of the evidence linking Iraq to uranium in Africa, when you knew this, and why you and senior officials in the Administration presented the evidence to the U.N. Security Council, the Congress, and the American people without disclosing the doubts of the CIA. In particular, I urge you to address:

(1) Whether CIA officials communicated their doubts about the credibility of the forged evidence to other Administration officials, including officials in the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the National Security Council, and the White House;

(2) Whether the CIA had any input into the "Fact Sheet" distributed by the State Department on December 19, 2002; and

(3) Whether the CIA reviewed your statement in the State of the Union address regarding Iraq's attempts to obtain uranium from Africa and, if so, what the CIA said about the statement.

Given the urgency of the situation, I would appreciate an expeditious response to these questions.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Ranking Minority Member.

ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES OF OMISSIONS FROM THE IRAQI DECLARATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

ANTHRAX AND OTHER UNDECLARED BIOLOGICAL AGENTS

The UN Special Commission concluded that Iraq did not verifiably account for, at a minimum, 2160kg of growth media.

This is enough to produce 26,000 liters of anthrax—3 times the amount Iraq declared; 1200 liters of botulinum toxin; and, 5500 liters of clostridium perfringens—16 times the amount Iraq declared.

Why does the Iraqi declaration ignore these dangerous agents in its tally?

BALLISTIC MISSILES

Iraq has disclosed manufacturing new energetic fuels suited only to a class of missile to which it does not admit.

Iraq claims that flight-testing of a larger diameter missile falls within the 150km limit. This claim is not credible.

Why is the Iraqi regime manufacturing fuels for missiles it says it does not have?

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The Declaration ignores efforts to procure uranium from Niger.

Why is the Iraqi regime hiding their uranium procurement?

VX

In 1999, UN Special Commission and international experts concluded that Iraq needed to provide additional, credible information about VX production.

The declaration provides no information to address these concerns.

What is the Iraqi regime trying to hide by not providing this information?

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS MUNITIONS

In January 1999, the UN Special Commission reported that Iraq failed to provide credible evidence that 550 mustard gas-filled artillery shells and 400 biological weapon-capable aerial bombs had been lost or destroyed.

The Iraqi regime has never adequately accounted for hundreds, possibly thousands, of tons of chemical precursors.

Again, what is the Iraqi regime trying to hide by not providing this information?

EMPTY CHEMICAL MUNITIONS

There is no adequate accounting for nearly 30,000 empty munitions that could be filled with chemical agents.

Where are these munitions?

UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES (UAV) PROGRAMS

Iraq denies any connection between UAV programs and chemical or biological agent dispersal. Yet, Iraq admitted in 1995 that a MIG-21 remote-piloted vehicle tested in 1991 was to carry a biological weapon spray system.

Iraq already knows how to put these biological agents into bombs and how to disperse biological agent using aircraft or unmanned aerial vehicles.

Why do they deny what they have already admitted? Why has the Iraqi regime acquired the range and auto-flight capabilities to spray biological weapons?

MOBILE BIOLOGICAL WEAPON AGENT FACILITIES

The Iraqi declaration provides no information about its mobile biological weapon agent facilities. Instead it insists that these are "refrigeration vehicles and food testing laboratories."

What is the Iraqi regime trying to hide about their mobile biological weapon facilities?

SUMMARY

None of these holes and gaps in Iraq's declaration are mere accidents, editing oversights or technical mistakes: they are material omissions.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Let us make it clear that this is not a stunt. It is not an attack on an individual. It is a very legitimate question. JACK MURTHA is a distinguished veteran. He is a good friend. We have joined together on many more defense issues than we have been apart on, and he has got an excellent background in defense, and he has every right to take the position that he has taken. We are all masters of our own opinion and our own position, and he studied this issue, and that is his position.

The reason I think it is important for this House to speak now before we break for a couple of weeks is because

the impression has gone out around the world, carried on international news agencies, U.S. news agencies to friends and foes alike. The impression has gone out that Congress is withdrawing its support of the mission in Iraq. And if we look at the Washington Post and look at the front page, that is precisely what we see. If we looked at the headline on CNN and many other of the electronic news media, that is what we see.

