MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE
A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the two House bills on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4939) “An Act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.”

ALLOCATING CONTROL OF TIME ON H. RES. 861
Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time be allocated by House Resolution 868 to the ranking minority members of four committees instead be controlled by the minority leader or her designee.

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

There was no objection.

DECLARING THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL PREVAIL IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR
Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 861) declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. Res. 861

Whereas the United States and its allies are engaged in a Global War on Terror, a long and demanding struggle against an adversary that is driven by hatred of American values and that is committed to imposing, by the use of terror, its repressive ideology throughout the world;

Whereas for the past two decades, terrorists have used violence in a futile attempt to intimidate the United States;

Whereas it is essential to the security of the American people and to world security that the United States, together with its allies, take the battle to the terrorists and to those who provide them assistance;

Whereas the Taliban, al Qaeda, and other terrorists failed to stop free elections in Afghanistan and the first popularly-elected President in that nation’s history has taken office;

Whereas the continued determination of Afghanistan, the United States, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will be required to sustain a sovereign, free, and secure Afghanistan;

Whereas the steadfast resolve of the United States and its allies, beginning on September 11, 2001, helped persuade the government of Libya to surrender its weapons of mass destruction;

Whereas by early 2003 Saddam Hussein and his criminal, Ba’athist regime in Iraq, which had supported terrorists, constituted a threat against global peace and security and was in violation of mandatory United Nations Security Council Resolutions;

Whereas the mission of the United States and its Coalition partners is to destroy Saddam Hussein and his regime from power, is to establish a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq at peace with its neighbors; and

Whereas the terrorists have declared Iraq to be the central front in their war against all who oppose their ideology;

Whereas the United States and its Coalition partners have formed a permanent, representative government under a newly ratified constitution;

Whereas the terrorists seek to destroy the new unity government because it threatens the terrorists’ aspirations for Iraq and the broader Middle East;

Whereas United States Armed Forces, in coordination with Iraqi security forces and Coalition forces, have scored impressive victories in Iraq including finding and killing the terrorist leader Abu Musab al-Zarqawi;

Whereas Iraqi security forces are, over time, taking over from United States and Coalition forces a growing proportion of independent operations and increasingly lead the fight to secure Iraq;

Whereas the United States and Coalition servicemembers and civilians and the members of the Iraqi security forces and those accompanying them to the ultimate sacrifice or been wounded in Iraq have done so nobly, in the cause of freedom; and

Whereas the United States, and its Coalition partners will continue to support Iraq as part of the Global War on Terror; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representa-

(1) honors all those Americans who have taken an active part in the Global War on Terror, whether as first responders protecting the servicemembers overseas, as diplomats and intelligence officers, or in other roles;

(2) honors the sacrifices of the United States Armed Forces and of partners in the Coalition, and of the Iraqis and Afghans who fight alongside them, especially those who have fallen or been wounded in the struggle, and honors as well the sacrifices of their families and of others who risk their lives to help defend freedom;

(3) declares that it is not in the national security interest of the United States to set an arbitrary date for the withdrawal or redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq;

(4) declares that the United States is committed to the completion of the mission to create a sovereign, free, and secure, and united Iraq;

(5) congratulates Prime Minister Nuri Al- Maliki and the Iraqi people on the courage they have shown since attending the Sadr resistance, increasing millions, in the elections of 2005 and on the formation of the first government under Mr. al-Maliki’s new government; and

(6) calls upon the nations of the world to promote global peace and security by standing with the United States and other Coalition forces in support of the Iraqi and Afghan people to live in freedom; and

(7) declares that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the noble struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 868 and the special order of today, debate shall not exceed 10 hours, with 5 hours equally divided among and controlled by the chairman of the Committees on Inter-

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time be allocated by the minority leader or her designee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 861. This resolution is about more than the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. It is about a global war to protect American ideals, and the democracy and values on which this great Nation was founded.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, like this war itself, is about freedom. Just 12 days ago I returned from Iraq. I can tell this House that the morale of our fighting men and women there is sky high. They are fighting from doubt and “second guessing.” And they are certainly not interested in the political posturing about the war that often goes on in this city. They know who they are fighting for. They know they are liberators doing good. And they believe passionately in their mission.

It is not possible to talk to these men and women without being inspired by their courage, their determination, their professionalism and their patriotism.

I came home from Iraq believing even more strongly, that it is not enough for this House to say “we support our troops.” To the men and the women in the field, in harm’s way, that statement rings hollow if we don’t also say what support their mission.

The clarity with which our men and women in uniform understand the reason they are in Iraq is a stark contrast to some here at home who talk about this war as a “war of choice.”

The facts are clear. America has been struck repeatedly. Despite the life-ending attacks on Khorab Towers, our East African embassies, the USS Cole and the first World Trade Center bombing, U.S. policy tended to confuse these attacks with isolated law-enforcement events. We failed to recognize them as

GENERAL LEAVE
Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 861.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, the Speaker of the House (Mr. HASTERT).

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, one of our greatest Presidents, Ronald Reagan, was fond of saying that “Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction.” President Rea-
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I came home from Iraq believing even more strongly, that it is not enough for this House to say “we support our troops.” To the men and the women in the field, in harm’s way, that statement rings hollow if we don’t also say what support their mission.

The clarity with which our men and women in uniform understand the reason they are in Iraq is a stark contrast to some here at home who talk about this war as a “war of choice.”
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the escalating strikes that they were. We failed to identify the networks behind the bombs. We convinced ourselves that these attacks were just somehow random acts of violence. And yet the attacks continued.

The terrorists did not admire or appreciate our limited response. They did not come to the table to discuss points of political concern, and they did not de-escalate, demobilize or disappear. Our response was inconstant and limited, but their reactions were not. They plotted and they practiced, while we hoped for the best and fired an occasional cruise missile into the desert.

We were wrong and we slumbered in denial.

And then came the day when terrorism slapped us in the face, awakening us to a stark reality. I remember it as a crisp, fall day. Where the clear blue sky was filled with fluffy white clouds. But that peaceful scene was transformed in an instant when planes went crashing into buildings and the clear sky turned to choking ash and soot.

I stood in my Capitol office, just a few yards from where I am speaking here today. I saw the black smoke rising from the Pentagon. The third plane had hit just across the river from this Capitol building.

On 9/11 the terrorists were not a distant threat, they were in our front yard, and they were very real and very deadly. In that moment, we were afraid. None of us had anticipated the lengths to which our enemies would go to destroy our American way of life, our ideals and our belief.

Of course, we knew that foreign terrorists had caused trouble elsewhere, maybe in Israel or in Northern Ireland, but we found it hard to imagine that they came to our shores hoping to kill tens of thousands of men, women and children, innocent, unarmed people, peacefully going about their daily lives.

It is hard, even now, to comprehend such enormous evil.

As we watched some of our fellow citizens leap from burning buildings to their deaths, our fear turned to anger and then anger to resolute determination.

America's response started high above a corn field in rural Pennsylvania. Brave men and women, armed with nothing more than boiling water, dinner forks and broken bottles, stood up, as Americans always do when our freedom is in peril, and they struck back.

We know from the messages they left behind that their final thoughts were for their families and their loved ones, but they also spoke of their love of their country.

"For the terrorist never more than one generation from extinction." Perhaps the brave souls on United Flight 93 reflected Ronald Reagan's words because the generation represented on that plane, like the patriots at Concord Bridge, were not going to let freedom be extinguished, not on their watch.

We in this Congress must show the same steady resolve as those men and women on United Flight 93, the same sense of duty as the first responders who headed up the stairs of the Twin Towers.

We must stand firm in our commitment to fight terrorism and the evil it inflicts throughout the world. We must renew our resolve that the actions of evildoers will not dictate American policy. And we must decide, right here, today what kind of a Nation we want to leave for our children and their generation.

We are not alone in the fight on global terrorism. I cannot list them all, but they include countries large and small, rich and poor: Great Britain, Japan, Canada, Jordan, Portugal, Denmark, Mali, Latvia, Romania, Italy, Poland, South Korea. In fact, the number of countries wishing to fight together. Our common enemy continues to grow.

Pakistan, a nation that once recognized the oppressive Taliban regime, has changed its course and now works closely with the coalition to round up terrorists and de-escalate, demobilize or disappear. Libya has given up her nuclear capability.

Today, more than three-quarters of al Qaeda's known leaders and associates have been detained or killed.

There is no doubt that since 9/11 our military, as well as our law enforcement intelligence agencies, have made great strides in uprooting terrorism. Nearly a dozen serious al Qaeda plots have been stopped since September 11th. But there is good reason for ongoing vigilance because the threat is still very real.

Just recently, our neighbor to the north, Canada, foiled a terrorist plot to storm that country's parliament and one of its major television headquarters. The terrorists planned to headthose they captured.

Mr. Speaker, today in parts of the Middle East, where once oppression choked out freedom, we are now seeing democracy take root.

Afghanistan was once a safe haven for the al Qaeda terrorist network. In remote training camps, terrorists planned their attacks on the United States and other freedom loving peoples. Those camps are now gone. In their place is a developing democracy with an elected President and a new Constitution that gives unprecedented rights and freedoms to all Afghans.

Just 3 years ago, Afghan women were whipped in the streets; schooling was denied to girls. Today, women have the right to vote, and two Afghan cabinet ministers are women.

In Iraq, just 3 years ago, a brutal dictator sat in palatial luxury. Unhampered by the United Nations, Saddam and his family stole the Oil-for-Food money from starving Iraqi children in order to support their lifestyle of debauchery and brutality. Schoolgirls were raped. Iraqi patriots were thrown alive into meat grinders. Unspeakable atrocities of all kinds were common, including the use of chemical weapons on Saddam's own people, the Kurds.

Saddam invaded the sovereign nation of Kuwait. He harbored terrorists in his midst, and he defied 17 United Nations Security Council Resolutions. Just a few days ago, I was listening to the radio, and a pundit remarked on the sectarian violence in Iraq. He observed that perhaps the Iraqi people were better off under Saddam. Given the unspeakable and systematic brutality under Saddam's regime, such a remark either reflects a serious misreading of history or a very naive and forgiving nature.

It might have been easier for us in America to turn our heads and look the other way, as many of the rest of the world did, but I would submit that Saddam was an evil cancer on the world. He was a threat to our country, and Mr. Speaker, America, not just Iraq, is better off today because Saddam Hussein is in a court of law, answering for crimes he committed against humanity.

While I was in Iraq, I met with Prime Minister al Malikii as well as my counterparts, the Speaker of the Iraqi Parliament. We talked about the birth of democracy in Iraq.

I looked at the Speaker. I looked him in the eye and I said, "Mr. Speaker, I admire you. The Iraqi people represent an ancient civilization, and you are working to defeat our common enemy.

Pakistan, a nation that once recognized the oppressive Taliban regime, has changed its course and now works closely with the coalition to round up terrorists and de-escalate, demobilize or disappear. Libya has given up her nuclear capability.
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Afghanistan was once a safe haven for the al Qaeda terrorist network. In remote training camps, terrorists planned and plotted. We were on the United States and other freedom loving peoples. Those camps are now gone. In their place is a developing democracy with an elected President and a new Constitution that gives unprecedented rights and freedoms to all Afghans.

Just 3 years ago, Afghan women were whipped in the streets; schooling was denied to girls. Today, women have the right to vote, and two Afghan cabinet ministers are women.

In Iraq, just 3 years ago, a brutal dictator sat in palatial luxury. Unhampered by the United Nations, Saddam and his family stole the Oil-for-Food money from starving Iraqi children in order to support their lifestyle of debauchery and brutality. Schoolgirls were raped. Iraqi patriots were thrown alive into meat grinders. Unspeakable atrocities of all kinds were common, including the use of chemical weapons on Saddam's own people, the Kurds.

Saddam invaded the sovereign nation of Kuwait. He harbored terrorists in his midst, and he defied 17 United Nations Security Council Resolutions. Just a few days ago, I was listening to the radio, and a pundit remarked on the sectarian violence in Iraq. He observed that perhaps the Iraqi people were better off under Saddam. Given the unspeakable and systematic brutality under Saddam's regime, such a remark either reflects a serious misreading of history or a very naive and forgiving nature.
President Bush told us from the beginning that this road would not be easy. We have lost many American lives. And each one is precious to us.

But our fighting men and women remain committed to the effort. Active duty troops and those in recruiting are doing their best to meet or exceeding all objectives, and we are making progress toward our goal, but the battle is not over.

It is a battle that we must endure and one in which we can, and will, be victorious. The alternative would be to cut and run and wait for them to re-group and bring the terror back to our shores. When our freedom is challenged, Americans do not run.

Freedom is the very essence of our Nation," President Reagan said in 1990 when a section of the Berlin Wall was presented to his Presidential library. America, he said, "remains a beacon of hope for oppressed peoples everywhere."

President Reagan also observed that freedom is not passed on at birth. It must be fought for and protected and handed down to the next generation. Freedom is being handed on.

Our soldiers, sailors, Coast Guardsmen, airmen, marines, and our Reserves are serving proudly and bravely in harsh conditions, far from their families.

When I was in Iraq, I told them that their task was important and how proud we all were of service. But frankly our men and women in uniform did not need to be told. In fact, it is we who should listen to them.

They know their sacrifices on foreign shores are keeping the battle against terrorists out of our cities. They know that by going into harm's way they are keeping American freedoms safe, and they know that they are helping a proud but brutalized people to throw off tyranny and stand tall once again. They know that they are liberators, not occupiers.

Our men and women in uniform know all this, and they are proud of it. It is time for this House of Representatives to tell the world that we know it too; that we know our cause is right and that we are proud of it.

Stand up for freedom. Adopt this resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the media just reported the sad news that we have just reached a sad milestone: 2,500 Americans have lost their lives in the Iraq war. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask at the outset of this very important debate that the House observe a moment of silence for all those who have given the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of our country. The toll, extremely high. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself thereafter.

All of us know, all of us understand stability in Iraq is important, not only to the United States but to the world.

It is no secret that Iraq is of particular importance because of its oil. The United States consumes 20.6 billion barrels of oil per day. Yet we produce only 5.1 billion barrels of oil a day. China is the second largest consumer, with 6.9 million barrels per day, and the production is 3.9 million barrels per day. Iraq has the fourth largest oil reserve in the world. Saudi Arabia is number one, Canada number two and Iran number three. So all of us agree Iraq is important. But how do we get to a conclusion?

Let me compare Gulf War I with Gulf War II. In Gulf War I, Kuwait was attacked by Saddam Hussein. It was a brutal attack. President Bush I immediately reacted. He sent his emissary, Secretary Cheney, to Saudi Arabia. They got an agreement from Saudi Arabia to use their land to put troops in. He immediately sent in the Airborne Division, and he immediately sent in F-16 fighters to deter Saddam Hussein. There was a good possibility at that time that he would have complete control of the oil in the Middle East. So we knew how important it was.

Then President Bush started calling up the Reserves. He called a number of Members of Congress over to the White House, and he consulted and talked to them. I do not remember if the gentleman from Illinois was there, but there were seven or eight of us went to the White House. We talked to him about calling up the Reserves and having other people pay.

This is important not only to the United States. This is important internationally. This oil supply, this stability in the Middle East is important to the whole world, and he went to work. He called every major nation. He called Egypt, and this was no easy task for these countries to come around to decide to support the United States.

Matter of fact, President Mubarak said to me that Hussein came to him and said if you support the United States, you will cut the throat of Saddam Hussein, and yet Egypt decided that they were going to go along with us.

Then he talked about that we needed to have a U.N. resolution, which we did have. Then we had to have a resolution in the Congress of the United States. But the big thing that he promoted was he got a coalition together, and this coalition ended up with 400,000 American troops and 150,000 coalition troops.

And I remember during this debate, I remember Secretary Cheney, calling General Scowcroft saying, you have got 250,000 troops over there, you don't need any more. Let's get this war going. And General Scowcroft said something I have never forgotten. He said, we are going to give General Schwarzkopf whatever he wants. He wants more troops, we are going to give him more troops. And Secretary Cheney called me and said we are going to have to send another 180,000 troops. We are going to have overwhelming force when we go into Kuwait.

And they did have overwhelming force. It went on for 6 months. The troops were out in the field, they had the upper hand, and when they did a magnificent thing. It was overwhelming. And it was paid for by other countries. Sixty billion dollars came from other countries. President Bush I convinced other countries that they had to help pay for it. Because it was not only important to the United States, it was important to them, the stability in the Middle East.

Now, let me talk about the second Gulf War. The second Gulf War we had intelligence that said there were weapons of mass destruction; there was an al Qaeda connection. I believed that. As a matter of fact, I listened to the reports, and I was hesitant about the al Qaeda connection, but I believed that they had biological weapons. Matter of fact, a week or so before it start-ed, Ms. Pelosi, as the new minority leader, wanted to go overseas on her first trip. She wanted to visit the troops. Even though she had been against the resolution to go to war, she wanted to tell the troops that we were thinking of them.

So we went over, and on our way over we stopped in Turkey. Imagine, the 4th Division was sitting outside Turkey. It was supposed to outflank the Iraqs. And the State Department asked me, okay, talk to the Turkish government about letting us go through. Now, we had the most modern division, the most technologically advanced division in the whole world sitting there off Turkey. I talked to them and I became convinced they weren't going to let us through, even though the American troops and 160,000 coalition troops. And anybody that votes for the Defense Subcommittee appropriations, anybody that belongs to the Armed Services Committee shows their support of the troops.

We went over, and we crossed our way over we stopped in Turkey. Imagine, the 4th Division was sitting outside Turkey. It was supposed to outflank the Iraqs. And the State Department asked me, okay, talk to the Turkish government about letting us go through. Now, we had the most modern division, the most technologically advanced division in the whole world sitting there off Turkey. I talked to them and I became convinced they weren't going to let us through, even though the American troops and 160,000 coalition troops.

And I went to the State Department, and I convinced them to let us through. And they did. And then we flew to Bagram and we flew to Baghdad and we flew to the Green Zone.

And I remember the last night there, the 8th of March, Mr. Secretary, at the Green Zone, we had a celebration. I remember General Scowcroft was all over the place. I remember Scowcroft saying, I got a team of air commandos in here.
And the team went over and the team looked for those weapons of mass destruction. Matter of fact, at first a fellow named Kay, that was so strong about it, former CIA, said, we will find them. And he looked for months and couldn’t find anything at all. Absolutely no evidence of any weapons of mass destruction. No biological weapon, no capability, no nuclear capability, no al Qaeda connection.

When we go to war, we should go to war. Now, there is a threat to our national security. It was a threat to our national security when you talk about the first war, because it destabilized and he would have controlled all the oil in the Middle East, which is so important to the free world. The second time was no threat to our national security. Now, we didn’t find that out, those of us who voted for it, didn’t find this out until after we had gone to war.

The second thing is you go with overwhelming force. I talked to one of the commanders who was in a meeting with five officials; there was him, there was Secretary Rumsfeld, there was Secretary Wolfowitz, General Pace, and General Myers. And he said we recommended 100,000 troops. And he knew, they gave him a lot less troops than that. The coalition troops at the most were up to 30,000 and now they are down to 20,000.

The first war, 160,000. And the first war we had it for. It cost us $5 billion. The reason I remember this so vividly is I was chairman of the committee at the time the money came through our committee, and we then sent it over, reprogrammed it over to the Defense Department itself. But the discrepancy that we have seen, the mischaracterization, the optimistic predictions are the problems that I have had.

Now, I sent a letter with DUNCAN HUNTER, chairman of the Armed Forces Committee. He knows what I am talking about. We paid $5 billion and they have 2 million people, zero. Zero. Number of civilians who died in Baghdad last month, 1,600, in sectarian violence. What is the definition of sectarian violence? A civil war.

All of us want to end this thing. All of us want to find a way to prevail in Iraq. This is a civil war and we are conducting a civil war with more than a thousand al Qaeda in Iraq. They have diminished al Qaeda. But we are caught in this civil war between 100,000 Shiites and 20,000 Sunnis fighting with each other.

The average monthly U.S. war expenditure in Iraq: $4.4 billion in 2003, $5 billion in 2004, $6.1 billion in 2005, and $8 billion. The average monthly expenditure, $8 billion. Now, think what we are saying. The GWB, the Gulf War, and DUNCAN HUNTER remembers this, they paid internationally. We paid $5 billion. He was on the Armed Services Committee. He knows what I am talking about. We paid $5 billion and they had 160,000 troops in the first Gulf War.

Now, let me talk about the sentiment and talk about the polls taken. We all look at the polls to see what is going on. Now, the only poll taken of U.S. forces in Iraq, about 2% months ago: 72 percent of the American troops serving in Iraq think the U.S. should exit the country within a year.

For instance, we went into Fallujah, we put 300,000 people outside their homes and only 100,000 have come back now. And when we put 300,000 people outside their home, every one of those are an enemy. Aba Ghrabi. Why did Abu Ghrabi happen? Abu Ghrabi happened because we had insufficient forces and untrained people and unsupervised people in that prison.

Now, what do I mean by untrained? We had one fellow, who happened to be from my district, that had a court order against him because he had abused his family, and he couldn’t carry a gun in Pennsylvania. And he said, I can’t do this. This is against my nature. I don’t know anything about taking care of prisoners. He is now in jail. But the point is he was untrained in that particular job, and even though he told them, they put him in the job, they hadn’t taught him to use overwhelming force. That is the way the military has to operate. But, you see, these payments from $5 million in 2004 to $20 million last year, that is because when we go into a place we kill them inadvertently and when we kill people inadvertently we make enemies, and Abu Ghrabi was the biggest public relations disaster we had since My Lai during the Vietnam War.
Now, I can understand that. Let me tell you, it is hot, they are wearing 70 pounds every day when they are out there in the field, and I can certainly understand that. Forty-two percent say they do not know what the mission is. And that is devastating when they do not understand it.

A public opinion Iraqi poll, a segment of 18 provinces, all 18 provinces: More than half the Iraqis say they are headed in the wrong direction, and 82 percent say the economic situation is either poor or fair. Now, these are self-proclaimed democrats. Ninety percent say the security situation is poor or fair.

And who do they trust? Who do they trust for personal security? Forty-three percent trust the Iraqi police, 35 percent trust the Iraqi army, 6 percent trust the insurgents, 6 percent trust the insurgents, 4 percent trust the armed militia, and 1 percent, I trust the multinational force. In another poll taken at the beginning of this year, 47 percent approve the attacks on the United States forces, and 87 percent of the Iraqis endorse a timetable for withdrawal.

Our global image couldn’t have been higher after the first Gulf War, with 90 percent of the people in the world thinking the United States did a marvelous job. We had recovered from Vietnam, finally, in the first Gulf War. Ten of 14 countries polled said the war in Iraq has made the world more dangerous, and most of the countries rated the U.S. troops in Iraq a bigger danger to world peace than the threat posed by Iran. Britain, France, Germany, Spain, Russia, Egypt, Indonesia, Pakistan, Jordan, and Turkey all have more favorable ratings of China than the U.S.

Now, this resolution is a restatement of the failed policy of this administration, and it is no surprise that that is what this is.

We can’t win this. This cannot be won rhetorically. We cannot sit here, stand here in an air-conditioned office and say we support the troops, say we support the policy.

I visit the hospitals every week, and the only person to visit them more than I do is Bill Young and his wife. I see these young people. I am so impressed by their determination, and I am so hopeful we can end this terrible tragedy.

When I got into this 6 months ago, I got into it because of the troops and because of the fact that I felt we couldn’t do anything more militarily. We had done everything we could do militarily, and, second, because of the future of the military.

The bill we are going to pass next week, and very few people are going to vote against it, if you want to really support the troops, that is what you vote for. I am for that legislation.

That will say we will run out of money for personnel for the troops because we cut $4 billion out of the base bill by September. We will take care of that. We will find a way to do it. But the point is the base bill was cut by $4 billion.

Now let me tell you the difference in what I believe is the answer. I believe we redeploys and be ready; that is what I say. I say redeploy and be ready.

We are the targets. We are causing the problem. You know who wants us to stay in Iraq right now, the al Qaeda wants us there because it recruits people. China wants us there. North Korea wants us there. Russia wants us there. We are depleting our resources, just like Russia depleted their resources in Afghanistan. The same thing is happening with the United States. We will have spent $450 billion by the end of this fiscal year. Now think, the first gulf war we spent $5 billion. We have spent $450 billion.

Stay and we will pay, not only pay in dollars, in money; we are going to pay long term.

I figure it took us through the Reagan administration to pay for the Vietnam War. We had $18 to 21 percent interest rates during the Reagan administration, and the reason we did was because Lyndon Johnson, the President of the United States, said we can have butter and we can have guns, and he didn’t raise the taxes he should have raised when we had the war going on.

So we continue to pay with lives lost in terms of financial treasure and more than $8 billion a month. We pay in terms of international reputation. We pay in terms of the future of our military. We stay and pay. I say redeploy and be ready.

Let me tell this one last story.

When I came out of Vietnam, they gave me this small bullet. It is a 45 caliber without any powder in it. It says: “First Marines, everything is going to be all right.”

A month after I came out of Vietnam in 1967, Lyndon Johnson said, and I believed in the Vietnam War. I thought we were fighting communism. But Lyndon Johnson said, and they had an election, one month after I came out of Vietnam, everything was going to be all right. Do you know how many people we lost from 1967 until we pulled out? 37,000.

Rhetoric does not answer the problem. Only the Iraqis can solve the problem in Iraq. They are fighting with each other, and our troops are caught in between. I say it is time to redeploy and be ready.

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

Mr. Speaker, I can’t help but comment on my good friend Mr. Murtha’s eloquence for the first gulf war. The problem we have had there is we quit too soon. We quit before the victory was secure. We left the Republican Army, we left Saddam Hussein; we just washed our hands. I hope we learned a lesson from that, what a mistake it was and it led to later difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, so much of what we do in this Chamber is inconsequential; but the subject of this debate is anything but trivial. Let us then be serious as life and death are serious.

The capacity to reproduce that fearful mushroom cloud was first terrorized the world in 1945 and multiplying and becoming the deadly plaything of rogue nations across the globe.

Partisans have charged the President with misleading the American people: a “misleading” being a pale euphemism for lying. The acquisition is made more grave by the assertion that he concocted the war for purely political purposes.

By any measure this is a monstrous charge, but questions persist that must be answered if we are to honestly examine the President’s rationale for intervention. It is essential to first understand the context in which the decision was made.

President Bush has cited two factors for his decision to intervene in Iraq: the first, his belief that Saddam was reconstituting his arsenal of weapons of mass destruction; and, secondly, that the Iraqi dictator was cooperating with al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations.

The threat from Saddam Hussein stretches back much further than many of today’s critics care to remember. Saddam’s effort to develop a nuclear weapon began in the 1970s, centered around the nuclear reactor being constructed at Osirak.

Despite the alarming evidence of its purpose, the world casually contemplated what it saw as a distant, perhaps even benign, development.

But the luxury of inaction was not available to Israel because her leaders knew that the country was certain to be among Saddam’s first targets. They also knew that the responsibility for Israel’s safety was theirs alone, and that the world would do nothing to save their country if they failed to act.

And they did. In 1981, they acted. But their attack in 1981, destroying the reactor complex and setting Saddam’s nuclear quest back many years. But far from praising this heroic act that benefited humanity, the world community responded with condemnation, even outrage. Yet, in hindsight, is anyone so foolish as to assert that Israel should have waited for the United Nations to confirm that a threat existed, that Israel should not have taken action to prevent the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction by the international community?

Had Israel not acted, the future of the Middle East and the West would likely have unfolded quite differently and far more tragically.

Unchastened by this setback, Saddam continued his aggressive campaign to dominate the region and control the world’s oil supply, launching a decade-long war against Iran in 1980 during which over a million people were killed in a war that should have been fought with poison gas and other means of mass slaughter.

After being beaten back from Iran, his attention then turned to Kuwait,
which he invaded and annexed in 1990, assuming the world would meekly accept this fait accompli.

Many forget that for a time that outcome was a real possibility. Much of the initial response in the world community, and in this country, was one of let’s look the other way and hope for the best.

Only when the United States decided to forcefully eject Saddam from Kuwait and to assume the principal burden for doing so was the international community finally persuaded to go along. We refused to allow our fate and that of the world to be shaped by a dictator, and all sensible people are glad of it.

What we providentially discovered after that war astonished the entire world. Despite years of inspections and the best efforts of numerous intelligence services, Saddam had managed to secretly construct a massive program to develop nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. The experts estimated that he was only 6 months from an operational nuclear device. Had he postponed his invasion of Kuwait by half a year, the world would now be a much darker place.

The unfolding of relentless aggression and implacable menace was the only context in which a reasonable person could view Saddam’s future designs. This was the background in which the events of 9/11 occurred.

Imagine yourself as President, confronting the fact that an unknown group of terrorists had incinerated 3,000 Americans in an attack carried out by individuals who gladly committed suicide to create this horror. We had no idea how extensive their resources were, how global the threat was, who were their allies, how massive were the hidden terrorists to come.

In this context, let us consider the alternative to our intervention in Iraq: The President is presented with evidence that once again Saddam Hussein has developing weapons of mass destruction, that he once again refuses to cooperate with international arms inspectors, that he has had contact with Al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations, that he is even harboring terrorist organizations. And yet the President decides not to act. He decides to wait, to see if those same inspectors who had previously been deceived by Saddam will again give him a clean bill of health years in the future, to wait until our allies or the United Nations grudgingly grant us a narrow warrant to act. To wait until Saddam perhaps gives some terrorist organization a nuclear, chemical, or biological weapon to detonate in some U.S. city.

To trust our fate to those who would destroy us is to die and leave no descendants.

Is it possible to imagine the storm of condemnation that would justifiably fall on a President who, by not acting, allowed Saddam to arm himself once again with nuclear, chemical or biological weapons? To allow the possibility that these might be made available to a terrorist organization, to acquiesce in the death of thousands, tens of thousands, perhaps of millions of Americans simply because the available evidence was not 99 percent, no, 100 percent sure?

For if al Qaeda had had a nuclear device, there can be no doubt it would have used it on 9/11 and we would be mourning the death of 3 million Americans, not a tragic 3,000.

Which then was the greater risk in the face of decades of evidence? To act or not to act? To trust Saddam? Who in this body is willing to assert that it is ever wise, that it is ever moral to risk the destruction of the American people? That is the context in which the decision to intervene in Iraq was taken.

Was our intelligence imperfect? In retrospect, that is obvious. But when is it ever perfect? Nor was this shortcoming uniquely ours. Excepted intelligence service in the world assumed that Saddam was once again engaged in developing weapons of mass destruction. After the invasion, we learned the astonishing fact that even Saddam’s own generals believed he possessed them and was prepared to use them.

It is certainly worth noting that among the shrillest voices condemning our intelligence failure are many who once devoted their efforts to weakening our intelligence capabilities, who employed their energies towards imposing restrictions, cutting budgets, sounding alarms about imaginary “rogue elephants.”

Permit me to quote from one of the most strident critics of this administration and its campaign against the terrorists.

The first is a United States Senator now serving with great distinction in the other body. And on September 23, 2001, 12 days after the events of 9/11 this Senator stated emphatically at this moment that the single most important weapon for the United States of America is intelligence.
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“We are weakest, frankly, in that particular area. So it is going to take us time to be able to build up here to do this properly.” You will find that on CBS’s Face the Nation, September 23, 2001.


Then we have a gentleman serving with distinction in this body, from sunny California, and in 1998 she stated, “it is time to totally eliminate the CIA.” CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 18, 1997.

On several occasions in the 1990s, following the collapse of the Soviet empire, a majority of Democrats in the House voted to cut the U.S. intelligence budget. Yet, following the horrific events of September 11, the chorus of voices that had previously advocated reducing our intelligence capabilities quickly reversed their theme. Even they must thank God that they had been unsuccessful in their efforts. But on this subject we hear nothing but demanding silence.

One inescapable lesson of history is that passivity in the face of a threat is an invitation to strike. The desire to run away only encourages pursuit. We find ourselves in fact appraising strength elsewhere in the world manifested in efforts to bind the hands of those who would attack terrorism at its source. The hope is that, as with the passing of a storm, the threat will move on and blue skies reappear and that the nightmare will at last be over. But the terrible reality is by succumbing to the fear of terrorism, by doing too little in the fear that we are doing too much, we condemn ourselves to a future of unending assaults.

We are told that, however meager their contribution to their own and the world’s security, however ineffectual their actions, in the end the United States will rescue them. We will make the world right. We will face all threats. We, however, no longer have that luxury. If we do not take action to defend ourselves, then we are lost because no one exists to rescue us if we fail.

Sure, aware of its responsibilities, aware of the horrific consequences that might occur from indecision and a reliance on trust and hope, President Bush acted to remove the threat posed by Saddam. What he did is called leadership. And for doing his duty for all of us, he has been denounced by many of the same people who would have denounced him had he not acted, denounced by people who bear no responsibility, who take no responsibility, even in their own lives.

Saddam is no longer a threat to anyone. That is a salutary lesson for those around the world who watch and wait for opportunities for unopposed aggression. They now know that their in vulnerability has vanished. Even more important, and almost entirely unnoticed amid the torrent of criticism focused on President Bush, is that his actions have greatly enhanced the credibility of the United States. For the next time this or any President warns a foreign despot to cease actions we believe are threatening to us, there can be little doubt that we will take decisive and forceful action, no matter how great the opposition of the world community.

No one can credibly question that this greatly enhanced credibility paid off with Libya’s decision to abandon its efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction. Qaddafi understood what President Bush had accomplished in Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation that we are here today. The challenge we face is the worst our country has ever faced since September 11th. It is a complex challenge. It is an unprecedented challenge. Yet it is a challenge we will face and overcome. Our vision of freedom and democracy in the world will triumph. And it will begin here at home.
Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Let me comment on a couple of things the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. PETE KING, has mentioned in his comments. As I hope the distinguished gentleman from Illinois knows, the Bush administration is working very hard to prevent these attacks, to prevent the assassination of our soldiers, to protect our troops.

Mr. Speaker, let me brief the Members of this Congress. In 2002, President Bush made a clear decision. It was a strategic decision. We are spending $8 billion a month, over $300 billion on this war. And more strikingly, we are losing.

We are losing. Mr. Speaker, a battlefield's worth of casualties killed or injured between Iraq and Afghanistan. By far, the saddest thing that we see is this: And there are increasing insurgent inspired attacks.

Now, what makes this resolution so interesting is the fact that it flies in the face of the law that we passed here in the Congress of the United States and the President signed. The bill, the defense bill of 2005 said this: "Calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating conditions for the phased redeployment of the United States forces from Iraq."

That is the law of our land. That is what the defense bill said last year. And we are creating transitions for the phased redeployment of the United States forces from Iraq.

What does this mean to us in the long run? Well, farmers in Missouri know that the quality of the corn that they plant will bring about the quality of the corn that grows. And we find ourselves militarily eating our seed in the country of the United States, if we do not make progress, we can win this militarily. And it arose. And here we are, some 3 years later.

Despite the fact that this resolution is a broad one, let's talk about Iraq, which should be the complete subject of the resolution before us.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is at a strategic crossroads. We are spending $8 billion a month, over $300 billion on this war. And more strikingly, we are losing.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is at a strategic crossroads. We are spending $8 billion a month, over $300 billion on this war. And more strikingly, we are losing.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is at a strategic crossroads. We are spending $8 billion a month, over $300 billion on this war. And more strikingly, we are losing.
And what will it take? It will take the Iraqi government to stand up on its own, and it is on its way there, to transfer the security problem and situation to their police force and to their military, and we have some 250,000 Iraqi forces that are either fully trained or nearly fully trained. We have to hand the baton over to them. We as a country, whether militarily or not, cannot determine the fate of Iraq. The Iraqis have to do it themselves, their own government, their own military, and their own police force. We can or be of help. We have been of help. We have been there some 3 years. I think it is time for us to seriously look at where we are, where we are going, and do our very best to keep ourselves militarily strong for those days that are bound to happen.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me remind the Members I have been in Congress 29 plus years thanks to those wonderful folks from Arkansas. I mean that by the fact that we have had 10 military confrontations with other countries. History being what it is reflects that, and the future may hold something similar. We hope not. But the question is will we be militarily prepared when the time comes?

The Iraq adventure needs to be looked at in light of the law that we passed last year. The calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq. That is the law. That is what the Congress passed. That is what the President signed. And that is where we are. Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD at this point my letters in full to the President dated September 4, 2002, and March 18, 2003.

The President,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you for inviting me to the briefing this morning. I share your concern about the continuing threat posed by Saddam Hussein and his efforts to produce weapons of mass destruction (WMD). I would like to offer my assistance as the administration considers how to deal with this threat.

Before Congress can authorize any military action that might be part of the administration’s plan, we must have answers to more questions than were able to be raised, at today’s meeting. Our constitutional duty requires us to ensure that all implications of such action are considered in advance. The case has not yet been fully made as to where the threat is, why military force is an appropriate way of addressing the threat, and why action must occur now. In short, Congress and the American people must be clear on your answers before we can consider a specific course of action. I believe, like Clausewitz, that in strategy there is an “imperative . . . not to take the first step without considering the last.”

Your strategy for dealing with Iraq must address the fundamental questions of the threat, the method of acting, and the timing. Furthermore, any strategy to eliminate Iraqi WMD must also address several component issues, each of which raises critical questions.

1. How to manage Iraq’s transition to a stable post-Saddam regime?
   As I reported this morning, this is a crucial question for administration strategy to answer in advance of any military action. I have no doubt that our military would decide to defend Iraq and remove Saddam. But like the proverbial dog chasing the car down the road, we must consider what we would do after we caught it.

As Sun-Tzu, the classic treatise, The Art of War, “To win victory is easy; to preserve its fruits, difficult.” Military planners and political leaders alike have to address this in planning for the occupation of Germany and Japan—two economically viable, technologically sophisticated nations—too long in advance of the end of the war. The extreme difficulty of occupying Iraq with its history of autocratic rule, its balkanized ethnic tensions, and its isolated economic system argues both for caution and prudence and the risks of undertaking military action and for detailed advanced occupation planning if such military action is approved.

Specifically, the administration must consider the form of a replacement regime and take seriously the possibility that this regime might be rejected by the Iraqi people, leading to civil unrest and conflict. The effort must be to craft a stable regime that will be geopolitically preferable to Saddam and will incorporate the disparate interests of all nationalist, Shia, Sunni, and Kurd. We must also plan now for what to do with members of the Baath party that continue to support Saddam and with the scientists and engineers of the Iraqi WMD program.

All these efforts require careful planning and long-term commitment of manpower and resources. The American people must be clear about the amount of money and the number of soldiers that will have to be devoted to this effort for many years to come.

2. How to ensure the action in Iraq does not undermine international support for the broader war on terrorism?
   In planning for operations in Iraq, we cannot ignore the lack of international support to date. Pre-emptive action against Iraq is currently vocally opposed by many of our allies and friends throughout the world and particularly in the Middle East.

When we are seen as acting against the concerns of our friends, it calls into question the “humble” approach to international relations you espoused during the presidential campaign. More than that, it has several potentially damaging long-term consequences. First, it risks losing the large number of partners needed to prosecute the global war on terrorism. To ferret terrorists and to destroy their hiding places, we must have broad allied support. Second, it risks seriously damaging U.S. moral legitimacy, potentially providing states like India and Pakistan with a pre-emptive option that could drive long-standing conflicts beyond containable bounds.

Finally and perhaps most dangerously, actions without broad Arab support may inflame the sources of terrorism, causing unrest and anger throughout the Muslim world. This dynamic will be worse if Iraq attacks states without broad Arab support. The aftermath of the destruction—and draws them into the conflict. Iran, which has the potential to seize a reformist path, may well move away from the United States and the alliance that it could next be taken against them. Together, these dynamics will make achieving peace in the Middle East more difficult and may well provide the rationale for more terrorist attacks against Americans.

These concerns do not make military action in Iraq untenable. They do, however, highlight the depth and importance of the issues to be addressed before we strike. We must ensure that in removing Saddam, we don’t win the battle and lose the war.

3. How to ensure that the United States can execute this operation successfully as well as its other military operations?
   As you are well aware, Mr. President, the consideration of military action against Iraq has taken place at a time when U.S. forces have actively engaged throughout the world in a range of missions. Given the operational pressures these forces currently face, we must ask whether the forces available will be of defeating Iraq, particularly if Iraq’s forces mass in Baghdad for urban operations. How many casualties must the American people be prepared to take in a worst-case scenario? What will be the impact of sustained operations be on so-called high-demand, low-end assets? What military operations might we have to forego to meet continued demands in Iraq? Will we still be prepared for the range of other threats that might emerge throughout the world? With little allied support and contributions, will we still be able to maintain military spending on transformational technologies and on sound quality of life for our forces? Are we bearing a huge wartime cost alone? What will be the impact on the domestic economy of these resources drains and of the long-term costs of reconstructing Iraq? These questions must be answered before any military action commences so that the American people understand the risks and the sacrifices involved.

I ask these questions only to highlight the complexity of the undertaking and the need for the administration, the Congress, and our friends around the world to understand exactly what is at stake and why we must act now. Only such a comprehensive strategic approach will ensure that we commit U.S. troops conscientiously and with full knowledge of the range of challenges we face—both in the initial campaign and in the long after-math to follow. Even a strategy that has military action as its centerpiece will require great diplomatic efforts to ensure its success. I look forward to hearing the administration’s answers and to working with you to find the best course of action.

Sincerely,
IKE SKELTON,
Ranking Democrat.

The President,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is a critical week for our nation and for the world. As you prepare to make the most difficult decision involving our country, the thoughts and prayers of all Americans are with you. My colleagues here in Congress have many different views on the wisdom of action in Iraq and the severity of its consequences. But we are united in our support for all the men and women who serve this nation.

There is no doubt that our forces will be victorious in any conflict, but there is great potential for a ragged ending to a war as we have seen in the aftermath. The efforts that members of your administration have made to keep me informed about plans for the administration and reconstruction of Iraq have made to keep me informed about plans for the administration and reconstruction of Iraq have made.
Secretary Rumsfeld frequently talks about the list he keeps of things that could go wrong in an Iraq war. I have kept my own list—of things that could go wrong after the war is over. The list below is indicative of this broader list. My hope is that this will be helpful to members of your administration as you continue to plan for all possibilities. These are not complete scenarios but rather a series of possible problems that could occur in some combination.

**INTERNAL DIVISIONS AND EXTERNAL PRESSURES IN IRAQ**

Without access to Iraq through Turkey, U.S. troops are not present in northern Iraq in large numbers. Turkey enters northern Iraq to its benefit, and break outs between the Turks and Kurds. A significant U.S. military force is needed to separate the groups, complicating the governmental transition and international support.

As an uprising in Kirkuk leaves the Kurds in control of areas of the city and surrounding areas, Turkey’s probe becomes apparent. Iran is in a position to protect the Turkmen minority and to prevent Kurdish control of oil resources. Again, this would require U.S. military resources with a price tag of $1 billion.

In the event that Turkey crosses into Iraq, Iran may do the same, ostensibly to stem the refugee flows from southern Iraq and to protect Shi’a interests.

Shi’a populations in the south rebel and undertake attacks against Sunnis. U.S. troops are not present to protect the Sunnis and restore peace. These tensions resurface during attempts to build a federal and representative government.

Urban fighting in the south brings Shi’a into conflict with Sunnis. The resulting devastation causes a refugee crisis as Shi’a make their way from the Iranian border. The results of Saddam’s policy of forced Arabization of areas like Kirkuk yield dangerous consequences. Groups like the Kurds flow back into these areas seeking to reclaim their former homes and land, sparking conflict with Iraqi Arabs.

Attempts to fashion a federal government in Baghdad prove difficult. Iran is in a position to establish proxies for its influence among the Shi’a representatives. Once in Iraq, fighting breaks out among members of the former Iraqi military. The United States is unable to transition the administration of Iraq effectively and has to remain in place, with military backing.

The war involves lengthy urban combat, particularly in Baghdad. Most infrastructure is destroyed in a massive humanitarian crisis. The government faces massive political pressure from the sustained humanitarian crisis.

**WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION**

Saddam uses biological and chemical weapons against advancing U.S. troops, but also inflicts substantial civilian casualties. Efforts to stabilize Iraq and to establish a government are complicated by the need to deal with the large number of dead and to decontaminate affected areas.

Saddam uses biological and chemical weapons directly against civilian populations or against another Arab country and seeks to affix blame for civilian suffering to the United States. The period of transition, this remnant complicates U.S. efforts to maintain support for reconstruction efforts.

U.S. troops are able to quickly find all of Saddam’s capabilities, requiring a long, labor-intensive search and anxiety as to when the task is complete.

Regional leaders, for money or to gain influence, retain caches of WMD and transfer some to terrorist groups.

**OIL RESOURCES**

Saddam sabotages a significant number of wells before his defeat. Current estimates indicate he may have already wired up to 1,500 wells to become a major source of revenue. Efforts to contain at great economic and environmental cost and removes a major source of reconstruction funding.

Internal groups such as the Kurds, seize oil-rich land before American troops reach the area, causing internal clashes over these resources. Migrant Shi’a seize other wells in the South.

**INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT**

The United States takes immediate control of Iraq’s administration and of reconstruction. The United Nations can’t agree on how to proceed or to get involved. The divisions among the Security Council about the need for the conflict. The lack of UN involvement in the U.S.-led administration of the EU, the United States, and others less likely to give. This situation prolongs reconstruction and puts more of the cost on the United States and a smaller number of personnel.

The U.S. reconstruction efforts that give U.S. corporations a role at the expense of multilateral organizations and other participating nations. The funds are diverted to the European Union and others less likely to give. The situation prolongs reconstruction and puts more of the cost on the United States and a smaller number of personnel.

**AMERICAN COMMITMENT**

Stabilization and reconstruction prove more difficult than expected. U.S. troop requirements approach 200,000—the figure General Shinseki has mentioned—for a sustained period. This puts pressure on troop rotations, reservists, their families, and employers and requires a dramatic increase in end-strength.

Required funding reaches the figure suggested by a recent Council on Foreign Relations assessment—20 billion annually for several years. During a period of economic difficulty, the American public calls for greater burdensharing.

It is my hope that none of these events will come to pass. But as you and all military leaders know, good planning requires consideration of all possibilities. It also requires advance preparation of the American people. You have regularly outlined the reasons for why the United States must disarm Iraq. I urge you to do the same in explaining why we must stay with Iraq for the long haul, even with the economic and military burdens this will entail.

As always, I am willing to help in any way I can to make this case to my colleagues and the American people.

Sincerely,

IRE SKELTON

Ranking Democrat,

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Intelligence Committee for affixing this little time early in this debate, although I know the Armed Services Committee is going to come up a little later. And I wanted to talk about this war and touch on some of the subjects that my good friend Mr. MURTHA brought up a little earlier. And I know we all remember the Khorab Towers going up and a similar nonreaction from the United States. And we remember the embassies going up in North Africa and the national decision not to send the landing craft and the sending back of a couple of cruise missiles, one of which was alleged to have hit a drugstore, which was at most a symbolic response to the blowing up of those embassies in Africa. And I remember the Cole, and we all remember the Cole, and the destruction of that ship and the ensuing American casualties and the nonaction by the United States.

And then we were struck on 9/11, and we realized that it was wrong for us to be so compartmentalized, that we had an interest in what was happening, not just in those territories, but in our interests.

And I do not think we have to play old ground about Iraq. I think everybody understands Saddam Hussein, Gulf I. But I think it is important and it is good that my friend Mr. MURTHA has pointed out that, in fact, even as early as February of 1983 when I went over to Beirut with a good friend Mr. MURTHA has brought up the subject of how involved to get given the divisions and difficulties. And at that point we struck back. And we undertook a mission first to Afghanistan, secondly a mission to Iraq.

And I do not think we have to play old ground about Iraq. I think everybody understands Saddam Hussein, Gulf I. But I think it is important and it is good that my friend Mr. MURTHA has pointed out that, in fact, even as early as February of 1983 when I went over to Beirut with a good friend Mr. MURTHA has brought up the subject of how involved to get given the divisions and difficulties. And at that point we struck back. And we undertook a mission first to Afghanistan, secondly a mission to Iraq.
And I remember, as we were driving that armored spearhead north, and the Marines taking a piece of it, the Army taking a big piece of it, we had a number of experts appearing on national forums on a daily basis saying there were not enough troops. They used them, we are going to get “bogged down,” and what was interesting is even as they were on talk shows saying that there were not enough troops, the talk show would be interrupted with a news flash to the effect that Tommy Franks had taken yet another stronghold. And it was stated at the end of that drive toward Baghdad with what was described by some of the observers, some of the so-called experts, too few troops, that that lightning attack taking Baghdad would go down in history as an example of a low casualty level, and we did have an extraordinarily low casualty level, and a lightning advance in which the enemy in many cases was destroyed long before the American column moved ahead.

Now let us talk about troops in the occupation and the level of troops in the occupation because that has been brought up a number of times, and General Shinseki’s statement about needing the number of troops that we had there has been used many times. There have been two arguments: one, that we needed to have more troops to make sure we could suppress the insurgents; and the other statement that was made, sometimes in the same speech, would be that we needed to put an Iraqi face on the security apparatus. Well, you can’t have it both ways. You cannot have an American on every street corner and have an Iraqi face on the security apparatus.

And let me just say one last thing, which is a hard, tough truth for this House. But when the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I, as we watched the last of the 1990s unfold and the Clinton administration and, left the White House, we noticed in our defense committees that we went into that administration in the early 1990s with 15 American Army divisions. We came out of that administration with 10, count them, 10. Roughly 33 combat brigades. That is a fact of life. That is what we had to go into this operation with. Now we are moving and we are building toward 43 combat brigades right now. But we cut the military, we cut the U.S. Army, by almost 50 percent and that is what we had to go into this war with.

Now, with respect to the gentleman’s statements that in the first war we got lots of folks to chip in and pay for this thing, that is right. On the other hand, you had lots of self-interest. You had Saddam Hussein’s tanks in third gear before we threw the 82nd Airborne in between him and his objectives, and you had everybody that had an oil well in that region scared to death and willing to pour money into this operation. So it is that contempt of self-interest will pile on and will help out. It is also no surprise that we have had lots of times in our national history when it has been tough to bring allies on board, when we had to have big pieces of this operation by ourselves and go it alone. And yet we were able to bring at least 20,000 coalition members into this operation.

And it is true we did not have the French nor the Germans. But the French and the Germans were looking forward to major oil contracts with Saddam Hussein, and they did not want to go this time against their pocketbooks, and that is a fact of life.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate my colleague’s yielding.

You and I have had a great opportunity to work together in the defense arena in recent years. My chairing our subcommittee in Appropriations brought in clear form to me the contribution you have made to the strength of America as a world power.

I may not be able to speak later, but let me say to the gentleman that very early on in this process, one of the principles I have ever taken to the heart is that a cross-section of this House, people who voted against the war, people who were in the center somewhere, people who supported the President from the beginning, all of them over a long weekend. And together we visited Saddam Hussein for what he was, visiting killing fields with 500,000 people that this guy murdered, of his own people, while he was building golden palaces.

As we left, we came together to see what we would do about that big supplemental on the war. To a person, Democrat and Republican, one of our Members summarized it by saying this: All of you know where I have been coming from. I voted against the war. It is going to be very unpopular when I go home. But where was Saddam Hussein really about, how could we do anything else?

And all 13 of those Members came in that great debate and supported the President’s fight against Saddam Hussein because it was a fight against the war on terror.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman. And, you know, that takes me to another point, which is the Iraqi Army. It has been said many times, and probably will be said again in this debate, that we should have kept the Iraqi Army intact.

Now, the idea that that is not taken is always the smoothest. But looking at the Iraqi Army, at Saddam Hussein’s army, he had 15,000 Sunni generals. How are you going to maintain an efficient Iraqi Army that is responsive to a new fledgling civilian government with 15,000 Sunni generals running this thing?

We have had to build this army from the ground up. I think that history will show that that was the right thing to do. To have an efficient army, you have got to have a couple of things. You have got to have an army that has a chain of command which is responsive, that means that the private does what the sergeant says and the sergeant does what the captain says, and right up the chain of command.

And you have also got to have an army that is responsive to the civilian government, that to new defense minister that was just put in place. I do not believe you are going to see an army with 15,000 Sunni generals. I have seen that statement tossed around so much that I hope to be able to talk to some of the folks a couple of years down the line when it is reflected.

Incidentally, people like Barry McCaffrey who have not been great friends of the administration’s operation have said that looking at the Iraqi Army now, they see a core of strength, they see leadership emerging, and let me say to the gentleman that very clearly this is not a nation-builders. We are building a nation. It is also to train up the Iraqi military, and we are going to hand off this defense burden, that means our people come home after we train up and mature the Iraqi military.

If the question for us is, who is best equipped to decide when we take the training wheels off, when we let the Iraqi military go forward, I think we should leave that judgment up to the people who tracked down and brought to justice Mr. Zarqawi, a gentleman who said that he was going to take this war to Washington, DC, and London. He is going to be a little late for that one, because we have an extremely competent American military on the ground in Iraq right now. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania would agree with that.

So let’s use that same judgment of those combat commanders who are training those Iraqi units in their areas of operation who say, okay, this battalion is just about matured, this one is not, this one needs more equipment, this one needs some more training. Let’s rely on their judgment as to when we can hand that load off to them and let them bear this burden.

Why should a Senator from Wisconsin or a Congressman from California try to impose an arbitrary date on when that maturity takes place. You cannot do it. So I would just ask my friends to give to those great Americans who are over there working this mission right now, let’s send a united statement to them that there is value in this mission, there is value in their operation.

We are going to complete this mission. You know, you are lacking something that the Greatest Generation had. The Greatest Generation in World
War II had a united American public. When the 101st went into Northern Eu-
rope, they had a united American pub-
lic. Let's give the 101st Airborne now in
Mosul, and in that tough Sunni Tri-
angle, let's give them the same support
we gave them in Europe, a united
American public and a united Amer-
ican Congress.
Let's give the 1st Marine Division
that is out there in that tough province
in the al Anbar Province out in Fallujah
the same support we gave them when they were fighting the Guadal-
canal. The 1st Marine Division deserves
a united American public and a united
American Congress.
So let's send a message. The main
message that is manifested in this res-
olution is that we should not have an
arbitrary cut-off point, an arbitrary
deadline, and, secondly, that we will
complete this mission. Let's send this
message to every soldier, every marine
who is watching this thing from the mes-
halls in Mosul and Tikrit and Baghdad and Fallujah, the message
that the United States House of Rep-
resentatives stands with them.
Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of
my time.
Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield
myself 2 minutes.
Mr. Speaker, I believe we send them
a message when we vote on the armed
services bill. Very few people voted
against it. I believe we voted, in the de-
fense authorizations, appropriations
only 15 or 16 people voted against it.
But Theodore Roosevelt said, "If you
disagree with a policy and you do not
say anything, you are actually trea-
sonous."
I disagree with the policy. I do not
disagree with supporting the troops.
There is no one that supports the
troops better than the Members of this
Congress. And that is shown by the few
people that vote against the bill.
Once, I think the gentle-
man made a mistake when he said
we are for the war, against the war on
terror. We are actually fighting for the
war on terror is what we are doing. But
I appreciate what the gentleman is say-
ing.
I appreciate the fact that he and I
both asked for more troops at one
point. He was the lead sponsor at that
particular time.
I recognize the gentleman from Cali-
ifornia.
Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, before
we went to war, President Bush and
other administration officials made
three promises to the American people:
one, we would find weapons of mass de-
struction; two, we would be welcomed
as liberators and the reconstruction
of Iraq would pay for itself.
Well, all three promises proved to be
false. Today I will focus on the recon-
struction effort in Iraq and the massive
waste, fraud, and abuse that have un-
dermined our efforts.
Stuart Bowen is the Special Inspec-
tor General for Iraq reconstruction. He
often talks about the reconstruction
gap which is the chasm between the
President's promises and reality.
Mr. Bowen is absolutely right: the
gap is enormous. But it is dwarfed by
the incompetency and corruption gaps
in Iraq. The consequences of mis-
management and corruption are seri-
ous. The taxpayers' money always have
flourished. The taxpayer has been re-
peatedly gouged.
Iraq is not being rebuilt. We have
lost credibility and are now viewed in
Iraq as occupiers and our troops did not
have the equipment when they needed it.
We have now spent $50 bil-
lion on Iraq reconstruction, including
$30 billion from U.S. taxpayers.
Let's look at what we got for the
money. Despite spending $2 billion,
Iraq's oil production is still well below
prewar levels, running about a half
million barrels below 2003 levels. We
have invested $4 billion into improving
electricity generation.
Not only is the administration
2,000 megawatts short of reaching its
goal for peak output, but generation is ac-
tually below prewar levels. And we spent
$6 billion on oil production and elec-
tricity generation. And we have ac-
tually lost ground.
The situation is the same for drink-
ing water. In essence, we have squan-
dered $50 billion. Profiteering has been
rampant, and the taxpayer has gotten
gouged and the work has not gotten
done. And what is especially shameful
is that our troops face desperate short-
esages. Halliburton was supposed to be in
Iraq to provide support for the troops,
but the company used one standard for
the troops and a completely different
standard for its own executives. Halli-
burton employees stayed at the five-
star Kempinski Hotel in Kuwait, where
it costs taxpayers $10,000 per day.
This is the five-star Kempinski. This
gorgeous hotel offered maid service,
complimentary fruit baskets to Halli-
burton employees.
They stayed in tents in the desert. At one point, a cost-conscious
Army official asked Halliburton to
move its employees into air-condi-
tioned tents, but they refused.
To their credit, career government
auditors identified these overcharges.
When they examined Halliburton's sec-
don oil contract, they harshly criti-
cized Halliburton's performance, citing
profit and systemic problems and exor-
bitant indirect costs. But their recom-
endations were rejected.
After reviewing Halliburton's first oil
contract in Iraq, auditors rec-
ommended that the Army not pay $263
million in unreasonable and unsup-
supported charges. But the Army ignored
these auditors and paid Halliburton
$254 million, over 95 percent of the dis-
pputed charges.
And in spite of the auditor's findings,
Halliburton was paid nearly $100 mil-
lion in profits and bonuses for over-
billing taxpayers.
Well, Halliburton symbolizes what
went astray in Iraq, but it is not the
only contractor abusing the system.
Parsons received the contract to re-
build health clinics throughout Iraq.
But despite spending $186 million, Par-
sons completed just 20 of 122 health
clinics they promised to build.
Another firm, Custer Battles, re-
ceived two security contracts. A Fed-
eral jury recently found that the com-
pany committed 35 separate acts of
fraud. These are not isolated instances.
There are over 70 corruption investiga-
tions currently under way in Iraq.
These cases involve allegations of
fraud, false claims, theft, bribery and kickbacks. Some of the worst problems in Iraq are almost beyond comprehension.

The U.S. management of the Development Fund for Iraq, which was the fund that held the proceeds of Iraqi oil sales, is a classic example of what not to do. The Coalition Provisional Authority handed out over $3 billion in cash, in cash, to Iraqi ministries. And they had no idea what happened to the money. $8 billion in cash simply vanished.

One former U.S. official who was in Iraq at the time, Frank Willis, described conditions as the Wild West. He said the lack of controls effectively created a free fraud zone.

Iraq was awash in brand-new $100 bills with no controls to prevent corruption. All the while, the White House looked the other way and Congress put its head in the sand.

Under the Constitution, we are supposed to act and balance, but we have abdicated this responsibility. The Republican majority is terrific at applauding the President, and they are proving it again today with this dishonest resolution.

Congress isn’t doing the serious and important work it must do to protect our troops, rebuild Iraq, look out for American taxpayers. Congress must be more than a cheering section for the White House.

The picture in Iraq was a windfall for some. Halliburton made more than $2 billion in profits last year. Its total revenue has increased by 66 percent since 2002. Another beneficiary was David Brooks. He is the CEO of a company that makes bulletproof vests. In 2001, Mr. Brooks reportedly earned $525,000. In 2004, he earned $70 million.

Last year, the U.S. Marines recalled more than 5,000 of the company’s armored vests. But by that time Mr. Brooks pocketed $186 million. But by that time Mr. Brooks pocketed $186 million.

Well, the American people might think that Congress would rise up in the face of such unconscionable profiteering. When our troops are willing to sacrifice so much, and they do sacrifice so much, how can we let others create cynical fortunes off their blood?

As we debate this resolution, 2,500 of our bravest men and women, have been killed in Iraq. Over 18,000 have been wounded, and the total cost of the Iraq war is over $300 billion. Those of us privileged to serve here have been spared any of the personal consequences of being on the front line, but we should not be spared the responsibility of doing our job.

We owe more to our troops than slapping “I support our troops” bumper stickers on our cars and extolling their courage. Instead of wasting time on bipartisan charades, we should acknowledge and fix our mistakes so that Iraqis are better off, and our troops in Iraq can come home.

We owe more than empty promises to American families who are paying for this costly war in Iraq. They count on us to make sure that their money is spent well, and we haven’t done that.

An honest unsparring look at the record of the past 3 years tells us a stark truth. The White House and Congress have failed the troops, the taxpayers and the Iraqi people. They deserve better than a partisan resolution that pats ourselves and the White House on the back.

It is shameful that we are squandering money on Halliburton at the very same time that we don’t have enough money to protect our troops. It is shameful that Congress has abdicated its oversight and legislative responsibilities to rein in the incompetence and corruption that has undermined our efforts in Iraq.

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution in front of us today is about an urgent proposition. We are a nation at war, a nation at war with radical Islamists. The war was not of our choosing, but it is the central struggle of our time, the first major conflict of the Information Age.

This debate is a defining one for the House and for our Nation. It is important to begin by explaining that the threats that we face are real. They are serious, and they are ongoing. We must address these threats by continuing to confront them aggressively rather than shying away from them because they are difficult. These are the four fundamental issues that define the war with radical Islam.

First, our Nation is engaged in a long-term war. That war didn’t begin on 9/11. We should maybe look back to February 26, 1993? That was when the World Trade Center was attacked for the first time.

Second, al Qaeda views Iraq as a central front in its war against Western democracies. Bin Laden’s stated goal is to establish a global Muslim caliphate whose historical center includes Iraq, and Zarqawi was operating in Iraq long before American troops entered that country.

Third, al Qaeda is a sophisticated enemy in the first war of the Information Age. In a war against terrorism, a critical battle is over intelligence. We must use every means at our disposal to obtain information about our enemies and counter that sophisticated information war.

Fourth, our Nation must recognize how this battle is evolving. We need to recognize the threat of home-grown terrorism, home-grown terrorism that has already been experienced in Spain, the United Kingdom, Australia, the Netherlands and, most recently, Canada.

We are a nation at war. America has been in an armed struggle with radical Islam for at least 15 years. The first clear declaration was the attack on the World Trade Center, 6 dead, 1,000 wounded. The Khobar Towers were attacked in June of 1996. Our ambassadors were attacked in Kenya and Tanzania in August of 1998 and the USS Cole was attacked in October of 2000.

In 1998 bin Laden declared war against the United States in its fatwa. Throughout the 1990s, we treated it as a crime, not an act of international terrorism.

On June 25, 1996, American airmen who were conducting operations in the southern no-fly zone in Iraq were setting in for the night in their quarters in Saudi Arabia in a building known as the Khobar Towers when a sewage truck drove into the compound, backed up to the wall of that building, and the people who drove it fled in a white car.

They were seen from the roof of the building by the security forces, and they started evacuating the building. They were about three floors down when the truck exploded and 19 airmen were killed.

In August of 1998, we were here in this House when we got word that our two embassies, one in Kenya and one in Tanzania, had been attacked by bombs. The U.S. Attorney in the District of New York got 17 indictments, one of them for a man whose name wasn’t really well known at the time. His name was Osama bin Laden.

In October of 2000, the USS Cole was in port in Aden, in Yemen when a small boat came up to it and exploded, tearing a gash 40 feet by 60 feet long midships on the USS Cole, and 17 sailors died.

All of those actions we treated as isolated instances. We played defense ineffectively against a transnational, loosely connected movement against extremists who exploit Islam and use terrorism to bring about their dark visions of the future.

Those adherents to this movement are parasites who thrive in weak states and in failed regimes. That is why the terrorists made Iraq a central front in
their war. If they could foment civil war, if they could keep self-government in Iraq from being born, then they could thrive in the chaos and continue their attacks on us.

That is why it is important to see it through. We made a decision after 9/11 that we would play offense and not defense. As Americans, we know the enterprise that we are engaged in is difficult and requires persistence and resolve. That is very hard on some days. It is very hard for us to understand why it is important to stay the course.

But we know this. Our enemies are persistent and will stay the course. They will not stop if we ignore them.

So that is the choice we face as a nation and why this debate today is so important. It is a choice between resolve and retreat. For me and my family, I choose resolve.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

A quote from Zawahiri to al Zarqawi in July of 2005: It has always been my belief that the victory of Islam will never take place until a Muslim state is established in the manner of a prophet in the heart of the Islamic world.

End of quote.

Al Qaeda views Iraq as a central part of the war. I would like to yield to my colleague from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the central front in the war on terrorism, despite what you hear and despite the pointing out of problems in a very difficult task, we ought not to be asking politicians here in Washington, we ought to be listening to our enemy.

Osama bin Laden, quote, this third world war is raging in Iraq. The whole world is watching this war. It will end in victory and glory, or it will end in misery and humiliation.

With that said, let me talk to you earlier, Mr. Chairman, from that letter from Zawahiri to al Zarqawi, he went on to say that prophet in the heart of Islam world, specifically Egypt, neighboring states of the peninsula and Iraq, they have declared war against the United States and all those who seek to find democracy and peace, and every girl that now walks in Iraq and Baghdad and goes to school, for every young mother that goes to a medical clinic to get treatment where there was none before, for every dead terrorist in Iraq, we make progress every day.

One platoon sergeant in Iraq, and I quote, I have yet to speak to an American here who thinks we are losing. Trust me, no soldier wants to be here. No one wants to cut and run either. Leaving would send the wrong signal to our enemies.

There are only two groups of people who want America to leave and withdraw in humiliation, Mr. Speaker, from Iraq.

President Bush met with the Shi’as, the Sunnis, the Kurds just recently, just this last week. None of them, even the Sunnis, wanted the United States to leave. As a matter of fact, they asked for reassurance that we would stay with them in this difficult and tough struggle for freedom.

That would leave only the terrorists who want an early American withdrawal and politicians in this town.

I would listen to what our enemies said when Zarqawi declared, "We have declared a bitter war against the principle of democracy and all those who wish to enact our future to fellow Americans at any given opportunity."

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that we should stand with our soldiers. We should stand with our families here that helped take the fight to the terrorists overseas. We should stand for victory, and we should stand with the United States of America.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague from Michigan for those comments.

The other thing that we have learned is that this is the first war in the Information Age. The Information Age provides some unique opportunities to our enemy. As we work to deny the terrorists their physical sanctuary, radical Islamists, using the tools of the Information Age, are working actively to develop a virtual sanctuary on the Internet which enables them to grow their movement around the globe.

Some have said, well, this is a battle that should be fought in Afghanistan. This is a battle that we will fight in Afghanistan or Iraq. Tell that to the people in Spain, the Netherlands, the U.K., Canada or Australia that this is really just a battle about Afghanistan.

The Information Age is making this a very, very different battle than we have ever fought before. To explain that in more detail is my colleague from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

I yield to Mr. THORNBERRY.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, part of the job of intelligence is to understand our enemy, and what we should clearly understand about our enemy in the war on terrorism is that they are very sophisticated. They are sophisticated users of technology, using, as Chairman HOEKSTRA just mentioned, the Internet in order to recruit, in order to train its people, in order to intimidate populations, go along.

They use Internet video games in order to help train and indoctrinate people in the Arab world to their way of thinking. They use the Internet for communication. They use videotapes and DVDs to get their message out. They have very adept users of technology.

But they are also adept at using media. As a matter of fact, Prime Minister Blair said recently that they play our own media with a shrewdness that would be the envy of many a political party. They know, for example, that one horrific act of cruelty shown on video will get far more attention than a thousand acts of kindness or patience from our soldiers.

They are agile and clever in using cruelty through the media in order to achieve their ends; and, Mr. Speaker, I think maybe the most important point we can make on our sophistication is that they know they cannot beat us militarily, and that is their objective.

They are sophisticated enough to know that the way they can beat us is to influence our political decisions, to impact our political will.

There has been a very, what has now really become a classic study of this sort of warfare, often called 4th-generation warfare, a book called "The Sling and The Stone," which traces this sort of attack from Mao’s Tse-tung all the way through al Qaeda and its affiliated groups. One of the key points that the author makes, unlike previous generations of war, it does not try to win by defeating military’s forces. Instead, it directly attacks the minds of enemy decision-makers to destroy the enemy’s political will.

That is what is going on. Their use of technology, their use of cruelty, their use of the media has a target which is us because, as another author has written, it only takes a few hundred people in Washington, DC, to decide that this war is lost. So they are focusing their attention not on our strength, but on our weakness, which is potentially our political will.

That is why this resolution is important. It is why in order to meet a sophisticated threat, a psychological threat, which al Qaeda and its affiliated groups try to pose to us, we have to resist that sort of manipulation. Part of that resistance occurs on the floor of the House. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, this battle continues to evolve. We know that al Qaeda wants to attack us again in our homeland. That is why it is important to stay on the offensive, attacking them where they are and making sure that they do not have a safe haven to plan, to train and to develop the resources to attack us again.
But the other thing that they are trying to do is to develop the concept of homegrown terrorism, and it is something that is evolving. I would like to yield to our chairwoman of the committee, Mrs. Davis.

Mrs. M. J. DALY of Virginia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, some of the worst acts of radical Islamic terrorism have been committed by homegrown terrorists, and homegrown terrorists are citizens or residents of the Western countries who, without any direct contact with al Qaeda, adopt a militant radical Islamic outlook, and they seek to conduct acts of terrorism in support of the global jihad.

Propaganda on the Internet, as we heard from you and from Mr. Thorsberry, drives the movement. Groups like al Qaeda and the Zarqawi network use it to distribute their slick videos, to glorify the violent jihad.

Homelands committed, as I think you have said before, recent acts in Spain, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

The Madrid attack, for instance, on March 11, 2004, a group of Moroccans living in Spain attacked passenger trains, killing 190 people; and the plot was conceived, it was organized, and it was equipped with no support from international terrorist groups.

Recent events have demonstrated that Europe is not the only place where homegrown Islamic militants can develop.

On June 4, 2006, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police arrested 17 Canadians for planning to attack Canadian government buildings.

We have seen homegrown Islamic extremist groups in the United States. Our Federal, our State, and our local law enforcement agencies have so far been able to stop them before they could launch attacks.

In August 2005, for instance, the FBI arrested four members of the JIS plotting to bomb military recruiting offices and synagogues in southern California, and this is the interesting part: the JIS was founded by an inmate at the California State Prison in Sacramento, and most members of the JIS are American citizens who were born and raised in the United States. They were radicalized and recruited into JIS while they were in prison; and as far as authorities know, none of these members had any contact with foreign terrorist groups.

Last February, the Justice Department indicted three men in Ohio for aiding insurgents in Iraq and planning to attack U.S. troops there. Two of the men were naturalized U.S. citizens, and one was a permanent legal resident. The men learned their craft by downloading terrorism instructional videos from jihadist Internet sites. They had all been in Iraq, and as far as authorities know, had they not been arrested, they may have started looking for local targets that they could attack.

We cannot ignore the threat of homegrown terrorism. It is imperative that we understand which elements of our society are vulnerable to jihadist propaganda, how radicalization occurs, and how we can prevent Americans from becoming pawns of al Qaeda.

The British House of Commons concluded that the U.K. counterterrorism community did not anticipate the March 2005 suicide attacks because it did not understand homegrown terrorism and the radicalization process. We cannot make that mistake.

At the same time, we cannot let our concern about homegrown threats breed suspicion and distrust of our fellow Americans. The diversity and the harmony of the American people is our country’s greatest strength, and the global jihadist network we are fighting wants to divide us by inspiring homegrown terrorists whose attacks will spread.

And I think Mr. Thorsberry said it best. They are using that to divide our country, and that is what will take us down, Mr. Speaker. That is why it is imperative that we continue on this course and we continue to fight this war on the front way, not the home front.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague. Reclaiming my time, it is why this resolution is so important, to send a clear signal that we are going to win this global war on terror; that we are going to be successful in Iraq; that we are going to fight the enemy where they are using all of the techniques that they use in an Information Age; and why we need to redouble our efforts to make sure that they cannot attack us; and that we stop the development of homegrown terrorism in this country.

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

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

This all sounds good. It is all rhetoric. It is rhetoric. The number of daily attacks in Iraq have gone from 2004, 53 attacks per day; May 2005, 70 attacks per day; May 2006, 90 attacks per day. Electricity is less than prewar level. No water available to all, only 1 hour a day. Mr. Speaker, and the oil production which was supposed to pay for the war is less than prewar.

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

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, there is no more pressing issue in our country today than bringing an end to the war in Iraq as quickly as possible and saving American lives.

I thank my colleagues on the other side who just completed their discussion of the war on terror. They remind us that it is a war in which we can never yield and about which we have no choice. They also remind us that Iraq has become a recruiting ground for those international terrorists; that Iraq has become a proving ground for those international terrorists; and that Iraq has become a proving ground for many of those international terrorists, none of which existed before the President’s choice to go to war, a war not of necessity, a war that was unjustified based upon falsified intelligence.

And I see that the CIA Director said that intelligence that the administration used to make the case for war was wrong, inaccurate, and misleading. There were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, and there was no connection between 9/11 and Saddam Hussein.

The administration used fear to scare this country into war based upon those lies. He refused to properly prepare for the war and its aftermath; to properly pay our soldiers, our families, and our Nation are paying an enormous price for this President’s tragic blunder.

Two thousand five hundred Americans soldiers, we are informed today, have died in Iraq, and many more soldiers have been wounded, many of them missing limbs and suffering other very serious debilitating injuries that will afflict them the rest of their lives. The war has cost almost a trillion dollars in taxpayer money, and America’s international reputation and respect in the world has been severely damaged.

The President often says that he makes decisions about the future of Iraq based upon what the generals say; but when the time came to listen to the generals prior to Iraq, the President refused to listen to them. He refused to listen to them when they questioned the necessity, a war that was unjustified based upon falsified intelligence.

What we now see is massive national cycles for which our soldiers were not trained, not given any instructions on how to deal with, and certainly did not have sufficient numbers to deal with. The President sent the troops into that war with that poor planning, that poor structure, and that poor understanding of what would take place afterwards.

The American public had to witness soldiers being forced to buy their own body armor, have their families buy it because we did not have a proper supply prior to going into that war. Many men and women were sent into battle with unarmored, old Humvees that were used for flood control in the California rivers before they showed up in Iraq. We have those soldiers of that inadequate equipment and because of the roadside bombs that are the number one killer in Iraq.

We see the torture of detainees was approved at the highest levels in the Pentagon; and this, again, has led to an undermining of our position in the world, our moral position in the war in Iraq and the war against terrorism.
This is a policy blunder of historic proportions by this President, and it is very important that we understand that we are paying a huge price for these mistakes by this administration. Tragically, we stand here on the floor of this House 3 years after the beginning of this war, but for 3 years questions were not raised in this Congress about that force structure, about that preparedness, about the detainee policy, about these actions that have so severely undermined us.

Yes, we saw the taking of Zarqawi, and what do we have there? We have the real use of smart intelligence on the war against terror. As you pointed out, they are not going to come after the 130,000 troops. They are not going to come after our strengths, but that is what people have been saying for a long time. That is what people have been writing about at the military schools, about the networking of terrorism and how you had to go after it. We went after it exactly the wrong way, in exactly the same way, as people who made these historic blunders throughout history, when confronting this kind of force.

Yes, we should provide the special ops; yes, we should provide the surveillance; yes, we should provide the intelligence and we should work together. In the case of Zarqawi, we saw, once the Jordanians were insulted enough by the attacks on their land, they put their intelligence sources to work, combined with ours, and Zarqawi was run down, and we provided the 500-pound bombs. We provided the special ops.

That is not what is happening day to day in the war in Iraq, and our troops are paying a horrible, horrible price for the lack of preparation, the lack of planning and the lack of prosecution of this war. And the initial mistake and lies by the President of the United States.

The President’s policies in Iraq have severely undermined America’s national security and made the world less safe.

In response to the clear failures in Iraq, the Republican Congress has acted like a rubberstamp for President Bush rather than the elected representatives of the people of America.

Republicans in Congress have hid their heads in the sand and refused to question the President, instead sheepishly pretending success is around the corner.

As a result, Iraq is engaged in a civil war that threatens to consume the country. Congress has done nothing to stop the civil war in Iraq, nothing to hold the President accountable for the failures in Iraq, and nothing to put our troops on a safe and speedy path toward home, or to other parts of the world where they are needed to fight against terrorism.

The President and his allies in the Republican leadership in Congress have made up their minds.

They have a plan for Iraq. It is the same failed plan they started the war with. It is chaos with no end in sight.

There is no more that we can ask of America’s troops. They have done everything they have been asked to do. It is time for them to serve their nation where they are needed most, and that is surely not in Iraq.

Now is not the time to stay the course of failure.

America needs a new direction in Iraq—a new direction that will make Americans safer.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The historical blunder is that we didn’t address this problem in the 1990s when it started rearing its ugly head.

I yield to my colleague for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to place a statement concerning this resolution in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman’s statement will be placed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, much of this resolution is language that everyone supports, especially the praise for our troops.

They do a great job everywhere they are sent, and it is certainly no criticism of them to criticize this war.

In August of 2002, two months before Congress voted for the war in Iraq, Dick Armey, then our Republican Majority Leader, in a speech in Iowa, said:

“I don’t believe America will justlyifiable make an unprompted attack on another nation. It would not be consistent with what we have been as a Nation.

Jack Kemp wrote before the war, “What is the evidence that should cause us to fear Iraq more than Pakistan or Iran. Do we reserve the right to launch a preemptive war exclusively for ourselves or might other nations such as India, Pakistan or China be justified in taking similar action on the basis of fears of other nations?”

Mr. Kemp said, based on evidence that he had seen, there was not “a compelling case for the invasion and occupation of Iraq.”

William F. Buckley, Jr., wrote in 2002 that if he had known in 2002 what he knew then in 2004, he would have been against the war.

Last year he wrote another column against the war saying: “A point is reached when teacrony conveys not steadfastness of purpose but misapplication of pride.”

The very popular conservative columnist Charley Reese wrote that the war was “against a country that was not attacking us, did not have the means to attack us, and had never expressed any intention of attacking us, and for whatever real reason we attacked Iraq, it was not consistent with America from any danger, imminent or otherwise.”

Many years ago, Senator Robert Taft expressed the traditional conservative position: “No foreign policy can be justified except a policy devoted to the protection of the American people, with war only as the last resort and only to preserve that liberty.”

Millions of conservatives across this Nation believe that this war was unconstitutional, unaffordable, and, worst of all, unnecessary. It was waged against an evil man, but one who had a total military budget only two-tenths of one percent of ours.

We are not going to be able to pay all our military pensions, social security, Medicare, and all the little things we have promised if we are going to turn the Department of Defense into the Department of Foreign Aid and attempt to be the policeman of the world.

This is contrary to every traditional conservative position on defense and requires huge deficit spending.

The conservative columnist Georgie Ann Geyer wrote: “Critics of the war against Iraq have said since the beginning of the conflict that Americans, still strangely complacent about overseas wars being waged by a minority in their name, will inevitably come to a point where they will have to have a government that provides services at home or one that seeks empire across the globe.”

Mr. Speaker, we need to start putting our own people first once again and bring our troops home, the sooner the better.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our chairwoman, Mrs. DAVIS.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, an issue that hasn’t received enough attention in the debate on the war on terror is what happened to American intelligence during the 1990s.

To effectively wage the war on terrorism, we need a robust intelligence community that is capable of gathering intelligence to eliminate the terrorist threat. Unfortunately, as the war escalated in 2001, the intelligence community was still reeling from policies that were implemented in the 1990s which undermined the ability of our intelligence agencies to predict 9/11 and to effectively fight the war today.

Simply throwing people and money at the issue, it doesn’t solve the problem. Developing expertise to replace what was lost in the 1990s is a long endeavor. It takes 5 to 7 years of training and experience to bring an operations officer up to full performance.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to list a few examples of what happened in the 1990s that hampered our intelligence community efforts leading up to and at the onset of the war.

Between 1992 and 1999, the CIA’s presence overseas declined by almost one-third. Our intelligence agencies had their hands tied by the Deutch Doctrine, forbidding recruitment of sources that had shady backgrounds, limiting our ability to get information on potential terrorist attacks. The number of officers declined and overseas facilities were closed. And as a result of the crises in the Balkans and in Africa, our intelligence was not current in key areas where many times they had little knowledge of the issues there and, in some places, the targets had little and sometimes no presence.

As a result, overall intelligence collection was decimated. James Pavitt, the former CIA Deputy Director for Operations, told the 9/11 Commission in April of 2004 that we were vastly underfunded and did not have the people to do the job, and noted that spending on CIA human collection was cut by 20 percent during the peak years of the 1990s.

Analysis suffered equally in the 1990s, with low priority accorded to terrorism analysis. Intelligence analysts were
discouraged from writing original out-of-the-box assessments that might have raised awareness to terrorists staging unconventional attacks. And, instead, our analysts were pressured to craft politically correct analysis.

The fact that the arrests of 17 terrorist suspects in Canada are recent successes in the global war on terror. However, we still have a long way to go to rebuilding our networks of human sources. Reform has to continue. We must acknowledge that many of the problems facing U.S. intelligence agencies today are the product of unwise and neglectful intelligence policies of the past.

It is simple to destroy, but it is much more difficult to build. Over the past 6 years, we have worked to rebuild our Nation’s intelligence capability, and it may take a few more years to complete. There is not a moment to waste in carrying out these essential reforms to our intelligence community. And I will say, Mr. Speaker, that we must continue this war. We must continue to let our intelligence community do their job.

Mr. MURTHA. I yield myself 1 minute.

One of the Members said, ask Spain about the threat. Fifty-six percent of the population of Spain believes the U.S. in Iraq is the most dangerous threat to world peace. They rank Iran lesser of a threat than the United States.

And one other thing. When we look back at the Intelligence cuts, President Bush I felt it was a peace dividend and started to cut the intelligence budget years ago. So we have to make sure we don’t let our rhetoric get ahead of the facts.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Emanuel).

Mr. Emanuel. Mr. Speaker, since day one of the war in Iraq, Democrats have provided the President with everything he asked for, yet Republicans have faulted in fulfilling their Constituency do their job.

In a post-9/11 world, the American people need the vigilance and the patriotic determination of every Member of Congress to demand answers to the questions their constituents are asking. Instead, the Republican Congress sat and watched the administration make mistake after mistake after mistake.

And don’t listen to just one Member of Congress. Consider the words of Three Star General Greg Newbold, top Operations Officer for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. After a scathing critique of Secretary Rumsfeld, he says, “The Bush administration and senior military officials are not alone in their culpability. Members of Congress defaulted in fulfilling their Constitutional responsibility of oversight.”

General Anthony Zinni, former Commander of the U.S. Central Command in the Mideast: “We are paying the price for the lack of credible planning, or the lack of a plan. Ten years of planning were thrown away.”

Major General Batiste, who commanded 22,000 soldiers on the ground in Iraq, “Rumsfeld and his team turned what should have been a deliberate victory in Iraq into a prolonged challenge.”

Eight generals have raised serious questions concerning Secretary Rumsfeld’s leadership. I don’t know, maybe the Pentagon suffers from the soft bigotry of low expectations and social promotion as a policy. Maybe these gentlemen were only ahead of their time, just maybe, they had to speak up because the Republican Congress was silent. You have adopted an approach of “see no evil, hear no evil, and speak no evil” with abandon. America was told this would be a quick war, and it turned into a long war. This Congress walked away from its oversight responsibility. America was told 130,000 troops would be enough, but more were clearly necessary. This Congress, the Republican Congress, walked away from its oversight responsibility. America was told this would be a conventional war. It turned into an insurgency. This Congress walked away from its oversight responsibility. America was told oil would pay for reconstruction, and the taxpayers are left with a $480 billion tab. This Congress walked away from its oversight responsibility. America was told we would be greeted as liberators, but they have become and are treated like occupiers. This Congress walked away from its oversight responsibility.

And then Don Rumsfeld, a man who expressed contempt for the idea of nation-building, was assigned the responsibility of rebuilding Iraq and mismanaged the war against the insurgency, this Congress, the Republican Congress, walked away from its oversight responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans want to portray the greatest foreign policy challenge of a generation as simply the choice between more of the same or a new direction. Democrats welcome that. The debate today is about whether the American people want to stay the course, with an administration and a Congress that has walked away from its obligations, or pursue a real strategy for success in the war on terror.

Twenty-five hundred brave Americans, male and female, have given their lives in trying to stabilize Iraq. Last month was the bloodiest in Iraq’s history. According to Major General Rick Lynch, attacks against civilians increased 80 percent since November 2005. We cannot achieve the end of victory and continue to sit and watch, stand pat, in our military, as a matter of fact just this morning, launched a 10,000 troop crackdown on terrorists. This morning. Last week, Iraq launched a 70,000 security personnel crackdown on terrorists. This week, they are our allies in the fight against terror. There are our allies just 4 years later in hunting down al Qaeda.

Afghanistan is now an ally in the war on terror. Their Intelligence services, their military, as a matter of fact just this morning, launched a 10,000 troop crackdown on terrorists. This morning. Last week, Iraq launched a 70,000 security personnel crackdown on terrorists. This week, they are our allies in the fight against terror. There are our allies just 4 years later in hunting down al Qaeda.

But because we had brave men and women who put on the uniform and fought the terrorists with a military uniform so our children wouldn’t have to fight it in a school uniform here at home, and now what has happened? Pakistan has joined us in the fight against terror. There are our allies just 4 years later in hunting down al Qaeda.

The electricity isn’t on, cause very brave men and women put on the uniform and fought the terror. Libya, they had a nuclear weapons program and self declared they would share it with anyone.
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Which country would you have go back? Which one would you say, ah, it was not important that they became an ally? Four Muslim nations have stood up against the ravages and the terror and the brutality of terror today because of actions our brave soldiers take overseas.

So don’t get confused in every little problem that happens, and there are a lot of them, Sir, you served in Vietnam. You know this challenge. They are great, they are hard, and sometimes they are disappointing, yes. But at the end of the day, every great victory every great victory ends with our heads held high and safety and security for the United States.