But more importantly, it is not just important as to what our allies think or what our adversaries think. The most important people on this stage are the people wearing the uniform of the United States. And people who are reading the media, watching the media, those 140,000 personnel presently stationed in Iraq are obviously getting an impression about the United States Congress and its position with respect to all of the publicity that has emanated not just from this body and statements that have gone out from this body but also from the other body that happened just a couple of days ago and the headline stories that emanated from that.

Now, all of us, and I can just say as the chairman of my committee, we have held lots of hearings, lots of briefings. We held full House briefings for every Member of the House, Democrat and Republican, where they could ask our intelligence officers, with no handlers from the White House present, every single question that they wanted to have answered. We have had full briefings on armor, on troop deployments, on operations. Everybody here is competent to answer this question: Should we terminate our deployment in Iraq?

Now, of all the issues that we have studied over the last year or so that we have been working on, this is certainly one that we all have a background in now. Nobody can complain now that they have been duped and therefore this is not a real question or a solid question or an important question to answer. So we are going to let every Member answer that, and I hope that the message that goes back to our troops in Iraq, and I know that the message that will go back to our troops in Iraq, is that we do not support a precipitous pullout from Iraq, and that will do more to restore their morale than anything else this Congress could do.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Can I inquire of the gentleman from California how he intends to vote on the resolution that he has introduced that does not provide for the protection of our troops?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against a precipitous termination of our deployment in Iraq.

Mr. MCGOVERN. You are going to vote against the Hunter amendment.

Thank you for voting against your own amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. But I am going to allow you to vote "yes."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair would advise Members that it is improper to walk in front of a Member speaking in the well.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, the troops in this country are going to be surprised to find out that the Republican chairman of the House Armed Services Committee filed a resolution saying that it is the sense of the House of Representatives, apparently as he sees it, that the deployment of the United States forces in Iraq be terminated immediately. Apparently, the Republican chairman of the House Armed Services Committee thinks that we should not have an orderly withdrawal of the troops, thinks that we should not provide for their safety and protection on the withdrawal, thinks that we should not do the things that Mr. MURTHA suggested that we do.

It is either that, sir, or they are going to think that this is some sort of a trick, that you filed this so that we would have been looking at something that Mr. MURTHA did not want us to look at. Because if you are concerned about what the message is that the troops are getting in Iraq, you would, in fact, have a full-fledged debate here so that Mr. MURTHA and other Members of both parties could express clearly and succinctly what it is they believe ought to happen in terms of policy.

But that is not what we are seeing here. You should have a chance for Mr. MURTHA to discuss his idea on protecting the troops when there is a redeployment or redeploying to over the horizon so that there will not be a spread of terrorism, of making sure that any redeployment is made with the protection and the safety of the troops. But I do not think that is what is going on here.

You talk about your respect for Mr. MURTHA. You talk about his known knowledge for the military, and yet it is you, sir, who comes down here and says that the Republican chairman of the House Armed Services Committee proposes that the House of Representatives put their statement and their resolve that we should deploy immediately from Iraq and not protect our troops, apparently, because it does not say that, and not provide for their safety, not provide for redeployment somewhere over the horizon so that we will be sure that terrorism does not spread there and we will be ready for any emergency.

If instead you want the troops to get the message that that is not what we want, then why did you not work with your delegation over there to make sure that Mr. MURTHA's resolution could be proposed and debated and ex-

plained fully and then this country could have the benefit of a full discussion of where the policy is going, because this administration, apparently, has no clue and has no idea. They politicized the lead-up going into the area, and now you are politicizing how it is we are going to get this country back in order and out of there.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would also advise Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