Let us not come home in humiliation. Let us not tell all of those families that their loved ones died in vain because we have a November time frame and not a time frame for victory. ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to address their comments to the Chair.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This is rhetoric. It is not getting better. I spoke out November 17, and things have gotten worse than it was 6 months ago. They are worse today than they were then.

When I left Vietnam in August of 1967, they gave me this bullet, and they said in this bullet that everything is going to be all right. The President of the United States said we just had an election, and we have a new election in Vietnam, and this was a month after I got out of Vietnam, and everything is going to be all right. We lost 37,000 people.

It is not a matter of whether we want to prevail in this operation, it is a matter of how we are going to do it, and I disagree with the way we do it. I disagree with the policy. That is what I disagree with the policy. Thank our troops here become the targets. Incidents have increased every day, and more Americans are being killed every day. And we are going to pay a heavy price in people being killed and also we are going to pay a heavy price for the individuals in the future with the debt increasing at $8 billion a month.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAuro).

Ms. DELAuro. Mr. Speaker, it is to my great sorrow, that this is the President of the United States does not seek to unify the country. He does not use these moments to stay the course with this policy which will make us safer, undermine our military, help the terrorists, cost many thousands of lives and cost another trillion dollars. This Congress has never held the President and his administration accountable, even when there were no plans.

This President, more than any other, has politicized this war, ignoring the advice of the military at every step, from General Shinseki’s call for more troops to General Casey’s admission that our troops’ presence was inflaming violence. They have imposed political judgments from ideologues at the White House to the expense of our military’s best advice.

And this Congress supported the White House politicians, not the generals when our course was set. This Congress supported the White House politicians who gave our troops the body armor and Humvee armor they needed. Now, when the President says just support the politicians in the White House one more time, they are here with this resolution.

What our troops need is a policy that is good for America and for our military. Being bogged down in Iraq indefinitely will make us less safe. All of the countries in the world and the region and the Iraqi people need to hear that America will redeploy over a reasonable period. The current course allows countries a free ride at the expense of American troops and taxpayers. A policy of responsible redeployment will force others to play their role.

No one on this floor is for a precipitous withdrawal, and the President’s statements are reckless, political and a disservice. We all agree, as did both bodies of the Congress, that 2006 would be a turning point. The White House politicians have ignored that resolution.

I support a redeployment of our troops to meet critical security needs over the next 12 months, with a significant reduction by the end of 2006. Ongoing support redeployment by the end of 2008, and some by the end of 2007. But we all believe America’s interest and our troops are served by a new course.

So I ask the President to change. Why not speak to the country’s better virtues and unite the country? We want your best advice. We should work together for a stronger America.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a colleague from the Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT).

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, in November 1979, Ayatollah Khomeini, the former radical Islamic leader, seized power in Iran, riding the slogan, ‘Death to America.’ America was months after his rise to power, it became evident that agents of radical Islam would stop at nothing to kill Americans. This doctrine of hatred resulted in terrorists killing over 600 people prior to 9/11.

In 2003, my colleagues, my chairman, has mentioned this, Congressman Wilson mentioned part of this, and I wish everyone who got up here would go over this list.

In April 1983, 63 people died at the U.S. Embassy in Beirut. That is not rhetoric; that is dead Americans.

In October 1983, 241 died at the U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut. That is not rhetoric; that is dead Americans.

In February 1983, six people were killed at the World Trade Center. That is not rhetoric; that is dead Americans.

In June 1996, 19 American servicemen died after a truck bombing at Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia. That is not rhetoric; that is dead Americans.

In August 1996, 224 died at the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. That is not rhetoric either; that is dead Americans.

In October 2000, 17 died on the USS Cole in Yemen. That is not rhetoric either; that is dead Americans.

If some people continue to preach cut and run from this war, then they will continue to kill Americans, kill Americans and kill Americans.

The global war on terrorism must be fought. We can do it on the streets of our hometowns, or we can take the war to the terrorists. Either way, it has to be done; and personally, I prefer doing it over in Iraq rather than in New York or Washington, D.C., or San Francisco.

For the first 20 years, we allowed the terrorists to think they could win this war. That is dead Americans.

The mission in Iraq is achieving the Abu Baqas’s objectives of killing Americans is clearly spelled out in a 2005 letter from Ayman al-Zawahiri, bin Laden’s closest advisor, to Musab al Zarqawi, the man tapped by bin Laden to head al Qaeda operations. He had told the Bush administration, and with the support of this Republican-led Congress, we took the fight to the terrorists, wherever they may be.

Mr. Speaker, right now their choice is Iraq. It is the central front in the war on terror. In fact, Osama bin Laden has said he believes the war going on in Iraq is nothing short of the Third World War. The importance of Iraq in achieving the Abu Baqas’s objectives of killing Americans is clearly spelled out in a 2005 letter from Ayman al-Zawahiri, bin Laden’s closest advisor, to Musab al Zarqawi, the man tapped by bin Laden to head al Qaeda operations. He had told the Bush administration, and with the support of this Republican-led Congress, we took the fight to the terrorists, wherever they may be.

Mr. Speaker, right now their choice is Iraq. It is the central front in the war on terror. In fact, Osama bin Laden has said he believes the war going on in Iraq is nothing short of the Third World War. The importance of Iraq in achieving the Abu Baqas’s objectives of killing Americans is clearly spelled out in a 2005 letter from Ayman al-Zawahiri, bin Laden’s closest advisor, to Musab al Zarqawi, the man tapped by bin Laden to head al Qaeda operations. He had told the Bush administration, and with the support of this Republican-led Congress, we took the fight to the terrorists, wherever they may be.

Mr. Speaker, right now their choice is Iraq. It is the central front in the war on terror. In fact, Osama bin Laden has said he believes the war going on in Iraq is nothing short of the Third World War. The importance of Iraq in achieving the Abu Baqas’s objectives of killing Americans is clearly spelled out in a 2005 letter from Ayman al-Zawahiri, bin Laden’s closest advisor, to Musab al Zarqawi, the man tapped by bin Laden to head al Qaeda operations. He had told the Bush administration, and with the support of this Republican-led Congress, we took the fight to the terrorists, wherever they may be.
Mr. Speaker, we have accomplished so much in the global war on terror, highlighted by the recent death of Zarqawi. We have significantly degraded the al Qaeda network by denying them a safe haven in Afghanistan and capturing or killing many of their leaders and associates. We have also built a dedicated international coalition to combat and prevent terrorist financing and dismantle terror support networks.

Mr. Speaker, America is safer, but we are not yet secure. The enemy we are fighting is determined about its desire to kill Americans. We cannot allow Iraq to become a breeding ground for terrorist activity.

A free and democratic Iraq is absolutely essential to fighting the terrorist threat and building long-term peace and stability in the region. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes. I was in Beirut the day after the attack, and I recommended to President Reagan, I recommended to the President of the United States, get out of Beirut because we didn’t have enough troops; 2 months later he got out of Beirut because he didn’t have enough troops.

And you are not talking about Iraq. The gentleman up there was talking about the war on terror. I am talking about Iraq. That’s what I am talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for 4 minutes.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank Mr. MURTHA for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I visited the Johnson VA Medical Center in Charleston, South Carolina. That medical center is named for a young man who is the recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor because just out of high school he went off to fight in Vietnam and killed himself on a grenade to save the others in the foxhole with him.

I went to the hospital last Saturday to visit one of my heroes, Joseph Henry Washington. Joseph Washington was on the USS Arizona on that fateful day at Pearl Harbor. I went because I wanted to report to Joseph Henry Washington on my recent trip to Iraq because he questioned the wisdom of my going there.

I told Joe that I was very pleased with what I had found militarily in Iraq. I told him that I thought that our military forces were doing an admirable job, and I thought they were meeting with significant success.

But I told, Uncle Joe, I am very, very disappointed in what I have found on the domestic front. We are not going to win the hearts and minds of the people of Iraq until we involved the Iraqi people in the reconstruction efforts. We see $9 billion that we can’t account for. We see construction going on up in the northern part of the country. But in Baghdad, in and around that part of the country, we see a failed policy. That is the problem in Iraq. We must begin to involve the Iraqi people in the reconstruction of their country.

Eighty-five percent of the country is without electricity. Almost 60 percent of the country does not have drinking water. We are never going to be successful until we tackle these problems, and that is where we are falling because there is no accountability on the domestic front in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I go back to Charleston the day after tomorrow because we are going to bury Uncle Joe. He stayed alive long enough for me to make my report to him. And for over 45 years in my consultations with him, he never wanted to talk about experiences on the USS Arizona or his experiences after returning home. Why? Because he was never sufficiently included in the building of this great Nation. And the people of Iraq are not being sufficiently included in their own country.

Until we do that, we will never be successful with this policy.

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important week for us to have this debate on the necessity of the global war on terror, a war that we did not ask for, but a war that came to us.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out that after Beirut, we left. We did not react to it. Several other instances like that occurred during the 1990s. We could not react to Khobar Towers; we did not react. We were attacked at the Kenya embassy; we did not react. We were attacked the first time at the World Trade Center; we did not react. The Tanzania embassy was bombed; we did not react. The USS Cole was bombed; we did not react. What did it yield us? A continuing battle against terror around the globe.

I would remind my fellow colleagues that one such incident of attacking America occurred in the Philippines when Gracia and Martin Burnham were kidnapped, along with a constituent from Representative Bono’s district. The leader of the Abu Sayyaf Group, ASG, was trained by al Qaeda in Afghanistan. That training occurred because we did not respond to these prior attacks. We left them alone.

In the Indonesian al Qaeda training papers they found, they said one of the things that America is vulnerable about is they don’t follow up. You can attack them, and they withdraw. They withdrew from Vietnam, they withdrew from Beirut, they withdrew from the Cole, the Kenya embassy, and Khobar Towers. They did not react the first time when they attacked the World Trade Tower. We have continued to make ourselves vulnerable by not responding to the worldwide war on terror.

I think thanks to American training and intelligence aid, the Philippine Government was able to rescue Gracia Burnham. Martin Burnham died in the rescue attempt. It was probably because we couldn’t get close enough into the fight. But the important thing that we need to remember is if we back off now, according to the paper, or the letter that was written from al Zawahiri to the now-deceased al Zarqawi, it will be considered a victory for al Qaeda if we leave. Al Qaeda is the one that has decided to bring this war to Iraq and to fight Americans. That information is available on their Web sites and in the information that we collect. It is what the captives tell us when we interview them.

They want to take this fight to the Americans in Iraq. I tell you, if we are going to have to fight terrorists, I would rather fight them at a place where every American carries a gun rather than on the streets of New York or Washington or Wichita because they have brought the fight to us. It is not what we decided to do this.

I think it is very important as we pursue this worldwide battle against terrorism that we insist on doing it with our full resources, with full dedication, and that we disrupt their finances, that we disrupt their places of safe haven, that we disrupt the countries that are providing protection for them, and that we go to the terrorists and we find the root causes of this terrorism and sever the root.

I think the reason we have seen so much money from al Qaeda going to Iraq, the reason that they have sent so many foreign fighters into Iraq is because they want to take this fight to the Americans in Iraq. I tell you, if we leave now, it would be giving them a victory and we would be once again putting another picture on the board here saying we should have fought harder; we should have stopped it back in 2006.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The problem is that the opposite is happening. That is the problem we have. We can stand here and say we want to fight the terrorists in Iraq. Actually, al Qaeda we think is less than 1,000.

We think we are caught in a civil war. It is the way that we are doing it. The military cannot win this war. The military commanders, even General Pace admits we cannot win this militarily.

What we are doing is, we have become the target of the insurgency of the sectarian violence. It is the way that we are doing it is what I disagree with.
Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Larson).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MURTHA for having the temerity to speak truth to power, for having the temerity to separate the war on terror from the travesty that is taking place in Iraq.

It is amazing to me, and this used to be a place, as Professor Remini writes, where Members would come down, unrehearsed, without charts or graphs. They would speak from their heart. They would talk about this institution and what it means to democracy all over the world.

What a sham today. We should all glory in the aspects of democracy that take place all around the world and in Iraq. But what a sham this is today when we are denied any alternative resolution.

Mr. LANTOS eloquently stated that earlier today, when he talked about Bob Michel and his eloquence standing on this floor, talking about speaking truth to power. And that is what is so upsetting to the American people and why Mr. MURTHA has been recognized all around this country for standing up and speaking the truth to the American people, something this administration and, frankly, this Congress, has been unable to do. Level with the American people. Let's start with leveling the American troops, leveling with all of those families of reservists and National Guardsmen who I speak with on a regular basis, who have been deployed, redeployed, deployed and redeployed again many times because we haven't had a plan.

Here we are in a race between cooperation and catastrophe, and you guys bring to the floor a political document not designed for a new direction or to bring the country together to discuss it but instead as talking points outlined by Karl Rove in New Hampshire, sandwiched in between the President's photo op and a picnic this evening.

Americans are outraged that we don't have a citizenry and Members here who are willing to stand up and have accountability. We all support the war on terror. And this party, from Roosevelt to Truman to Kennedy, to Bush, has had to say because he had the temerity to speak truth to power. He had the temerity to speak truth to power. He had the temerity to speak truth to power.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman for 30 minutes.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) for 30 minutes.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and, as prior speakers have done, I commend him. Speaking truth to power.

Mr. Speaker, 1,184 days ago American troops invaded Iraq to rid Saddam Hussein of weapons of mass destruction.

The weapons weren't there. But American troops still are. I have met some of those troops on my three trips to Baghdad and Afghanistan, as well as Pakistan, Qatar, and Saudi Arabia. Our Armed Forces and intelligence personnel are extraordinary. Many are on their third or fourth tours.

As a mother of two sons and two daughters, and as a newly minted grandmother, my heart goes out to families who have lost their dear ones. I am deeply moved by the courage, dignity and patriotism of the men and women, recovering from grievous wounds at Walter Reed and other U.S. hospitals. And I have visited with them.

Our action in Iraq created a failed state and, tragically, our postwar misdirection and misadventure, as presently defined, cannot succeed. There are too few troops to stabilize the country. They are inequally equipped.
They are fighting an insurgency we didn’t predict, at constant risk from IEDs we can’t find, with no clearly developed goals to help the new Iraq government achieve political and economic security, and no exit strategy.

Two major failures led us to war, and we have made less progress at home less risk making the same mistakes again. As ranking member on the Intelligence Committee, these failures haunt me.

Had we gotten the intelligence right, I believe we would have made different choices, and the pain and loss and anger many feel could have been avoided.

First was a massive intelligence failure in assessing Saddam’s WMD capability. The second, equally grave, was the politicization of intelligence by the President and a White House determined to push us toward war.

The failure to assess Saddam’s WMD capability accurately has been well documented. As CIA weapons inspector David Kay put it, “We had made different assumptions about the timeline of Saddam’s WMD development than had been made by others.” Overriding the advice of intelligence professionals, administration officials put stock in hocus pocus like CURVEBALL, and self-promoters like Ahmed Chalabi.

But simply calling Iraq an intelligence failure ignores the larger policy failures that created the false momentum toward war.

The administration cherry-picked intelligence and hype the threat. They talked in ominous tones about “mushroom clouds,” even though many questioned evidence suggesting Saddam had nuclear weapons capability.

They made a mantra of the claim that 9/11 hijacker Mohammad Atta met with Iraqi agents in Prague, a claim that has been thoroughly discredited.

Writing in Foreign Affairs, Paul Pillar, the intelligence community’s senior Middle East analyst, described how the Bush administration disregarded the community’s expertise, politicized the intelligence process, and selected unrepresentative raw intelligence to make its public case.

To date, nobody has been held accountable for this misuse of prewar intelligence.

The intelligence failures did not end when we invaded Iraq. Our President declared “Mission Accomplished” in May 2003. Senior U.S. officials in Iraq asserted in July 2003 that insurgent attacks represented “a limited problem of some bitter-enders” loyal to Saddam.

Yet, 3 years after Saddam’s fall, 2,500 U.S. troops are dead, a number confirmed by the Pentagon just today, and insurgents appear more active than ever.

We have surged intelligence resources into Iraq in a frantic effort to find the next IED. As a result, we have taken our eye off the ball in Afghanistan, where Taliban fighters are reconstituting themselves, even as the United States reduces the number of troops there. Osama Bin Ladin and Ayman al Zawahiri are still at large, inspiring a new generation of recruits to the jihad.

Just as constant deployments to Iraq cause burnout in the Army, National Guard and Reserves, we are also burning out large numbers of intelligence professionals. And assigning them to Iraq means we are unable to address other national security challenges, like Iran and North Korea.

There has been good news. U.S. intelligence agencies operating with Special Operations Forces have tracked down many key terrorist leaders. The take-down of Zarqawi showed the importance of fusing human intelligence, imagery, signals intelligence and a military strike capability in real time. That is how intelligence ought to work. It was a huge tactical victory.

But tactical victories alone are not enough. We need a new strategy for Iraq, a dramatic change of course. We need to hold senior officials accountable for massive policy and management failures. Replacing Donald Rumsfeld, the chief architect of the postwar policy, is long overdue.

He ignored the advice of senior military advisers, ignored the careful recommendations of those who understood nation-building, and ignored those horrified by a prison situation that virtually cannot be controlled.

And he prides himself, even now, on refusing to change a failed policy.

Congress must also provide aggressive oversight to learn why the administration erred so grievously.

Since I returned from my third trip to Iraq last September, I have been calling on the administration to develop an exit strategy and I believe it is now time to begin a phased, strategic redeployment of U.S. and coalition forces out of Iraq on a schedule designed by military commanders. A schedule designed by military commanders, not designed by the U.S. Congress.

I believe the U.S. is part of the solution in Iraq, but our large military presence is part of the problem. Beginning to reduce the “footprint,” while maintaining an over-thor of horizon strike force, will improve our chances for success.

I think we have 3 to 6 months to advance three objectives: first, helping the new Iraqi Government provide electrical power, particularly in Baghdad, and deliver other critical economic and social services to the Iraqi people. Second, supporting the Iraqi Government in its effort to disarm Shiite militias and integrate them into a trained Iraqi national security force. Third, continuing efforts to make the administration’s original promise of being able to withdraw our 14,000 troops and Ambassador Khalilzad, of obtaining buy-in from Sunni political leaders. Achieving these objectives will enable us to leave Iraq in better shape than we found it.

Mr. Speaker, the next 3 months are critical. We have a moral obligation to assist Iraq on its path to democracy. But if clearly defined minimum objectives cannot be achieved within that time frame, the prospects for success in Iraq could all but disappear.

So a change in course is urgently needed. The President’s visit to Baghdad was important, but it was not substitute for needed policy changes. And Congress cannot be infinitely passive.

This debate today will only have meaning if, in fact, it leads to a change of course in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to lead. This resolution, in my view, is a press release for staying the course in Iraq. It does not signal a change in policy, and thus I cannot support it.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Arizona, a member of the Intelligence Committee, Mr. RENZI.

Mr. RENZI. I thank the chairman.

I have respect for the gentlewoman from California, I have listened to her words carefully, and I want to remind her that on October 9 she spoke about Saddam Hussein and his development of weapons of mass destruction, saying that he is impulsive, irrational, vicious, and cruel and that left unchecked, he will grow stronger, only to develop the capability to match his disdain for America and his Middle East neighbors and that he poses a clear and present danger.

Those were the words of the ranking member. That was the belief of Bill Clinton. That was the belief of HILLARY CLINTON. That was the belief of Madeleine Albright. And yet we are told today that this is a press release.

 al Qaeda is a cancer. It has metastasized itself throughout the world. There is a lot of negativity, whether or not we want to join and take the war in Iraq and link it with terrorism. It is a cancer. It needs to be cut off, and the American people need to show the will and the endurance. Our troops do. Our people at home, I believe, have that will.

I believe there should be no arbitrary date set for withdrawal and yet no permanent, unending deployment. No cut and run, yet measured progress in helping a people who want to be free without an illusion of overnight success.

The enemy wants to take the fight into the later rounds. They want to prey on what they perceive is our lack of concentrated focus, and their captured documents refer to the U.S. being worn down and quitting.

The Bush resolution is very similar to Rosie the Riveter. We bring out and ask the American people to stay strong. During World War II, we fought an enemy whose goal was to invade and dominate the land and the geography and to gain power and spread fascism.

Those cannot be achieved within the different tactics may be in place. Islamofascists want to establish a caliphate covering Southeast Asia,
Southern Europe, and North Africa, very similar to the same geography that we saw in World War II.

Zarqawi died in Iraq. Saddam was pulled out of a spider hole in Iraq. The Taliban was defeated in Afghanistan.

Terrorism, Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence.

This is about prevailing against our enemies, about achieving a shared success, Republicans and Democrats with the Iraqi and the Afghan people.

America must endure, endure and prevail.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from California control the 30 minutes and yield to people.

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

There is no objection.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time of my 30 minutes remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 21 minutes remaining.

Ms. HARMAN. It is now my intention to yield to members of the minority of the House Intelligence Committee who are here.

First, I would yield 3 minutes to Representative BOWES who is ranking member on our Subcommittee on Terrorism, Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence.

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

Mr. BOWES. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say to Mr. MURTHA, I salute you, sir. We both served in Vietnam. I had two tours. I never told you this. I don’t go around talking about it much. You don’t either. But Charlie Beckwith, you remember that name, don’t you? In the Iron Triangle? Sometimes we had those assaults and sometimes we had to go bring them out. When we had to bring them out, there were lots and lots of casualties. We did not like to do that.

So this exercise we went through a few months ago, saying that you wanted to make an immediate withdrawal, that is not what you said. I know that, and we all know it because that would be chaos. It needs a plan.

So I come today to share that little bit with you. I finished up my tours in the military as an instructor at the Command Staff College, Department of Tactics. We rewrote 101-5. We might want to talk about that sometime. You might find it interesting. And I would say to my friends, LEONARD BOWES, JACK MURTHA, and probably everybody in this Chamber support our troops, absolutely, 100 percent. That is not on the table, as far as I am concerned. They are in a difficult mission. They are performing superbly. And we are very, very proud of them. That is not the question.

Last December IKE SKEELETON and I, do not know how I got invited, but we got invited to the White House to meet with the President, the Vice President, Mr. Rumsfeld, Ms. Rice, General Pace. And the whole conversation was everything is going really, really good in Iraq. And I got engaged in conversation with the President, and I said it seems to me what I am hearing here is we have got 90-plus battalions, at that time, and now it is over 100, 20-something brigades, several divisions, armed, equipped, and in the field. And I have been to Iraq. A lot of us have. I am not sure about that, but if that is true, then why don’t we start a withdrawal program carefully?

Do you know when we do best? We do best when we are under a little bit of pressure, when we know we have got to perform, we got to get the job done. And I think that applies to everybody in my life experience, Iraqis included.

Under pressure, we went through the libel case. I was of the opinion that a full investigation of how we decided to make the decision. We can debate that if you want to, but I do not want to do that. I supported the resolution based on what information I had. But regardless of that, if we would look at it in the face, we have liberated the country from Saddam. He is in jail. He is on trial. Now we are occupiers. We want to help them get settled. They had a great election. We all understand that. They have established a government. And it is pretty tough. They got it done, I am told.

You know, it is kind of like putting the team on the field. You haven’t seen them play yet together. Maybe they will do well, or maybe they won’t. I don’t know. We don’t know. But we wish them well. We want them to succeed absolutely.

My point is this: they need to take some responsibility and the pressure is on to do it. They have got 254,000 troops trained, equipped, and in the field. We have a right to start, orderly, with a plan, bringing our troops home. We ought to do that. Not run, but an orderly withdrawal.

And I salute you for that, Mr. MURTHA.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), a senior member of our committee and a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time on this very important matter.

To my good friend Mr. MURTHA, I also salute you as a Vietnam veteran, one that knows what the cost of war does to a family and to our country.

My point of view, on the side of the aisle would have you believe that this is a simple choice between retreat and resolve. This is a false choice. It is a political stunt. This is about respect. This is about respect for our role to do our jobs as a Congress in oversight.

We can win this war with a comprehensive and reasoned approach to deployment of our troops. But the President’s supporters characterize any disagreement as cutting and running.

It does not wash. This is unfair and it is disingenuous and this is unpatriotic.

The real choice is between blind adherence to Secretary Rumsfeld’s ill-conceived strategy of the so-called "surge", the proper action to fight against an insurgency. Congress has an important role to play in this process, and that is what today’s debate should be about.

In my role as a member of both the Intelligence and Armed Services Committees, I traveled to Iraq and paid a great deal of attention to the effects of this war and their impact on our military, on their families, and our intelligence apparatus.

These mistakes, these gaps in our knowledge, frankly, cry out for oversight. It is about resolve versus retreat. It is about respect for this Congress doing its job in oversight. This Congress could have and should have done a better job of conducting oversight and vigorously questioning the statements that have been made by this administration: statements about the presence of WMD or about connections to 9/11 or about the war taking no longer than 6 months.

In fact, when I asked the administration, before we went to this war, whether there was a connection between al Qaeda and Iraq, the answer was no. We could have made America safer by conducting vigorous oversight, but we as a Congress have failed to do that.

At the same time, while most of our men and women have served honorably and bravely, the unsustainable pace of our operations combined with an overstressed force has led to major problems. It led us on the road to Abu Ghraib and to some of the most heinous allegations lodged against our American troops in history.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the conduct of this war has made us less safe. This is what this debate should be about. It has distracted us from the global war on terrorism. It has hurt recruiting and retention in the military. It has broken our Army for possibly the next decade or more. It has hurt
Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to Mr. HOLT of New Jersey, ranking member of the Intelligence Policy Subcommittee.

Mr. HOLT. I salute Mr. MURTHA, and I salute the servicemen and -women in the field, recovering at Walter Reed, and waiting to come home, wherever that means.

This is a critical matter that we waited far too long to debate on this floor. And instead today we now get a meaningless resolution that says, well, stay the course, whatever that means. Well, today I was meeting with some seventh and eighth graders. And I asked them to help me put in perspective what we are talking about here today, what would we say that 10 years from now we wish that we had said about the war in Iraq.

The first one said, too many lives have been lost already. The second one said, the reasons for going to war were wrong, maybe even deceptive. The third said, the Iraqi people are worse off today than they were before.

We should ask ourselves how posterity will regard Congress for giving President Bush everything he asked for without oversight, without accountability. There are shifting rationales for war: weapons of mass destruction; oh, no, it was retribution for September 11; no, actually it was about human rights abuses under Saddam; no, actually it was containment and disarmament and the U.N. were not working.

No. No. It was to stand up a democracy that could be emulated throughout the Middle East. No, it was to protect America’s strategic interests, including oil. And today we have heard over and over again a response that this is about terrorism.

No, it is not about terrorism. This is not about Khobar Towers. It is not about the USS Cole; it is not even about the World Trade Center. Today’s resolution before the House. It is a resolution that says, stay the course.

The other side, Mr. Speaker, is engaging in classical misdirection. This has nothing to do with terrorism except that Iraq has now become a breeding ground and a training ground for terrorists. And meanwhile the war has warped American priorities and cost us dearly.

Numerous powder kegs around the world are being ignored. International standing and our ability to counter terrorism is hurt. Here at home, I must say, Hurricane Katrina crystallized American thinking when they realized that the President and Congress were putting our attention, our resources in Iraq and not for the needs of the people here at home.

History will remember this war as a colossal blunder. When we leave Iraq, even the middle-road thing we have to do. We did not go into this war the way we went into, as Congressman MURTHA said, Beirut, only a little bit, only not enough, and only for a little while.

We have gone into the war on terrorism with commitment, from this Congress, in Afghanistan, in Iraq, in the South of the Philippines, wherever the terrorists may be; and we said we will stay the long haul in each of these places.

My time is short. I just want to do two things. One, is, to say that, unlike Congressman MURTHA, I did not serve in combat. But I entered the Army in
1970, and I entered as a grandson of Lebanese immigrants.

And throughout the 1970s and 1980s and 1990s, I visited Lebanon, and I visited the region, and I got to know my fellow Arabs of the world. And I knew there was a problem and they knew there was a problem. But we were not addressing it. We are now addressing it.

So we will be punished by the opposition any time we either do nothing or do something. But I would rather do something in the interests of freedom.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, many on this side advocate a strategy for success.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to another member of our committee, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER of Maryland.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, whether you are for or against the war in Iraq, the fact is we are there now and we must support our troops. We must give them the resources they need to protect themselves.

In Congress and across the country, we all want the same thing. We all want the Iraqi military to be able to take control of their own country and secure their cities so that we can bring our men and women home that are in uniform.

What we disagree on, though, is strategy. We have been staying the course and continuing down a bumpy, dangerous and deadly road for a long time. The American people are losing confidence in the war in Iraq. Americans are turning on the news and opening up the newspaper to see more and more stories about troops being killed by roadside bombs and suicide bombers.

The Department of Defense released today that 2,500 troops have died in the war in Iraq since it began more than 3 years ago, and more than 20,000 have been injured.

The only people sacrificing in this war are the troops and their families. I have been to Iraq four times and just returned from my most recent trip over the Memorial Day recess. I also serve on the House Select Intelligence Committee where I am briefed often on the situation in Iraq and the global war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we need a new strategy in Iraq. I believe we must have the Iraqi security forces take on more responsibility in securing their country. We must move American troops to the perimeter of the urban areas and let the Iraqi military patrol the streets in their cities.

Under this perimeter strategy, the American military will still back up the Iraqis in an emergency. This will reduce the Iraqi dependence on Americans and help them gain confidence in their own ability to secure their country.

This perimeter strategy will free up American troops to start the process of bringing our men and women home. Having the Iraqi military patrol their own streets will show the Iraqi people that their new government has been created and their own forces are now protecting them.

It will also give the American public new hope that the Iraqis are taking more control of their country and U.S. troops are not put in the dangerous situation of patrolling the Iraqi streets every day.

This perimeter strategy will allow the American military to do what it does best. Our intelligence analysts can use technology to locate insurgents and al Qaeda operatives. Our special operations forces can focus on high-value targets, and our air power can be used to take them out.

Changing the mission of U.S. forces, redeploying them to perimeter areas, and lowering the profile of the U.S. forces in urban areas will break the dependency the Iraqi military has on U.S. forces.

Mr. Speaker, you know, it is not about being a Republican or Democrat. It is about having the right strategy. It is about having the Iraqi military secure its own cities, and it is about bringing our men and women in uniform home.

I believe this new perimeter strategy will help us do that. I also, with the remaining time that I have, want to talk about the issue of the Iraqi war versus terrorism. There is no one that I know in the Democratic Party that is not behind the United States fighting the war strongly against terror.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, regretfully this debate on America’s role in Iraq has been converted into a debate on the war on terror.

The Republican leadership has mimicked this House in seeking a political squabble instead of a policy debate. The majority leader’s memorandum that was circulated directing his Members to politicize and name call and obfuscate the issue is a disservice to this House and to the country as a whole.

Nothing was gained when the administration first conflated the issue of Osama bin Laden and terrorism with Iraq, and nothing is gained here today by this bald attempt to avoid discussion. Mr. Secretary, what we want to talk about is the issue of the Iraqi war versus terrorism.

Our country’s democratic system requires the active involvement of Congress on key policy questions, particularly the issue of war. Its Members have a patriotic duty to hold the executive branch accountable, especially during a time of war. Troops as well as our citizens at home deserve and expect no less.

Back in 2001 this entire Congress went into Afghanistan against al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden, the Taliban and essentially every Member, Republican, Democrat or Independent, agreed with the international community, rallying to the side of Americans, rallying to our aid. Our intelligence personnel, special ops forces, military and our allies were there.

But it was not the same case in Iraq where this President, President Bush, prematurely diverted troops and resources out of Afghanistan, before that mission was completed, before Osama bin Laden, al Qaeda and Taliban leaders were captured, and before Afghanistan was stabilized.

President Bush and Secretary Rumsfeld chose to start the Iraqi conflict on selective and incomplete intelligence when there was no imminent threat to the United States, without letting the international inspections run their course, without building international support, without a plan to stabilize and rebuild the country and bring our troops home, and ignoring the advice of less-risk generals about troop strength and strategy.

As a result of these failed judgments made over and over again, our troops have suffered in the field, not having adequate body armor and vehicle protection, they have been deployed an unreasonable number of times, and they are under unbelievable stress and danger. Our veterans have received inadequate care, some $3 billion short of what they should be having, and we have experienced a harmful lack of oversight and accountability.

The Iraqi people, more than half of them, are without clean water, 85 percent lack electricity, oil production is lower than what it was before the war started, and there is unemployment of up to 40 percent and billions of dollars of American taxpayer money being spent without getting it where it is supposed to go, our troops not getting the safety equipment, Iraqis not getting the reconstruction done, and the American taxpayer $360 billion out of pocket. The policy of the Bush administration has done more to harm our military strength and more to harm and misdirect resources away from terror.

United States troops have done their jobs. They got rid of Saddam Hussein, they allowed for the constitution to be drawn and elections to be held, and they trained Iraqi security. The time has come for Iraqis to have the incentive to take control and responsibility for their own security. This idea of an open-ended commitment to stay the course just impedes this goal.

The troop presence in our country impedes success and fuels the insurgency. Nine out of 10 Iraqis want a timeline for withdrawal. Seventy percent, including the Prime Minister, want a time set for withdrawal. It appears that the Bush-Rumsfeld group wants to be more Iraqi than the Iraqis. It is time to shift the focus to political and diplomatic solutions. It is time to abandon any intention to permanent bases. It is time to revitalise our military, refocus on Afghanistan and Osama bin Laden and the Taliban, and
secure our own country by fulfilling the 9/11 Commission’s recommenda-
tions.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Zarqawi’s document:  

However, here in Iraq, time is now beginning to be of service to the Amer-
ican forces, harmful to the resistance, for the following reasons.  
Time is on our side. We are making progress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, today we have heard a lot about who is right and who is wrong. Let me begin, at the outbreak of the Civil War, from Leroy Walker, who later became first Confederate Secretary of War. He said that he could wipe up with one handkerchief all the blood that would be spilled in that war. Let me begin with the same words, but applied to the war we are fighting in Iraq. He said, despite everything that has been going on around them, they still voted. Despite all the violence, they stood in line to be heard. Word is that despite the insurgents’ best efforts, voter turnout may be as high as 72 per-
cent across the country, even in the States, that would be a great turn-
out.  
All I can say is that together we, the United States and the Iraqis, no kid-
ding, we did it. I know we will still that this doesn’t solve everything. Sure, there will be tough days yet to come. But for today, we won, we all won.  
Our returning military personnel tell us something else. Iraqi and Americans have confidence in our strategy. They want American forces to come home, but not just yet. Members, now is not the time to go wobbly. Let’s give victory a chance and a lasting peace will surely follow.

Mr. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to explain to our colle-
agues that this side is not trying to go wobbly. We are trying to articulate what we believe would be a better strategy for success in Iraq.

For our final 2 minutes, I will yield the first minute to Representative CROWLEY of New York, a member of the International Relations Committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thought we would start this debate tonight to talk seriously about the problems we are facing in Iraq and begin to talk about our con-
stitutional oversight powers to begin to address this situation. I was wrong.

The American people want a change in our Iraq policy, and as their rep-
resentatives, we have an incredible op-
portunity to speak to those concerns. But, quite frankly, we won’t do that today.  
As a New Yorker, and as the only Member of this House to lost a relative on September 11, I am sickened that once again my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to try to spin this as an answer to 9/11.

If we thought that Ann Coulter’s criticism of the Jersey girls who fought for an independent inquiry into the 9/11 attacks was bad, today Ms. Coulter pales in comparison to this Republican-led Congress. The Bush Administration needs to win the war of 9/11 as a reason for being in Iraq in the first place, when all evidence, all evidence says otherwise.

When I hear my colleagues continue to talk and say that Iraq is a stop in the war on terrorism, let me ask them the first stop? What happened to Osama bin Laden? Five years later, we have yet to capture or eliminate the person responsible for that action in the first place. But yet we find ourselves in a quagmire in Iraq. I intend to vote “no” on this resolution.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), a member of the committee.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I just want to make a couple of observations. To my colleagues on the minority side, ladies and gentle-
mens, every vote is a vote. It is very important to know what you wish to debate. No one is telling you what to debate here today. All I have heard you do is complain about what you can and cannot say. I very much want to hear your strategy.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, talked about we have a strategy for success. The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. EMANUEL, talked about we want to take the fight to the terrorists. I would love to hear how.

That is what we are doing at this mo-
ment. There is an old country and western song that teaches you, you know, while I was busy dreaming about yesterday, tomorrow hit me right be-
tween the eyes.  
What you are doing is dreaming about yesterday. We are in Iraq, Mr. Speaker, and it is right. It is bringing ground, a recruiting ground for terror-
ists. It is interesting, it is instructive, and we should talk about how that hap-
sens so we don’t repeat it in the future.

But it is the reality for the moment. What do we do to end it? Where do we draw the line? Where do we say this is where we have to win? It is Iraq, and we better get it right.

Ms. HARMAN. To the prior speaker, we are trying to articulate exactly what we should do.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield the final minute of the Intelligence Committee’s time to Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Maryland, a member of the National Security Sub-
committee of the Government Reform Committee.

I thank Mr. MURTHA for yielding me the 30 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, we can say what we want on the floor of this House. We can debate and vote on nothing. Nothing.

But what is most important to the Amer-
ican people is not what we say here but what we do here.  
This resolution does not commit this House to do anything. It does not re-
quire this Congress to take any meas-
ures to hold the Bush Administration or ourselves accountable for what is happen-
ing in Iraq.

The Bush administration was totally wrong about weapons of mass destruc-
tion in Iraq. No one is held ac-
countable. The Bush Administration totally miscalculated the number of troops that would be required to pro-
vide greater stability on the ground in post-invasion Iraq. No one was held ac-
countable. The Bush Administration got the costs of the war totally wrong. Again, no one was held accountable.

It is a simple principle. If you reward and ignore failure today, you are going to get more failure tomorrow. This House has ignored those failures. While our men and women have been fighting bravely in Iraq, this House has been AWOL when it comes to providing oversight.
We Americans cannot continue to be free if we spend all our time questioning our mission. Many Americans want to debate the validity of prewar intelligence or weapons of mass destruction. Whether one nation or another supported al Qaeda, how many troops were sent to Iraq have to look beyond the tactical challenges.

We must do as Tony Blair did. The people who are fighting us, he said, know what is at stake. The question is, do we?

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 60 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) from the Out of Iraq Caucus, and I ask unanimous consent she control the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this resolution as the chairperson of the 72-member Out of Iraq Caucus of the House of Representatives. Tomorrow will mark the 1-year anniversary of the Out of Iraq Caucus.

My colleagues and I joined together to form the Out of Iraq Caucus to pressure the Bush administration into telling the truth about what is going on in Iraq, to admit their mistakes, and to admit their misjudgments, and to force them to devise a plan to bring our troops home.

The Bush administration cannot deny that they misled the world about the reasons we invaded Iraq. There were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. There was no connection between the unfortunate destruction of 9/11 and Saddam Hussein. We have not been welcomed with open arms in Iraq. We have no substantial support for this war by other countries. Yet, Mr. Bush, Mr. Cheney, Mr. Rumsfeld, Ms. Rice, Mr. Wolfowitz, and Mr. Karl Rove continue to squander the American taxpayers’ dollars on a war that cannot be won with a military solution.

Here we are 3 years later, 2,500 American soldiers dead, 18,498 U.S. soldiers seriously injured, and Congress has appropriated over $320 billion for this war, and the costs will only continue to rise. Even Condoleezza Rice admitted there have been thousands of missteps. The American people are increasingly aware of this mismanaged, corrupt, and bungled war.

The company that Vice President Cheney served as CEO of, Halliburton, has been awarded no-bid contracts for billions of dollars, and they have had over $400 million in unsupported costs and another $1 billion in questioned costs. In simple words, they are cheating the American people. Yet they are not facing any of their criminal actions, and the administration has facilitated these illegal actions.

However, Congress has done virtually no oversight of this war, no hearing, no acknowledging the generals that are trying to tell us about Mr. Rumsfeld’s mismanagement of this war. We have not done the oversight, and today, we find that we have this debate. It is not supposed to have happened, and it has been improperly characterized. This resolution we are debating is a sham.

As a matter of fact, it is a trap. It is an attempt to force Democrats to sign on to a resolution that will do nothing to bring our troops home. Our colleagues want to make us sound as if we are unpatriotic. They want to make us sound as if we do not support our troops. We love our troops. We are as patriotic as anybody, and so I would implore my colleagues not to get caught into this trap.

This resolution is not intended to solve any problems or chart a new course that will permit us to preserve the lives of our troops or to be successful in Iraq.

I know what is happening. My friends on the opposite side of the aisle are getting frightened. They went home on the break, and they heard the American people. They saw the polls, and they got home on a Karl Rove-constructed resolution to try and make it seem as if now they get it. But this resolution does nothing. It will only continue to mislead.

We formed the Out of Iraq Caucus to oppose any permanent bases in Iraq. We support H.J. Res. 73 to redeploy U.S. forces from Iraq, commonly referred to as the Murtha resolution.

There are a lot of misconceptions about what the Murtha resolution is. So let us take a minute and explain clearly what the resolution says.

Section 1 says: “The deployment of United States forces in Iraq, by direction of Congress, is hereby terminated and the forces involved are to be redeployed at the earliest practicable date.” They would have you believe this is meant to withdraw immediately. That is not what it says, and let us get that straight today. What that means is there will be no more U.S. troops sent to Iraq and that the troops in Iraq will be redeployed as soon as possible, a judgment that should be made by military officials on the ground. So stop misrepresenting what this resolution is all about.

Section 2 says: “The United States of America shall pursue security and stability in Iraq through diplomacy.” This war cannot be won through military aggression, nor does it mean to utilize our allies in the region or the national security of the United States.

Section 3 says: “The United States of America shall pursue security and stability in Iraq through diplomacy.” This war cannot be won through military aggression, nor does it mean to utilize our allies in the region or the national security of the United States.
The Murtha resolution endorses these principles, and there is no reason why the entire Congress of the United States cannot get behind this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the Out of Iraq Caucus supports the Murtha resolution as the clear path for America. We support bringing our troops home, and stop saying we do not have a plan. We have a plan. It is a good plan. It is the Murtha resolution.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be able to control the remainder of the Intelligence Committee’s time on this side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CAS-}
decision on Iraq policy in very recent days was taken out by the Republican majority behind closed doors. They stripped from the war supplemental an amendment that we offered to prevent the establishment of permanent military bases in Iraq.

The American people do not want an open-ended war and occupation. Quietly removing a measure that was approved by both the House and the Senate is a gross abuse of the democratic process and is further evidence that Republicans are afraid to level with the American people about their real plans for Iraq.

Let me tell you, there will be a day of reckoning. The American people are demanding answers. They deserve a truthful accounting of how we got into this unnecessary war, how the billions of dollars have been misspent and when our troops are coming home, and also, they really deserve to know if our troops are still being given recent reports that the administration is considering leaving a permanent force of 50,000 troops in Iraq and indications that establishing permanent military bases are not off the table.

So, Mr. Speaker, the American people will not forget that, instead of answers to their questions, the Republican majority keeps giving them rhetoric and posturing like they are doing today, and the American people deserve better.

This sham resolution, it really should be rejected. We should support the Murtha resolution. That is what we should do today. That will take steps to end this war. It would take steps to bring our young men and women home; and I tell you, if we do not debate this, we do not know when the opportunity to debate or to have a real debate will take place.

It should have been a real debate today. Unfortunately, this has deteriorated into posturing into rhetoric and into misrepresenting what the facts are.

I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the gentleman from Maryland, I yield myself 30 seconds to read a quote we mentioned earlier in this debate from Osama bin Laden. He said, "This Third World war is raging in Iraq. The whole world is watching this war. It will end in victory and glory, or misery and humiliation." That is not the case of the aisle. That is Osama bin Laden.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Gilchrest).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. As we debate the war in Iraq, Afghanistan and the war on terrorism, there will be strong, heartfelt feelings and expressions on this House floor. Let us, however, as we debate have a powerful sense of resolution, a powerful sense of urgency, a powerful sense of urgency to end the war and to end the war successfully.

A stable, free Iraq, a stable, free Afghanistan will be a blessing to the Iraqis, a blessing to the Afghans and a blessing to the region and the world at large.

The war on terrorism is the next stage of the Cold War. Civilized people who believe in the rule of law, justice, equality and freedom cannot allow self-anointed fanatics to rape, pillage and murder at will around the globe.

A great Islamic theologian once said, "One hour of justice is equal to a hundred years of prayer." The world wants to hear from us. It is our job to end the war in Iraq successfully. The United States, with the assistance of and for the good of the civilized world, can and will defeat terrorism. This debate is our hour of justice.

General Eisenhower said, "The emphasis of the military is on authority and obedience; the emphasis on public office is communication and consent." As we craft this resolution, I urge you to keep these themes in mind.

And as we will eventually walk across the graves in Arlington Cemetery and we will hear the "fare the dead. Short days ago we lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow, loved and were loved. And now we lie in Flanders Field." Let us work together through this debate to figure out how to end the war.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California, Representative Woolsey, 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, many of us voted against this war from the very beginning. In fact, 60 percent of the Democrats voted "no" to the war in Iraq. Since then, we have hosted informal hearings, we have founded the Out of Iraq Caucus, we forced a debate and vote on the House floor, Mr. Murtha offered his amendment to redeploy our troops, and last night I gave my 151st 5-minute speech on Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 39 months since our troops were sent to Iraq, and today, more than 37 months after the President declared "Mission Accomplished," our troops are still there.

Just this week, the President of the United States said this about Iraq, and I quote: "My message to the enemy is: don't count on us leaving before we see success." I believe the American people want answers to these questions, the President calls American politics is actually a majority of our citizens outraged at the loss of life, the hundreds of billions spent, and the global credibility we have squandered.

The American people, as of this morning, see 2,500 U.S. troops killed, more than 18,000 U.S. soldiers gravely wounded, and thousands more mentally and physically traumatized from their experience in the war. They see the United States losing an equivalent of one battalion every month in Iraq, and the American people deserve answers. They do not want partisan resolutions like the one before us today, a resolution that does nothing to end this war.

They see all the sacrifices, Mr. Speaker, and they ask, for what? They know none of it is making Americans in Iraqi safer. In fact, the presence of nearly 150,000 American troops in Iraq has become a rallying point for anti-American extremist in the Arab world. The people of this country support our troops. They are inconsistent about having the deepest contempt for this war while expressing the utmost admiration for the soldiers on the front lines.

Last fall, I traveled to Iraq and I visited with our troops. My conversations with them confirmed what I already knew: These are uniquely loyal, intelligent, and courageous Americans. If only those civilians who are running this war had half the honor and integrity of the men and women who are fighting it.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, this Congress caught up to the American people. It is time that the Commander in Chief stepped up by offering a solution, instead of dismissing American anxiety as just politics. It is time to establish a multilateral security force to keep the peace in Iraq while shifting the U.S. role from military occupier to reconstruction partner. It is time to give Iraqis a seat at the table. We are the United States, with the assistance of and for the good of the civilized world, can and will defeat terrorism.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, a leader on national defense affairs, Mr. Wick-er.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, what is the status of our effort in Iraq today, and where do we go from here?

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle see the situation getting worse and worse. I see real progress. I see three successful elections, I see the completion of a national unity government, and where do we go from here? What is the status of our effort in Iraq today, and where do we go from here?

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle see the situation getting worse and worse. I see real progress.
me that our mission is succeeding and that their sacrifice is accomplishing a valuable service for our effort and for our people. I haven’t surveyed many seventh graders, but the soldiers I see express support for what we are doing and frustration over the coverage they see in the media.

Now, as to the question of where we go from here, two things are certain: Iraq is ground zero in our global war on terror. And the decisions we make will affect U.S. credibility for decades to come.

Al Qaeda attacked our homeland unprovoked on 9/11, and it is that same al Qaeda we fight today in Iraq. We must defeat them there and anywhere else until their terrorist threat has ended. But make no mistake, this is the same enemy that demolished the World Trade Center and attacked the Pentagon.

Another argument we have heard today is that this war was a mistake to begin with; it was unnecessary; that it was in fact based on a lie. This view, of course, ignores the fact that intelligence agencies not only in the U.S. but from Israel, Great Britain, Germany, and France, to name a few, were unanimous in their conclusions that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. President Bill Clinton and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright cautioned that it was a real possibility Saddam would use these weapons or share them with terrorists intent on attacking the U.S. again.

But if you think about it, Mr. Speaker, what such an argument really advocates is a present day Iraq with Saddam Hussein, and the world will be safer if we maintain our resolve.

The administration has embarked on a sound plan for freedom and stability in the region and for better security for our citizens, the course Mr. Murtha has endorsed.

Mr. WITERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of Washington, Representative McDermott, 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, this debate begins with one fundamental truth. We are in Iraq and our leaders have no plan to get us out of Iraq.

The President says U.S. soldiers will stay in harm’s way for as long as he says so. “We will stand down,” our leaders say, “when the Iraqis stand up.” In other words, Iraqi clerics and the factions they control and the decisions they make about whether to cooperate with the Iraqi government will determine what we can do. The extent of our involvement, the length of our stay, the number of our dead is controlled by religious clerics in Iraq because the government has no ability to bring Iraq the role model for projecting U.S. influence around the world.

Today, the American people say with a growing voice that Iraq was a mistake, and staying with no plan or timetable is the wrong course for our soldiers and our Nation. The unending war, the permanent bases, the fortress embassies we are building all make a powerful argument that our involvement in Iraq is more an occupation than a war on terrorism. This helps recruit terrorists. It doesn’t end the terrorism.

U.S. soldiers in Iraq are doing an heroic job, but we are not doing ours. It is not partisan politics to insist that a new, more effective strategy and a different point of view. The resolution and its backers seem to think it is unpatriotic to ask questions and to demand a plan. That is not true. Our foreign policy fails when we fail to ask enough questions, not too many.

American soldiers are falling every day, and there is no one, not a single person in this House who does not respect and support our soldiers. But this resolution is intended to paper over the truth about the Iraq war and it does not support our soldiers and will not make a difference in winning the war. Our soldiers need and the American people expect their leaders to develop a battle plan that will work in the field because it is based on military intelligence, not political expediency.

We are in a war and we need a battle plan from the President, not a message memo from the House majority leader. War isn’t waged by a political party nor is it won by political ideology. Iraq needs a credible battle plan. There is only one at the moment, and we should be debating it.

John Murtha put forward a plan 6 months ago and only today are we able to discuss the ability to alter the resolution before us. This is not an honest debate, an honest attempt to seek answers for our problems in Iraq. It is a debate about a letter of endorsement for the President, not an examination of our options.

Jack Murtha has emerged with a battle plan, and it is no surprise. He is a decorated combat soldier who reflects what the best military minds believe. As a veteran member of the Vietnam era, I must say that Jack is a soldier, a combat hero who has one and only one goal: To defend our Nation with the finest military and the best plan.

Jack has a plan: Strategic redeployment. It is smart, proud, honest and effective. You can’t win a war with rhetoric and resolutions. You win with a thoughtful plan. I support the Murtha resolution that puts in place a plan to protect our soldiers and American interests in the Middle East, and protects American people here at home. It is a battle plan that resolves to bring our troops home on a timetable driven by the United States, not subject to the approval of Iraqi clerics. It is a commitment to secure the peace by being smart about the war.

The American soldiers need a battle plan, not a resolution that reflects a bunker mentality of the Republican Party losing its grip on political control.

Two grim things came out of the Pentagon today. When the President declared “mission accomplished,” 141 people had died. Today, the 2,500th person died. The other thing that came out was a 74-page booklet to help Republicans manage spin control during the Iraq debate on the floor. It is called “The Iraq War Debate Prep Book.”

The Defense Department is putting out PR pieces. That is an affront to the American people. It is not a front on the war. The American people want change because the Pentagon under this administration distributes PR plans. Debate talking points. What is the military doing with that kind of stuff up here on the Hill in this body? We see no military plan.

Support U.S. soldiers by passing Jack Murtha’s plan to get out of Iraq.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Murphy).

Mr. MURPHY. After September 11th, Mr. Speaker, bin Laden’s deputies said, “People of America, your government is leading you into a losing battle. Remember, your government was defeated in Vietnam, fled in panic from Lebanon, rushed out of Somalia, and slipped across the face in Aden. Your government today is leading you into a losing war.”

And no wonder. Look at our past. November 1979: 52 Americans taken hostage at the U.S. embassy in Iran. We had a failed response. April 1983: 17 Americans killed at our embassy in Beirut. We took no action. October 1983: 241 Marines killed, 100 wounded. Our Marines were redeployed. April 1988: 259 killed in the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103. We sought indictments. February 1993: Six killed and a thousand injured after the explosion of the first World Trade Center bombing. We took them to court. October 1993: 18 U.S. servicemen were killed and 84 wounded in Somalia by our troops. August 1998: 224 killed at U.S. embassies. We fired cruise missiles in the region and for better security for our citizens, the course Mr. Murtha has endorsed.
However, since September 11 we have been much different. We fought the Taliban in Afghanistan, and now we are fighting al Qaeda in Iraq, and the U.S. is sending a message to the terrorists and the world, and we are different and we are successful.

Now, there will be disagreements between leaders who are retired and current ones. This is part of history. Witness the disagreements between Lincoln and McClellan, Patton and Montgomery, MacArthur and Truman.

But having said that, our troops are being redeployed outside of the cities of Iraq. We are transferring the battle to Iraqi security forces and their police, and now they have a government where they must face the scourge of al Qaeda, and we cannot let them face it alone.

I wish we could finish quickly, but I know we cannot finish hastily. I think one wounded soldier said it to me, summed it up best, he said, I want to go back and fight the job I trained to fight there, not in our suburbs.

I know we cannot fight them in our courts. I know we cannot fight terrorists with our police in our streets. I know surely we cannot fight terrorist murderers with diplomacy. Let’s finish the job of terrorism, then we bring them home.

Ms. WATERS. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAUKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAUKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, as a founding member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I rise in strong support of our brave troops and in strong support of Congressman MURTHA’s plan for a responsible redeployment from Iraq.

Americans want the truth about the Iraq war. Americans deserve the truth, and despite all the talk from those who declared this war, ineptly pursued this war, and still today justify this war, the American people in overwhelming numbers are determined for themselves the truth about this war.

Polls taken even after the killing of al Zarqawi show that only 33 percent of American adults think that the results of the war were worth the loss of life and other costs. Only 33 percent approve of the way George W. Bush is handling the situation in Iraq. Only 26 percent of Americans feel that the United States is better off because of the war.

The American people in their wisdom have been able to distinguish reality from rhetoric. The truth has been a major casualty in the war of Iraq.

It is worth reviewing just a few of the statements presented as truth that have been proven to be not true, never true, and still today not true:

DEAN CHENEY said in August 2002, “Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction.”

And Donald Rumsfeld on the cost, “Well the Office of Management and Budget has come up with a number that is higher than $50 billion for the cost. How much of that will be the U.S. burden and how much will be other countries an open question.”

DICK CHENEY said May 30, 2005, “I think they are in the last throes, if you will, of the insurgency.”

And what happens to those experts who tell the truth? Are they heeded and embraced by the Bush administration? Hardly. Although it is now universally agreed we didn’t have enough troops to avoid the chaos and violence after the initial invasion, when the Army’s top general, Eric Shinseki, testified in February 2003 “something on the order of several hundred thousand soldiers” would be necessary to achieve victory in Iraq, “he was immediately and repeatedly by Secretary Rumsfeld who said that “the idea it would take several hundred thousand U.S. forces I think is far off the mark.”

Shinseki was quietly ushered into retirement, and Secretary Rumsfeld remains in his job. It was a failed Bush administration policy in Iraq.

When Dr. Lawrence Lindsey, former assistant for economic policy to the President, told the Wall Street Journal in September 2002 that the war’s cost could reach $200 billion, he was fired by the President.

Yet by the end of this year we will have spend $450 billion in Iraq. Some say at the end of the day the war will cost $1 trillion taxpayer dollars.

Since the time the President announced on May 1, 2003 that “major combat operations in Iraq have ended,” more than 2,350 U.S. soldiers have lost their lives, and the President has not attended a single one of their funerals. And for the United States is spending in excess of $3 billion a month to wage the war. That is $266 million a day, $11 million an hour, $185,000 a minute and $3,100 a second, every second for this war.

Certaintly we could have afforded body armor and proper Humvees for our soldiers.

We could have insured 165 million children for 1 year, provided more than 13 million American students with 4-year scholarships at public universities, fully funded global anti-hunger efforts for 11 years, give basic immunization to every child in the world for 92 years, and I believe that would have bought us more security than invading Iraq has done.

Our military men and women have done a magnificent job in the Iraq theater and deserve better. The civilian leadership in the White House and the civilian leadership in the Pentagon have failed. Time after time they have been wrong. They projected the cost of the war, and got it wrong. They predicted the length of the war, and got it wrong.

They predicted the existence of weapons of mass destruction: wrong. They predicted the Iraqi reaction to our occupation: wrong. They got the reconstruction of Iraq wrong. When it came to providing needed equipment, they got it wrong.

And who will pay the price for those mistakes? None of the architects of this war. No one of them has been held accountable. The only ones paying the price are dead and wounded soldiers, our men and women in uniform.

We need a new direction for Iraq. The majority has nothing to offer in terms of a plan, just more political ploys, more talk, more mistakes like those cited today.

It is time to redeploy our troops from Iraq. There is a plan, the Murtha plan; and we should make sure that we are not establishing a permanent military presence there.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I draw 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this debate, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to terrorism and in support of honoring our commitments. I rise in support of this resolution.

It is clear that one-half of those engaged in this debate believe we need to get out of Iraq and believe we need to get out soon. In support of their position, they cite mistakes that were made leading to the war and mistakes that have been made in conducting the war, and they cite the recent increase in terrorist attacks in Iraq.

Let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, reaping on our commitment to defeat terrorism in Iraq now would be a mistake of monumental proportions for which future generations would pay and pay dearly.

Of course mistakes have been made. In every human endeavor, mistakes are made. That is the nature of human endeavors.

I personally am convinced we had too few troops in Iraq when Baghdad fell. I joined my colleague JOHN MCCAIN in opposing Resolution 868. Under House Resolution 868, the previous question has been ordered without adoption of the resolution without overriding amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this debate, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to terrorism and in support of honoring our commitments. I rise in support of this resolution.

It is clear that one-half of those engaged in this debate believe we need to get out of Iraq and believe we need to get out soon. In support of their position, they cite mistakes that were made leading to the war and mistakes that have been made in conducting the war, and they cite the recent increase in terrorist attacks in Iraq.

Let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, reaping on our commitment to defeat terrorism in Iraq now would be a mistake of monumental proportions for which future generations would pay and pay deeply.

Of course mistakes have been made. In every human endeavor, mistakes are made. That is the nature of human endeavors.
we needed more troops there. I have joined his call for sending more troops repeatedly, and I join those who call for sending temporarily more troops now to take advantage of the defeat of Zarqawi as an opportunity to crush the insurgents. And no doubt, other mistakes have been made, but if our mistakes have been made, they do not justify cutting and running.

Recently, a constituent of mine, a Vietnam War helicopter pilot, approached me in Phoenix and said, This war is unlike Vietnam. It is unlike Vietnam, he explained, because we were to abandon this effort without succeeding, make no mistake about it, the consequences would be far reaching and disastrous.

Let’s talk about some of those.

First, it would be a humiliating defeat for the United States. Look no further than the words of Osama bin Laden. He said: The whole world is watching this war and the two adversaries. It’s either victory and glory, or misery and humiliation.

Future commitments by the United States could be scooped at by our allies and by our enemies around the world for generations to come. It would shatter the trust we have built amongst our allies in the region. The newly elected Iraqi Government, and I find it ironic that we are having this debate within days of its selection, would collapse and we would have the creation of a radical, non-Western state. But sadly and most importantly, to fail now would establish beyond a shadow of a doubt that our brave soldiers, men and women, who gave of their lives or who suffered grave injuries that will be with them for the remainder of their lives did so in vain.

Most importantly, it is not necessary. We can succeed, but the path to defeating terrorism in Iraq is not surrender; it is resolve. The opponents argue that we have suffered recent increases in violence and insurgent attacks. The increase in those attacks is not proof that we are losing, and it is certainly not proof that we cannot prevail. Rather, I submit to you it is proof that the insurgents understood that the period leading up to the election of a permanent representative government in Iraq was their best chance, and they took their best shot. And they failed.

For all that is rational, for that is honorable, we must not now within days of the election of that new permanent government cut and run. No, indeed, we must give it an opportunity to do its job, an opportunity to succeed.

Now, those who say that we are losing in Iraq, by their own admittance, from al Qaeda is acknowledging that it is falling in Baghdad. I urge us not to cut and run now for our children and for our grandchildren.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first let’s note what a degradation of democracy is taking place here.

The majority party has put forward a resolution that allows no amendment. There will be a debate in which those of us who think some things are good and some things bad, contrary to every reason the Senate procedure, will have no opportunity to say so.

Here is the tactic that is being used: they take a number of things that people agree with, they mix in with them things which are quite controversial. They tell them as if they were not separable.

Let me say what I have said again before. The majority party thinks the way to legislate is the way you feed a pill to a dog: you take the unpalatable with the popular.

Now I will have to say this: one of the things we are trying to do is to persuade the people in Iraq to be able to work together and make democracy work. We are trying to persuade, we are trying to get the Sunnis to work together. We are trying to tell the majority Shia to share power.

Mr. Speaker, how can you and your party believe that we inspire people to share power by giving the example of its monopolization in an abusive fashion?

I just hope that the members of parliament in Iraq who may hear about this will remember a very important point: please do not try this at home.

Now let’s talk about substance.

This war in Iraq came after September 11. It was not the response to terrorism the war in Afghanistan was. I am struck in listening to the Members on the other side of the aisle that Afghanistan appears to have too many syllables for them to pronounce. What is in fact happening is that the war in Afghanistan, which was the response to the terrorist attack, which was almost unanimously supported here and by Democrats in the Senate is in fact not going as well as it should.

One of the prices we are paying for the war in Iraq is the deterioration in Afghanistan. Now, the war in Iraq was launched based on a couple of lies we were told. And I am struck to hear people still defending the arguments about the weapons of mass destruction. It seems my colleagues on the other side have decided to adopt a Marxist idea. The Marx in question, of course, is Christianity. Do you agree with me on this? Are you going to believe, me or your own eyes? Having been repudiated overwhelmingly by the facts, they stick to the rhetoric.

Here is the price we are paying. We shouldn’t have gone in. Of course having gone in, we are victimized by one of the most incompetently administered examples in American national security history. But here is the price we pay: the war in Afghanistan deteriorates our ability to protect ourselves at home. Every time we hear that we can’t afford communications, we can’t afford more people at the border, we can’t afford port security, every time people hear that we can’t afford something that would enhance our security at home, understand that it is the war in Iraq that makes it impossible for this Nation to afford it.

If we did not have these hundreds of billions being drained there, we could take care of the agenda.

Finally, it constrains us elsewhere in the world. It has led to an increase in anti-Americanism which I deplore, with which I disagree, but it is a fact. Our ability to deal with the potential Iranian nuclear weaponry is constrained by the fact that we are in Iraq. In fact, the Iranians have been among the major beneficiaries of what we have done in Iraq.

So you went into a war on the basis of two lies. You have handled it incompetently. We are now at the point, well, does that mean you pull out? And here is the point. You have to tell us one thing, there is one reason that there is great success. We have built a government, et cetera, et cetera. But also, you tell us simultaneously that if we withdrew American troops the house of cards fails. Well, why isn’t it doing better? Have you failed the identity in Iraq? If you have, why can’t we pull out? Why can’t 28 million people in Iraq, with a couple of hundred thousand Iraqis under arms deal with 15 or 18,000 terrorists?

The fact is that this is a failed policy that gets worse every day.

Mr. THORNBERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Dr. WELDON.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, the President’s plan, and our troops.

In recent days U.S. and Iraqi forces have dealt terrorists in Iraq a decisive blow. The brutal leader of al Qaeda in Iraq, Abu al Zarqawi, responsible for untold deaths and horrendous acts of terrorism the war in Afghanistan was.

And let us not forget, Ramzi Yousef, the man who plotted and attempted the 1993 attack on the World Trade Center that could have led then to tens of thousands of deaths, was an Iraqi intelligence agent.

And let us remember the great accomplishments of our troops in the field. For too long a media that has focused only on the negative and has chosen only to report bad stories, stories of terrorist attacks. Indeed, for every story that reports heroism and accomplishment of our troops in the field, our American news media focuses 9 or 10 stories on terrorist attacks and the failings of our military. Where our military can accomplish great things over and over again, the American news media ignores it and instead looks for a negative story to report.

Well, I want to report on one good story, a great story that shows that we are getting the job done and the Iraqi people are with us. And indeed, this
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know how are the oil revenues going to

be distributed? If I live in a province

where there is no oil, will my area ben-

efit?

These questions need to be answered

honestly. Congress must seize the ini-

tiative from the American oil barons

and demand justice for the Iraqi citi-

zens. The oil belongs to them.

We must win their trust and separate

the masses of the Iraqi people from the

fanatical murderers. Follow the logic

of the Murtha resolution. Give the peo-

ple control of their oil revenues and get

out of Iraq. We can do that when we

have the trust of the Iraqi people.

When the Iraqi people have their own

revenues, they can equip their own po-

lice forces. They can take charge of

their government in a competent way.

They don't need us, and they will be

less likely to join hands with the insur-

gents and protect the fanatical mur-

durers that have now found greater re-

ceptivity in the population than ever

before.

Get out of the Iraq. Give the people

control of their oil revenues.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I

yield 2 minutes to a distinguished

member of the defense appropriations

subcommittee from gentleman from

New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and

was given permission to revise and ex-

tend his remarks.)
And so, on the birthday of the Army, I want to salute the Army. Mr. Murtha, I want to salute you for your service and your plan. And I want to salute all of the United States military. And might I say that our soldiers are doing their job. They have done their job. And one of the things that thematic casualties are some 19,000, and today, I am very sad to say that 2,500 of them are now dead.

And so I come with a heavy heart to suggest that there are myths that we need to overcome. And one of them is that there is something called “cut and run.” It is not “cut and run.” It is the opportunity of involvement, debate and patriotism, a belief that we can put forward a plan that the American people will believe in.

The Bush Iraq policy has harmed the United States military, and I might say that I am glad to stand with a retired Marine Lieutenant General, Greg Newbold, who says, “my sincere view of the nominating that our forces to this war was done with a casualness and a swagger that are the special province of those who have never had to execute these missions or bury the results.”

And I come again to suggest that there is no “cut and run.” There is reality. A Pentagon commission study concluded that the Army cannot maintain its current pace of operation in Iraq without doing permanent damage to the quality of the force.

We realize that the large and extended deployment of the National Guard units overseas has undermined the ability of the United States to deal with terrorist attacks or natural disasters. We realize that resources are being diverted and, therefore, we are not able to fight the global war on terror.

I don’t want my friends to pigeonhole us. We want a debate and a plan to save lives and win this war, not a free, independent and democratic Iraq. That can happen with a new change, a new day, Democrats and others, who believe in leading this country to a new future.

I don’t want the same old plan, and I am not ashamed of saying so. That is why I am here to open the doors to disent, tell the American people to come marching into the United States Congress. Don’t let us talk for you. You want redeployment. You want the troops out. You don’t believe the Democratic Congress is in “cut and run.”

You understand that the General, Lieutenant General, has said we are careful about this war. Come home.

Murtha plan, the Out of Iraq Caucus is proud of our patriotic stand.

That says you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. I rise to speak on H.R. 861, a resolution which declares that the “United States will prevail in the Global War on Terrorism.” I believe that it is the resolve of all Members of this House and of all Americans. But to prevail in the global war on terrorism, we must remain focused on the global war on terrorism, and not allow ourselves to be diverted or distracted.

Unfortunately, we have been distracted from waging a full-scale, all-out global war on terrorism by the President’s fateful decision to go to war in Iraq. Before and after 9/11, Iraq was not a part of the global war on terror, much less the central front. It only became so when the President launched his ill-advised preemptive and unilateral attack on a country which did not have WMD, which did not support terrorism, which posed no threat to U.S. national security.

I am proud to be among the majority of House Democrats who voted against the Resolution Authorizing the Use of Military Force, AUMF, in 2002, which authorized the President to use military force to disarm Iraq of its alleged weapons of mass destruction, WMD. I voted against going to war in Iraq because I thought it a diversion from the important task facing the Nation and that was winning the global war on terror. History has shown that we were right. The ill-advised rush to war in Iraq has not only been a diversion from the war on terror but a strategic disaster of epic proportions. As Thomas Jefferson would say, to prove this let facts be submitted to a candid world.

(i) The Bush Iraq Policy has harmed the U.S. economy. We just learned today the sad news that the 2,500th soldier has been killed in Iraq. More than 19,000 others have been wounded. The Bush administration’s open-ended commitment of U.S. troops to Iraq has weakened the U.S. Army, the Army National Guard, and the Army Reserves. The extended deployments in Iraq have eroded U.S. ground forces and overall military strength. A Pentagon-commissioned study concluded that the Army cannot maintain its current pace of operations in Iraq without doing permanent damage to the quality of the force. So more than 3 years of a continuous deployment of U.S. troops to Iraq has:

Contributed to serious problems with recruitment, with the U.S. Army missing its recruitment targets last year;

Forced the Army to lower its standards for military recruits; and

Led to military equipment shortages that hamper the ability of U.S. ground forces to do their job in Iraq and around the world.

The large and extended deployment of National Guard units overseas has undermined the ability of the United States to deal with terrorist attacks or natural disasters. For example, State officials in Louisiana and Mississippi struggled to overcome the absence of National Guard members from their States in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. In Louisiana, about 100 of the National Guard’s high-water vehicles remain abroad—even as the State continues to rebuild from Hurricane Katrina. Coastal North Carolina is missing nearly half its Humvee fleet, and Guard officials there say shortages have forced the State to pool equipment from different units into one pot of hurricane supplies.

In addition, the equipment the Guard needs to help in the aftermath of natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina is in shorter supply because the gear is in use in combat zones, is battle-damaged, or has been loaned to cover gaps in other units.

(1) War in Iraq has diverted resources and attention from war in Afghanistan. The large and extended deployment of National Guard units overseas has undermined the ability of the United States to deal with terrorist attacks or natural disasters. For example, State officials in Louisiana and Mississippi struggled to overcome the absence of National Guard members from their States in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. In Louisiana, about 100 of the National Guard’s high-water vehicles remain abroad—even as the State continues to rebuild from Hurricane Katrina. Coastal North Carolina is missing nearly half its Humvee fleet, and Guard officials there say shortages have forced the State to pool equipment from different units into one pot of hurricane supplies.

In addition, the equipment the Guard needs to help in the aftermath of natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina is in shorter supply because the gear is in use in combat zones, is battle-damaged, or has been loaned to cover gaps in other units.

(2) War in Iraq has increased the burden on U.S. taxpayers without stabilizing Iraq or making Americans safer.

Over the last 3 years, the United States has spent more than $300 billion in Iraq, yet the investment has failed to stabilize Iraq or improve the overall quality of life for most Iraqis. According to the Congressional Research Service, total assistance to Iraq thus far is roughly equivalent to total assistance, adjusted for inflation, provided to Germany—and almost double that provided to Japan from 1946 to 1952. Yet on key metrics like oil production, Iraq has failed to advance beyond pre-war levels, and quality of life indicators remain dismal:

- Oil production is below pre-war levels—2.6 million barrels per day in 2003 vs. 2.1 million barrels per day in May 2006;
- The majority of water sector projects and health care clinics planned in 2003 remain not completed, despite spending hundreds of millions of dollars;
- One in three Iraqi children is malnourished and underweight, according to the United Nations Children’s Fund.

One reason for this is that the Bush administration’s focus on Iraq has diverted resources and attention from war in Afghanistan. The large and extended deployment of National Guard units overseas has undermined the ability of the United States to deal with terrorist attacks or natural disasters. For example, State officials in Louisiana and Mississippi struggled to overcome the absence of National Guard members from their States in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. In Louisiana, about 100 of the National Guard’s high-water vehicles remain abroad—even as the State continues to rebuild from Hurricane Katrina. Coastal North Carolina is missing nearly half its Humvee fleet, and Guard officials there say shortages have forced the State to pool equipment from different units into one pot of hurricane supplies.

In addition, the equipment the Guard needs to help in the aftermath of natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina is in shorter supply because the gear is in use in combat zones, is battle-damaged, or has been loaned to cover gaps in other units.

(1) War in Iraq has diverted resources and attention from war in Afghanistan. The large and extended deployment of National Guard units overseas has undermined the ability of the United States to deal with terrorist attacks or natural disasters. For example, State officials in Louisiana and Mississippi struggled to overcome the absence of National Guard members from their States in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. In Louisiana, about 100 of the National Guard’s high-water vehicles remain abroad—even as the State continues to rebuild from Hurricane Katrina. Coastal North Carolina is missing nearly half its Humvee fleet, and Guard officials there say shortages have forced the State to pool equipment from different units into one pot of hurricane supplies.

In addition, the equipment the Guard needs to help in the aftermath of natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina is in shorter supply because the gear is in use in combat zones, is battle-damaged, or has been loaned to cover gaps in other units.

(2) War in Iraq has increased the burden on U.S. taxpayers without stabilizing Iraq or making Americans safer.

Over the last 3 years, the United States has spent more than $300 billion in Iraq, yet the investment has failed to stabilize Iraq or improve the overall quality of life for most Iraqis. According to the Congressional Research Service, total assistance to Iraq thus far is roughly equivalent to total assistance, adjusted for inflation, provided to Germany—and almost double that provided to Japan from 1946 to 1952. Yet on key metrics like oil production, Iraq has failed to advance beyond pre-war levels, and quality of life indicators remain dismal:

- Oil production is below pre-war levels—2.6 million barrels per day in 2003 vs. 2.1 million barrels per day in May 2006;
- The majority of water sector projects and health care clinics planned in 2003 remain not completed, despite spending hundreds of millions of dollars;
- One in three Iraqi children is malnourished and underweight, according to the United Nations Children’s Fund.

One reason for this is that the Bush administration’s focus on Iraq has diverted resources and attention from war in Afghanistan. The large and extended deployment of National Guard units overseas has undermined the ability of the United States to deal with terrorist attacks or natural disasters. For example, State officials in Louisiana and Mississippi struggled to overcome the absence of National Guard members from their States in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. In Louisiana, about 100 of the National Guard’s high-water vehicles remain abroad—even as the State continues to rebuild from Hurricane Katrina. Coastal North Carolina is missing nearly half its Humvee fleet, and Guard officials there say shortages have forced the State to pool equipment from different units into one pot of hurricane supplies.

In addition, the equipment the Guard needs to help in the aftermath of natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina is in shorter supply because the gear is in use in combat zones, is battle-damaged, or has been loaned to cover gaps in other units.
Iraqi Defense Ministry officials spent $1 billion on questionable arms purchases; the Interior Ministry has at least 1,100 ghost employees, costing $1.3 million a month.

In short, we have no strategy, no support from much of the region, a nascent civil war in the country we are supposed to be helping, an overstretched military, a misdirected counterterrorism effort, and a massive diversion of funds in support of a failed effort.

(II) RESPONDING TO ADMINISTRATION MYTHS AND FANTASEYS

The Bush administration and its rubber-stamp Republican allies in the House have politicized national security in the past. They have used national security as a wedge issue to divide the country and push for policies that have not made Americans safer. But today a majority of Americans are now skeptical about the Bush administration’s Iraq policy.

Myth 1: Democrats want to quit while we are ahead and the Iraqis are just getting started.

Conservatives argue that Democrats who criticize and offer alternatives are snatching defeat from the jaws of victory, retreating just as the Iraqi Government needs the most help.

Fact: The time has come for the United States to give Iraqs the incentive to stand on their own two feet and take control of their own affairs. In a few short months, the U.S. military involvement in Iraq will be longer than it took the United States to win World War II. The open-ended commitment of U.S. troops fueling as much as it retards the insurgency and civil conflict in Iraq. Nearly 9 in 10 Iraqis approve of a U.S. withdrawal, and 70 percent of the Iraqi public supports the withdrawal of U.S.-led forces by the end of 2007. A growing number of Iraqis, including the new prime minister, are saying that Americans must begin to leave.

U.S. troops have done their share. By getting rid of Saddam Hussein, they have given Iraqis an historic opportunity to take charge of their destiny.

By fostering the birth of the constitution and the holding of elections, they have assisted in the birthing of a new democracy. They have trained more than a quarter of a million Iraqi security forces. It would be self-defeating for the United States to want Iraq to succeed more than Iraqis do.

Myth 2: Democrats offer only “cut and run” and “retract and defeat.”

Facts: Belittling opponents will not divert attention from a failed policy. Staying the course and offering a vague and open-ended commitment of U.S. troops gives Iraqis a blank check and a veto of America’s national security.

The country cannot be more sacred to Americans than to Iraqis. Responsible redeployment offers Iraqis a chance to take responsibility for their political and security future after we have already aided in the creation of a new constitution, the staging of two elections, and the training of a quarter of a million security forces.

Myth 3: Democrats who raise questions and oppose the Bush Iraq policy are unpatriotic.

Over the past 3 years, the Bush administration has questioned the patriotism of its critics.

Facts: Our country’s democratic system requires the active involvement of Congress in key policy questions—particularly at a time of war. The United States has a strong tradition of its Congress asking tough questions. During a time of war, including the hearings organized by Democratic Senators like Senator Harry Truman during World War II and Senator William Fulbright during Vietnam, even though the White House was controlled by Republicans.

It is the patriotic duty of Members of Congress to hold the executive branch accountable, especially during a time of war. Two prominent Vietnam war veterans, Republican Chuck Hagel and Democrat John Murtha, have recently argued that it is unpatriotic to raise questions in a time of war. America suffers when Congress and the public are silent.

Myth 4: Democrats reject the Bush administration’s efforts to advance freedom.

Facts: The Bush plan for Iraq is solidly grounded in a flawed view of combating terrorism, arguing that promoting a narrow vision of democracy will crowd out and defeat terrorists.

The United States must and should support real democratic transitions around the world. But the Bush administration’s naive approach to democracy promotion narrowly focused on elections—has failed by giving terrorist organizations an opening to seize the reins of power, as seen by the Hamas victory in the Palestinian elections earlier this year. Terrorists have been exploiting the Bush administration’s flawed and narrow strategy focused on the most ostensible images of democracy, like purple fingers in elections.

Despite impressive gains in Iraq’s political transition, the country remains in the very early and fragile stages of a long-term process of building a democracy. Contrary to the rhetoric put forth by the Bush administration, Iraqis do not live in freedom, according to Freedom House, which measures trends in political rights and civil liberties over the past three decades. The rights of women and minorities are not protected; the rule of law is honored more in the breach than the observance; and political violence remains rampant. Despite much work left undone, the Bush administration has cut funding for programs to support freedom and democracy in Iraq this year.

Myth 5: Democrats who criticize the Bush policy hurt the morale of the troops.

The Bush administration and its conservative allies have said that offering criticisms and concrete policy alternatives on Iraq hurts the morale of U.S. troops.

Facts: There is no evidence that debate at home has any effect at all on the morale of troops. But other factors directly impact the morale of U.S. troops. Not equipping the troops. When asked by a soldier in the field why U.S. troops did not have the right armor for their vehicles, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld said, “As you know, you have to go to war with the Army you have, not the Army you want.” Iraq was a war of choice, and the Bush administration had time to get ready.

Not taking care of the troops when they come home. The Bush administration has not developed policies to take care of the troops when they return from battle. Health care has proven inadequate, and wounded veterans have been hounded by debt collectors because of inefficiencies in the Pentagon’s administrative systems.

Myth 6: Democrats who oppose the Bush Iraq policy are ignoring and not listening to the generals.

Facts: It is the Bush administration that has failed to listen to U.S. generals before and during the invasion. Through troop surge, it sent U.S. troops to stabilize the country. It is Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld who has constrained free expression in the military by firing or forcing out those who disagree.

Nonetheless, even the current commanding officers argue that the United States needs to take realistic steps to reduce its military presence to remove the fuel that fires the insurgency. For example, in October 2005, GEN John Abizaid, the commander of Central Command Forces, argued that the United States must reduce its “military footprint” in Iraq and the region as a means to create more stability, but President Bush has continued to stick with a “stay the course” message.

Myth 7: Democrats who criticize the Bush Iraq policy are helping the terrorists and giving them what they want.

The Bush administration has argued that questioning its plan embodies America’s terrorist enemies, an unconstitutional argument aimed solely at shutting off real debate at home. Harkening back to 2002, when Bush officials warned that people should “watch what they say,” President Bush and top officials in his administration have warned against “irresponsible” debate to limit and control democratic political debate at home, even while the Bush administration purports to advance democracy abroad.

Facts: Bush policies at Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib do more to undermine our place in the world than any words spoken by administration critics. The Bush administration policies that coerce rather than create cooperation through dialogue and common purpose undermine how others view us. A new poll by the Pew Research Center finds that America’s image has slipped further, and global support has declined for the U.S.-led war on terrorism.

Myth 8: Democrats prefer a world with Saddam Hussein still in charge of Iraq.

Facts: Saddam Hussein was an evil dictator, and it is a good thing that he is no longer in power. But that is not the key question today. The key question is: Where is Iraq now, and where does it go from here? And the many mistakes made by the Bush administration—including sending in too few troops to secure the country and invading without a clear and realistic plan for Iraq’s reconstruction—have made the situation in Iraq much worse off than it should have been.

Iraq has become a failing state and is suffering from several major internal conflicts—in large part the consequence of the Bush administration’s failure to plan for the post-war situation. And moving forward requires Iraqis, not Americans, to be in charge of the future.

Myth 9: Democrats just want to criticize and politicize Iraq and do not have plans about what to do.

Facts: This is simply not true. A growing number of leading Democrats and other progressive leaders have offered realistic alternative visions about what the United States should do next to set the right course in Iraq. Nearly all progressive plans recognize that the United States must intensify its political and
diplomatic efforts in Iraq and that the commitment of U.S. troops to Iraq should not be permanent or open-ended.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I close by quoting from the Declaration of Independence and the motto of the U.S. Army, which marks its 231st anniversary tomorrow, it is a motto that says, "We will not fail, we will not fall." The war in Iraq does not help us in the global war on terror. There are only two directions to take in Iraq: President Bush's plan of staying the course and letting a future President clean up the mess, or the Murtha plan to change the direction of that course. I stand with Representative MURTHA in calling for the redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq to make our country safer, our military stronger, and the region more stable. I support the Murtha plan. It is the only plan for success in Iraq that is worthy of the sacrifices made by our troops. And I support a plan for greater coalition support for Iraq as it moves to protecting itself as a sovereign nation.

Our troops in Iraq have never faltered and they have never failed. They were never defeated in battle. They won the war they were sent to fight. They completed their mission. They soldiered magnificently. Well done. Well done. Well done.

Our troops have earned the right to return home and be reunited with their families and loved ones. Now is not the time for us in Congress to falter or fail. Now is the time to embrace a plan for our troops in Iraq that offers a chance of success. We need a plan that will work. There is only one such plan. It is the Murtha plan that allows for redeployment of our troops as soon as practicable and allows for redeployment of troops at the perimeter of Iraq to be used in time of crisis. This is a plan that will work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution on capacity as chairman of the Veterans Affairs Subcommittee on Health. I was fortunate enough to visit the American cemetery in Normandy, France that is located overlooking Omaha Beach. Our brave soldiers during World War II were in France not to fight the French, but to fight the Nazis that had occupied France.

Today our soldiers are not in Iraq and Afghanistan to fight the citizens of those countries, but the terrorists that support the insurgents and the Taliban. In listening to the debate today, it reminded me of my visit and reading some of the names of the brave soldiers that fought for our Nation during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 9,300 patriots buried in Normandy today. Those brave souls fought in a war against the forces of evil then, just as our soldiers in Iraq are fighting against the forces of evil today. I realize all too well why are none of the good stories making it back to the folks back home?"

Mr. Speaker, I think many of us today are trying to share some of the good stories and positive things that our soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan are doing for us.

The good news is that now women in Afghanistan are able to vote in democratic elections for the first time in their lives. The good news is that Iraqi citizens are now able to protest and let their opinions be heard in public.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I represent the Out of Iraq Caucus, and I support the Murtha resolution.

This war of choice so far has cost us the lives of close to 2,500 American men and women, and we have had tens of thousands of Americans live in Iraq $230 billion and has weakened the United States' prestige and brought our interests and our values into question to a degree not seen since the Berlin Wall divided Europe.

It is our failure here in Congress to perform our duty of oversight which has cost America most. From the beginning of the march to war, the President and his advisers blundered into failure after failure. False claims about African uranium and mobile anthrax labs were just the first of Saddam's leaks to al Qaeda.Stubbornly ignoring the advice of the uniformed military about troop levels. Turning a blind eye to the real corruption that swallowed $9 billion of Iraqi money, U.N. Oil-for-food money, without a trace. Shame on us.

Mr. Speaker, our Founding Fathers in their wisdom gave us a mechanism, a defense against tyranny called congressional oversight, and it is about time we start doing our duty to the American people. The good news is that oversight. While I welcome this debate, it is a poor substitute for what we really should have been doing.

I call upon you to withdraw this empty resolution, this meaningless, self-congratulatory, fraudulent scam and let us work together to examine our mistakes, fix them, and bring our troops home. Let Iraqis rebuild their own nation.

The President says we need to stay in Iraq until the mission is complete, but the President cannot explain to the American people exactly what the mission is, let alone tell us when he expects to complete it.

Let's take credit towards victory by sighting the completion of a democratic government in Iraq and killing the biggest terrorist there, claim these as a victory, and keep our word by honorably deploying our forces. Three and a half years is hardly cutting and running.

We all share the same dream that the Iraqi people do. We want them to live in peace in a secure and prosperous society where they are free to choose their future, unemployment. But the presence of our troops and our occupation of Iraq has become such an obstacle to that future that we can no longer ignore reality. How can we win a war against terrorism when terrorism is a concept? You must change the hearts and the minds to succeed.

So let us work together to bring our courageous troops home and put an end to this devastating war of choice.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, it is rare that I would speak on this issue. I do support this resolution, but more than that, I would like to remind people why we are here.