And let me make this point: that the resolution is written in precisely the way that I think describes the essence of the publicity that has emanated from Washington, D.C. This is a message that has been sent to our troops; and if you look at the e-mails coming in, I think the question is well described, and I think that it manifests what a lot of people now think, especially uniformed people in the Iraq theater, and it is precisely the question before the House that the gentleman will have an absolute right to vote on; and I would hope that this is not Mr. MURTHA's position. He will have a chance to vote "no" on it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand it to ever be the habit of this institution for a Member on one side taking it upon himself to interpret the meaning of a resolution of a Member on the other side without giving that Member the courtesy and the respect of allowing them to put forward what the meaning and intention of their own resolution is. I think, sir, you are playing games.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, let me just reiterate to my friend, he said this should not be about Mr. MURTHA, and it is not about Mr. MURTHA. It is about the message that has been sent around the world, as evidenced by e-mails coming back in from our troops now who think that the Congress is pulling the rug out from under the mission.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask Members to respect the gavel and the time yielded.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know a single Democrat who supports the Hunter resolution that would basically provide for the immediate withdrawal without the protection for our troops. This is a counterfeit. This is an insult to this institution. And to not allow us to have a real debate, to not allow us to bring up different proposals, I think, undercuts the process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from California why he introduced a counterfeit Murtha resolution rather than allowing us to vote on the real Murtha resolution, if he wanted us to vote at all.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, let me answer my friend.

This is a letter from an army captain in Iraq. He says in this e-mail: "I am a U.S. Army captain currently serving in Iraq, and I am shocked and appalled by Rep Murtha's call for an immediate withdrawal. Please, please, please convince your colleague to let us finish this critical job. He is correct that the deployments and service and casualties are hard on all of us. He is wrong about what is demoralizing to us. What is demoralizing is a Congress which no longer stands behind our mission."

That is why we are offering this resolution. That is obviously the message that is going out to thousands of servicemen around the world.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For 24 hours you maligned a great Member of this House, a decorated Vietnam War veteran. You should be ashamed of yourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

□ 1715

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, in response to the speech of one decorated veteran of this institution, the Republican chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has taken this position of that Member, and he has written this abbreviated, interpreted version which mischaracterizes the position of Mr. MURTHA. This is signed by Mr. HUNTER, and it has a number on it. Just think of the mischief al-Zarqawi can do with this when he puts it on the Internet. We have a signed document from the Chair of the—chairman of the Committee on Armed Services asking for immediate withdrawal.

Now, I have an e-mail, too. We all get them. This is from the president of the Oregon War Veterans Association, who did disagree with Mr. MURTHA and knows my position against the war. He said, "I am writing not only to thank you for your service, but also to ask you to be cautious about politicizing the war effort in Iraq. It is our determination to keep our servicemembers safe from injury that may come from pure partisan political sabotage," and if a fabricated document fabricating the position of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee with his signature on it which is now winging its way around the world is not pure partisan political sabotage, I do not know what is.

If you have good sense, you will withdraw this resolution. We will even give you unanimous consent to do it, Mr.

HUNTER. But if you will not, maybe you can start doing your job: Hold a few hearings and a little bit of oversight in what is going on in Iraq, and maybe we can even act like the bipartisan Senate and ask that the President report to us on his goals, objectives and progress in Iraq. But none of this has happened in this House. This is the only substantive action you have taken on Iraq since we went in there, and you should be awfully ashamed.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER).

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, first, I wish to make it clear on my part that it is impossible to impugn the character of the gentleman from Pennsylvania because we could not do it if we so intended. Like so many of our citizen soldiers, their service did not end with their military career, and they continue to serve our country.

But I would hope that this rule would be adopted because this is a question that we have all had to answer. My constituents have asked it. It is incumbent upon me to respond, and I would think it would be no different today.

But I would hope the consequence of this rule being passed and this resolution being debated with free vote of conscience on either side of the aisle is that should it fail, is that we then strive to find a bipartisan plan for victory in Iraq, and an articulation of our war aims that can motivate the American people to galvanize behind it. For if we do not, whatever happens to this resolution, our resolution to prevail in this cause will be gone, and our cause will be nil, and the sacrifice will be in vain. Vote for adoption of the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am confused. When I came here, I was told that the Republicans had put the Murtha resolution on for debate, and then I saw what they put on. I was just wondering and I have a question where they got this. Did they, by any chance, get it from CBS and Dan Rather?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, today's debate should be about one thing, whether or not we believe that this administration and this President are pursuing sound and competent policy in Iraq. Instead, the Republican leadership has orchestrated a pathetic, partisan political ploy in an effort to distract the American people from this administration's failure in Iraq. The Republican leadership is making a mockery of JACK MURTHA's able and selfless service to his country in a blatant abuse of power.