There are not many in this room, but there are a few that remember 1939. I lived in that era and I listened to people speak about “Hitler’s really not a bad guy. He’s just minding his own business. He’s taking care of his people. We shouldn’t be involved.” Fifty-two million people later, we won World War II. We should have knocked him in the head when we had a chance instead of listening to Chamberlain, the Prime Minister of Britain. We should have addressed the threat to the world. We should have addressed it. We should have addressed it. We should have addressed it.

I call upon you to withdraw this empty resolution, this meaningless, self-congratulatory, fraudulent scam and let us work together to examine our mistakes, fix them, and bring our troops home. Let Iraqis rebuild their own nation.
They deserve a real plan to secure the peace so that they can be redeployed, and I wholeheartedly support the Murtha plan.

American taxpayers, Members, deserve accountability for the $17 billion in no-bid contracts for Halliburton and real measures to protect the homeland and the military. The Bush administration has failed to fulfill its responsibilities to our troops, veterans, and all Americans. This resolution fails them.

It is a sad day when this resolution is the only thing that can be offered for our servicemen and women. Francisco Martinez Flores did not die in vain. He deserves the very best. The American people deserve a real debate.

Bring our troops home and no permanent bases in Iraq.

Mr. THORNBERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the families of East Texas, especially those with loved ones serving overseas, I strongly support this resolution.

Despite what the national media portray, the inconvenient truth is this: Terrorists have been attacking America and our allies for more than two decades. We should have learned we cannot push America's security forward by retreating from terrorism. We cannot strengthen the world by weakening our resolve, and we cannot support our troops by belittling them at every turn.

It is clear to all but perhaps us that the terrorists' strategy is not to defeat America in Iraq. They cannot do that. Their strategy is to defeat America in America. They are counting on the American public to lose its will and for Washington politicians to undermine the morale and support of our troops overseas.

The truth is if America quits, if America turns back now, no nation, no community will be safe from terrorism again. Terrorists will learn that they can wait us out one public opinion poll at a time. And the next time America is attacked, the next time innocent people die and we vow justice, who will believe us then? Who will support us then?

I stand with the President. We must persist in Iraq and Afghanistan until these nations are no longer safe havens for terrorism. We have “taken the hill” against the terrorists. Too many Americans have sacrificed their lives for us to give it back now. Americans like Chief Warrant Officer Chuck Fortenberry of Woodville, Lance Corporal Shane Goodman of Orange, Staff Sergeant Christopher Everett of Huntsville, Specialist Michael Weger of Spring, and Specialist Hoby Bradfield of The Woodlands, among many.

Our troops have proven they will not quit. The question is will we? Our troops know that success is at stake. The question is do we?

Let us not snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. Let us put aside our partisan politics and unite until terrorism is truly and soundly defeated.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative KAPURT.

Ms. KAPURT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding and for her leadership on a real strategy against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. It contains no plan, no solution, no way forward. I support the Murtha plan, which clearly demonstrates a commitment to redeploy and be ready.

Indeed, the invasion in Iraq has diverted our Nation from the war on terrorism and created a new terrorist training platform. Across the Middle East, Central Asia, Africa, and the Pacific, United States policy has engendered more hatred, yielding a counter-reaction of more radicalism and protest.

In Egypt, the most populous Arab nation and a key ally in the Middle East and Africa, recent parliamentary elections yielded a quantum leap in representatives from the Muslim Brotherhood, a radical anti-Western party. This group now comprises 88 members of their parliament, up nearly 25 percent from 17 in the 2000 election.

In the Palestinian Authority, the peace process with Israel is dead. Rather than parties moving toward peace with Israel, we witness another tragic breakdown as Fatah and Hamas mass in the streets and Israelis and Palestinians shoot and kill with abandon.

Mogadishu, Somalia has just fallen into the hands of Muslim extremists. That failed state is another breeding ground for terrorism.

In Afghanistan more loss of life has resulted this year than at any time since the U.S.-led invasion and President Karzai remains a prisoner of circumstance, unable to move freely without heavily armed guards.

Mr. Speaker, we are not winning the war on terrorism. The situation in Iraq teeters on all-out civil war between the Sunnis and the Shiias.

To win the war on terrorism, the United States must use our military assets wisely, not just robustly. We must transfer policing to Iraqi forces and remove ourselves as a source of friction.

Secondly, we must decouple ourselves from the repressive oil dictatorships that create regional antagonisms and become energy independent here at home.

Thirdly, the Palestinian-Israeli standoff must be elbowed to the peace table, because it is a primary lightning rod for unrest across the region.

Our current presence in Iraq is counterproductive in the broader war on terrorism. Meanwhile, diplomatic efforts are strained by this administration. Unfortunately, this resolution offers no plan. It offers no solution. It offers no way forward.
Mr. THORNBERY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the first 5 hours of this debate, trying to listen carefully to each speaker. And it seems to me that some people try, as best they can, to isolate Iraq from the rest of the war on terror.

Now, that may be politically convenient for them to do, but it is not what the real world is like. As a matter of fact, it was not long ago that we found a letter from Zawahari, Osama bin Laden's closest associates wrote about Iraq a couple of years ago. And he said, a far more dangerous threat is sectarian democracy, because it drives Muslims to refuse to take part in jihad.

There are a lot of people who want to debate the procedures or debate Congress's job or debate past decisions. And it is true, history will have to pass judgment on decisions that the military commanders and the President and the Congress have made in the past. They will do so when the air of partisan ideology is played.

But the truth is, however you feel about where we are, we are where we are. And the question is, do we leave a job half done? Do we leave early, and leave those Iraqis who are willing to put their lives on the line by being part of the government or part of the police force or part of the military, do we abandon them when they are trying to build a country? I think that would be a mistake.

In fact, I think to retreat at this point, whether you call it a strategic retreat, a strategic redeployment, or whatever word you want to use to back up now, will only embolden the terrorists. We have seen time after time, when they sense political vacillation, they strike. They struck in Istanbul in 2003, in Madrid in 2004, in London in 2005.

Where they sense weakness, it is like an animal. Where they sense fear, they attack. We have got to do better and make sure we win this war.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio).

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, despite the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle, ground zero on the global war on terror is not, never was Iraq. It was Afghanistan: 9/11, it was planned in Afghanistan by Osama bin Laden, al Qaeda, with the complicit help of the Taliban.

In a near-unanimous vote on the floor of this House, we voted to go in there and root them out and end that threat once and forever. But something happened on the road to victory, and the eradication of the Taliban and al Qaeda, and the capture, dead or alive, of Osama bin Laden. Remember that.

We got the middle of a civil war. And today the Taliban, al Qaeda, and Osama bin Laden are still at large and they are re-emerging. I just saw 800 Oreganians off to Afghanistan. We need more troops there. We need to finish the job we abandoned to go into Iraq.

But 1,093 days ago, a complacent, compliant Republican-dominated Congress acceded to the Presidential demand to divert our energy into an unnecessary war in Iraq. I was one of the 60 percent of the Democrats who voted no.

Here we are, 2,497 troops have died, 18,490 seriously wounded. We all honor those troops and do not question that. But we disagree, not on the noble service of the troops, but the competence of the leadership of President Bush, Vice President Cheney, and Secretary Rumsfeld in initiating an unnecessary war in Iraq and insisting on an open-ended, indefinite commitment of U.S. troops in that country.

The President has said, "Bringing U.S. troops home from Iraq will be decided by future Presidents." That means after 2009. That is what George Bush is talking about. That is not acceptable.

At its core, this resolution says stay the course indefinitely. We should be debating a real policy on Iraq, not a nonbinding politically motivated resolution. We should be debating the Murtha resolution.

As a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I resent the fact that we have here a meaningless, nonbinding Karl Rove–politically inspired resolution on the floor, not amenable, no substitutes allowed; and they call that a debate on the policy in Iraq.

They say they are honoring the troops. That is a dishonor to the people of America and those who serve us. And they tread on turf.

We have won. Saddam Hussein, he is on trial. They have a Constitution. They have a government. They have succeeded. We have succeeded. But they have a sectarian problem. They have been at war for 1,400 years. And they are going to continue fighting. We need to negotiate a timetable with their legitimate government to get the U.S. troops redeployed, out of Iraq, to other hot spots and bring the remainder home to retire in peace.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as Chair of the Middle East and Central Asia Subcommittee, I have traveled to Iraq, having led a delegation just this last January. And I met with officials again and received a wealth of congressional testimony here in this well-constituted subcommittee.

The intelligence community has 21 force or part of the military, do we leave early, and leave them when they are trying to build a country? I think that would be a mistake.

In fact, I think to retreat at this point, whether you call it a strategic retreat, a strategic redeployment, or whatever word you want to use to back up now, will only embolden the terrorists. We have seen time after time, when they sense political vacillation, they strike. They struck in Istanbul in 2003, in Madrid in 2004, in London in 2005.

Where they sense weakness, it is like an animal. Where they sense fear, they attack. We have got to do better and make sure we win this war.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio).

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, despite the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle, ground zero on the global war on terror is not, never was Iraq. It was Afghanistan: 9/11, it was planned in Afghanistan by Osama bin Laden, al Qaeda, with the complicit help of the Taliban.

In a near-unanimous vote on the floor of this House, we voted to go in there and root them out and end that threat once and forever. But something happened on the road to victory, and the eradication of the Taliban and al Qaeda, and the capture, dead or alive, of Osama bin Laden. Remember that.

We got the middle of a civil war. And today the Taliban, al Qaeda, and Osama bin Laden are still at large and they are re-emerging. I just saw 800 Oreganians off to Afghanistan. We need more troops there. We need to finish the job we abandoned to go into Iraq.

But 1,093 days ago, a complacent, compliant Republican-dominated Congress acceded to the Presidential demand to divert our energy into an unnecessary war in Iraq. I was one of the 60 percent of the Democrats who voted no.

Here we are, 2,497 troops have died, 18,490 seriously wounded. We all honor those troops and do not question that. But we disagree, not on the noble service of the troops, but the competence of the leadership of President Bush, Vice President Cheney, and Secretary Rumsfeld in initiating an unnecessary war in Iraq and insisting on an open-ended, indefinite commitment of U.S. troops in that country.

The President has said, "Bringing U.S. troops home from Iraq will be decided by future Presidents." That means after 2009. That is what George Bush is talking about. That is not acceptable.

At its core, this resolution says stay the course indefinitely. We should be debating a real policy on Iraq, not a nonbinding politically motivated resolution. We should be debating the Murtha resolution.

As a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I resent the fact that we have here a meaningless, nonbinding Karl Rove–politically inspired resolution on the floor, not amenable, no substitutes allowed; and they call that a debate on the policy in Iraq.

They say they are honoring the troops. That is a dishonor to the people of America and those who serve us. And they tread on turf.

We have won. Saddam Hussein, he is on trial. They have a Constitution. They have a government. They have succeeded. We have succeeded. But they have a sectarian problem. They have been at war for 1,400 years. And they are going to continue fighting. We need to negotiate a timetable with their legitimate government to get the U.S. troops redeployed, out of Iraq, to other hot spots and bring the remainder home to retire in peace.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as Chair of the Middle East and Central Asia Subcommittee, I have traveled to Iraq, having led a delegation just this last January. And I met with officials again and received a wealth of congressional testimony here in this well-constituted subcommittee.

The intelligence community has 21
Mr. Speaker, this clearly demonstrates that our efforts in Iraq are serving long-term efforts of spreading democracy as an antidote to Islamic terrorism and extremism.

Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of President Ronald Reagan’s words in his first inaugural address when he said, “Above all we must realize that no arsenal or no weapon in the arsenal of the world is so formidable as the will and the moral courage of free men and women.”

Every day the Iraqi people are proving how true that statement is. We too must demonstrate the will to press ahead. Leaders from the Arab world have confided their views on how important it is for their own efforts to have the U.S. in Iraq. However, the best evidence that we are on the right path comes from those closest to me, including my stepson, Dougie, and his fiancée, Lindsay, both marine officers, both who have served as fighter pilots in Iraq.

And I hear it from one of my subcommittee staffers, Matt Zweig, who is currently deployed in Iraq. Their unwaivering belief that success in Iraq will make us safer at home confirms that our strategy is correct and that our goals are sound.

They remind me that we must heed the advice issued by Winston Churchill when he said, “One ought never to turn one’s back on a threatened danger and try to run away from it. If you do that, you will double the danger. But if you meet it promptly and without flinching, you will reduce the danger by half.”

Mr. Speaker, we must not, we will not flinch in Iraq.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution because we should not be echoing the lies we have been fed to justify this cruel and deceitful war. We should not continue pretending that by fighting the war in Iraq we are advancing the war on terrorism.

Our intelligence tells us that only 7 to 8 percent of those we are fighting in Iraq are Islamic terrorists. The other 92 to 98 percent are fighting a war for power between competing religious groups.

There is no compelling reason to send our young people to die to determine how to divide the spoils between the Sunnis and the Shiites. We should be redeploying our resources to secure all of the real war on terrorism, going after Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan, fighting jihadist ideas all over the Muslim world, getting the loose nuclear material out of the former Soviet Union before it is smuggled to al Qaeda to make nuclear weapons, securing all of the shipping containers before they enter our ports, and protecting our chemical and nuclear plants against sabotage that could kill tens of thousands of Americans.

But the Bush administration and this Congress will not vote the funds to fight the real war against terrorism. And every reason we were given for invading Iraq has been shown to be false. Weapons of mass destruction. Not there. Saddam Hussein working hand in glove with al Qaeda. Not true. And the more information that leaks out, the more apparent it becomes that all of these were not mistakes, but deliberate lies.

But does this Congress get to the bottom of this? Not this Republican Congress. This Republican Congress sees no evil, hears no evil, and speaks no evil when it comes to a war that has already killed 2,500 of our young men and women and promises to kill thousands more.

This Republican Congress asks no questions about what we can possibly achieve that can justify the continuing slaughter.

I ask you, if the President had gone to the American people and said, we must invade a country that poses no imminent threat to us, we must sacrifice thousands of lives in order to create a democratic government in Iraq, would we have agreed? I think not.

As the President now says to us that we should continue indefinitely to expand American blood and treasure to support one side in a sectarian civil war, a side, moreover, that is increasingly comúnizing the conflict, but by their very existence, who pose a threat to us, should Congress continue to consent? I think not. This Congress should agree with the Out of Iraq Caucus. We should say enough already. Enough with the lies.

Out of Iraq Caucus. We should say that we are not going to vote the funds to continue this bloody, senseless and diversionary war, a side, moreover, that is increasingly comúnizing the conflict, and the more information that leaks out, the more apparent it becomes that all of these were not mistakes, but deliberate lies.

But does this Congress get to the bottom of this? Not this Republican Congress. This Republican Congress sees no evil, hears no evil, and speaks no evil when it comes to a war that has already killed 2,500 of our young men and women and promises to kill thousands more.

This Republican Congress asks no questions about what we can possibly achieve that can justify the continuing slaughter.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. The gentlewoman has been a leader for freedom, for human rights of Iraqis, but especially the women.

They told us they want to vote, to work, to be part of their society, a democratic society. But we also heard about what life was like before the coalition came. We heard about the treatment of women under Saddam Hussein and during torture, oppression, that most of us could hardly imagine.

We were told of the heart-wrenching stories of husbands torn from their homes in the middle of the night by brutal, secret police, and the women left behind, usually with children, face with the impossible burden of providing for their families in a society that doesn’t even allow women to work. Some were raped, some were tortured, but that was before liberation.

The road to liberation has been a rocky one. But our troops are doing good work every day in Iraq. We saw soldiers building schools and hospitals, vaccinating hundreds of children. They coach soccer. They tutor. They make a difference. They risk their lives every day to protect the newly acquired rights of Iraqis, but especially the women.

If I were asked to give one good reason why we should stay in Iraq, I would tell you to stay. We need to stay for the women.

Well, I saw women of diverse ethnicities, religion, socioeconomic classes. They were empowering each other with education, with hope, with friendship, just like Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony. Another courageous woman I met, Nasreen Barwari, the Minister of Public Works, was later the target of an assassination attempt. Her crime, being an outspoken woman in an important position. Thankfully she survived, but her bodyguard was killed. Her female colleague, Dr. Al-Hashimi of the Iraqi Governing Council, was not so lucky. She was tragically gunned down.

Ladies and gentlemen, if we stay in Iraq, one of the major reasons is to stay for the women.

Just over two years ago, I was privileged to lead a bipartisan, all-female congressional delegation to Iraq.

It was one of the most emotionally overwhelming experiences of my official life. We met women of enormous courage and hope. They told us they want to vote, to work, to be a part of the democratic process.

Some said they wanted to run for office and help create the laws that will build a new Iraq. But we also heard about life before the coalition came.

We heard about the treatment of women under the Saddam regime—enduring torture and oppression that most of us could not imagine.

We were told heart-wrenching stories of husbands torn from their homes in the middle of the night by a brutal secret police.

The women left behind, usually with children, faced the impossible burden of providing for their families in a society that didn’t allow women to work or remarry.

Some were themselves raped and tortured. But that was before liberation.

The road since liberation has been a rocky one.

But our troops are doing good work every day in Iraq.
We saw the soldiers building schools and hospitals, vaccinating thousands of children, and putting an archaic infrastructure back in operation. They coach soccer, they tutor—they make a difference! And they are risking their lives to protect the newly acquired rights of all Iraqis—but especially women.

If I were asked to give you one good reason why we should stay in Iraq, I would tell you we should stay for the women.

If we can make the values of a free society—freedom, justice, and the right for women to work for the women of Iraq, we create the conditions for these new democratic values to take root and spread.

While there I saw women of diverse ethnicities, religions, and socio-economic classes empowering one another with education, hope and friendship—much like Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony.

In Mosul, we met with the Women’s Social and Cultural Society. They had been meeting secretly, but now felt safe enough to be public and actually welcome our delegation.

The women, accompanied by their wide-eyed daughters, are creating a new Iraq as they promote social, political and educational equality for all Iraqis. But they’re not alone.

One of my favorite stories of the trip was of two girls who arrived one day at a fountain in the town center of Hillah dressed in traditional Muslim women’s clothes but with a decidedly non-traditional mission.

A courageous woman I met, Nasreen Barwari, the Minister of Public Works later was the target of an assassination attempt.

Her crime? Being an outspoken woman in an important public position. Thankfully, she survived, though her bodyguard was killed.

Her female colleague, Dr. Al-Hashimi, of the Iraqi Governing Council, was not so lucky. Her female colleague, Dr. Al-Hashimi, of the Iraqi Governing Council, was not so lucky. Her female colleague, Dr. Al-Hashimi, of the Iraqi Governing Council, was not so lucky. Her female colleague, Dr. Al-Hashimi, of the Iraqi Governing Council, was not so lucky. Her female colleague, Dr. Al-Hashimi, of the Iraqi Governing Council, was not so lucky. Her female colleague, Dr. Al-Hashimi, of the Iraqi Governing Council, was not so lucky. Her female colleague, Dr. Al-Hashimi, of the Iraqi Governing Council, was not so lucky. Her female colleague, Dr. Al-Hashimi, of the Iraqi Governing Council, was not so lucky. Her female colleague, Dr. Al-Hashimi, of the Iraqi Governing Council, was not so lucky.

She was tragically gunned down outside her home.

The dangers Iraqi women face can’t be underestimated nor can the obstacles put in their path to liberation. But these women remain undaunted.

We also visited the police academy in Baghdad where 29 women were training to be the first female police officers ever in Iraq.

These wonderful women told us how excited they were, how here were not men, statistics. Each one represents the tragic story of a ruined life and a shattered family, 2,500 troops dead, more than 18,000 wounded, many so grievously. The average tour for National Guard members has been 9 to 12 days, turning the fountain of countless American families upside down.

The material cost of the Iraq war is about $230 billion. But you can never put a price on its toll in human suffering. Nor can you realistically argue, Mr. Speaker, that Iraq has made our country safer or advanced our effort to combat global terror.

Those that come to the floor and link Iraq to 9/11 are certainly wrong. They are factually wrong, because there remains no evidence that Saddam was involved in the al Qaeda attacks on our Nation, and they are morally wrong to invoke the memories of the victims of September 11th to justify this indefensible war of choice.

I am pleased that al Zarqawi is dead, but his death does not change the fact that Iraq has become a haven for terrorists and the best recruitment tool we could have handed our enemy. No, Mr. Speaker, those who oppose this war are not soft on security. We believe strongly and passionately that keeping the hand in the middle of this increasingly bloody civil war only weakens our security.

It is a disgrace it has taken so long for Congress to spend a few hours of this day debating the Iraq war, but the American people will not be fooled. They recognize that there is a debate on a cynical and politically motivated resolution. It is a substitute for a thoughtful Iraq policy that advances our national interests and the voices of the people. Let us vote “no” on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the terrible numbers we have heard here are not mere statistics. Each one represents the tragic story of a ruined life and a shattered family, 2,500 troops dead, more than 18,000 wounded, many so grievously. The average tour for National Guard members has been 9 to 12 days, turning the fountain of countless American families upside down.

The material cost of the Iraq war is about $230 billion. But you can never put a price on its toll in human suffering. Nor can you realistically argue, Mr. Speaker, that Iraq has made our country safer or advanced our effort to combat global terror.

Those that come to the floor and link Iraq to 9/11 are certainly wrong. They are factually wrong, because there remains no evidence that Saddam was involved in the al Qaeda attacks on our Nation, and they are morally wrong to invoke the memories of the victims of September 11th to justify this indefensible war of choice.

I am pleased that al Zarqawi is dead, but his death does not change the fact that Iraq has become a haven for terrorists and the best recruitment tool we could have handed our enemy. No, Mr. Speaker, those who oppose this war are not soft on security. We believe strongly and passionately that keeping the hand in the middle of this increasingly bloody civil war only weakens our security.

It is a disgrace it has taken so long for Congress to spend a few hours of this day debating the Iraq war, but the American people will not be fooled. They recognize that there is a debate on a cynical and politically motivated resolution. It is a substitute for a thoughtful Iraq policy that advances our national interests and the voices of the people. Let us vote “no” on this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KROLLENBERG), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Transportation and HUD Appropriations.

Mr. KROLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution before us. I want to convey a very simple message. We must stay the course. At this crucial point in our history, it is unacceptable to enact a policy of passivity, resignation or defeatism in the face of terror.

We have seen that we should surrender and pull out. They may think that this will win them votes and that it is good politics, but it is terrible policy, devastating policy. It is essential that we continue to fight in Iraq so that the fight does not come into our backyards.

Make no mistake, we do not choose Iraq as a front line on the war on terror. Al Qaeda has done that. But we must have that fight over there so we don’t have it back here.

Like many of my colleagues, I have visited Iraq and seen firsthand the revitalization of country. The men and women our Armed Forces are fighting terrorists who are trying to claim Iraq for their own. Without their valor and dedication, the progress made in Iraq would not be possible. It takes time, will, patience and perseverance to transfigure a country once ruled by a tyrannical despot.

Terrorists, who seek to eliminate anyone who provides hope for the future have infested Iraq, but they will not succeed. The Iraqi people are committed to freeing their country from these fanatical invaders, and we are too. The Iraqi people’s future is in their hands, and right now they want U.S. help.

Just this week, Iraqi army and police forces backed by U.S. troops launched Operation Forward together. This operation was created by Iraqi Prime Minister al-Maliki and his parliament, and it is their first major security action since a new government of national unity was sworn in on May 20.

Mr. Speaker, the resolve of the United States should never be questioned. The world must know that the United States finishes what it starts.

We will win the fight against global terrorism, including in Iraq.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) for an unanimous consent request.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and submit a statement for the record in opposition to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the resolve of the United States should never be questioned. The world must know that the United States finishes what it starts.

We will win the fight against global terrorism, including in Iraq.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and submit a statement for the record in opposition to this resolution.

There was no objection.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand in opposition to this resolution. I was illustrated by the House Majority Leader’s memo establishing this debate as "a portrait of contrasts between Republicans and Democrats," the primary intent of this resolution is political—shifting attention from the real issues behind the slow progress in Iraq. In this connection, Republicans are using this resolution as a divisive strategy rather than holding a substantive debate on Iraq.
Today, the debate, which should have been an opportunity for Members of Congress to have a serious discussion on the war and to pose tough questions to the Administration on Iraq, has regrettably become nothing more than a partisan ploy. While I do not hesitate to applaud various aspects of the resolution honoring and supporting our countrymen who are risking their lives in Iraq, I cannot be supportive of capitalizing on these very sacrifices for political gain.

I also disagree with the dangerous analogy made in this resolution between Iraq and the Administration’s “war on terror” policy. There is not, and never has been, any credible intelligence linking Iraq to 9/11 and Al Qaeda. Focusing the discussion on the war on terror and victories won, rather than on workable policies to bring our troops home, reduces this debate to no more than a justification for maintaining the Administration’s status quo agenda in Iraq.

Seizing the political momentum after the killing of Zarqawi, Republicans are offering a resolution which does little more than tout recent “impressive victories” in Iraq. While the death of Zarqawi may be a setback, we must be careful not to pat ourselves on the back prematurely for another “Mission Accomplished.” Terrorist cells are still numerous and active, violence is still prevalent, and our brave men and women still continue to fight.

Although I voted against the initial resolution approving the war in Iraq, I have consistently voted to support our troops with much-needed armor and supplies. However, this should not be construed as favoring continued occupation of Iraq and the transfer of power to a government that does not respect the rights of all Iraqis. The Administration must not act to propel Iraq into the distant future.

The President will not bring an end to this war. He says it is a decision for the next President. But he is building permanent bases in Iraq, and he is determined to keep 50,000 troops in Iraq into the distant future.

This Congress may not bring an end to this war because the real power to end the war is in the hands of the Iraqi people. Only the American people can bring an end to this war as they brought an end to the Vietnam War. Let this be a time of stirring of civic soul.

It is a time for a reawakening of civic conscience. There were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. There are WMDs in D.C. Lies are weapons of mass destruction. 2,500 soldiers dead. Over 10,000 Iraqis, innocent Iraqis have died.

The Pentagon today the Pentagon be construed as favoring continued occupation of Iraq. However, this should not still continue to fight. It is still prevalent, and our brave men and women still continue to fight.

The global war on terror has become a global war of error: attacking or threatening countries which did not attack us, bombing neighborhoods to save neighborhoods, committing atrocities in the name of stopping atrocities, losing our vision, losing our way in the world, sacrificing our children and their future, giving up their future resources for education, for health care, for housing, piling it all high on the altar of war and worshiping a false god of destruction.

When we begin these proceedings with this remembrance, this is the kingdom and the power and the glory, we are not talking about any nation. We are talking about a force which is above all of us. The world is not ours to conquer. There is no glory in the abuse of power. When this President will not bring an end to this war after the Murtha resolution, this Congress may not bring an end to this war, but the American people certainly will bring an end to this war. They will do it in the streets, and they will do it at the ballot box, and the American people will become the Out of Iraq Caucus.

Mr. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the chairman of the subcommittee on State, Justice and Commerce appropriations.

Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. WOLF. The war on terror and this whole thing began really in 1980 when our embassy was taken over in Iran and the bombing of the Marine barracks in 1983, Lebanon, embassy in 1983, USS Cole, Khobar Towers, Nairobi and Dar es Salaam.

I have so much that I want to say. If we were to set a date, the Mujahedeen would say we defeated the Russians in Afghanistan, we defeated America in Iraq and the jihadi would take place all over this world. This would be a very, very dangerous thing to say.

So I rise in strong, strong support of this resolution and say we can and will win this war. I remember when I read the book by Whittaker Chambers. He was a witness. He said when I left the Communist Party, I believed I was leaving the winning side and joining the losing side. Whittaker Chambers was wrong because of people like Ronald Reagan. We must be resolute. I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 861 and to show my support for our troops serving in Iraq and Afghanistan who are on the front line of the global war on terror. I commend our forces for the recent actions in targeting Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the insurgent leader killed in an airstrike June 7. I also commend President Bush for his visit earlier this week to Iraq to meet with Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki and encourage the work of the new Iraqi government.

I share the deep concerns about the continuing violence in post-war Iraq, which is taking the lives of U.S. military personnel and civilians. I continue to pray for the protection of the men and women who are putting their lives on the line every day to help the Iraqi people as they build their own government, and also for their families here at home who continue to make tremendous sacrifices.

I recognize there were good and reasonable people on both sides of the decision to send U.S. armed forces to Iraq, and for not agreeing with the decision, and for not agreeing with it today. I also agree with the dangerous analogy made in this resolution between Iraq and the Administration’s “war on terror” policy. There is not, and never has been, any credible intelligence linking Iraq to 9/11 and Al Qaeda. Focusing the discussion on the war on terror and victories won, rather than on workable policies to bring our troops home, reduces this debate to no more than a justification for maintaining the Administration’s status quo agenda in Iraq.

It is time for an end to our national sleepwalk to the graveyard of the Iraq war. Let this be a time to bring our troops home, a time to bring our troops home, a time to reduce this debate to victories won, rather than on workable policies to bring our troops home, a time to return to the foreign policy of the United States. It is time to focus on the issues of the American people.

Only the American people can bring an end to this war. They will do it in the streets, and they will do it at the ballot box, and the American people will become the Out of Iraq Caucus.
have heard caution from varied sources about the potentially cataclysmic consequences of America withdrawing before our mission is complete. I had the opportunity to speak with our troops who are performing their duties with professionalism and dedication. They are positive about their mission and are doing an outstanding job in fulfilling it.

One interesting comment I heard on that trip is that we can’t expect to rebuild Iraq on our timetable, but rather it must be on Iraq’s timetable, and not artificially tied to a calendar. Many I talked to said we must set conditions for victory, not dates for withdrawal.

The Bush administration needs to do a better job articulating just what is at stake and the potentially catastrophic consequences. No one believes we will lose the war on the ground in Iraq; it’s here at home that there is a concern. I had one general officer say point blank that the “center of gravity” for our success in Iraq is the American public.

That said, I strongly believe that it would be of great value to have an independent review of ongoing operations in Iraq. I call this effort “fresh eyes on the target” and offered this suggestion following my latest trip to Iraq. On March 15, I was pleased to attend the announcement of the formation of the 10-member bipartisan Iraq Study Group, being led by former Secretary of State James Baker and former Congressman Lee Hamilton, who co-chaired the 9/11 Commission. The members, and their co-leaders, are America’s most honorable and venerable citizens: former CIA Director Robert Gates, former U.S. Attorney General Ed Meese, former Clinton adviser Vernon Jordan, former Clinton Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, former Defense Secretary William Perry, former Virginia Senator Chuck Robb, former Wyoming Senator Alan Simpson, and former Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O’Connor.

The study group was launched in partnership with the United States Institute of Peace, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, the Center for the Study of the Presidency, and the Baker Institute for Public Policy at Rice University. Its mission is to undertake a bipartisan, forward-looking assessment of the current and prospective situation on the ground in Iraq, its impact on the surrounding region, and its consequences on U.S. interests and our alliance, and it will focus on political, military, security, and reconstruction in Iraq. The group will travel to Iraq and report to the American people. I understand they will meet with President Bush this week.

It will assess what is working and what changes should be made in helping the Iraqi people to establish their own government and stop the terrorist insurgency which is continuing to foment the violence of the Saddam Hussein regime. One of the most critical jobs of this panel is to determine the ramifications of failure to accomplish our country’s mission in Iraq and to explain that to the American people.

In the 1930s, the world failed to stand up to fascism. When we—with our allies—did stand up and fight, we defeated fascism. It also took some time for the world to stand up to communism. But when we did so, that failed communism.

Now we face al Qaeda and its leader Osama bin Laden, who in his own words has said he will use chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons against us. We must continue the determined effort now that we have had in the wars over the years as we confront the al Qaeda republics, and, with as little patience as will be required, we would find ourselves leaderless in the global struggle against Islamic radicalism.
Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHLEY).

Mr. HINCHLEY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution before us, House Resolution 861, is an unfortunate farce. It is part of an orchestrated political propaganda, which has come from the Republican Party in defense of their so-called war on terror. It is not the first example. We have had many others.

Some of the highest-ranking members of this administration have purposefully and intentionally misled this Congress and the American people by providing them with wrong information. We saw it right here in the House of Representatives when the President himself talked about how the British had learned that Iraq was importing enriched uranium from Niger.

He was told before he delivered that speech that there was no evidence that that was true. Yet he came here and said it and put the responsibility on Great Britain knowing that what he was saying was untrue. It is a criminal violation of Federal law, two criminal violations of Federal law to consciously, purposefully, intentionally, mislead the Congress, particularly when you are trying to obtain actions from the Congress which result from that purposeful and intentional misleading.
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What has been the cost? So far, 2,500 American service men and women killed in Iraq. We hear today from the Republicans how they honor the servicemen, but they continue to have them killed, wounded, continue to have them suffer on the basis of false information, deceit and lies.

They claim that this is continuing the war on terror. Well, what happened to the real war on terror? We were attacked. It was Al Qaeda. The Al Qaeda had nothing to do with Iraq. We know that to be the case. We know that there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. We know that to be the case.

Yet, after we went into Afghanistan, which was providing solace and security for the Al Qaeda network, and chased Osama bin Laden up into the Tora Bora Mountains, the administration decided and the Defense Department decided that they were going to abandon the search. Why did they not pursue the person who was responsible for this attack?

Well, there is one logical answer to that question, and the answer is if they had found Osama bin Laden, the rationale for the attack on Iraq would disappear. That is why we need to get out. That is why we need to pass the Murtha resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LEACH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, there are few certitudes in these complicated times. Anyone who was not conflicted in the original decision to invade Iraq or who does not see a downside to all courses of action today is not thinking.

But I am hard pressed to believe anything other than the case for a steady, measured drawdown of troops in Iraq is compelling. The neocon desire to establish a semi-permanent presence in a divided Muslim country is foolhardy.

It is true that there are circumstances that could enable the United States to fight over there than here at home. Afghanistan is a case in point. But we should not be so naive as to fail to recognize that there are also circumstances where fighting over there can increase the likelihood that conflict will spread to our shores. A decision to prolong unnecessarily our intervention in Iraq could be a case in point, as could a military confrontation with Iran.

There are tipping points in all struggles. The tipping point in Afghanistan we are very close today to a calamity if we do not recalibrate our policies. The irony is that our troops have lost no battles and shown great heroism, but Western occupation is intolerable for Muslims. It is, as New Yorker magazine put it, the longer we stay, the greater the prospect that anarchistic acts will multiply and spread, perhaps to our shores.

The issue is no longer, as is so frequently asserted, the need to stay the course. It is to avoid overstaying our presence.

Sometimes it is harder to know how to end a war than to start one. Just as it is important to think through the "why and how" of committing troops to conflict, we must also think through the "why and how" of ending an engagement. Timing is a key element of both considerations.

For many Americans, including me, the war in Iraq has been difficult to justify. But all Americans, except perhaps a few who may be associated with the neoconservative movement, have not been given a clear rationale for the war and have not been given added momentum by our intervention in Iraq, and whether the ideologically advocated policy of establishing long-term bases or one of returning our troops home is likely to be the more effective strategy in prevailing in the world-wide war on terror.

But we have no choice except to assess whether Osama Bin Laden and his movement have been given an alternative by our intervention in Iraq, and whether the ideological bases raises the risk of retaliatory terrorist attacks at home and abroad.

Indeed, according to the University of Chicago scholar, Robert Pape, in his definitive book on suicide bombers, Dying to Win, the principal reason anarchists choose to wrap themselves in explosives and kill innocent civilians is to register martyrdom to the occupation of countries or territories by the Western governments. Suicide bombing, by implication, will exist as long as occupations continue.

In this regard, a note about al Qaeda is in order. Just as neither Iraq with its secular leanings nor any Iraqs were responsible for 9/11, so Saddam Hussein apparently considered Osama Bin Laden as much a rival as a soul brother. It is Western military intervention that has precipitated al Qaeda’s rapid growth in Iraq and elsewhere, creating a “cause célébre” for its singularly malevolent actions. If America’s withdrawal policy comes to turn on the question of anarchy—i.e., troops can’t be drawn down as long as IED attacks continue—we place ourselves in a catch-22 and, in effect, hand over decision-making discretion to those who wantonly kill. We allow the radical few to use our presence as the reason for their actions. On the other hand, our involvement to be held hostage to their vil

On the other hand, if we proceed with a turn-over of responsibilities to the new, freely elected Iraqi government, Sunni dissidents will claim a critical choice: to pursue the insurgency or join the political process. Pursuing the insurgency would be a risky gamble; if it fails, Sunnis may fall under Shiite domination.
for years to come, and the demise of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi makes prospects of expanding influence through terrorist tactics less likely. Joining the political process, on the other hand, would guarantee Sunnis a role in governing the country.

Though the individual and civilized choice may seem obvious to us, a continued American military presence in Iraq gives Sunnis radicals a popular cause—ridding the country of the occupier—for rallying popular sentiment in Iraq and elsewhere and justifying continued violence. Announcing the commencement of an orderly drawdown of our troops, and trumpeting it widely, would rob radicals of this powerful cause, allowing moderate Sunnis to join the government and pursue sectarian interests through the constitutional process.

In the realm of policy timing can often be as important as substance. Just as Senator Dink- 

sen once noted that a billion dollars here and a billion dollars there and pretty soon you’re talking about real money, in foreign affairs a week here and a week there can soon add up to a policy dilemma.

It is often the case of civil strife will ensue when we withdraw, but this is just as likely to be the case in 2026 as in 2006. In any regard, civil union is for the Iraqi people to manage. It’s not for American troops to sustain. The authorization this Congress gave to the Executive would contemplate a future largely one-sided cease-fire, and only a clear prospect of military intervention in Iraq. It did not, however, contemplate prolonged occupation. If this is not understood by the Executive branch, the current overwhelming Iraqi polling sentiment favoring American troop withdrawal will be more than matched by shared American sentiment. And in a democracy no one can be a leader without followers.

The older I get, the more central I consider the human factor to be in international relations. Logic is never totally dominant. No one knows the exact origins of the seven deadly sins, but to the degree human nature is the least changed aspect of the human condition, it is relevant to today’s debate to contrast two human foibles: avarice and pride. Let me suggest that avarice, the weakness of business class and rulers, is fundamentally more dangerous than avarice.

For example, if a bookstore owner were to read two books and strongly prefer one to the other, he might inventory half a dozen of the one he prefers and one of the other. But if his customers buy the one he likes least, he will not reorder the one he likes. He will put it on the discount shelf and re-order the public’s choice. His pride isn’t hurt. In politics, on the other hand, the tendency is to avoid embarrassment, never acknowledge error. Mistakes are often repeated to avoid political inconsistency.

An anecdote comes to mind. In one of my early terms in Congress I was invited to the Library of Congress to a seminar Henry Kissinger was asked to give on the 1973 Paris Peace Accords. Before going, I perused one of his autobiographical tomes and was struck by a singular paragraph. In December 1968, Kissinger had delivered his lecture, “I asked him about his pre-Presidency talk with Nixon. Why, I inquired, didn’t the Nixon administration immediately do what he said they had decided in December 1968, to do? Kissinger looked at me and responded: “We meant with honor.” I asked him if honor required escalation. “Absolutely,” he replied. “Honor” and “pride” do not have the same meaning. But in some circumstances they are clearly first cousins.

I mention this incident as a reflection of human nature and the psychology of decision-making. LBJ was too much of a Texan to reverse gear on his own policies; Nixon was too much a product of the Cold War to risk being perceived as less tough than his Democratic predecessor.

All wars evoke analogies to prior conflicts; Vietnam is on everyone’s mind. My sense is that references to our Southeast Asian experience are somewhat oblique, but important to ponder. Of particular relevance is the advice of a former Vermont Senator, George Aiken, who suggested we just declare victory and get out of Vietnam. Aiken’s advice was rooted in frustration, but wise as it was, represented more spin than reality. Given the strategies then in place, it wasn’t closer than that hand.

Today, on the other hand, despite the escalation of world-wide violence and the precipitation of widespread mistrust of the United States, particularly in Muslim societies, the Administration can point to positive political developments as an indication that change may be historically compelling, but it would have more currency now than when originally suggested.

In governance, judgment to be good must be timely. If we maintain a heavy presence much longer than desired, we risk finding ourselves in a dilemma of the kind Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon came to know too well. Despite the overwhelming nature of our military capacities and the courageous commitment and sacrifice of our armed forces, well-intentioned policies can fail if they are inadequately justified, poorly executed, or pursued too long. The timing and explication of disengagement can be as consequential as the decision to intervene.

This is why clarity of purpose and flexibility of response are so crucial. Hasty withdrawal is much a product of the Cold War to risk being perceived as less tough than our Democratic predecessor. The policy question Americans must think through is whether great powers may be more effective with policies of restraint rather than intervention. Just as Gandhi and King led non-violent revolutions which have proved more lasting than the barbarism of Stalin and Pol Pot, maintenance and embellishment of the American model of governance may itself be more intrusively revolutionary in oppressed societies than interventionist policies.

Caution and restraint are better models for 21st Century statecraft than naive adventurism.

When this admonition in mind, it is critical that Members of the Executive Branch must understand that how and what they say to justify various policies determines how others respond.

Anyone who ever studied physics may recall that Sir Isaac Newton set forth three fundamental laws, the second of which was that for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. A decade ago when the Congress was led by an extraordinary upstart whose first name was Newt, I suggested, at first as a pun, the existence of a fourth “Newt-onian” law, this one of social physics: reaction is greater than action. My thoughts at the time related to the partisan bickering within Congress. But with the passage of time I have come to the conclusion that international slights have gravier consequences than domestic.

When, for instance, we use words like “insult,” “reference events,” “interventions,” and employ tactics designed expressly to “shock and awe,” should we not expect others to think and respond in like or escalated terms, although the methods employed might in the current vogue be described as asymmetrical?

This brings me to several broad precepts, one of which is seemingly new to me: those of which are intended to form a theoretical and practical framework for a recalibrated foreign policy.

First, the triad. Every society has a sage who cautions that wise leaders should put themselves in the shoes of their adversaries before reaching self-centered judgments. The profoundest illustration of this comes from literature rather than Clausewitz or Tsun Tsu.

When speaking to constituents of the rational for and against the Iraq War, I have over the past couple of years referenced a set of books that provides more geo-political wisdom than balance of power strategists: the Alexandridra Quartet by Lawrence Durrell.

Set in inter-war Egypt, each of Durrell’s four books chronicles the same series of events through the eyes of a different participant. When repeating, the stories are profoundly different. The basic idea is that one set of eyes, one set of interactions, is insufficient to gain a full grasp of what is happening around us. Likewise, in world politics one
country's perspective is not enough. The views of others matter. If we are to manage prudently the affairs of state, we have to use more than just our own eyes, rely on more than just our own experience, and reference more than our own historical circumstance. The West, for instance, gives substantially less weight than the Western experience to the two cataclysmic wars of the 20th century. Despite Lawrence's involvement in Arabia and the battles between Allied forces and Rommel's tanks, the engagements in the Middle East and North Africa were skimmed compared with the struggles in Europe and the Far East. Not only do Muslims see the 20th century differently from Westerners, but Europeans and Americans have drawn different strategic parallels in the application of common experience to current challenges in the Middle East.