This leadership has rushed a resolution to the floor that bears no resemblance to JACK MURTHA's considered position on Iraq. The war is a matter of life and death for our servicemen and

for the people of Iraq, and this Republican leadership has instead decided to make it a political power play. This is a disgusting offense to JACK MURTHA, to every one of our veterans, and, most importantly, to all of our brave men and women serving today.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT), our newest Member.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I stood at Arlington National Cemetery attending the funeral of a young Marine from my district. He believed what we are doing is the right thing, and had the courage to lay his life on the line to do it.

A few minutes ago I received a call from Colonel Danny Bupp, Ohio Representative from the 88th District in the House of Representatives. He asked me to send Congress a message: "Stay the course." * * *

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the words of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Clerk will report the words.

□ 1730

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, my remarks were not directed at any Member of the House, and I did not intend to suggest that they applied to any Member, most especially the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. I therefore ask for unanimous consent that my words be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

Mr. SNYDER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's words. And I accept, as one Member, her offer to have her words withdrawn. But I encourage all of us here tonight to recognize the seriousness of what we are about and to choose our words carefully. Our side is greatly offended by this process. I suspect that you have a fair number of Members that are not very satisfied with it, either. My suggestion would be that the resolution be withdrawn and we come back and discuss it another day.

However, I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman's words will be stricken.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, in the heart of the spirit of discussion, I have received many telephone calls and e-mails asking us to show the world that we do support this effort. That is what we are here about. That is the debate that is at hand, whether we support this war or that we do not support this war. My constituents, the world, expect us to stay the course.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 min-

utes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Georgia how many more speakers he has on his side.

Mr. GINGREY. I have no more speakers. I reserve the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me close for our side here.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, this Republican resolution is consistent with the dishonest political way the Republican leadership has acted over the past 3½ years. This Congress has not served as a check. It has not served as a coequal branch of government. This Republican Congress is only interested in covering up for this administration. We have lost over 2,000 American men and women in Iraq. Thousands more are wounded. We have spent hundreds of billions of dollars in this war effort, our credibility around the world is at an all-time low, and this is the best that you can do for our soldiers, this resolution? This is it? This is our debate on Iraq? This is what the American people get for all of what they have gone through, all the sacrifices they have made?

As for this legislation by the gentleman from California, which hasn't had a hearing and hasn't had a markup, if it comes up, I am going to vote against it. I think all of us are going to vote against it because it does not provide for the safe and the orderly withdrawal of our forces. Nobody on this side has said anything other than that.

Let me close with this: to my Republican friends, JACK MURTHA isn't afraid of you. He has faced down a lot worse than some of the pathetic smears that we have heard from the other side today. And let me be clear to all of you. If you truly oppose this resolution, if you want to honor our soldiers, if you want to do your job and hold this administration accountable, which we are supposed to do, then you should oppose this rule.

If you oppose the rule, we are not going to have to deal with this lousy bill. We will come back and do it right. To vote for this rule is to politicize a war and that is a mistake. All of us whether we are for this war or against this war, whether Republican or Democrat or liberal or conservative, we should not want to politicize this war. To do so is tragic.

Mr. Speaker, by moving ahead with this resolution, we demean the service of our soldiers. We demean the families who have lost loved ones in this war. We demean this institution. We need to do our job. This is not about a game of political gotcha. This is about doing the right thing, making sure we are on the right course, that we can disagree about that, but we can respect each other's opinion without trying to smear one another.

And so I would urge all my colleagues for the sake of collegiality, for the sake of civility in this House, for

the sake of doing the right thing for the people of this country and especially for our troops overseas vote down this rule. Vote down this rule. Let's end this right now, and let's come back and let's do it right and let's get the American people what they deserve: a real, thorough, honest debate and discussion on the war in Iraq.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I close this debate by thanking the various Members of this body from the chairmen who have shepherded these legislative initiatives to the conferees whose hard work has given this House the opportunity to move our legislative agenda forward. While this process may not be perfect, Mr. Speaker, it is at the end of the day a process in which Members can work together through compromise and long hours to complete the work of the American people.

This is good governance; and, Mr. Speaker, good governance is never easy, but it never should be. This is serious work and the American people deserve every ounce of our attention and every ounce of our labor to see their agenda realized. Again, I would like to urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the misguided Hunter troop withdrawal resolution. How irresponsible this is.