In the immediate aftermath of the First World War, historians and political strategists in Europe rightly concluded that the European alliance system had been too rigid and the assassination of a relatively minor figure, an archduke, should not have precipitated a war of such devastating consequences. Hence European leaders in the 1930's falsely concluded that historical wisdom necessitated initial accommodation with Hitler's adventurism. Too little flexibility caused one war; too little spine caused one war too easily spring into a clash of civilizations. Too little flexibility caused one war; too little spine caused one war. Americans and Europeans have drawn different strategic parallels in the application of experience to the two cataclysmic wars of the 20th century. Despite Lawrence's involvement in Arabia and the battles between Allied forces and Rommel's tanks, the engagements in the Middle East and North Africa were skimmed compared with the struggles in Europe and the Far East. Not only do Muslims see the 20th century differently from Westerners, but Europeans and Americans have drawn different strategic parallels in the application of common experience to current challenges in the Middle East.

Yet policymakers in Washington appear to underestimate a series of strategic phenomena, more sophisticated and experienced in terrorist undertakings than Al Qaeda. A preemptive strike on Iranian nuclear facilities would unleash a level of anarchy in world affairs that would be unprecedented. It would slow but not stop its ability to develop nuclear weapons. It would have little effect on Iran's ability to obtain such weapons elsewhere. The "loose nuke" phenomenon is real. A rich country has as good a chance to purchase or steal weapons of mass destruction as it does to develop them on its own. And if that country is attacked as part of an effort to block nuclear development, it has to be assumed it will have new incentives to seek and use such weapons. This sequence of events is conceivable unless Iran ceased supporting Hamas and Hezbollah. The ambassador responded with frankness. He chillingly acknowledged Iranian support of terrorism and then asserted that such support would cease the moment a peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians was reached in a framework acceptable to the Palestinians.

The slight hope implicit in this position may or may not have reflected Tehran's real position at the time, but it is apparent that Ahmedinajad is far more radical today than Khatami was yesterday. While neither has nor had the power of the Ayatollahs, the hardening of Iranian public attitudes toward us and our allies and the evident ineffectiveness of our strategic and psychological isolation of Iran important to ponder.

Last week the administration suggested a possible policy shift. We indicated a willingness to join the Europeans in talks with Iran to try to persuade the seat of this great European nation to engage in negotiations to prevent the development of an Iranian nuclear weapon. Last week the administration suggested a possible policy shift. We indicated a willingness to join the Europeans in talks with Iran to try to persuade the seat of this great European nation to engage in negotiations to prevent the development of an Iranian nuclear weapon. The slight hope implicit in this position may or may not have reflected Tehran's real position at the time, but it is apparent that Ahmedinajad is far more radical today than Khatami was yesterday. While neither has nor had the power of the Ayatollahs, the hardening of Iranian public attitudes toward us and our allies and the evident ineffectiveness of our strategic and psychological isolation of Iran important to ponder.
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of a few weeks duration—one to three weeks of intensive bombing. The Iraqis may be thinking of a multi-decade or multi-century response. Western history has known a 30-year war. Eastern peoples carry in their hearts the burden of centuries of crusades, and many Islamic scholars would like the 21st century to be a continuation of what they consider to be a struggle against Judeo-Christian intervention. Sequencing is a historical as well as diplomatic term of concern.

The Iraqis, too, are in a quandary. They recognize that no American President can take the force option completely off the table. They suspect DOD has made extensive contingency plans and they see a President who has little hesitancy to take difficult, unpopular decisions. They know he is in his last term and does not want to pass on strategic problems to his successor. They may reason that a U.S. decision to attack is irrational because it would solidify a radical reaction in Iran, in other Muslim countries, and perhaps even within the U.S., but the government of Iran cannot be certain that the President will conclude he is passing on a bigger mess if he attacked rather than engaged.

The Iranian challenge is stickier than many Americans assume. The President may see himself in a position analogous to that of John Kennedy in the Cuban Missile Crisis. Kennedy was caught between a rock and a hard place. He would have needed a system that had many despotic dimensions. But while communism was manipulated in such a manner as to become a quasi-state religion, it is fundamentally about political and economic rather than spiritual relationships. Iran, on the other hand, is a theocracy in a region where religion and, too frequently, its version are dominant themes. Just as the Iranian government must understand the strong will of the President, Washington has to come to grips with the pride and principles of an adversary which is the inheritor of one of the oldest civilizations on earth. Each side may understand the consequences of individual actions, but that does not mean that decisions in one or the other country will not unfold dominion-like in a manner that could be catastrophic for all. To hold human interrelationship—diplomacy—is so key.

Let me suggest a corollary to Lord Acton’s maxim that power corrupts and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely. The Leach corollary is that majority power tempts and excessive power tends to tempt excessively. America’s enormous military strength is critical at this stage in history. But while we are obligated to recognize that its maintenance is imperative, we must also realize that its utilization may not fit, and may indeed be counterproductive in certain strategic settings. Analogies between all wars exist, but comparisons between Iraq and Vietnam are frail. What must be understood is not that Iraq could be as bad as Vietnam; rather, that it is becoming far worse. Vietnam, after all, involved no WMD issues; while the North was predominantly Buddhist and the South Catholic, there were no implications of a world-wide religious struggle; nor of a conflict that might last many decades, if not centuries. The issue at the time was Communism and fears that if Vietnam fell, neighboring governments would be conquered. In retrospect, the real domino lesson of Vietnam was about political decision-making. Once the patriotic flag was raised, stands taken, words uttered, one doubtful decision precipitated another, and the pride of politicians did not allow a change of course until the people demanded common-sense reconsideration.

Interestingly, in the 19th century, two obscure Italian political theorists, Vito and Paolo, noted that for all the differences in political systems, one person alone at the top had the power to make critical decisions for a nation. While these decisions might be of a social magnitude, they are personal in the making.

Our Founders were moral as well as political thinkers. They feared kingly powers and wanted shared decision-making, especially when it came to war. But as we all have come to understand, modern times have produced wars without formal declarations approved by Congress. In response to Vietnam, Congress fashioned the War Powers Act to establish new constraints on the Executive. While most Constitutional scholars are convinced the Act would be declared unconstitutional if it were ever tested, it stands today as the law of the land. What is often overlooked, however, is that the Act also empowers the Executive wide-ranging options to commit American forces for a period of several months. Hence, there is no question of the administration assuming it has no need to come to Congress if it decides to launch an air assault on Iran, as long as it is only of multi-week duration.

Let me conclude with an observation about priorities, contrasts, and principles. First, priorities. The Iraqi war has had the unfortunate effect of decreasing American attention on both Afghanistan and the Israeli-Palestinian dilemma, both of which have extraordinary consequences for U.S. national security. In addition, we have assumed most of my adult life that world peace is the biggest issue in the world, the bigger challenge to life itself may be disease control. We have lost nearly 2,500 American troops in Iraq and 20 to 40 times as many Iraqis have been killed. But over the past two decades more than 20 million people have died of AIDS, and this number will double or triple in the next decade or two. Likewise, a new flu epidemic might match or exceed these numbers. Yet we are spending less on these problems than the cost of one month in Iraq.

Second, contrasts. Educated Americans are well aware of the ideas that Samuel Huntington and Joe Nye of Harvard have propounded about the dangers of a clash of civilizations and of the importance of soft as contrasted with hard power in diplomacy. These are important frameworks of thought for the American public to dwell upon. But I would add to those considerations the elements of individual judgment and the contrasting model of realism vs. pseudo-realism in policymaking. Realists look to the differences in political systems in the making to advance the rule of law? An earlier excess of pseudo-realism caused the Senate to reject Wilsonian idealism and ignore the League of Nations. Nevertheless, it approved U.S. participation in the World Court. Americans want law and order, and the dominoes in alliances and in the diplomatic system that had many despotic dimensions. But while communism was manipulated in such a manner as to become a quasi-state religion, it is fundamentally about political and economic rather than spiritual relationships. Iran, on the other hand, is a theocracy in a region where religion and, too frequently, its version are dominant themes. Just as the Iranian government must understand the strong will of the President, Washington has to come to grips with the pride and principles of an adversary which is the inheritor of one of the oldest civilizations on earth. Each side may understand the consequences of individual actions, but that does not mean that decisions in one or the other country will not unfold dominion-like in a manner that could be catastrophic for all. To hold human interrelationship—diplomacy—is so key.
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my son to receive a Purple Heart, but he was in no condition to appreciate it. He was in bad shape. I also said some things to President Bush that he, President Bush, did not like. I basically told him he should end this war and bring our troops, like my son, back home. He did not answer, just walked away.’’

I say we should not walk away from the young men and women who are left over in Iraq and Afghanistan. We should listen to what Shurvin’s mother said. Bring our troops home. Bring our troops home. Bring our troops home. She said she did not want to see any more young men or women laying back like this, and if you saw Shurvin you would know what I meant. He is in a chair, where he is sat up like this. His lips are swollen, stickling out. He can hardly say a word. We are saying to him, you know, Shurvin, we are sorry you are a casualty; you stood and fought bravely; you stood up for the United States of America. But he cannot stand up for himself.

Let us stand up for the young men and women of America. Bring our troops home, redeem them, and let us think of America first.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the International Relations Committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming majority of U.S. forces have performed their mission in an exemplary, professional fashion and deserve both our praise and profound thanks.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that Iraq remains a dangerous place today because hate-filled fanatic, perhaps even psychotic, mass murderers bomb and shoot innocent men, women, and children. In the past their thugs were in the government suites and Hussein’s opulent palaces—now some remain in the streets—hopefully not for long.

The terrorists have a morbid fascination with all things violent. There is nothing whatsoever benign or noble or praiseworthy about these people. They are mass murderers. If left unchecked, the terrorists would impose dictatorship once again on Iraq and Afghanistan, which would result in more mass killings, systematic torture, rampant fear, political prisoners, and an end to freedom and liberty.

While I respect the right of those who criticize American policy and our solidarity with the Iraqi people, I remain deeply disappointed that many of those who protest U.S. policy outside of this chamber seldom—if ever—criticize the terrorists.

No, harsh, mocking words of condemnation of President George W. Bush are left unchecked. You hear it on TV and radio talk shows and at war protests, but no such angst is directed at the mass murderers who blow up our soldiers or incinerate pious worshippers at prayer in Mesquites or who kidnap, torture, and kill humanitarian workers trying to save the lives of the vulnerable.

American and coalition soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan are peacemakers and they have the toughest assignment in the world. They are peacemakers who put their own lives at risk to create sufficient space and order so that democracy and respect for human rights can grow and peace can be established and grow.

I want our soldiers to come home—and soon.
Mr. ROHRABACHER. It is good that the American people are able to hear this debate and judge for themselves who should be making the policies and which policies are best for our country. I have been through this before. I worked with Ronald Reagan for 7 years, and I heard some of the same shrill voices that we hear today in those days. I heard the same gutting of the President of the United States for political purposes, but also for personal reasons during those days. I heard Ronald Reagan called a warmonger. I heard all of the charges that we hear today aimed at our President aimed at Ronald Reagan, and by some of the same people, I might add. We have voices who are ideologically opposed to war and are in fact affected in their heart, perhaps more than others, when war does come, as it comes to all free people because without strength of purpose and willingness to fight there will be no freedom in this world. But when we fought communism, President Reagan stood firm when the shrill voices of defeatism and retreatism attacked our effort and tried to undermine that effort in the same way our effort today is being undermined by nitpicking, backbiting, and defeatism. Yet, he stood firm and, guess what? The world was shocked when the evil of communism collapsed.

Well, today we are in a war with radical Islam, which is every bit as much a threat and hates Western democracy every bit as much as the Communists did. We have made a stand in Iraq, and I would hope that people understand that had Ronald Reagan backed down, we would still be in the middle of the Cold War. And if we back down today, as is being advocated, what I consider to be a Cold War. And if we back down today, as is being advocated, what I consider to be a Cold War, then terrorism will have grave consequences. It will not end the war.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. BUYER for the purposes of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BUYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Immediately following the attacks on September 11, 2001, this Nation’s focus was on countering the fundamental ideals of terrorism that spawned the attack on our homeland. Osama bin Laden and his Al Qaeda network, Saddam Hussein, and the Taliban, connected together throughout their history, had shared ambitions to destroy our way of life. Five years later, we have witnessed successes of historical proportions. Saddam—imprisoned and on trial for acts against humanity; Osama is on the run and we captured his successor; the Taliban exists—only for the first time in Afghanistan, their citizens are free to hope and dream; women are receiving an education. Al Qaeda is demonstrating what comes from the crushing pains of defeat, left with cowardly acts of desperation in a weakening effort to survive the blows that we have dealt it.

Today in Iraq we are on the verge of the blossoming of a successful new republic, accomplished by the perseverance of its citizens, and the sacrifices of many. Yet, some of our own countrymen are showing a dangerous tendency to waiver, their faith shaken by the drive-through mentality of our society. They are verbalizing their doubts at a time when we need them to stand strong. The peace-doves who turned hearts and minds; after September 11 were predicted to not have the intestinal fortitude to see this fight through to its necessary resolution. They are living up to that prediction despite the threat of terrorism still lurking around the world.

We cannot forget that the goals of Al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden are to destroy western culture in all of its forms and manifestations. All across America, our constituents live their lives—take their kids to school, go to work, earn a living—and this is the strength of our Nation. However, we still live in the shadow of a real and looming threat to our way of life. We must remain vigilant of that threat and stand firm in our vow to dismantle it. While we have not been attacked on our own soil since September 11, we cannot afford the ramifications of complacency. The recent arrest of hundreds of terrorists across the border in Canada is clear evidence of that. We have forced the terrorists into making this an “away game,” the battlefield pushed from our homeland, but nonetheless the outcome must be in our favor. Yes, the victories in this battle are many, but we must have the resolve and determination to defeat terrorism here at home and abroad. To succeed we must be absolute and have constancy of purpose.

For decades Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq with an iron fist of repression. In the midst of that oppression was the intense yearning of the Iraqi people to taste freedom. They were forced to keep their hopes hidden, wrapped in a cocoon that they could one day blossom into the living principles from which they could rebuild their nation. They have emerged from that cocoon and are attempting to fly. The elements that were forming in it have manifested themselves in the formation of their new government, two successful national elections, and a successful national constitutional referendum.

Iraq cannot continue to succeed in the transition from war to building their Nation without our continued help. The people of Iraq have appealed to us in this critically important period. We have pledged our commitment to them and we need to see it through. The Iraqi people are proud of their accomplishments thus far, but they have asked for a steady hand of reassurance from us to help guide them in this transition.

The pride and motivation that the Iraqi population has demonstrated to this point are key elements to making their young government a success. We must continue to nurture their growth of confidence so that they can effectively govern, defend, and sustain themselves. The motivation to man a completely volunteer army is one point of evidence that these people have pride and faith in their new republic. We cannot fail the security of our own Nation and the people of Iraq in a time of such dire need. The consequences of walking away at this point are too great to fathom. We must have the resolve to fulfill our commitment to the peace-doves and the global fight to free ourselves from the grip and fear of terrorism.
Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SKELOEN), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the time and yield the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 30 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SKELOEN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his indulgence and for the recognition, and I want to focus on something that has been little discussed in this debate, and that is how much this war is costing us.

Cost is not the ultimate determinant. When we have troops in the field, we should be unstinting in their support. But let us look in the context of the enormous outlay of billions of dollars, it has to be a consideration. The greatest cost, of course, is counted in human lives: 2,514 killed so far, 17,774 wounded so far. The dollar cost is not nearly so precious, but it is substantial.

First, for comparison, here is what the first Persian Gulf War cost us: $61 billion. But our allies contributed $10.6 in kind, $48.4 billion in cash contributions, and so out-of-pocket we were $2.1 billion. That, my friends, is the benefit of having allies.

Now, look at the annual cost of the war we are fighting. Notice that it has increased by almost 100 percent from 2003 to 2006. Notice, the troops we are maintaining there, 130,000 strong, is running at $8.4 billion a month. That is $8.4 billion a month.

Now, we have asked CBO, and CBO itself decided to set up a model to estimate what the outyear cost of this deployment would be, assuming that after this year there is a substantial drawdown to the point where 50,000 troops remain in theater, Afghanistan and Iraq. This covers both. The total cost of this, over a period of 10 years, is $371 billion, assuming a modest increment in our deployment to that theater of 50,000 additional troops. This is CBO speaking.

Now, if you add $371 billion to $318 billion, you get $689 billion. That is what this war could cost us if its goes on at its current level. And we have not reflected in this number the accrued costs we are incurring daily due to the harsh environmental conditions in the Army says it will cost $24 billion alone over the next 2 years to restore and repair and replace equipment.

Now, as I said, cost is not the ultimate determinant, but it has to be a consideration when it reaches this magnitude. I do not think we can debate the deployment in Iraq in existing troop levels in a vacuum, as if the cost does not matter, as if we had infinite resources if we were ever to balance our budget. Cost matters in meeting other military needs for operations elsewhere in the world, for transformation, and for modernization.

It is too bad we cannot have a full debate where we fully all of the grave issues facing us due to the deployment in Iran.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Terrorism and Nonproliferation of our International Relations Committee.

Mr. ROYCE. It becomes clearer by the day, Mr. Speaker, that we are confronting a broadband, a breathing, a sourceful enemy: Islamist terrorism, as the 9/11 Commission identified it.

We have seen messianic, violent ideologies before, but al Qaeda and its ilk represent a more severe threat. In today's world, we would acquire weapons of mass destruction. Bin Laden has made clear his intention to do so. It was such a concern that led President Bush to remove Saddam Hussein from power, and Iraqis are better off for it.

We have heard legitimate debate of choices made in Iraq: Disbanding the Iraqi army, troop levels, and we have heard other critiques. Looking back, it is clear that this mission's difficulty and expense were underestimated. Hopefully, we have improved our intelligence. But dwelling on past choices does not get us ahead.

Looking ahead, I don't see how we succeed by immediately withdrawing, and we have seen that position that our troops should stay longer in Iraq makes us all uncomfortable. But an alternative, an immediate withdrawal, concedes that Iraq will fall into chaos, because there is no way that the Iraqi security forces could stand alone yet. That is the judgment of our military professionals. So if you are going to argue that the costs of staying are too high, you are obligated to calculate the cost of withdrawing or the cost of what most certainly would be our defeat.

The real world is dangerous, and unpleasant choices must be made. An honest appraisal is that we don't know Iraq's future, but we know with far greater certainty that an American withdrawal would spin Iraq into chaos. Bedlam in the region would likely follow. This outcome would be a stunning boost for jihadists, the forces determined to deliver as big a blow as they can against the American people. We owe it to the American people and the Iraqi people our continued effort.

We know Iraq today is a central front in our struggle against terrorism. Al Qaeda has said it, and last week's killing of al Zarqawi in Iraq made it clear that our success there and our success in the high stakes fight against terrorism go hand in hand.

Mr. SKELOEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ).

Mr. ORTIZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, you know, this bipartisan bill by which today commends our troops, and we realize that our troops are the greatest in the world. This Nation must never forget that. And, of course, we all agree that Saddam should have been removed. The problem was our tactics, our planning.

But this resolution nowhere addresses the central issue that the American people are crying out for us to discuss: Where do we go from here?

I think that the American people want an honest discussion where this Nation stands in the two wars that we are prosecuting today, and in particular Iraq, I think that we owe this to the American people who are risking their lives on a daily basis. We owe it to their families, to the American people, to our allies, and to our enemies.

Supporting our troops means more than bumper stickers on trucks, though of course we appreciate those people that put on the bumper stickers. We appreciate that. But it is time to talk about the hundreds of thousands of American soldiers, their blood, their future, their hopes, hopes for the young people of this great country and the people in Iraq, their young people.

I wish the resolution before us provided the context for this debate. Honest discussion must include the nuts and bolts of this policy, literally what we are expending daily in Iraq. You know, when we talk about the policy, are we going to allow for us to conduct another preemptive attack? Was this the wise thing to do? Was the planning correct? Do we need to correct our mistakes? Do we need to change the training? These are the things we need to look at.

If we truly want the Iraqis to stand up and protect their country, and if we are ever ready to stand down, to stand down, are we ready to put the money in the budget? I just came from a hearing a few moments ago we are having a hearing on how do we protect our soldiers. We don't have a uniform policy on what helmets will protect the soldiers. Our soldiers don't have the equipment that they need, and for us to stand down, we need to provide the Iraqi army what they need, the equipment. And we wonder why because we haven't been able to do that for our troops.

Our military is the best. It has been feared throughout the ages for our ability to respond immediately anywhere in the world, to be ready to defend our freedom. I support our troops.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize for 2 minutes...
the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER), who has been to Iraq three times.

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, recently, I attended my oldest son’s eighth grade graduation, and graduating with him was Jennifer Davis, the daughter of Karen and Major Miles Davis, who could not attend because he was deployed to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I believe we owe Americans an account of our progress in the war on terror, an assessment of the situation, the stakes, and the strategy for victory in the battle for Iraq, as well as an affirmation that we will defend our country, defeat the enemy, and win this unsought struggle for survival. Unfortunately, this resolution fails to do so, for it is strategically nebulous, morally obtuse, and woefully inadequate.

This resolution sanitizes the hard truth that the enemy is not only to intimidate us but to kill us. It provides an abashed defense of our Nation’s sovereign right to preemptively eradicate the terrorists and their state sponsors before they kill us. It implies our preemption of this threat must meet a higher legitimary. It further fails to affirm the battle for Iraq was waged because Saddam Hussein’s regime was a direct threat to the United States of America and was in violation of mandatory treaty obligations of said United States of America.

It fails to stress our mission is to ensure a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq at peace with the United States, its coalition partners and all other peaceable nations.

It fails to stress that terrorists seek to destroy the new unity government because it threatens the terrorists’ aspirations for the United States of America, Iraq, and the broader Middle East.

It asserts how despite the enemy having declared Iraq a central front in the war on terror, the United States and its coalition partners will continue to support Iraq as only a part of the war on terror.

It omits any mention of the battle for Iraq’s difficulties and does not offer a comprehensive strategy on how to conquer them. It overlooks the fact our troops’ return home hinges upon creating Iraqi security forces and destroying the enemy’s insurgency.

Finally, this resolution calls the terrorists our adversary, not our enemy.

Mr. Speaker, at the graduation I did not try to comfort Karen Davis by declaring her husband, Major Miles Davis, who was defending global peace and security or enforcing United Nations resolutions. No, I thanked Karen for her family’s sacrifice because Miles was in Iraq honoring his solemn pledge to God and to us to support and defend the people of the United States against all enemies.

So in this time of war when we ask the best of our troops and we ask the best of their families, we must ask the best of ourselves. We have not done so with this resolution, and that is why I will be voting “present,” because I am committed to victory in the war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, recently, I attended my oldest son’s eighth grade graduation. Graduating with him was Jennifer Davis, the daughter of my childhood friend, Major Miles Davis, who could not attend. That night, I talked with Miles’ wife, Karen, who told me how painful it was for their family to have Miles so abruptly deployed to Iraq.

Such heart rending scenes throughout our land are why I believe we owe Americans more in this resolution than a simple declaration of our resolve in Iraq. We owe them an account of our progress in the world War on Terror; an assessment of the situation, the stakes, and the strategy for victory in the battle for Iraq; and an affirmation we will defend our country, defeat the enemy, and win this unsought struggle for survival.

Thus, I rise to express my profound disappointment with this resolution before us, because it is strategically nebulous; morally obtuse; and woefully inadequate.

To begin, this resolution’s purpose is limited to “Declaring the United States will complete the mission in Iraq and prevail in the Global War on Terror.” While it is necessary to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary.

This is patently inadequate to the task at hand; and, unfortunately, under continued examination the resolution fares no better. To wit, the first “Whereas” clause informs us: “The United States and its allies are engaged in a Global War on Terror, a long and demanding struggle against an adversary that is driven by hatred of American values and that is committed to imposing, by the use of terror, its repressive ideology throughout the world.”

This clause elicits elementary questions: what “values” of ours cause our enemy to hate us; and what, precisely, is the enemy’s ideology? Sadly, this clause provides no clues.

The second clause recounts how: “... for the past two decades, terrorists have used violence in a futile attempt to intimidate the United States.”

This clause is too sanitized. The hard truth is the enemy has not tried to intimidate us. The enemy has tried to kill us and too often succeeded. The enemy does so because our very existence as sovereign citizens of a free Republic constitutes a beacon of hope for all who are—and all who yearn to be—free; thus, we are our enemy’s paramount obstacle to world dominance.

Next the third clause right asserts: “... it is essential to the security of the American people and to world security that the United States, together with its allies, take the battle to the terrorists and to those who provide them assistance.”

Agreed. But this clause must stress both a philosophic principle and a strategic tenet. Philosophically, any state-sponsor of terror is a threat to the United States, because terrorism is an attack upon the self-evident, inalienable human rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Strategically, this clause falters as an oblique and abashed defense of our Nation’s sovereign right to preemptively eradicate terrorists and their state-sponsors before they kill us. Instead, the clause must reaffirm our Nation’s full right of self-defense.

The seventh clause decries how: “... by early 2003 Saddam Hussein and his criminal, Ba’athist regime in Iraq, which had supported terrorists, constituted a threat against global and national security; and was in violation of mandatory United Nations Security Council Resolutions.”

Bluntly, this clause omits the obvious: By early 2003 Saddam Hussein and his criminal regime in Iraq, which had supported terrorists, constituted a threat against the United States of America and was in violation of mandatory treaty obligations to the United States of America.

By omitting the fact Hussein’s regime declared the United States not as just a part of the global community, but as a mortal enemy, this clause wrongly implies our preemption of his threat must and does meet a “global test” for legitimacy.

Finally, this resolution reiterates: “... the mission of the United States and its Coalition partners, having removed Saddam Hussein and his regime from power, is to establish a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq at peace with its neighbors.”

Again, the point is missed. Our mission is to transform Iraq from a rogue dictatorship aiding terrorists into a representative democracy eradicating terrorists; and into a sovereign, free, secure, and united nation at peace with the United States, its Coalition partners, and all other peaceable nations.

Next, clause eleven’s belief: “... the terrorists seek to destroy the new unity government because it threatens the terrorists’ aspirations for Iraq and the broader Middle East,” also misses the point. As an American, I believe the clause should read: “the terrorists seek to destroy the new unity government because it threatens the terrorists’ aspirations for the United States of America, Iraq, our Coalition partners, and the broader Middle East.”

Now, lastly, we reach the resolution’s three lethal failings.

To start with, taken together, the ninth and fifteenth clauses raise a stark conundrum. Ignoring that the United States, in word and deed, first targeted Iraq as a “central front” in its Global War on Terror, clause nine notes: “the terrorists have declared Iraq to be a central front in their war against all who oppose their ideology.”

Later, clause fifteen asserts: “... the United States and its Coalition partners will continue to support Iraq as part of the Global War on Terrorism.”

These clauses’ collective conundrum is this: If, after we militarily deposed Hussein, the terrorist enemy now deems Iraq a central front in its war against all those who oppose their ideology, why do we claim it was but “part of the Global War on Terror”? Upon this critical question and its ramifications, the resolution is silent.

The resolution’s second lethal failing is found, interestingly enough, in clause twelve, which offers hopeful news of how we, our Coalition partners, and the Iraqis have: “... scored impressive victories in Iraq, including finding and killing the terrorist leader Abu Musab al-Zarqawi.”

Peace and. But nowhere does this resolution explain the battle for Iraq’s past, present, and future difficulties, or proffer any concrete or comprehensive strategy as to how U.S., Coalition, and Iraqi forces will confront and conquer
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revolt against their German and Japanese oppressors, and against the traitors in their own ranks, known by the already infamous name of Quislings. And I think that it is a fair point of view that, as we get closer to the patriots in those lands, they too will fire shots heard ‘round the world.

This production of ours in the United States will far above those of other peoples, even though it will mean the dislocation of the lives and occupations of millions of our own people. We must raise our sights all along the line, and let no man say it cannot be done. It must be done—and we have undertaken to do it. . . .

Our task is hard—our task is unprecedented—and the time is short. We must strain every existing armament-producing facility to the utmost. We must convert every available plant and tool to war production. That goes all the way from the greatest plants to the smallest—from the huge automobile industry to the village machine shop. Production for war is based on men and women—the human hands and brains which collectively we call Labor. Our workers stand ready to work long hours; to turn out more in a day’s work; to keep the wheels turning and the fires burning twenty-four hours a day, and seven days a week. They realize that speed and efficiency of their work depend the lives of their sons and their brothers on the fighting fronts.

Production for war is based on metals and raw materials—copper, rubber, aluminum, zinc, tin. Greater and greater quantities of them will have to be diverted to war purposes. Civilian use of them will have to be cut further and still further—and, in many cases, completely eliminated.

War costs money. So far, we have hardly even begun to pay for it. We have devoted only 15 percent of our national income to national defense. As will appear in my Budget Message tomorrow, our war program for the coming fiscal year will cost $56 billion or, in other words, more than half of the estimated annual national income. That means taxes and bonds and bonds and taxes. It means cutting the hours of work in many industries; in a word, it means an ‘all-out’ war by individual effort and family effort in a united country.

Only this all-out scale of production will hasten the ultimate all-out victory. Speed will count. Lost ground can always be regained; speed will save lives; speed will save this nation which is in peril; speed will save our freedom and our civilization—and slowness has never been an American characteristic.

We cannot wage this war in a defensive spirit. As our power and our resources are fully mobilized, we shall carry the attack against the enemy—we shall hit him and hit him again wherever and whenever we can reach him.

We must keep him far from our shores, for we intend to bring this battle to him on his own home grounds.

American armed forces will be on all the oceans—sailing to guard the essential communication which are vital to the United Nations.

American land and air and sea forces will take such positions as will constitute an essential fortress in this great world struggle.

American armed forces will help to protect this hemisphere—and also help to protect bases outside this hemisphere, which could be used for an attack on the Americas.

If any of our American armed forces from Europe or from Asia, attempt long-range raids by ‘suicide’ squadrons of bombing planes, they will do so only in the hope of terrorizing our people and making our people afraid of that. We know that we may have to pay a heavy price for freedom. We will pay this price with a will. Whatever the price, we will pay it. But we will do it without quaking in our knees, for we will never be afraid of the enemy.

That is the spirit in which discussions we have been conducting during the visit of the British prime minister to Washington. Mr. Churchill and I understand each other, our motives and our objectives. During the past two weeks, we have faced squarely the major military and economic problems of this greatest world war.

All in our nation have been cheered by Mr. Churchill’s visit. We have been deeply stirred by his great message to us. He is welcome in our midst, and we unite in wishing him a safe return to his home.

For we are fighting on the same side with the British people, who fought alone for long, terrible months, and withstood the enemy with only their own resources and skill. We are fighting on the same side with the Russian people who have seen the Nazi hordes swarm up to the very gates of Moscow, and who with almost superhuman will and courage have forced the invaders back into retreat.

We are fighting on the same side as the brave people of China—those millions who for four and a half long years have withstood bombs and starvation and have whipped the invaders time and time again. We are fighting on the same side as the indomitable Dutch. We are fighting on the same side as the other governments in exile, whom Hitler and all his armies and all his Gestapo have not been able to conquer.

But we of the United Nations are not making all this sacrifice of human effort and human lives to return to the kind of world we had after the last world war.

We are fighting today for security, for progress, and for peace, not only for ourselves but for all men, not only for one generation but for all generations. We are fighting to cleanse the world of evil, ancient and new.

Our enemies are guided by brutal cynicism, by unscrupulous hatred and hunger—hunger for peace in Iraq. General Shinseki warned us, and they ignored him and sent him out to pasture.

We didn’t vet Saddam’s army so we couldn’t secure Baghdad. Mistake, mistake. We have lost oil production now than we did when Saddam was in power. The Iraqi people have lost their opportunity. They have 3.9 hours of electricity in Baghdad and we are talking about things getting better? In a third world war, this administration and this Congress has an obligation to tell the truth about what is happening in Iraq.

We also have a responsibility to provide the oversight so we correct mistakes, we get our troops into the background because we are sitting ducks up there because we have an occupation that our own State Department polls say is unpopular by 85 to 90 percent of the Iraqis. They tell us the Iraqis talk about the terrorists and how we are fighting al Qaeda. Al Qaeda was not in Iraq until this President stood before the world and said, ‘Bring it on. Bring it on.’ Well, they brought it on and now 10 percent of the insurgency are actually terrorists. When we leave Iraq, they will leave Iraq.

We ought to listen to what the State Department told us in advance. We should look at our own investigations and analysis by the State Department that tell us we cannot win this war militarily. You don’t beat an insurgency with military conflict; you beat
an insurgency through making the right planning decisions, by making the right decisions to give the Iraqis what they need to be upfront to keep their own security in that country. You give the Iraqis what they need to make their own determination of what their security needs are. The time has come for the United States to move into the background and bring our men and women home.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), a member of the International Relations Committee.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, September 11 changed our lives forever. But the war on terror started long before that. The year 1979 changed the world. When Iran took our embassy hostage, the seeds of Islamic jihad were spread all over the Middle East.

These seeds planted hatred and contempt for freedom in the souls of men like those who murdered our marines in Beirut. In 1993, Ramzi Yousef and his al Qaeda associates bombed the World Trade Center. They were supposed to fall that day, but that day would come later.

Then the Khobar Towers in 1996. They bombed our embassies in Africa. They defeated us in Somalia. And they deliberately attacked the USS Cole.

Each time we failed to respond. And then came September 11. It was as if the United States was a sleeping giant. And not until the bloodiest alarm of 9/11 did the giant finally awake. America cannot afford to go back to sleep again.

We are fighting this war in distant lands, and we are winning. Our struggle in Iraq and Afghanistan is the great stand in this war on terror. The terrorists are there. Zarqawi was there before, and we are there. And if we fail, the terrorists will prevail just as they did in Somalia. And not until the bloodiest alarm of 9/11 did the giant finally awake.

Before me is a picture of Sergeant Byron Norwood taken moments before he died for his country in this global war on terror. In Fallujah, Sergeant Norwood helped save seven of his fellow marines in a gun battle with insurgents and gave his own life in the process. Simply put, Byron was a hero.

His story reminds me of the Bible verse found in the Gospel of John: “Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.”

Some say we should retreat in this war on terror, but to them I say to cut and run now would not only be an insult to those waging this liberating battle but a disservice to those like Byron who made the ultimate sacrifice because few causes are as worthy, few prices are as great.

I received a letter from Byron’s mother expressing her concern that the American people would soon forget about Byron and his sacrifice for freedom. To Janet and all of the other Gold Star Mothers, I say we will never forget Byron, and we will never forget about the other fallen heroes who paid the ultimate sacrifice for freedom.

Whether it is Bill and Janet Norwood or the wounded soldiers at Walter Reed Hospital or the soldiers I met with in Iraq, they all tell me the same thing. Congressman, finish the job. And finish the job.

I would like to close with a message that Byron’s father gave to me to deliver to this Chamber. Byron’s father said, “Byron understood the meaning of the American dream. The American people, a people who understand what direction do we want to take this country.”

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to clarify for the record that this resolution honors all those Americans who have taken an active part in the global war on terror, whether as first responders, protecting the homeland, as servicemen overseas, as diplomats and intelligence officers, and in other roles.

And further, it honors the sacrifice of the United States Armed Forces and of partners in the coalition, and of the Iraqis and Afghans who fight alongside them, especially those who have fallen or have been wounded in the struggle, and honors as well the sacrifices of their families and of others who risk their lives to help defend freedom. This is a resolution to honor their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS), a member of the House International Relations Committee.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this strong, proactive defense of our liberties and freedoms from the preying forces of Islamic radicals in their jihad against the core values of our Western Civilization.

We did not choose this war. They picked the fight. The events of September 11 represented the final moment of spending our days as bystanders.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not about the choices which precipitated the war in Iraq. The choice we face today, and Americans will face in November, is between two visions: full commitment to or Republican, you deserve the opportunity on the floor of the people’s House to have a real debate, not a discussion, but to have substantive words on the floor.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

Mr. ABERCROMBIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to indicate to one and all who cannot be here today that our legislative hands are tied. We have no opportunity, even though we plead for an alternative and why we need to vote "no" on this resolution, because it doesn’t support the troops, and it does not support the war on terrorism.

The people in this resolution that are referred to, the honored sacrifice that has been made by the Armed Forces of the United States, is supposedly on behalf of somebody called Prime Minister Blair in the war against control terrorist acts.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to engage in conversations with terrorists who have murdered Americans to give them amnesty. This is the amnesty resolution.

To vote for this resolution is to vote for those who support amnesty for those who kill American troops. This is the government we are supposed to be standing up and defending, the very freedom that gives that prime minister the possibility of speaking to the terrorists who have murdered Americans to give them amnesty.

There are people on this floor who will not grant amnesty to people who cut their lawns, who wash the dishes in the restaurants they eat in; but they are willing to vote for a resolution that says that they support a government that is willing to give amnesty to people who murder the men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States. I am not going to do that. And if you disagree with that interpretation, give me the right to put it on the floor for a vote and let’s see who wins the hearts and minds of the American people, not the Iraqi people, as to who is really supporting the troops and who is really willing to fight a war on terror.

This is nothing but a resolution confirming the existing administration policy. Whether you are Democrat or Republican, you deserve the opportunity on the floor of the people’s House to have a real debate, not a discussion, but to have substantive words on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), a member of the International Relations Committee.

Ms. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this strong, proactive defense of our liberties and freedoms from the preying forces of Islamic radicals in their jihad against the core values of our Western Civilization.

We did not choose this war. They picked the fight. The events of September 11 represented the final moment of spending our days as bystanders.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not about the choices which precipitated the war in Iraq. The choice we face today, and Americans will face in November, is between two visions: full commitment to
Are we safe for today? Absolutely. Should we cut and run from Iraq? Never.

As Winston Churchill said: “We shall not fail or falter; we shall not weaken or waver. Neither the sudden shock of battle nor the long-drawn trial of vigilance and exertion will wear us down. Give us the tools and we will finish the job.”

Mr. SKELOTON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

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

This afternoon, regrettably, we are talking about the cost of this war, the cost of the commitment of the American people: the cost in money, and the cost in lives, over 2,500 to date; the cost in wounded, over 18,000, of very little or no oversight, very little or no accountability, and certainly very little or no shared sacrifice in this country.

This resolution that we are discussing, because it is not even a debate, is more about politics than about practical solutions. Anyone that doubts that, all you have got to do is read today’s paper, and see what our plan post “Mission Accomplished” press conference? Where were we during the issue of Abu Ghraib rendition and so many other things that have come up?

In fact, last night I went home and I switched on the TV and I just happened, by chance, to catch the program on HBO, Last Letters Home: The Families. And it occurs to me this afternoon that we owe those families from that HBO program, and the 2,500 other families, an apology, because they have made it. They understand the cost of this war. And they must be wondering where the accountability and the where the oversight is. We need to apologize to them and to the American people for not doing our job.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT), who has traveled to Iraq and has witnessed the progress firsthand.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we have talked about facts and figures tonight. We have talked about whether we have got the right number of forces and how much money we are spending. But we can talk about facts and figures all the time. This is more than that.

This is about faces. This is about faces in the fight on global terror. This is about the faces of leaders like Maliki and Karzai, guys that are worried whether the United States is going to keep its pledge and its word to be with them.

This is about the faces of citizens who want to raise their families, who want to live and worship in a country that is free, where they can walk down the street without the fear of being blown up.

This is about the faces of families who are concerned about whether we are going to do everything we need to do to make sure our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines have everything they need in this fight.

This is about the faces of the enemy, cold blooded murderers with red eyes who have only one mission in life, death or victory.

And this is about the faces of soldiers, dirty, tired, hungry, scared sometimes, but soldiers with a resolute mission, a mission of victory.

Mr. Speaker, every day I thank God that we have men and women worldwide willing to do something bigger than any of us here today, willing to fight for freedom and justice and to keep America safe and strong.

Mr. SKELOTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution contains phrases such as “we will prevail,” words like “determination,” “resolve,” “we are committed to the completion of the mission.” It is a good, well written pep talk. But where is the discussion of how?

As Mr. GILCHRIST, our colleague from Maryland and a decorated Vietnam war veteran said, where is the urgency in figuring out how we are going to do those things?

We should be having a debate and a discussion on how we will prevail, not just that want to prevail.

Specifically, how are we going to equip a very poorly equipped Iraqi army? How are we going to set up a system of support and supply and repair for the Iraqi army? How are we going to ensure that more Iraqis are employed and develop the economy? How are we going to increase electricity production, which is below prewar levels? How are we going to increase access to potable water and sanitation, which is below prewar levels? How are we going to increase oil production and the oil production sector? How are we going to finish putting together the provincial reconstruction teams? How are we going to increase and improve the training of police? How are we going to help create and improve local courts and the judicial system? How are we going to improve the refining capacity? Iraq is an importer of gasoline. How are we going to improve the accountability for contractors? That means how are we going to quit wasting billions of U.S. tax dollars? How are we going to find more allies to share in this burden? How are we going to keep our Army, our military from breaking down? How are we going to strengthen our Reserve component, our blessed Guard and Reserve people? How are we going to build a volunteer Army? How are we going to increase our public diplomacy, so that people will quit hating America all around the world? How are we going to make our troops safer?

These are the kinds of discussions we should be having. But what are we doing? We are rehashing the past. We are talking about the war resolution. Let us look ahead. How are we going to prevail? How are we going to keep this commitment to the completion of this mission?

Specifically, I think we need to do far better oversight. I am a member of the House Arms Services Committee. We are abysmal in our oversight, abysmal.

Years ago when the Republicans took over, and maybe it was a good move at that time, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations was eliminated. It has not worked to do that.

I see friends over here. Ladies and gentlemen, we need to bring back the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, so we can ask these kind of questions. How are we going to do the things? How are we going to achieve this pep talk that is going to be voted on today or tomorrow?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a member of the International Relations Committee, who has traveled to Iraq, has met with our U.S. coalition, and Iraqi troops.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I went to Iraq in 2005. I was one of two Members of this Congress to view the first free elections in their history, and I watched in awe and admiration as more than 8 million people went to the polls and elected a Congress. Men and women, young and old, courageously cast their ballots in the face of the violent terrorists.

I spoke to many Iraqis and they showed great defiance against those outrageous that we wish to ask of these elections. Despite facing 300 attacks across the nation that day, more than 60 percent of the Iraqis went out to vote. Not even 44 murders by the terrorists could remove the resolve of these people.

Men and women waited in line to cast their vote. They took the historic ballots, entered a cardboard booth and made their choice. With that simple but noble action, they pushed tyrants and terrorists aside and set Iraq on a path to freedom. Then they marched down the street holding their ink stained finger up high in defiance of those terrorists.

I talked to Iraqis. And I talked to a woman who came up to me with tears in her eyes after she voted and said how grateful she and her family were for the America that we live in, for giving their sons for her family’s freedom. They went on to report that after her husband was murdered by the devil of the desert, Saddam Hussein.

There have been more successful elections since the first, and the speakings to the criticism with each and new free and successful election.

Democracy is the enemy of terrorists. They hate democracies as much as
they hate the human life of the innocents that they murder.

We cannot give in to these madmen. The insurgents have discovered that the United States and her allies cannot be defeated on the battlefield. They have also found that the only way to resolve the Iraqi people to create a free and fair and inclusive government cannot be broken. Liberty and freedom are overcoming treachery and tyranny and violence. We will not fear nor flee nor flinch to do what is right.