Instead, let me thank Congressman and Marine JACK MURTHA.

Thank you for your patriotism.

Thank you for your honorable discernment of duty . . . to America . . . to our troops . . . to the cause of victory and freedom in Iraq. Your judicious resolution deserves hearing by the American people, our troops and this House.

Yesterday, you stood high on this Hill. Your message reached the American people. And it reached our troops and their commanders. Unlike the Bush Administration, you have a plan for Iraq. Your plan is real. It says:

Within six months, redeploy our troops consistent with their safety.

Create a quick reaction force in the region.

Back that up with an over-the-horizon presence of Marines.

Push the diplomacy button hard to secure and stabilize Iraq.

You don't want America's soldiers to be viewed as the enemy of freedom. For indeed they are its champions.

You spoke the truth when you said our soldiers have been made the victims of freedom in a growing counterinsurgency movement inside Iraq caused by the Bush-Cheney Administration's bungling, misleading, distorting and propagandizing of this war.

You were right in letting the American people know that since Abu Gharib the Bush-Cheney Administration has lost U.S. moral authority in the Middle East. Since Abu Gharib, American casualties have doubled. Since last year, insurgent incidents have increased from about 150 per week to over 700 last year.

Yes, winning means winning the hearts and minds of the people, over there, not just here. Victory means political victory as well as military victory. Our military has done everything asked of them. Our diplomats have been

missing in action. Our troops were not led to believe that their lives would be lost in a counterinsurgency movement. Our troops are trained to fight force on force. The challenge America faces in the Islamic and Arab world is being made worse every day by the Bush Administration's miscalculations and misreading of the enemy. Every day, we see the Bush Administration wins us fewer friends.

America will win when the people we are trying to liberate believe we are their friends, not their enemies. 80% of Iraqis are strongly opposed to the presence of coalition troops and nearly half of the Iraqi population believe attacks against American troops are justified. This is not a prescription for victory. The time for the Murtha Plan to begin is now.

Thank you JACK MURTHA for placing your life in the line of fire for our troops and for freedom. Your resolution has a right to be heard and debated as a way forward to freedom.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

Add at the end the following:

(5) A resolution relating to U.S. forces in Iraq.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I think a number of people on this side of the aisle and maybe on the other side of the aisle did not hear what the amendment is. Could it be repeated, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will re-report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk re-reported the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous—

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has offered an amendment to the resolution. A vote will occur on the amendment to the resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state her inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. My inquiry is if this amendment is voted on, does this mean that the underlying resolution could not be withdrawn as we would like for it to be so that we can debate in a civil manner the discussion of our troops in Iraq?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House is debating a rule that would enable the debate of a resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if I might restate, if this resolution is voted on and it succeeds, is there then an opportunity to have by unanimous consent the resolution itself withdrawn? Does this block the withdrawal of the resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is uncertain what the gentleman is asking. The rule is under consideration.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I appreciate the indulgence of the Speaker. We have now had an amended rule. My question is—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rule has not yet been amended. An amendment has been proposed.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. We may ultimately have it. My question is, if the rule passes, can we still have the opportunity to have the actual bill withdrawn?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A measure may be withdrawn from consideration at any time before the House has acted thereon by decision or amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is my question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the amendment and on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 211, nays 204, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 606]

YEAS—211

Aderholt	Cole (OK)	Granger
Akin	Conaway	Graves
Alexander	Crenshaw	Green (WI)
Bachus	Cubin	Gutknecht
Baker	Culberson	Harris
Barrett (SC)	Davis (KY)	Hart
Barton (TX)	Davis, Jo Ann	Hastings (WA)
Bass	Davis, Tom	Hayes
Biggert	Deal (GA)	Hayworth
Bilirakis	DeLay	Hefley
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Hensarling
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, L.	Herger
Blunt	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hobson
Boehlert	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Boehner	Drake	Hulshof
Bonilla	Dreier	Hunter
Bonner	Duncan	Hyde
Bono	Ehlers	Inglis (SC)
Boozman	Emerson	Issa
Boustany	English (PA)	Istook
Bradley (NH)	Everett	Jenkins
Brady (TX)	Feeney	Johnson (CT)
Brown (SC)	Ferguson	Johnson (IL)
Brown-Waite,	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Johnson, Sam
Ginny	Foley	Keller
Burgess	Forbes	Kelly
Burton (IN)	Fortenberry	Kennedy (MN)
Buyer	Fox	King (IA)
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Cannon	Garrett (NJ)	Kirk
Cantor	Gerlach	Kline
Capito	Gibbons	Knollenberg
Carter	Gillmor	Kolbe
Castle	Gingrey	Kuhl (NY)
Chabot	Gohmert	Latham
Choccola	Goode	LaTourette
Coble	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)

Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence

NAYS—204

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford

Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood

Shinkus
Shuster
Simmons
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman

Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—18

Beauprez
Berman
Boswell
Boyd
Cunningham
Flake

Fossella
Gallegly
Hall
Jindal
Kind
LaHood

Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Paul
Peterson (PA)
Shadegg
Towns

□ 1805

Mr. FORTENBERRY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in the family, I was unable to vote on H. Res. 563. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1281) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for science, aeronautics, exploration, exploration capabilities, and the Inspector General, and for other purposes, for fiscal years 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1281

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as “National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATIONS

Sec. 101. Fiscal year 2006.

Sec. 102. Fiscal year 2007.

Sec. 103. Fiscal year 2008.

Sec. 104. Fiscal year 2009.

Sec. 105. Fiscal year 2010.

Sec. 106. Evaluation criteria for budget request.

SUBTITLE B—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 131. Implementation of a science program that extends human knowledge and understanding of the Earth, sun, solar system, and the universe.

Sec. 132. Biennial reports to Congress on science programs.

Sec. 133. Status report on Hubble Space Telescope servicing mission.

Sec. 134. Develop expanded permanent human presence beyond low-Earth orbit.

Sec. 135. Ground-based analog capabilities.

Sec. 136. Space launch and transportation transition, capabilities, and development.

Sec. 137. Lessons learned and best practices.

Sec. 138. Safety management.

Sec. 139. Creation of a budget structure that aids effective oversight and management.

Sec. 140. Earth observing system.

Sec. 141. NASA healthcare program.

Sec. 142. Assessment of extension of data collection from Ulysses and Voyager spacecraft.

Sec. 143. Program to expand distance learning in rural underserved areas.

Sec. 144. Institutions in NASA'S minority institutions program.

Sec. 145. Aviation safety program.

Sec. 146. Atmospheric, geophysical, and rocket research authorization.

Sec. 147. Orbital debris.

Sec. 148. Continuation of certain educational programs.

Sec. 149. Establishment of the Charles “Pete” Conrad Astronomy Awards Program.

Sec. 150. GAO assessment of feasibility of Moon and Mars exploration missions.

Sec. 151. Workforce.

Sec. 152. Major research equipment and facilities.

Sec. 153. Data on specific fields of study.

SUBTITLE C—LIMITATIONS AND SPECIAL AUTHORITY

Sec. 161. Official representational fund.

Sec. 162. Facilities management.

TITLE II—INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION

Sec. 201. International Space Station completion.

Sec. 202. Research and support capabilities on international Space Station.

Sec. 203. National laboratory status for International Space Station.

Sec. 204. Commercial support of International Space Station operations and utilization.

Sec. 205. Use of the International Space Station and annual report.

TITLE III—NATIONAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION POLICY

Sec. 301. United States human-rated launch capacity assessment.

Sec. 302. Space Shuttle transition.

Sec. 303. Commercial launch vehicles.

Sec. 304. Secondary payload capability.

Sec. 305. Power and propulsion reporting.

Sec. 306. Utilization of NASA field centers and workforce.

TITLE IV—ENABLING COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY

Sec. 401. Commercialization plan.

Sec. 402. Commercial technology transfer program.

Sec. 403. Authority for competitive prize program to encourage development of advanced space and aeronautical technologies.

Sec. 404. Commercial goods and services.

TITLE V—AERONAUTICS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 501. Governmental interest in aeronautics.

Sec. 502. National policy for aeronautics research and development.

Sec. 503. High priority aeronautics research and development programs.