And our mission statement was stated 40 years ago by President John F. Kennedy when he said, "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe in order to assure the survival and success of liberty.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity, in light of the gentleman from Arkansas' comments, Dr. Snyder, to remind the body, Mr. Speaker, that it was the Investigation Subcommittee on the Armed Services Committee that produced the all-important legislation we now call Goldwater-Nickels, which brought about jointness within the armed services.

And I also might mention that all 29 Democrats sent a letter to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, from which we have not received an answer, recommending and asking that the Investigations or Oversight Subcommittee be reestablished.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

(Mr. SMITH of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this debate on this resolution, and the resolution itself, continues two very dangerous patterns that have sort of governed all of our actions in Iraq for far too long.

First of all, there are no specifics, as Congressman SNYDER said quite articulately, as to how we are going to achieve this victory.

When this debate was billed, we were told this was going to be the floor of the House, the People's House talking about how to deal with the very tough challenges that now present themselves in Iraq. Even the President admits that things have not gone the way we had hoped. We need to step up and figure out how to fix the problems.

And yet, this resolution doesn't say a thing about that. It says, terrorism is bad, our troops are good, and we want to win.

This House is failing in its mission with such an open statement that does not get at the how of winning. How are we going to deal with an open-ended commitment to Iraq? How are we going to pay the price for that? Is it even in the best interest of our goal of a stable and peaceful Iraq to say that our troops will stay there for as long as is necessary?

Those questions are not answered. Unless we in this House are willing to step up and put policy forward, we shouldn't say that this is a debate about the future of Iraq. It is not. We have many hard questions that need to be answered. This resolution does not do that.

And the second dangerous trend is the pattern of the President and the majority in this Congress to say anyone who disagrees with them is somehow unpatriotic and defeatist, which to me, Mr. Speaker, is in a real need of a re-fresher course on why democracy is important. We are all very good at saying that it is important. It is important so that we hear all the voices, not just those who disagree with us. That way we can learn from our mistakes, which we desperately need to do in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in disappointment—though I must say, not in surprise—about the exercise the House is engaged in today. This is not a true debate about our policy in Iraq. A real debate would be how to consider alternative proposals and vote on meaningful amendments that could help us improve the very difficult situation there. Instead we have before us an un-amendable, rhetorical document about the war on terrorism that we certainly feel is irrelevant when it comes to the real issues in Iraq. It says, essentially, that we support fighting terrorism and that we are committed to achieving success in Iraq. I agree with that, but that doesn't say anything about how we get there.

These are the questions we should be debating, Mr. Speaker, because they directly affect our ability to achieve success in Iraq. We owe it to our brave men and women in uniform and to the American people to ask these questions. But instead, we have a resolution before us today that is not relevant when it comes to the real issues in Iraq. It says, essentially, that we support fighting terrorism and that we are committed to achieving success in Iraq. I agree with that, but that doesn't say anything about how we get there.

Mr. Speaker, today Congress is continuing to utterly abdicate its oversight responsibility. Since the outbreak of war, this Congress has done little more than endorse the administration's policy in Iraq, instead of asking the tough questions and scrutinizing that policy, as the Constitution requires us to do.

Mr. Speaker, I hope, despite this Congress' refusal to conduct oversight, that we can be honest today as we look ahead in Iraq. We all want to see an Iraq that is stable, secure, and free. Our troops are doing an outstanding job, and they deserve our full support and respect.

But the fact is that success or failure in Iraq increasingly depends on the decisions of Iraqi leaders, and they must understand that. In order to achieve success in Iraq we must accelerate the transition to Iraqi sovereignty.

I believe that significantly reducing our military footprint is critical for making that happen. While we cannot simply abandon Iraq at this point, drawing down our forces levels in a responsible way in the coming months will force us to take greater responsibility for their own security and reduce their dependence on U.S. forces. It will also send an important message to the Iraqi people that Americans are not there to occupy the country, but rather seek to begin leaving as Iraqis take control of their own country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as we move forward in Iraq, both the future and the past matter. We must make the best of a difficult situation by working diligently to help Iraqis take full responsibility for running their country so that our overburdened troops can come home. And we must do so in a manner that does not give the violent Islamic terrorists in the world any greater strength. Yet we must also be willing to acknowledge and learn from our mistakes.
Our impatience to leave is matched by their impatience to take the reins of their destiny. The reins are being transferred. Patience, hope, perseverance. Our children will inherit a safer world.

My heartfelt gratitude for those who have given their lives to our Nation, and for their families.

America salutes you.

I have a picture on my desk and letters in my files from children who have been orphaned and women killed in Iraq. I am proud of their commitment to our country of their service of the values they held dear. But I am unendingly sad—for the sacrifice they and their families have had to make.

Let us be clear—terrorism as a method of achieving political goals and settling political differences is intolerable to the civilized world. Terrorism maximizes the killing of the innocent. Terrorism glorifies the brutality of torture and murder. Terrorism knows no diplomats and rejects negotiations as a means of resolving differences.

In our world, weapons of mass destruction—chemical, biological, and nuclear—will be increasingly available to terrorist organizations espousing terrorism as a means of political action.

That is unprecedented. Never has a non-nation organization been able to deliver weapons of mass destruction. That is unprecedented, unacceptable and intolerable.

Yet terrorism as an organized system of political action has developed to new heights in the Middle East and it is there that it must be defeated.

Within the Palestinian Authority, for the first time, the issue of terrorism as a method of political action is now the issue between Mr. Abbas and the Prime Minister. Very specifically, they are debating not the legitimacy of a national army or diplomacy, but the legitimacy of political armies, factional armies and terrorist action—that is, violence, depersonalized by national interest or law.

And in Iraq, the same issue is being joined. The new Prime Minister recognizes that there can be no government if political organizations are to each have their own armies.

Iraqis had the courage to vote to adopt an interim government, to adopt a constitution, and to elect their first democratic government. The prime minister, as well as communities throughout Iraq, get it, that governing themselves is what they want, and they are in varying degrees.

We as a people know the power of freedom—of communism. Mr. Speaker, Churchill’s words still ring true today. From the Berlin Airlift to the rebuilding of Japan, from the DMZ in Korea to the mountains of Afghanistan, and now to the streets of Baghdad, the world has come to learn that America does not back down from its commitments.

Today we affirm our commitment not only to the Iraqi people but to the cause of liberty throughout the world.

Mr. SKELETON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. JOHNSON).

Ms. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, let us be clear. Terrorism, as a method of achieving political goals and settling political differences, is intolerable to the civilized world. Inevitably, terrorists will gain access to chemical, biological and even nuclear weapons. Never has a non-government organization been able to deliver weapons of mass destruction. That will be unprecedented, and it is truly intolerable. So terrorism, as an organized system of political action, must be defeated.

Within the Palestinian Authority, for the first time, the issue of terrorism as a method of political action is now the issue between Mr. Abbas and the Prime Minister. Very specifically, they are debating not the legitimacy of a national army or diplomacy, but the legitimacy of political armies, factional armies and terrorist action—that is, violence, depersonalized by national interest or law.

And in Iraq, the same issue is being joined. The new Prime Minister recognizes that there can be no government if political organizations are to each have their own armies.

Iraqis had the courage to vote to adopt an interim government, to adopt a constitution, and to elect their first democratic government. The prime minister, as well as communities throughout Iraq, get it, that governing themselves is what they want, and they are in varying degrees.

We as a people know the power of freedom under law. And our forces have distinguished themselves in Iraq, both as skilled military units and as model citizens respecting others and supporting and encouraging the local processes of governance.

I salute our troops and women of the U.S. military. They have won the war we had to win and are now training thousands of Iraqis and transferring authority to Iraqi units, to win the war only they can win.

Ultimately, Iraqi units will defeat terrorism as a method of political action and the people all over the world will triumph. Our impatience to leave is matched by their impatience to take the reins of their destiny.
honor and distinction, and we would be foolish not to heed their counsel. But this administration and this majority refuse to listen to any views other than their own.

I agree with many of my colleagues who say that the failure in Iraq is not an option. But unless we take a long, honest look at how we got where we are right now and demand some kind of accountability for the mistakes that were made and learn from those mistakes, there can be no success.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Lewis).

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for House Resolution 861.

Answering questions at a September 27 Pentagon press conference, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Richard Myers, said, “If we are not successful in the global war on terrorism, then our way of life is, indeed, at stake. My view is, if terrorism wins, then our way of life is, indeed, not successful in the global war on terrorism, and our people, our soldiers, our women in uniform have shouldered the enormous tasks we have asked of them; and they should be commended for it, especially considering the careless way this war was planned and conducted.

Our soldiers would never complain about the mistakes of their Commander in Chief. The military just does not work that way. We all know that. Without any second guessing, they will always do the jobs assigned to them.

But we are the Congress. It is our job to raise questions about how our troops are used and cared for. It is our job to identify and to look into mistakes that are made by the executive branch. It is our job to consider and learn from the lessons of Iraq. But what have we learned today? recycling words and we are not fixing problems.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, just does not cut it. Our soldiers are doing their jobs. They have earned and deserve a Congress that does its job.

Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS), who has been to Iraq four times, to Afghanistan twice, and I had the honor of traveling to both places with him as well.

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

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 861.

The debate we have today serves as an important reminder to all Americans that we are a nation at war. This war is against an enemy that embraces hate and intolerance over life and liberty. Like other wars in our history, the human and financial costs are high. We mourn the loss of each and every American who has made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our nation. All Americans are forever indebted to these courageous citizens and their families.

It is understandable that Americans worry for the safety of our troops and have doubts as reports of suicide bombings and other attacks air regularly on television. But, as in the war against fascism in the 20th century, and as demonstrated by the tragic attacks of 9-11, the stakes for our Nation and our democratic allies throughout the world could not be higher.

I have traveled to Afghanistan twice and Iraq four times over the past four and one-half years. During these visits, there have been two constants that have instilled confidence in me about our mission and progress in these countries.

First is the professionalism, courage, and sense of duty displayed by our men and women in uniform. Whenever you thank our soldiers, marines, sailors, and airmen for their service, they humbly reply, “I’m just doing my job.”

Their job, of course, is to protect our way of life. To protect the lives of our nation’s citizens and the principles for which our great nation stands.

Our troops have removed truly brutal regimes from power in Afghanistan and Iraq.
They have denied terrorists two safe havens. They have eliminated the threat that a murderous dictator who used weapons of mass destruction on his own people—a dictator who continued to defy United Nations resolutions and shoot at American planes enforcing the no-fly zones in northern and southern Iraq—would use these weapons against civilians. We were right to sanction and impose sanctions on Iraq, and we were right when international support for sanctions broke down.

Our men and women in uniform are building schools and roads, training police and soldiers, and hunting down terrorists. They are fighting for our freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq so we don’t have to fight them here at home. They are helping the Iraqi security forces stand up so we can stand down.

In place of the regimes of terror and torture in Iraq and Afghanistan, we now have duly elected constitutional governments. Governments that are working to promote democracy in a region of the world that has rarely embraced it. The citizens of these nations have demonstrated their intense desire for freedom through their willingness to face down threats of violence and death in casting their votes in the numerous national elections in both countries.

The devotion to duty of our men and women in uniform is truly inspiring. The sacrifices of these patriotic Americans on the front lines of the Global War on Terrorism, as well as the sacrifices of their family members on the home front, have earned the respect, admiration, and eternal gratitude of all Americans, as well as that of 50 million Afghani and Iraqi citizens who are free today because of the troops’ successes.

The consistent constant in my visits to Afghanistan and Iraq is the genuine gratefulness expressed by the Iraqi and Afghan people for our nation’s actions in liberating them and giving them a chance at freedom. Again and again, what I heard was simply: “Thank you for liberating our citizens.”

On my first visit to Iraq, I met with the Mayor of Kirkuk, Abdul Reham Mustafa, and other Kirkuk city leaders. Mayor Mustafa specifically asked my colleagues and me, upon our return home, to thank our nation’s mothers and fathers as well as the soldiers and their children, our troops, in going into harm’s way to defeat Saddam Hussein and thus liberate Iraq and its citizens. In the words of Dr. Kemal Kirkuki, one of Mayor Mustafa’s colleagues on the Kirkuk City Council, “This was not a war against Iraq. It was a war to liberate Iraq.”

On another trip, I met with a group of Iraqi women leaders, including Safia Taleb al-Suhail. This group of female government and private sector leaders exemplifies the transformation of their nation ruled by terror and torture to one in which men and women alike have constitutional rights and opportunities. Safia shared with me how her late father, an opponent of Saddam Hussein, was killed in 1994 while living in exile in Lebanon by Saddam’s intelligence service. Ten years later, Safia was named Iraq’s Ambassador to Egypt.

The general consensus of these Iraqi women leaders was that they couldn’t wait for the day when our and all Coalition troops could return home and Iraq did not need the military assistance of other nations. These Iraqi women leaders emphasized, however, how glad they were that our and the other Coalition troops were there ensuring the freedom of all Iraqis.

On my most recent trip to Iraq, I observed and met with Iraqi soldiers undergoing basic training. There are now over 260,000 Iraqis trained and equipped to fight the insurgency. Iraqis like those I met with at the East Fallujah training camp continue to stand in line and volunteer for service in Iraqi military and police units, which greatly makes them a likely target for the insurgents. The Iraqi soldiers I met expressed their deep thanks for what our troops have done in their country.

The Global War on Terrorism in the broad sense and the specific battles in Iraq and Afghanistan will not be won according to a specified timetable, and our enemy cannot be appeased. But we can and will win this war because our cause is just and right. And winning this war will ensure the democratic gains made in Afghanistan and Iraq are not lost. Winning this war will also have a far-reaching and critically important impact in other Middle East countries.

The security of our nation and its citizens, along with the defense of the ideals of freedom, democracy, and justice, is what is at stake in this global struggle of good over evil. This struggle requires us to go beyond Democrat and Republican, Liberal and Conservative—just as previous generations did to defeat the totalitarian ideologies of the 20th century. And, as Franklin D. Roosevelt at the beginning of the Second World War, it means going forward, “with confidence in our armed forces, with the unbounding determination of our people,” in order to “gain the inevitable triumph.”

May God bless the troops serving in harm’s way, and may God continue to bless our great nation—the United States of America.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I am deeply concerned that it is Congress’s responsibility to give our troops the resources needed to accomplish their mission. It is a responsibility that I take very seriously. It is precisely that support for the troops that motivates me to warn that we may be doing irreparable harm to our military if we do not alter our mission in Iraq quickly.

General Barry McCaffrey recently shared his frank assessment of operations in Iraq. He asked and knew by year’s end whether the new Iraqi Government can effectively control the insurgency. He has argued that we cannot sustain our current level of operations beyond Christmas without breaking our military and endangering our ability to fight future missions. In other words, we are quite possibly 6 months away from a point of no return that could have long-lasting effects on our military and the stability of the Middle East and on our ability to defend this Nation.

So what is our strategy to prevent the worst case scenario? Where is the oversight and accountability? Well, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you one thing. It is not in the resolution that we are debating today. The Republican leadership prefers to embrace the status quo and ignore the very difficult decisions this Congress needs to make.

We deserve better. Our men and women in uniform deserve better, and the American people deserve better.

Mrs. ROSS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this resolution declares to the world the resolve of America to fight and to win the global war on terror, including in its central front in Iraq.

We have heard a great deal during this debate about mistakes that may have been made in the lead up to the war and during its execution, and they may be somewhat correct. But the facts that cannot be debated are that Saddam Hussein had brutally repressed his own people, that he had used chemical weapons against his own people, that he had sanctioned the rape and murder of his own citizens with rape rooms and mass graves standing as a testament to that fact, that he had harbored terrorists within his borders and supported terrorist organizations throughout the region and the entire world, that he defied the world community by violating United Nations Security Council resolutions. Saddam Hussein was a threat to world peace and security, and it was a correct decision to go in and remove him from power.

And now we must complete the mission to bring freedom to the Iraqi people. And freedom is taking root. We have seen recently the completion of the freely elected Iraqi unity government serving under a Constitution written by the Iraqi people and approved by the Iraqi people. And last week American forces, with the cooperation of Iraqi citizens and security forces, eliminated al Zarqawi, the terrorist leader. And according to the Iraqi national security advisor, the elimination of Zarqawi has delivered his government, he said, a huge treasure of information on the terrorist operation. And we have already seen the results with raids across Iraq where hundreds of terrorists have been killed or captured. The Iraqi national security advisor also said that he thought the security situation in the country was improving enough to allow a large number of U.S. forces to leave Iraq by the end of this year.

Mr. Speaker, everyone in this House, every American, we all want our troops to come home. Lord knows our troops have performed brilliantly and have sacrificed greatly. But our leaders have done throughout our history when defending our freedom. But they do not want to come home before their mission is complete.

And simply put, you cannot say that you support the troops without allowing them to complete their mission.

This resolution declares the United States is committed to the completion
of that mission to create a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, in light of the comments made by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), I reflect on an article from The Washington Post. And it is sad and disturbing that on the very day that we announced and learned that 2,500 American troops have been killed in Iraq, that the prime minister, Maliki, proposes a limited amnesty, a plan likely to include pardons for those who had attacked only U.S. troops. That is very disturbing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have the privilege of working closely with our troops, the best fighting force the world has ever known.

And I am proud to support this resolution, because if people will just sit down and read it calmly, you will see that it expresses the strong support for our troops and for victory. Now, it is being used here today as some sort of political Rorschach test. I regret that, because the great leaders in American history have used our times of war to unite our country instead of divide our country.

Mr. Speaker, our troops are probably wondering why we are debating the Iraq war now 3 years after the beginning of that conflict. We should have had a good debate at the start of the war. I was not serving in Congress then. But it has gone down in history as one of the worst debates in American history.

There are many other flaws in the process. But today all Members of this body support our troops. All Members of this body support our troops. Democrat, Republican, Independent, you name it, we support our troops.

Now we should all question how the war is being run because that is our patriotic duty. I for one trust our military. I wish our Republican friends trusted our military before, because few times in American history has military wisdom been overridden as with this administration.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) who has been to Iraq four times to visit with our troops.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I spent many years in coaching. Every Monday morning after a Saturday game, I got lots of letters telling me what I had done. None of those letters helped me very much, because the game was over; hindsight was always perfect.

And the was not what we should have done, but rather, what do we do now.

And the same is true I think in regard to Iraq. We need to be proactive, not reactive. Like many Members of Congress, I have traveled to Iraq multiple times, and I met with the families of these soldiers. I met with a young captain from Nebraska. This is what he said. He said that if we pull out prematurely, if we do not see this thing through, three things are going to happen.

Number one, every soldier we have lost will have died in vain. I think what he says is true. I called a mother this morning whose son had just been killed. She was proud of her son. She was proud of the sense of mission he had. And I really hate to tell her that we are leaving, that he died in vain.

Number two, tens of thousands of Iraqis will die as the nation implodes. This is what he said. And there may be hundreds of thousands. We will have broken our promise. We told them we would not pull out until we were ready and they were ready. And we cannot break our promise.

And, third, we will put a huge bullseye on our backs, because as terrorists feel that terrorism works, and that we will retreat in the face of terrorism, only more terrorism will result.

We have seen many examples, Beirut, Kenya, USS Cole, World Trade Center bombing number one, and Bali. One of my All-American football players was killed in that bombing. Three hundred people lost their lives. And so inaction has led to only more terrorism, including 9/11.

The lack of resolve and willingness to see this through will only result in the spread of terrorism and greater loss of life than anything we have experienced so far.

Many of the soldiers I have met in Iraq are on their third and fourth tours of duty. They volunteered because they feel that terrorism works, and that we will retreat in the face of terrorism, only more terrorism will result.

The stakes are high. The Afghani people ultimately will get control of the security situation in that country. If we fail, our security situation gets worse. Theirs is awful. It is a huge threat to Israel. It is a threat to Europe, and a threat to the world. I encourage all of my colleagues to support the resolution, even though they may be disappointed in the process that has been offered us today, in the ‘‘whereas’’ clauses in the resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the previous speaker for the vote of confidence. I am sure that the troops are very happy with that support as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my good friend, my Florida colleague, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, who has been to both Iraq and Afghanistan and has spent Thanksgiving with our troops and our coalition forces.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is fighting bloodthirsty monsters like al Zarqawi, monsters that behead civilian hostages and that blow up innocent women and children.

And if many of our Democratic colleagues across the aisle have their way, we would already have cut and run from Iraq and Zarqawi would still be alive beheading innocent people.

Thankfully, our brave troops understood the kind of enemy that we are facing.

This is an enemy. Mr. Speaker, that kidnaps and beheads hostages. This is an enemy that walks into a mall full of innocent people and explodes bombs. This is an enemy that declared war on the United States decades ago, Mr. Speaker, and refuses to stop until liberty has been snuffed out.

But the United States cannot and will not allow that to happen. Hard work remains in Afghanistan and Iraq. The stakes are high. The Afghani people understand that. The Iraqi people understand this as well. So do the terrorists who murder on a daily basis.

But we are steadily working towards success, not defeat. Because, you see, there is more to our troops than helping people over here. This is about protecting our country from rogue states and terrorists over here.
This resolution, Mr. Speaker, makes it clear that the American people are determined to prevail in protecting our freedom from terrorism. We will not cower to these thugs. We will continue to support our honorable troops and prevail over this evil. Mr. Speaker, as we maintain our resolve, Mr. Speaker, and do not cut and run, we will win, we will defeat the terrorists.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, in response to pressure from both sides of the aisle, the Republican leadership promised a full debate on Iraq. What we are is certainly a long debate, but it is far from full.

A full debate would mean that Members would be able to offer alternatives to this resolution. We would then be able to debate the merits of all of the resolutions offered. I had hoped to offer a bipartisan version I had introduced with my colleague, J. SCHWARZ of Michigan, that recognizes political progress in Iraq, including the establishment of a national unity government, but also recognizes that more progress is needed and that the Iraqis must meet their own deadlines for modifications to their Constitution.

As it is, today’s debate has been tightly controlled, and our only choice is to vote up or down on a ‘status quo’ resolution that does not focus on Iraq and does not reflect reality on the ground. This resolution does not bring us together, Mr. Speaker. And I regret that this debate is driving us further apart.

We were led into war as a divided Nation, and today we are even more divided. A successful conclusion in Iraq is only possible if we all work to bring unity at home.

As we maintain our resolve, as we work to bring unity at home, Congress and the Bush administration must be held accountable. A successful conclusion in Iraq is only possible if we all work to bring unity at home.

This resolution talks about how much we honor our troops and the sacrifices they and their families have made to help defend freedom. No matter how much each Member chooses to vote today, there’s no question that we all honor and support our troops.

But I would argue that if we really cared for our troops, we would make sure they had the equipment and training they need. We wouldn’t force them to meet some future mission. No one wants a new mission for our troops, but if we had to fight somewhere else, we wouldn’t have the equipment or forces to do it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we should be debating in a resolution today, not the “feel good” messages included in the Republican resolution. We all want to feel good about Iraq and believe that progress is possible. But we can’t want progress so much that we blind ourselves to the reality on the ground.

This debate is driving us further apart.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman, my colleague from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), who has traveled multiple times to Iraq to meet with our forces.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in the days after 9/11, the United States took the last action that our enemies thought we would take, we took the fight to them. They believed that our bipartisan bickering would provide them with the protection they needed to continue to operate. But they were dead wrong.

Today, we have them on the run. Saddam Hussein has been captured, and Zarqawi is dead. In their place stands the very thing our enemies fear the most, democracy. Instead of a fascist dictator, a newly elected prime minister. And fear and oppression have been replaced with an emerging economy.

But our enemies continue to fight. Why is that? Does their resolve stem from some military, political, or strategic error on our part? No. To the contrary, it is our doubt that gives them strength. Al Qaeda has declared Iraq as the battleground between democracy and their hatred of our way of life.

But they know that their war cannot be won in Iraq. And I look forward to the day when our friends in the Middle East can stand on their own. They have already proven to be allies, and the future of our friendship still hangs in the balance.

Some would rather abandon our friends and everything we have accomplished, hoping this act of good faith would somehow appease a foe proven to be without mercy. But I know our borders and our communities should not be our front line, it is our job to keep our Nation safe, and we will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman from Missouri has 4 minutes left, and the gentlewoman from Florida has 8 minutes left.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, this administration speaks of patriotism, yet cuts health care for wounded soldiers by $300 million. It cuts our military budget, and then wraps itself in the flag, the same flag draping the coffins of our dead, numbering over 2,500 as of today.

Yet now there are revelations of $12 billion missing from the Treasury, shipped to Iraq in $100 bills and distributed in ways we may never learn, bringing a total of unaccounted funds from the Iraq Rebuilding Fund to $21 billion.

Yet the Bush administration has launched no investigation, has imposed no penalties on the corporations involved, The American people have been defrauded of our money, our morality, and the precious lives of our soldiers.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining in our segment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 8 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better person to close our segment of the International Relations Committee, and I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JONES), who served in the United States Air Force from 1951 to 1979, decorated combat veteran with two silver stars, and as all of us know is a living hero, a prisoner of war during the Vietnam War. We welcome him and we thank him for closing up our segment of the debate.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the question of the day is this, do you support the war against terrorism or don’t you? You know, our enemy brutally attacked the World Trade Center in 1993, and we did nothing. In 1998, they attacked two American embassies in East Africa killing 80 people. We did nothing. We were attacked again on USS Cole. We did nothing.

Well, now we have a strong President with courage and conviction who is bold enough to say enough is enough. If you are going to attack the United States, then we are going to fight back, and we will not tolerate terror.

If you know, I devoted 29 years of my life to the Air Force, flew 62 missions in the Korean War, 25 in Vietnam, and spent 7 years as a prisoner of war in Vietnam, more than half of that in solitary confinement. When I say I revere freedom, I mean that with my whole heart. I know what it is like not to have it. Every single day, since I left that God forsaken place, I thank God for my freedom.

Now the people here in America take the countless blessings of this Nation for granted. However, freedom is the touchstone of democracy, and America means business when we say we want to help people in Iraq experience the rich taste of freedom. When we say we are with you, our word is golden. It is through the lens of a lifelong fighter pilot that I step back today and marvel at some of the tremendous accomplishments of the last several years in the promising democracy of Iraq. It gives me hope and provides just a glimpse of how the best is yet to come.
Mr. Speaker, we are making great progress in Iraq, I have been there, and I have seen it. What a difference a few years makes. For generations, the people of Iraq only knew hate, fear and death. The former leader of Iraq gassed his own people by the thousands and hung people in his very own death chambers.

Remember just days ago looking at the image on the television of Zarqawi, the leader of al Qaeda in Iraq? He was cornered and killed. Better yet, from that image you could see the lives of those lost. We are hunting down terrorists, and they are going to pay.

According to the Associated Press, American and Iraqi forces have carried out 452 raids just since last week’s killing of al Zarqawi and 104 insurgents were killed during those raids. They also resulted in the capture of 759 anti-Iraqi elements. As a result, we discovered a treasure trove of al Zarqawi’s information, almost ensuring a defeat against arms of al Qaeda in Iraq. We are already tasting the fruits of this new democracy and planting the tree of freedom in tyrant’s backyard. Our men and women in Iraq deserve more, and our majority in this House.

Americans are training and working with Iraqi forces nationwide. There is over 260,000 Iraqi security forces serving their country. Another exciting facet of the development in Iraq is the budding democracy. Remember last January we saw the pictures from the first election? The news media predicted gloom and doom. What did we see? We saw bold images of people patiently waiting in lines for hours, defying death threats just to cast a vote.

Today, people are working tirelessly to guarantee their freedoms. Participation in many Sunni areas of Iraq went from as little as 25 percent in January 2005 election to 75 percent in December. That is tremendous. Wouldn’t we like that here in the United States?

The people of Iraq have created a framework for their own future, their very own constitution. They have announced unity government, and the people of Iraq refused to allow those who rule by hate and fear to stop them from forging ahead for the future. They are already tasting the fruits of our freedom. Their strong resolve will pay off in the long run. They know what a difference several years of budding democracy makes. This is what democracy looks like in Iraq today.

Schools and hospitals have been renovated, over 3,700 schools. In May, oil production was 2.1 million barrels a day. In 2003, barely anyone had a cell phone. In Iraq today there are 6.4 million telephone users, and 1 million land-line connections. There are over 100 privately owned newspapers and magazines and more than two dozen radio and television stations. That is just the beginning.

Our men and women in uniform are doing a tremendous job bolstering this new democracy and planting the tree of freedom in tyranny’s backyard. Our men and women are making a difference, and making progress. They are lifting up the people of Iraq, so ultimately the people of Iraq can help themselves. We must stay the course and see this through. We must be patient and persevere. I think President Bush said it best, quote, this is going to be freedom’s century.

God bless you. God bless America. I salute you, one and all and praise the people of Iraq.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes at this time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

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

Mr. SCHIFF. With all due respect to my colleagues in the majority, Mr. Speaker, I think the question posed by this resolution is whether you support accountability and oversight by this body of the war in Iraq or whether you do not. This resolution is not a substitute for oversight and accountability.

Our brave men and women in Iraq deserve more than this rhetorical pom-pom. Even as we celebrate the killing of Abu Musab al Zarqawi and the completion of the Iraqi cabinet, we cannot turn away from the grim reality that the war President Bush declared over in the spring of 2003 has resulted in 3,500 American deaths and over 50,000 more than the administration anticipated or planned for.

We need a new way forward in Iraq, a fact that seems glaringly obvious to everybody but the President, his advisers and the majority in this House.

Last fall the Senate voted 79-19 for a resolution sponsored by Senator JOHN WARNER, the Republican chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which stated that 2006 “should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with full Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq.”

Earlier this year, House and Senate Democrats unveiled our “Real Security” agenda that charted a new way out of Iraq. Our plan calls for the establishment of full Iraqi sovereignty during 2006, provides for responsible redeployment of our forces to better protect our troops and facilitates the transfer of authority, and holds the Administration accountable for the terrible mistakes that have been made in the prosecution of the war and the reconstruction of Iraq. In response to our plan and the overwhelming bipartisan majority of our colleagues in the Senate, the Republican majority in the House has prepared and rubber-stamped a resolution that once again permits the President’s “stay the course” policy in Iraq—a policy that he has reiterated in recent days.

At a time when Congress needs to inject itself—forcefully—into the process of determining what our country should be, the Republican majority is again prepared to rubber-stamp a policy that national security experts across the political spectrum recognize as plagued with misjudgment and malfeasance.

I have spent three times to visit with our troops there and I have spent time with our wounded here and in Germany. They have done everything that we have asked of them and they have done it magnificently. Whatever success we have had in Iraq—every village that is secured, every public works project that is completed, every school that is reopened— is due to the efforts of our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines.

We owe our men and women serving in Iraq more than this rhetorical pom-pom.

General Newbold has nothing to hold the administration accountable for its conduct of the war. Last week I had the pleasure of meeting Lieutenant General Greg Newbold, the former commander of the 1st Marine Division. General Newbold is one of a growing number of general officers who have courageously voiced their concerns about Iraq. General Newbold told me what he told Time Magazine in April when he said, “What we are living with now [in Iraq] is the consequence of successive policy failures.”

I believe any other variable under the control of Congress, our failure to perform oversight has been a major contributing factor to these failures and to the difficult situation we find ourselves in.

Regrettably, I must vote “no” on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, even as we celebrate the killing of Abu Musab al Zarqawi and the completion of the new Iraqi cabinet we cannot turn away from the grim reality that the war President Bush declared over in the spring of 2003 has been brutal, costly, longer and more difficult than the Administration anticipated or planned for.

We need a new way forward in Iraq—a fact that seems glaringly obvious to everybody but the President, his advisors and the majority in this House. Last fall the Senate voted 79-19 for a resolution sponsored by JOHN WARNER, the Republican Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which stated that 2006 “should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with Iraq security forces taking the lead for a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq.”

Earlier this year, House and Senate Democrats unveiled our “Real Security” agenda that charted a new way out of Iraq. Our plan calls for the establishment of full Iraqi sovereignty during 2006, provides for responsible redeployment of our forces to better protect our troops and facilitates the transfer of authority, and holds the Administration accountable for the terrible mistakes that have been made in the prosecution of the war and the reconstruction of Iraq. In response to our plan and the overwhelming bipartisan majority of our colleagues in the Senate, the Republican majority in the House has prepared and rubber-stamped a resolution that once again permits the President’s “stay the course” policy in Iraq—a policy that he has reiterated in recent days.

At a time when Congress needs to inject itself—forcefully—into the process of determining what our country should be, the Republican majority is again prepared to rubber-stamp a policy that national security experts across the political spectrum recognize as plagued with misjudgment and malfeasance.

I have spent three times to visit with our troops there and I have spent time with our wounded here and in Germany. They have done everything that we have asked of them and they have done it magnificently. Whatever success we have had in Iraq—every village that is secured, every public works project that is completed, every school that is reopened—is due to the efforts of our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines.

We owe our men and women serving in Iraq more than this rhetorical pom-pom.

General Newbold has nothing to hold the administration accountable for its conduct of the war. Last week I had the pleasure of meeting Lieutenant General Greg Newbold, the former commander of the 1st Marine Division. General Newbold is one of a growing number of general officers who have courageously voiced their concerns about Iraq. General Newbold told me what he told Time Magazine in April when he said, “What we are living with now [in Iraq] is the consequence of successive policy failures.”

I believe any other variable under the control of Congress, our failure to perform oversight has been a major contributing factor to these failures and to the difficult situation in which we now find ourselves.

That failure of oversight and the need to hold people accountable has plagued the Iraq war from the beginning. And because this Congress—this Republican-controlled Congress—refuses to hold the President to account, we keep making the same mistakes over and over.

For years the administration and the majority have tried to cow into silence anybody who dared to question the conduct of the war by caling them unpatriotic. That’s the subtext of the resolution that we are debating today. It is
not disloyal to ask these questions; oversight is a core responsibility of Congress. The great strength of a democratic system with built-in checks and balances is that mistakes are caught and corrected.

Every member of this House, Republicans and Democrats, wants a stable and representative government. But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot hope to change course in Iraq until and unless we are willing to acknowledge mistakes and until the administration is held to account and forced to change.

Developing and implementing a successful endgame in Iraq will be difficult, but the President's open-ended commitment to remain in the country is untenable and unwise. The American people want Iraq to succeed, and for representative government there to survive and lead to a better future for the Iraqi people, but that success requires a new direction. This empty resolution fails to provide that and, accordingly, I will oppose it.

Mr. SKELTON. Can the Chair advise the time I have left, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying how proud I am of those young men and women in uniform. I know every Member in this body joins me in saying how pleased and proud we are of them.

A sad moment earlier today was when it was announced that 2,500 had given their lives in Iraq. But what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, more than anything is the request that we made for a discussion of the resolution on the House floor, and that the request that we made for a substitute resolution was denied. That amendment stayed in the law unless we are willing to acknowledge mistakes and until the administration is held to account and forced to change.

Strength of a democratic system with built-in oversight is undermining the democratic process and the very principles that these brave servicemen and women have gone abroad to defend.

Mr. Speaker, our country is at war. Men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces, Republicans and Democrats, are making the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq to defend the freedom of 2,500 plus troops who are in Iraq right now.

Mr. Speaker, I was thinking about this question of who should determine when we leave Iraq. Over the last week, we have talked about the bringing to justice of Mr. Zarqawi, and everyone. Democrats and Republicans, have been talking about the extreme competence of the American military.

We have talked about the fact that they are extremely effective, that they know what they are doing, that they may be the best military we have had in decades, that we have great leadership. That is why their judgment on the ground as they stand up and train this Iraqi force is absolutely determinative of when that Iraqi military is able to carry that load and take that handoff from the American military and handle those security duties themselves. It shouldn't be a Congressman from California. It shouldn't be a Senator from Minnesota. It shouldn't be a Democrat from New York. It shouldn't be subject to a committee vote by those of us in Washington, D.C. It should be a function of the collaboration and the discussion and the analysis of the combat commanders on the ground listening to their captains and their majors and their colonels who are training up this Iraqi force. When they say they are ready, that is when we make that handoff.

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

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for 30 seconds.

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, instead of finding, capturing or killing the man who viciously attacked our country almost 5 years ago, the administration misled our country and sent 150,000 troops to war with a country without any credible link to 9/11.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us mentions Iraq 18 times, but it does not mention Osama bin Laden even once. Not even once. Not even the hunt for bin Laden in Afghanistan, we cannot find him in this resolution.

If the other side of the aisle is serious about a resolution on the global war on terror, they would be better served to get their target correct.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and ask unanimous consent that he control the time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our country is at war. Men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces, Republicans and Democrats, are making the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq to defend the freedom of 2,500 plus troops who are in Iraq right now.

I am deeply disturbed by critical issues concerning our efforts in Iraq that this resolution does not address: the facts from the President's hand-picked special Inspector General, Mr. Stuart Bowen, are shocking. Billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars have been wasted in Iraq and leave the country unsecured. Our men and women in uniform are striving, sometimes without the necessary troop strength and without adequate equipment to make the effort in Iraq a success. Here the House majority is undermining the democratic process and the very principles that these brave servicemen and women have gone abroad to defend.
Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLELY).

MR. HUFLELY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, we have been at this for about 6 hours, I guess, and I think everything that has been said on the subject has been said. Not everybody has said it, and so we will continue for another 6 hours on it.

But I have met many people today who seem to have used this as an opportunity to insist that the mission in Iraq has been a failure, and that our presence in Iraq has not been properly run, and that we are not winning the peace. Frankly, I think this is absolutely a wrong assertion and only serves to lower the morale of the men and women fighting in Iraq, while encouraging the terrorists who aim to harm both America and Iraq.

Rather than taking up legislation that will merely wile away the hours in a debating society, we need to be responsive to the concerns of the American people, who seem to have used this as an opportunity to insist that the mission in Iraq has been a failure, and that our presence in Iraq has not been properly run, and that we are not winning the peace. Frankly, I think this is absolutely a wrong assertion and only serves to lower the morale of the men and women fighting in Iraq, while encouraging the terrorists who aim to harm both America and Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, let nobody, not in this Chamber and not in this country, let nobody be fooled by the picture that the Republican leadership tries to paint with a debate over this resolution. There is no need to make a choice between “cut and run” and “stay the course.” What is called for is a long overdue course correction in the way the executive branch manages our country’s efforts in Iraq and in the way Congress fulfills its critical constitutional role of oversight.

Since I deeply favor a course correction, I will vote against this resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. Speaker, what we are engaged in here in the U.S.A. is a war, a war that is fought across Asia and Europe, in many countries in Africa, and we know of the terrorist presence today in Canada and right here in the U.S.A.

I have spent a career, Mr. Speaker, in Congress studying the threat posed by terrorism. Long before September 11, I came to learn the dangers of ideologically inspired terrorist organizations. As a result of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, we have made great strides in combating this enemy, but we must remember that this is a long war, and although the challenge is great, our commitment to security and human freedom will ultimately defeat the oppressive ideology that fuels our terrorist enemies.

Let me just close by listing some terrorist acts which occurred and some plots which were uncovered, and then by simply asking my colleagues a question.

In 1993, the first World Trade Center bombing occurred. In 1995, a plot to bomb 11 U.S. airlines was uncovered. In 1996, the Khobar Towers bombing took place. In 1998, the embassies in Tanzania and Kenya were hit. In 2000, the USS Cole. In 2001, the 9/11 attack, killing 3,000 Americans and others. In 2002, the Bali bombing. In 2003, the Marriott hotel attack in Jakarta. In 2004, the railroad bombing in Spain. In 2005, the subway bombings in London, and the bombings of the resorts in Egypt. And in 2006, 17 jihadists were arrested in Canada.

The question to those who plan to vote against this resolution, and I will conclude with this: Can we really afford to belittle this threat and question the criticality of our mission in Iraq?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia on the Democratic side, Mr. ACKERMAN of New York.

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of our troops in the field and the belief that the United States will ultimately prevail in the global war on terror and against this partisan, transparent, cynical, and divisive resolution.

Mr. Speaker, what we are engaged in today is not a serious debate about the progress of the war in Iraq or alternatives to achieve the victory there that we all seek. If it were not a sham, Members would be able to offer amendments. We would be able to vote up and down on our future course in Iraq. What we have here, instead, is more unanswerable Republican take-it-or-leave-it attitude.

Mr. Speaker, our soldiers are fighting and dying, and the American people are spending hundreds of billions of dollars, and we are here patting ourselves on the back while providing effective oversight. This Republican Congress has abdicated that responsibility and continues to whitewash an incompetent, dysfunctional Republican administration.

I would like to be clear, Mr. Speaker. Just because I am for oversight doesn’t mean that I hate freedom. Just because I am for tracking how billions of dollars have been wasted and misspent or stolen doesn’t mean I don’t support our troops. And to be quite frank, republication the competence of the President and his administration doesn’t mean that they are not patriots.

On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I don’t think you can be a patriot if you just turn a blind eye and bury your head in the sand as war profiteers run off with the money needed to protect the troops and to reconstruct a broken country.

Instead of discussing the difficult and costly work necessary to achieve that victory, our Republican friends have simply decided to move directly to this victory party and 10 hours of cheerleading. This resolution begins and ends declaring our ultimate victory against terrorists, and in between we sing our own praises. This is actually a prayer. Prayer is good. But what we need is a plan. All we are doing here is whistling past a growing graveyard.

What is more notable about the resolution, Mr. Speaker, is what it doesn’t say. There is no mention of the world class bait-and-switch lie that got us into this mess in the first place. No mention of the lie of the stockpiles of weapons that the Vice President swore existed. No mention of the lie of the stockpiles of weapons that the Vice President swore which does not enslave its own people.

Mr. Hunter. Mr. Speaker, the reenlistment rate for the soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division, the 4th Infantry Division, the 1st Marine Division, and the 10th Mountain Division exceeds 130 percent in this last quarter. And a lot of that is the result of the great work by the gentleman of New York (Mr. McHugh), who has been the chairman of the Total Force and the Personnel Subcommittee and has presided over a major part of the 41 percent pay increase that we have passed over the last several years.

I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHugh).

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to think this is a good debate, even when I vigorously disagree with some of the statements being said. This is the hall where discussions, concerns, where analysis and counterpoints need to be expressed.

The entire world is watching to see if we start, if I may, Mr. Speaker, with a couple of counterpoints. I have heard my good friends on the other side of the aisle repeatedly refer today to comments and observations made by clearly one of the greatest fighting generals this Nation has known in recent era, General Barry McCaffrey; things he has said about our current involvement and engagement in Iraq. Perhaps as a mere oversight, perhaps conveniently, those good folks omitted the following, and I am quoting directly. I noticed most of those folks quoted from their own notes.

These are from General McCaffrey’s own reports after his return, in this case to Iraq. He did similar analysis in Afghanistan. Under the bottom line observations from Iraqi Freedom, written in April of 2006, before Zarqawi, before the appointment and the filling out of the permanent government, “The morale, fighting effectiveness, and confidence of U.S. combat forces continue to be simply awe inspiring.” In every sensing session and interaction, I probed for weakness and found courage, both in the mission and the mission. Enormous confidence in their sergeants and company-grade commanders, and understanding of the larger mission, a commitment to creating an effective Iraqi army and police, unabashed patriotism, and even a sense of humor.”

He goes on to say, “Many have reenlisted to stay with their unit on its return to a second Iraq deployment. Many planned to do so regardless of how long the war went on.”

He then went on to observe, “The Iraqi army is real, is growing, and is willing to fight.”

And then on the last page of his analysis, Mr. Speaker, he said, and I quote, “There is no reason why the United States cannot achieve our objectives in Iraq. Our aim must be to create a viable federal state under the rule of law which does not enslave its own people, threatens its neighbors, or produce weapons of mass destruction.”

The last sentence of General McCaffrey that my friends also failed to
quote: “The American people are far safer today than we were in the 18 months following the initial intervention.”

I think, in fairness to General McCaffrey, if we are going to quote from him we should quote the entirety. I heard also some comments about how we are not doing right by our forces in very recent debate. I would refer again to General McCaffrey’s observation. I have here a list of five pages, bullet points of what this committee and this House and this Congress has done for our men and women in uniform in just the last four National Defense Authorization Acts. There are 51 points, and I won’t read all of them, but let me account for some.

In 2001, we provided $500 a month to assist the most economically challenged members, to take them off food stamps, and we did it. We did it. This Congress.

In 2002, we improved permanent change of station requirements to reduce out-of-cost moving expenses for military families. There is now no out-of-cost expense.

In 2003, we gave them assignment incentive pay, and in 2006 increased that maximum from $1,500 to $3,000 a month. We increased hostile fire and immediacy pay from $150 to $225 a month. Family separation allowance from $100 to $250 a month. We completed, as I said, that 5-year program to eliminate out-of-cost housing expenses.

We have eliminated the requirement to pay subsistence charges for those brave members of the military who are hospitalized. We now pay an allowance to reimburse for the cost of life insurance. And in the bill we passed this year, that cost will be totally paid for by the Federal Government for the first time in our Nation’s history. We authorized a new payment of $430 a month to combat wounded service members who are hospitalized, and on and on.

The chairman mentioned that in each of the last 8 years we have increased pay to our military men and women in uniform by more than half a percent over what the civilian sector in this country has received, whether it is TRICARE for every Guard and Reserve member; hospitalization, better coverage. We have cared for these troops.

The chairman noted, and the figures show, though I have heard about a strained force, and we are concerned about them. We worry about them every day. I know I have in my six trips to Iraq and twice to Afghanistan. But let me read you the recruitment figures for this very important year.

The Army, 104.3 percent of goal. The Navy, 100 percent of goal. The Marines, 101.5 percent. The Air Force, 100.5 percent. A DOD total of 102.1 percent. Lastly, retention. The brave members that General McCaffrey talked about. Retention in the Army, 113 percent; Navy, 106 percent; Marines, 145 percent; and Air Force, 109 percent.

My friends on the other side say they support the troops, and I believe them. They are all patriots, some extraordinary patriots on the other side that I have the honor of serving with. But I don’t think they are serving the troops in the long run. The reality is, they don’t see the commitment they have made there and win this war on terror in Iraq, where will we fight next? It will be right here at home.

It is a proud Army, we have a proud Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. We are doing right by them and we need to do better because they are doing so right by us. I hope all my colleagues will support this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes of my friend from Ohio (Mr. BROWN). Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. LANTOS and Mr. MURTHA.

Prior to the invasion, I introduced legislation that would have required the President to report to Congress on the possible consequences. It would have required the administration to provide a full accounting of the implications for homeland security, the war on terrorism, and regional stability in the Middle East. It would have required the administration to tell us the steps that our country and our allies would take to protect United States soldiers providing them adequate body armor. It would have required the President to estimate the full cost associated with military action against Iraq. And it would have required the President to provide an exit strategy, a plan for achieving long-term social, economic, and political stabilization of a postwar Iraq so that we and the troops could tell when we had crossed the finish line.

The administration has still not provided assurances many of us asked before the war. Three years later, the Iraq war has cost more than 2,500 American lives and nearly $300 billion, with no end and no plan in sight. Secretary Condoleezza Rice said this war could last into 10 more years.

Today’s resolution presents a false choice: Support the administration’s flawed war policies or concede defeat on the war on terror. We are asked to support the President including Mr. Rumsfeld in the amnesty, the amnesty he will offer to the insurgents who have attacked and killed U.S. troops.

Our troops have done everything, everything we have asked them to do in the last 3 years. They have acted heroically. They have done their job and we should honor them today and every day. But this is the second time that a congressional debate on the handling of the war has been replaced with a political stunt. The troops and the American people deserve much better.

Our troops deserve more than a round of applause. They deserve a realistic and forward-thinking plan. They deserve a plan that will bring a successful end to this mission so that they can come home. They deserve what many of us asked the President to give us 3 years ago: An exit strategy for Iraq. An exit strategy in Iraq is a crucial step toward bringing victory on the global war on terror.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker. I yield myself 1 minute to clear up a point.

There are 340,000 sets of advanced body armor produced and fielded. That is more than two sets for every single person serving in uniform in Iraq.

I have made this statement for the last year, but if anybody has a relative who is serving in Iraq without body armor, please call me personally. I have not yet received a single phone call.

Mr. Speaker. I yield ½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE) who does so much for the troops.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker. We can’t talk about the global war on terror without talking about the 922,000 heroes who have volunteered on behalf of our Nation, going to a land that must have never been to, to liberate a people most have never met.

Before 9/11, I worried if America needed our young people, would they go. And we all know that our history will remember their courage and name them. But until it does, I call them Freedom Believers.

On my first trip to Iraq, I met a young man on the crew of our C-130. He told me he had a small daughter, yet defending freedom was so important that when he finished his enlistment, he would join his Reserve unit. He said there were so many from that unit who volunteered to go to Iraq; he knew he would not be back soon.

Another soldier said to me: Let me make this simple. In a football game, you want to play at home. But this is not football. This is not a game. This is war. And war must always be played fairly, if we are going to quote from him right here at home. Many that I met were on their second and third tours. Their feelings are summed up in a recent letter to the editor, a returning soldier said: “If the choices are pull out or I go back, I’m going back.”

On the way home from Iraq in Shannon, Ireland, as a Marine unit walked through that terminal, the servicemen stood and clapped for them. On both of my trips to Iraq, I was asked repeatedly by our troops: When are we going to tell America what they are doing in Iraq, explain the threat to America and the world, and share the successes that we have achieved? The saddest moments were when they quietly asked me: What are Americans thinking and saying?
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These are people who show no fear on the battlefield, but it was like they were afraid to ask that question and hear my reply. They are probably referring to stories such as the one from the New York Times, October 26, 2005. They quoted Corporal Jeffrey Starr, who lost his life last year in Iraq. Here is his quote: “I kind of predicted this. A third time just seemed like I’m pushing my luck.”

And here’s the real quote: “Obviously if you are reading this, then I have died in Iraq. I kind of predicted this, that’s why I am writing this in November. A third time just seemed like I’m pushing my chances. I don’t regret going. Everybody dies, but few get to do it for something as important as freedom. It may seem confusing why we are here in Iraq. It’s not to me. I’m here helping these people so they can live the way we live, not to worry about tyrants or vicious dictators, to do what they want to do with their lives. To me, that is why this has died for my freedom, now this is my mark.”

Our military is the most lethal fighting force in the world, not solely because of their training, not solely because of their technology, but because they are good. Others have done so with the most unequivocal support of the American people. That is the most effective tool in their arsenal and one they cannot afford to lose.

Mr. Speaker, they watch our news. They watch CNN. They are watching us right now.

This is your time. What do you want to say to them? Do you want to tell them, you’re doing a terrible thing, but we support you?

Well, I want to say: you’re doing an honorable and noble thing. We support you and we love you.

There is only one option for Iraq, that’s victory. Thank you to our brave American heroes. Thank you to their families. God bless America, and God bless the men and women who keep us free.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

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

Mr. Speaker, I believe in fighting the war on terror. I believe America must stay engaged in the world, but what we have is a quadratic outcome. What we have on the floor today is a resolution that essentially says stay the course.

You know, sometimes the American people are smarter than the politicians. This resolution would have us believe that everything is hunky-dory in Iraq and everything would be wonderful if we only stayed the course. The American people don’t believe that; and, Mr. Speaker, neither do I any more.

We need a new strategy in Iraq, not an open-ended rubber stamp and more of the same. At what point do we reassess our strategy and come to the conclusion that it is not working? But what do we get here from our Republicans, a resolution that is a farce, a political document that by the majority leader’s own admission was designed to embarrass Democrats and put Democrats in a box.

All of the problems we see in Iraq today, the daily deadly attacks by insurgents, the rise of ethnic militias, the shortage of gas and electricity, the weakness of the economy, can be tied to the complete lack of planning by the administration. These were not tactical mistakes; these were strategic mistakes, mistakes of policy made back here.

But what do we have here from our Republican friends? A resolution that is not bipartisan. We could have had a resolution that we could have supported. We treasure our troops. We fired the Baath leaders and created all kinds of antagonisms and unemployed people. We fired the security forces so our people would have to do security, and we fired the front line generals that disagreed with the administration.

A former commander of U.S. Central Command, General Zinni, said: “10 years’ worth of planning were thrown away; troop levels were dissolved out of hand; these were not tactical mistakes; these were strategic mistakes, mistakes of policy made back here.”

But what do we have here from our Republican friends? A resolution that is not bipartisan. We could have had a resolution that we could have supported. We treasure our troops. I want us to succeed in Iraq, but what do we have: partisan, political drivel. Democrats had no input. Democrats want us to succeed in Iraq, but what do we get here from our Republican friends? A resolution that it is not working? But not so long ago, al Zargawi himself said of America’s leaders: “They are aware that if the Islamic giant wakes up, it will not be satisfied with less than the gates of Rome, Washington, Paris and London.”

Mr. Speaker, we cannot deny that we are fighting a war against an ideology that is bent on the destruction of the Western world. They are committed to killing us and would like nothing better than to decapitate this country by detonating a nuclear yield weapon 100 miles from here. They know Islamist extremists to declare victory in Iraq will only hasten such a day.

These are moments when we must hear the voice of history and remember the words of Winston Churchill when he began his part. “If you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly, there may come a moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival. There may even come a worse moment when your victory will be sure and not too costly, there may come a moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival. There may even come a worse moment when your victory will be sure and not too costly, there may come a moment when you will have to fight when there is no hope of victory because it is still better to perish than to live as slaves.”

Mr. Speaker, if freedom is to survive, to allow Islamist terrorists to declare victory in Iraq is not an option. We must win. The world has changed since Mr. Churchill warned us all. We are 60 years now into a nuclear age. We must not let terrorists have even the slightest hope of victory ever.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), a great member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution that we are debating, I would like to focus on point four of the resolution that the United States is committed to the completion of the mission to create a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq.

I think it is helpful for us to look back at some milestones over the last year so to help us understand how far we have actually come.

We went there to take Saddam Hussein out of power. He is now in jail and on trial for his life. We got that done.

In January of 2005 we held the first elections for a transitional government. That got done.

Their job was to write a Constitution. At each and every one of these
steps there was great anxiety that the Iraqi people couldn't get it done. They got their Constitution written in August of 2005.

The next step was a referendum on that Constitution. They got that done. Then the national elections was under that Constitution in December of 2005. Again, ahead of that election there was grave concern that the Iraqis couldn't do it. But they went to the polls and elected that government.

When I was there in April, the concern at that point in time was that they couldn't pick a prime minister, the next big step to the road to democracy in Iraq. That got done.

Two weeks ago when I was there, the final point was they couldn't find a minister of defense or a minister of interior to lead those very important ministries, but they have gotten that done.

By any evaluation, we have a long stretch of historic milestones that are proof that the Iraqi people are up to the task.

A CODEL I participated in, our job was to go over there and get a sense of whether the Iraqi Army was standing up to the task. We met with a General Bashir at his base at Tajik and found a very professional individual. He was very candid in his remarks on where the Iraqi Army was up to that point in time. As I watched the staffers, his staff in the room, I tried to assess them as best I could. I found professionals with a quiet sense of confidence that they could lead, fight and defend their country.

We are making this happen, and we are completing this mission in Iraq. I support this resolution and I ask that each of my colleagues all support it because a free, sovereign, united Iraq will make the Middle East a safer place to be, and by extension it will make America a safer place to be.

So I rise in support of this resolution and ask you to vote for it. I, too, like Mrs. Drake ask God's blessings on our country and in particular on our fine young men and women who are fighting this fight.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, Colin Powell thought Vice President CHENEY was so obsessed with attacking Iraq that he suffered from war fever. The problem is that fever can make you delusional and you can see things that aren't there, no matter how much you want them to be true.

The Vice President said that we would be greeted as liberators. False. Secretary Rumsfeld said that the war would not last more than 6 weeks. False. Secretary Wolfowitz said that Iraq would pay for its own reconstruction from oil revenues. Again, false. We were told that the administration had a coherent plan for postwar Iraq. False.

The truth is that the administration's incompetence has set back the effort against global terrorism. Don't take my word for it. Simply come to this floor and read the statements of these generals, patriots all.

The administration claimed that there was a link between Iraq and al Qaeda. Again, false. But they are not talking about a link that does exist and should cause us all profound concern. That is the relationship between off the wall zealots and Iran. That is the threat.

The new Iraqi government is full of Iraqi allies. They have signed a military cooperation agreement. And the Iraqi Foreign Minister just recently said, Iran has a right to develop nuclear technology and the international community should drop its demands that Iran should prove that it is not trying to build a nuclear weapon.

And we are supposed to believe that our national security has been strengthened, and that we are making progress on the war on terrorism?

The truth is that the war in Iraq has not just simply been a distraction from the global war on terror, it has actually increased the influence of the number one state sponsor of terrorism, according to our own Department of State, an original charter member of the axis of evil club, the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), a very fine member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to first rise tonight to thank the men and women of our military for their efforts in Iraq, in Afghanistan and other places around the world in the war on terror. Their sacrifice, their families' sacrifice, has value and will never, never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, there are many members of the minority that have forgotten an important lesson of history, and that is that you cannot appease tyrants and evil. Wellington in the 1810s said, the voice of Winston Churchill that said we must confront Hitler and the Nazis as they began to build up the German military machine. Well, we waited and we waited until they invaded their neighbors. And it was the blood and lives of hundreds of thousands of Europeans and Americans that defeated that evil.

In the 1960s and the 1970s, we failed to confront the growing Soviet threat. We waited and we waited until Ronald Reagan inspired this Nation to have the will to stand up to the Soviets and engage them in an arms buildup that cost Americans billions of dollars, but bankrupted the Soviets, and we defeated that evil.

In the 1990s the terrorists attacked us over and over again. We failed to respond, as President Clinton dismantled our intelligence capabilities. Appar- usment does not work. History shows us that over and over again.

President Bush learned this lesson, and he and this Congress did not wait until Saddam had nuclear weapons. We acted on intelligence, not just our intelligence, but intelligence from agencies around the world. We thought it was accurate. Unfortunately, it was wrong. But it took us going into Iraq Bankrupted the Iraqis to create liberty, justice and, most importantly, hope for a better tomorrow for millions of Arabs.

We must stay the course, as this resolution does.

And we are supposed to believe that the Iraqi people are up to the task.

The struggle will be as long as it is hard. But in the end, the lesson of history will be reaffirmed that appeasement is a failed strategy, and that sacrifice for freedom is always worth it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Florida (Mr. WEXLER).

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution because it represents an unrealistic and disingenuous portrayal of the situation in Iraq. The rhetoric on the other side of the aisle is filled with erroneous assertions of impending victory reminiscent of President Bush's "premature" claim.

Mr. Speaker, after 3½ years, it is clear that the Iraq war has become an exercise in futility that can no longer be justified with pipe dreams and good intentions. Americans were egregiously misled going into this war without a clear strategy and vision for victory. False.

But in the end, the lesson of history will be reaffirmed that appeasement is a failed strategy, and that sacrifice for freedom is always worth it.
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Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 861. I am proud of the progress being made in the global war on terror every day. While there is no quick path to victory, it is absolutely necessary for us to maintain our resolve. Many people forget that terrorists have long waged war against the United States, well before the 9/11 attacks. Americans were born in Lebanon in 1983, at the World Trade Center in 1993, at Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia in 1996, at the American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998, and on board the USS Cole in 2000. Over the years, terrorists have made it their mission to strip us of our freedoms, thinking they could kill innocent Americans unprovoked, without paying a price. It is vital that we continue to stand up to these murderers and show them that the United States will not sit back and tolerate their savage acts. We can either win this global war on terror now, or we can let the terrorists bring the war to us like they did on 9/11. The right choice is clear.

Today our military has liberated the people of Afghanistan from the brutal Taliban regime, and has denuded al Qaeda its safe haven of operations. They have crushed Saddam Hussein's brutal dictatorship and captured thousands of terrorists and terrorist operations. Children in Iraq are returning to school and Iraqi businesses are prospering. Iraq has had several successful elections and has formed its government under a new prime minister. There is undeniable progress and hope for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I close with a story about a constituent, Sergeant Dale Beatty of Statesville, North Carolina. Sergeant Beatty was severely injured while fighting the global war on terror and lost both legs. Yet Sergeant Beatty is not angry. In fact, his resolve is even stronger today. He knows that he made a great sacrifice for a noble cause. Sergeant Beatty came to visit me while he was at Walter Reed and told me he would gladly go back to the Middle East to fight alongside his comrades if he could. That is a true American hero. Sergeant Beatty's morals and the morale of our troops I have spoken with demonstrate we are doing the right thing.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), a very fine member of the committee.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, thank you for yielding time. Your commitment to our troops is unmatched.

Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Mr. Speaker, said we are all entitled to our own opinions, but he went on to say we are not entitled to our own facts.

Facts have been badly set aside today. Oversights? 92 hearings, 42 full committee, 52 subcommittee and others. Anyone that did not have oversight or was not fully informed simply had other priorities. And that is an option in the People’s House. But the information was there, publicly exposed. And other information was readily available.

Generals? Six generals have spoken out. In America we are free. We can speak out. But the facts are that in the Army alone there are 11 4-stars, 53 3-stars, in the Air Force 11 4-stars, 38 3-stars and numerous others who take exception to the quotes that have been misstated here tonight.

This is a war against terrorists. Terrorists have America in a death grip. Abu Musab al-Zarqawi was killed last week. Yet, as President Bush said, we must continue to prosecute this global war on terror until our mission is accomplished and until Iraq can defend and govern itself fully.

I am very proud of our troops for their service, selfless attitude and sacrifice. They are making great strides. They are freeing people from oppression so they may enjoy the same freedoms that all Americans cherish. Today our military has liberated the people of Afghanistan from the brutal Taliban regime, and has denuded al Qaeda its safe haven of operations. They have crushed Saddam Hussein's brutal dictatorship and captured thousands of terrorists and terrorist operations. Children in Iraq are returning to school and Iraqi businesses are prospering. Iraq has had several successful elections and has formed its government under a new prime minister. There is undeniable progress and hope for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I close with a story about a constituent, Sergeant Dale Beatty of Statesville, North Carolina. Sergeant Beatty was severely injured while fighting the global war on terror and lost both legs. Yet Sergeant Beatty is not angry. In fact, his resolve is even stronger today. He knows that he made a great sacrifice for a noble cause. Sergeant Beatty came to visit me while he was at Walter Reed and told me he would gladly go back to the Middle East to fight alongside his comrades if he could. That is a true American hero. Sergeant Beatty's morals and the morale of our troops I have spoken with demonstrate we are doing the right thing.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
value for the chance at being free was so strong that our Founding Fathers measured well that the risk was worth the reward.

Now is our opportunity once again to revitalize that spirit. And in doing so, we demonstrate to ourselves, the people of the United States, indeed, Mr. Speaker, the people of the world that we are worthy of the suggestion that we are the beacon of freedom for the world and we share that light with pride, with honor, and hope.

The Iraqi people who yearn for freedom, I am confident, do so with no less courage and resolve than those who so boldly signed the Declaration of Independence and at that time set this Nation on a destiny of freedom envied by all peoples of the world. As Members of the Congress, I believe that we share with the people of the world that we are the reward. And in closing, I want to thank Joe and all of our troops and those families, and I want to convey my eternal gratitude for everything that they do. May God bless them all. May God bless our troops, who, together with God, will keep our country free.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is sad that the greatest deliberative body of the world’s democracies cannot provide an opportunity to give voice to the concerns that are shared by Americans. Instead, we are given a White House press release against terrorism today. And Kevin wrote me a letter today that have volunteered, I repeat, volunteered, to come and serve. What are we going to tell the servicemen who have worked hard not disgrace those young men and women that are representing and defending freedom and democracy, we love you, we appreciate you.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I encourage people to support this resolution in order to say to the young men and women around the world that are defending freedom and democracy, we love you, we appreciate you. God bless them and God bless America.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), a very distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I recently traveled there, and like many of my colleagues, we met with soldiers from Florida. We each asked to meet with soldiers from our home State. I will never ever forget this young man. He was not from my district. He actually was from south Florida. And I asked each of them where they were from and if they were married. This young man’s name was Joe. And I said to him, “Joe, are you married?”

He said, Yes, ma’am. I am married and I have five children.”

So right away I said, “Your wife must be a saint to be home with five children.”

And he looked at me with all of the conviction that you would over ask for in a soldier, and he said, “Ma’am, he said, “my wife who’s home with my five children feel exactly the way that I do, and that is until the children in Iraq are safe on the streets, our children won’t be safe in Florida or in America.”

Obviously we are very proud of what our soldiers are doing, as are their families. As Members of the Congress, I believe that we have an obligation to honor every person’s service to our country. Using words like “quagmire” and “mistaken war” do not honor our military’s service. We can do this by providing our soldiers with the support that they deserve. The negative and media do nothing to make our children safer on the streets in America like Joe and his buddies do. This kind of rhetoric not only impacts our soldiers, but as I sat here tonight, I could not help but think about the families of the soldiers who are watching this at home, the children of our very, very brave soldiers who are in harm’s way.

In closing, I want to thank Joe and all of our troops and those families, and I want to convey my eternal gratitude for everything that they do. May God bless them all. May God bless our troops, who, together with God, will keep our country free.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is sad that the greatest deliberative body of the world’s democracies cannot provide an opportunity to give voice to the concerns that are shared by Americans. Instead, we are given a White House press release against terrorism today. And Kevin wrote me a letter today that have volunteered, I repeat, volunteered, to come and serve. What are we going to tell the servicemen who have worked hard not disgrace those young men and women that are representing and defending freedom and democracy, we love you, we appreciate you.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I encourage people to support this resolution in order to say to the young men and women around the world that are defending freedom and democracy, we love you, we appreciate you. God bless them and God bless America.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), a very distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise today in strong support of our service members who have worked hard during the global war on terrorism. They are keeping us safe by defeating a very destructive enemy.
I am disappointed, however, that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have lost sight of what our servicemembers are doing and have turned the global war on terror into a cheap political issue. They have forgotten that instead of defeating terrorists on their home turf, we could be preventing our citizens to be attacked here at home. I prefer to keep the terrorists outside our borders.

Right now al Qaeda and the insurgents in Iraq are busy attacking our servicemembers and our allies, and they would like nothing better than to bring these attacks to America. Even the terrorists themselves admit Iraq is the front line of the global war on terror. Why should we not continue this fight and keep it from coming to our own backyard?

Fortunately, we are fighting this battle in Iraq and our servicemembers are making real progress in the global war on terror. Not only are we capturing, destroying, and eliminating al Qaeda’s most brutal leaders, but we are training law abiding Iraqi citizens to defend their own freedom. In fact, over 250,000 Iraqi citizens have stepped forward and responded to the call of duty to defend their country.

I think there are several obvious reasons why so many Iraqi soldiers and citizens are willing to join the Iraqi security forces. First, they know the enemy they are fighting against because they have endured hardship under this enemy for most of their lives. For years they and their families have been brutalized by ruthless dictators. Many of them have been separated from their families and had not seen them for many years.

Second, they have seen the pain that al Qaeda has inflicted on America and other democracies around the world. They know that al Qaeda did on 9/11 is just a hint of what could happen. Because of this, Iraqi security forces are seizing this opportunity to root out evil.

Third, they can taste freedom and they want to hold on to it. After being liberated from tyranny and introduced to democracy they cherish the freedom and democracy and are willing to fight for it just as our servicemembers have fought for our freedom.

Fourth, they are inspired by the work servicemembers are doing in Iraq. As a result, they are joining the Iraqi security forces in the fight for freedom. Not only are their servicemembers fighting against terrorism, but they are also working alongside our members and the Iraqi security forces to train them how to effectively defeat the enemy.

I want to encourage all of our colleagues today to support our outstanding men and women in uniform. May we be successful and bless them and their families. Our prayers are with them. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 861.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share with the American people the truth about the war in Iraq. For truly it had nothing to do with 9/11 or the terrorists or the bombers who attacked our citizens to be attacked here at home. I prefer to keep the terrorists outside our borders.

We invaded Iraq because Vice President CHENEY erroneously claimed, there is overwhelming evidence that there was a connection between al Qaeda and the Government. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that Secretary of State Colin Powell conceded that he had no smoking gun proof of a link between the Government of Iraq, Saddam Hussein, and the terrorists of al Qaeda.

We know there were no weapons of mass destruction. The prewar costs estimates were as incorrect as our intelligence on WMDs. The postwar plan was nonexistent. The laundry list of things we did wrong and the deception that should not end, and we continue to make mistakes even now.

No, Mr. Speaker, the mission was not accomplished. Instead of invading Iraq, we should have mobilized all of our resources against Osama bin Laden, the terrorist who in fact orchestrated 9/11 while we had him pinned down in Tora Bora, in Afghanistan.

At that time we had an opportunity to unite the world and bring people together when we had a true coalition of nations. American families can tell that things are not going well in Iraq.

However, a leader, a true leader, a real leader, needs to have a plan. A plan of engagement. A plan of how to exit. We went into war with neither. The American people, the families who have lost the loved ones, deserve more than that. They deserve to know that there is indeed a plan, an exit strategy. Congress, this Congress, must stand up for our troops, for their families, for America, and for the sake of refocusing, to wage a real struggle against terrorism.

No, Mr. Speaker, we must not stay on our failed course. We must not be stubborn, because stubbornness does not win wars. Stubbornness really and actually causes us to lose. I tell my children not to be stubborn, because stubborn does not win. Let’s do the right thing for American people and tell them the truth.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I think that this debate is helpful. I think that whenever you get into a complicated project, even if you are solving a physics problem, many times it is helpful to just stop, stop right where you are and say to yourself, just using common sense, where are we on the right track? I think we should stand back from the war for just a moment tonight and ask that simple question: Are we on the right track? And we can think about this country that we love so dearly, the flag that we have just celebrated, and all that makes America special.

But what happens if you were to try to calculate the goodness that we love in America into a formula, which is, which really states what Americans have been for all time? If you were like an onion to peel off the outer things of hot dogs and baseball, that would make America what we love? I would suggest that the answer to that question is found in your birthday document, the Declaration, that says, we hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, life, liberty, pursuit of happiness.

And it goes on to say the job of government is to protect those rights. And that is what we have fought wars all through history, to support that basic principle. And so should we this evening to find ourselves on the battlefield against terrorists? Let’s see. Terrorists blow up innocent people. We say, innocent people have a life that is given them by God. Terrorism destroys them. They want to terrorize so that people cannot be free, to compel you to do what you do not want to do.

We say, liberty is a gift of God. And so it should be no surprise, just as we have found ourselves in that War of Independence and the wars against Hitler and the other wars of our history, that we are arrayed against people who have no respect for the formula that has made America so great.

And just as in the past, there is a cost. You know, my own son just came back from Fallujah. They say that the cost of freedom is not free. And the parents all across our country, just as my wife and I did, would look at the local paper in the morning. We would read oh, three marines killed in Fallujah. I wonder if my son is one of them.

No, freedom is not free. But we were proud that our son, just as other families are proud of their children, can carry on that same tradition that the patriots did. That is what makes us feel so good when we see the flag flying, the heart and soul of America, that there is indeed a God that gives basic rights to people and government should protect those rights and the terrorists will not stand, because that formula does not apply just to Americans; it applies to people all over the world.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by saying that I support the troops. Yet the debate about the Iraqi war is not about supporting the troops. I knew from the very beginning that there were no weapons of mass destruction. Well, how did I know that? Well, I am from Florida. And I knew back in 2000
that the Bush administration that we were dealing with would say anything and do anything. They were full of lies. Let’s look at the evidence.

Since the beginning, the Republican leadership in Congress has outright refused to investigate Vice President Cheney involving the billions of dollars awarded to Iraq for reconstruction contracts to Halliburton. $9 billion in reconstruction funds have been unaccounted for. I repeat, $9 billion in reconstruction funds have been unaccounted for.

The amount of taxpayers’ money spent by Halliburton and the defense contractors audit agents have deemed either excessive or insufficient documentation is $1.7 billion.

Halliburton has received more than $17 billion in no-bid cost-plus contracts for Iraq reconstruction. Folks, I am talking about billions with a B. That is billions and billions of dollars. It amazes me now that these figures contrast with the situation that the media has given to the Katrina mismanagement, while the billions and billions of dollars in unaccounted funds to Halliburton are still largely ignored by the media.

You know, we need checks and balances. There is a process that we need. The House, the Senate and the administration are all Republicans. There are no checks and balances. No checks, no balances. No checks, zero balance.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). The Chair will remind Members that although remarks in debate may include criticisms of the President’s or the Vice President’s official actions or policies, it is a breach of order to question the personal character of the President or the Vice President, whether by actual accusation or by mere insinuation.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the chair of the Land Air Subcommittee.

[Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.]

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished chairman for yielding me time.

I heard one of our colleagues on the other side say that we have two choices tonight: we could stay the course, or we can cut and run. Well, those are not the only choices we have. They were not the choices that we used in the 38 deployments in the 1990s when I supported our Democrat President when we sent troops to Somalia, Haiti, East Timor, Macedonia, Kosovo, Bosnia. You name it we were there.

The decision of when we left those countries was made by our military leaders. It was made by the generals and the commanders, not arm-chair politicians back here who try to do what they wish to the Congress during the Vietnam War.

Believe me, I want our troops back home. But there is a process that we can use that I think is very logical. You know, when I have been to the theater, the generals talk about the way that they assess the capability and the readiness of the Iraqi brigades.

They categorize them into four levels. The capability and the readiness of the Iraqi brigades. They have perfected it. What we should be doing is what is already happening. We do not tie the removal of our troops to an artificial date. We tie it into the assessment that our generals make of the capability of the readiness of the Iraqi brigades.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I went back to my district. I was at the Boeing plant where we rolled out the newest model of the CH-47F, the cutting-edge platform for our Army for the next 50 years. It is a great aircraft.

The speaker there, the keynote speaker for this rollout was an Army colonel. In fact, he was the airwing commander of the 101st Airborne Division, which oversees 107 aircraft in theater right now. He is home for two weeks of R&R. He oversees 3,200 of our troops that are on the cutting edge. He wants to be home with his family. He has been in the service 24 years. This was his second deployment. He is from Edgewater, Maryland; he is not my constituent.

And I said to Colonial Warren Phipps, Colonel, we are debating today in Congress whether or not we should set a specific date certain. What do you think? You are there. Is that the right thing for us to do? He said, With all due respect, sir, that is the worst thing that our Congress could do for my troops under my command.

That is the worst thing we can do, because it would telegraph and signal the enemy when they can plan their attacks, and when they can do harm to my colleagues.

Well, I will be honest with you, Mr. Speaker. I do not support artificial dates under President Clinton, and I do not support artificial dates under President Bush.

I want the ultimate decision of when the troops come home not to be done by us, but by the field generals in the command situation, command leadership in Iraq, who understand that the safety and security of the troops is their number one priority as well as ours.

What this young colonel said was, Congressmen, we are making great success. Today the Iraqis are handling more and more of their own security. That should be the determining criteria on when our troops come home.

As this colonel sees with his own eyes that the Iraqis are engaged and are handling more and more of their own defense. He said, Today, Congressman, they are going out on their own missions. He said, when I have meetings and we are doing planning sessions, if I hear the Iraqis planning, it is just as though it were American generals planning for our operations.

He said, Now is not the time to cut and run. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and not cut and run.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MURTHA).

[Mr. LANTOS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.]

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FARR).

[Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.]

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight. I have been watching this on TV and listening all day long. I am really kind of saddened by the fact that it seems to be an issue between making excuses for why we are in Iraq, and the other side is cut and run.

I remember being in the Congress before we voted on this resolution. I remember being summoned into a hearing with all of the intelligence agencies there. I remember a colleague asking these intelligence agencies, is Iraq an immediate threat to the United States, yes or no? Every single one of these intelligence agencies represented, every one said no.

And here we are 3 years later with all of the loss of life. Some say, just stay the course. Stay the course for what? There is not even a plan. Mr. WELDON was right, we had a plan in Kosovo, we had a plan in Bosnia, we had plans. Where is the plan?

We have a plan by Mr. MURTHA. There is no cut and run date in it. There are no specifics on it. But it is a plan. Why are we not debating a plan?
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It is embarrassing that we are here this far into the war, people watching us and having Congress without the ability to exercise democracy, without the ability to have a vote on the only resolution that is ready for a vote, which is Mr. MURTHA’s. I associate myself with the remarks he made about what he saw and what we experienced going into Iraq.

I wish the majority in this House would have allowed a debate on Mr. MURTHA’s resolution.

I rise to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. MURTHA and to everyone who supports our men and women in uniform. We all support the troops and the sacrifices they and their families have made. But, that’s not what this debate is about.

I’ve been listening all day to this debate and find Members are still making excuses for why we got into Iraq in the first place.

You are not hearing what the intelligence community really told this house.

Before the vote on authorization of the war all the intelligence agencies were gathered together for a Congressional briefing. One of my colleagues asked the question:

“Is Iraq an immediate threat to the United States, tell us Yes or No?”

It was surprising to me that each intelligence community representative said—“No, Iraq is not a threat to our national security.”
And even more shocking to see was that so few of my colleagues were listening. So, why have we been sucked into a war that was not necessary to protect our national security? And here we are 3 years later. Over 20,000 U.S. military personnel have been killed or wounded in Iraq. The loss of American lives is tragic and unnecessary. Especially because Iraq never was a threat to the United States, nor is it now. So, today why aren’t we discussing an end to wasteful spending, to unnecessary loss of lives and building a stronger America?

We can’t because, as you have heard so often today, the majority has stopped listening. They have made up their minds. They are just as wrong today as they were 3 years ago. Look—we need a plan. Congressman MURTHA is the only one with a plan. Congressman MURTHA’s bill, H.J. Res 73, is doable and its implementation would be respected by the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the President is listening to this debate. And more importantly I hope he implements the Murtha plan. The world would be better off for it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to a very distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. CALVERT.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, just last week we witnessed American, coalition and Iraqi forces taking the fight to the enemy by eliminating the terrorist leader in Iraq. During the very same week the Iraqi people looked as their first democratically elected Prime Minister finalized his cabinet by selecting a new Minister of Defense, a new Minister of Interior, a new member of the state for national security.

The two events are clear evidence that Iraqi forces are making progress on two major fronts in the ongoing war. On one front the coalition and Iraqi forces remain in the hunt for insurgents and other groups that threaten a free and democratic Iraq. On the other front the Iraqi government continues to show encouraging signs into developing a much needed stabilizing body the country is long for.

During my three trips to Iraq I have observed our military engaging the enemy, protecting the innocent citizens, training the Iraqi forces to make and control and support the new elected government. Despite the positive developments on the ground, we continue to hear the media on their side, time to spread fear and its effects to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution will not secure any success in Iraq. It will not bring our troops home. It will only signal the death of true, honest debate within the walls of this great Chamber. We are creating a political firestorm at the worst possible moment in our military’s history.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
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the answer that Teddy Roosevelt, a great patriot, a Republican, a wonderful President, had to say: "To announce that there must be no criticism of the President, or that we are to stand by the President, right or wrong, is not only unpatriotic and servile, but it is also a hangman out the American people." Listen to that. That is what we are supposed to do.

We are not supposed to be a concretion of yes men and lickspittles. We are supposed to be the voice of the people and the policies of this Nation in an honorable and open fashion. That is not happening today.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a fair and proper procedure nor is it a debate.

H. Res. 861 comes before us under a closed rule, no amendments are allowed. This body is told by the rule, no amendments are allowed. Take it or leave it, we are told.

I say shame. What is there to fear from an open debate and what is there to cause us to lose the right to amend this legislation?

The member can we approve in H. Res. 861 and much on which we can arrive at agreement and consensus.

There are things in this resolution which are controversial, and these require, more than ever, honest and frank discussion.

I find the paragraph 3 to be a particular problem. We should not foreclose our options on redeployment.

It may well become that there is such a need and such an interest in the United States, and arbitrary pronouncements such as this will actually prove to be destructive.

Like many other Members of this body, I supported the President's father when he came to Congress seeking authorization to liberate Kuwait.

There the process was honest, open, and truthful. The intelligence was clear, the mission was finite, and the world was united. Here the process is closed, the debate filled with hyperbole and half-truths, the world is alienated, and our mission is murky and indefinite.

Like many other Members of this body, I supported the President's father when he came to Congress seeking authorization to liberate Kuwait.

Here the process is closed, the debate filled with hyperbole and half-truths, the world is alienated, and our mission is murky and indefinite.

Here the reasons given for invasion of Iraq were that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, chemical weapons, and nuclear weapons.

Like many others, I did not believe the evidence supported the administration.

I believed we had careless use of intelligence: honest mistake, careless with use of the facts, or willful deceit.

History tells us one or all of these unflattering conclusions are supported by the unfortunate facts of the administration's behavior. Now, my own position: Like all of us, I support our troops. I consistently vote for more money, more equipment, and more resources to support them in every way I can to win and to bring them home safe and well.

I have not called for withdrawal of our troops. I have suggested no tactics or strategy, but the decision has the administration, which seems to have for its purpose and tactics more of the same, stay the course.

Our failures and mistakes are many, leaving weapons and munitions everywhere uncollected and available to criminals, insurgents, jihadists, and enemy forces.

We disbanded the army police and security services, necessary to keeping order and assisting in husbanding victory and peace.

I am outraged at the fact that this exercise appears to be politically motivated. Charges verging on disloyalty are directed at loyal Americans who criticize the administration failures or suggest better tactics or strategies.

Listen to Republican leadership instructions to their members: "Democrats on the other hand are prone to wave endlessly about the use of force to protect American ideals. Capitol Hill Democrats' only specific policy proposals are to concede defeat on the battlefield."

These words are false, deceitful, dishonest, outrageous, and vicious. So here we have today's proceedings: Political attacks on Democrats. Disregard of truth. Disregard of facts, and most importantly, disregard of the need to correct failed policies. I cannot, and will not, support such a phony and arrogant process.

We must deal more fairly with one of the great issues of our day, which has cost us over $450 billion, 2,500 dead Americans, 20,000 casualties, the trust of our people and the respect of the people of the world.

We are losing the equivalent of a battalion a month and spending 51% of our income. Our troops are performing magnificently, but the administration is functioning without any adequate plans.

The results are disastrous consequences for our troops, for our country, for our relations with our friends and allies, particularly people in the Arab world.

We need a real opportunity to discuss these matters and to provide real congressional input into this situation. That is being denied to the Congress and the country here.

I cannot support this process and I express the thoughts of the people on this war and on a strange, foolish, and irresponsible process.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say earlier the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) rose and talked about what he called a lack of oversight on the Armed Services Committee with respect to Iraq. I want to enter into the RECORD, if I might, the fact of 41 full committee hearings, 21 on the war on terror, two on reconstruction, three on the Iraqi forces, four on force protection, four on detainees and five markups on that issue.

I would just point out that the most extensive investigation in the history of detainees was completed by General Taguba, who gave us a voluminous report with something like 116 annexes. I made that available to everybody, Democratic, Republican, on the Armed Services Committee, including Mr. SNYDER, and a total of three members from the Democrat side of the aisle on our committee looked at that the report. It is still available for Mr. SNYDER. When he gets finished reading it we will have more hearings for him.
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Res. 861 and much on which we can arrive at agreement and consensus.

We should not foreclose our options on redeployment.

It may well become that there is such a need and such an interest in the United States, and arbitrary pronouncements such as this will actually prove to be destructive.

Like many other Members of this body, I supported the President's father when he came to Congress seeking authorization to liberate Kuwait.

Here the process is closed, the debate filled with hyperbole and half-truths, the world is alienated, and our mission is murky and indefinite.

Here the reasons given for invasion of Iraq were that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, chemical weapons, and nuclear weapons.

Like many others, I did not believe the evidence supported the administration.

I believed we had careless use of intelligence: honest mistake, careless with use of the facts, or willful deceit.

History tells us one or all of these unflattering conclusions are supported by the unfortunate facts of the administration's behavior. Now, my own position: Like all of us, I support our troops. I consistently vote for more money, more equipment, and more resources to support them in every way I can to win and to bring them home safe and well.

I have not called for withdrawal of our troops. I have suggested no tactics or strategy, but the decision has the administration, which seems to have for its purpose and tactics more of the same, stay the course.

Our failures and mistakes are many, leaving weapons and munitions everywhere uncollected and available to criminals, insurgents, jihadists, and enemy forces.

We disbanded the army police and security services, necessary to keeping order and assisting in husbanding victory and peace.
Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time. We have a lot less time than on the other side.

Mr. HUNTER. We have reserved the balance of our time. I think we have got a transition here, Mr. Speaker, with the next committee coming up.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California for the purpose of putting a statement in the RECORD.

(Ms. ZOE LOFgren of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ZOE LOFgren of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, when we made the decision to invade Iraq I said this: The President is asking us to pass this resolution now, but he has not yet made the case for war.

I cannot support the President’s request that we authorize military force against Iraq, the difficult decision for three important reasons: The United States is not acting in self-defense or from an imminent threat from Iraq, the United States should not be pursuing unilateral action without international support, and the President has not stated an exit strategy.

I believe there are times when countries must resort to war, and indeed international law recognizes the rights of nations to defend themselves. I strongly support our campaign against terrorism. But are we voting this week on a case of self-defense? It would certainly be self-defense if Iraq supported the al Qaeda attack on September 11, but the evidence of such support is lacking.

I have listened to the administration and met with top officials. I have yet to see any credible evidence that Iraq is connected with al Qaeda. The experts readily admit that there is no real connection.

I can believe that Iraq is a threat to the region and to some American interests overseas, but I do not believe the threat is imminent or must be handled with a unilateral military strike.

This resolution is an unwise step for America that will in the end weaken America.

How unsatisfactory are the words “I told you so”. We invaded Iraq even though it was not involved with al Qaeda and, when we diverted our gaze from the War on Terror, we let Osama bin Laden get away and now his organization has metastasized so that his capture would no longer be the disruptive blow to al Qaeda that it could have been then. Our soldiers have served bravely but their courage has been marred by inadequate leadership by the brass starting with the Commander in Chief. The problems that face us now in Iraq are not primarily military ones but we are expecting our military to accomplish them anyway.

This entire venture was a mistake, but the question is what do we do now? I think the answer is that it’s time for the Iraq’s to take responsibility for their own country. Our American soldiers signed up to defend America. Let the Iraq’s do the same for their country.

We have spent American lives and treasure in Iraq. It is now the obligation of the Commander in Chief to present a strategy for a successful completion of American activities there so that our troops can be removed from Iraq as soon as possible.

Doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result is the definition of insanity. It is time for leadership from the Commander in Chief that is more than “stay the course” and more than the same. The war in Iraq is not the war on terror and never has been. I voted to use the force in Afghanistan because it was necessary that we disrupt that terrorist hotbed that never has been. I voted to authorize the use of force in the Iraq war resolution, the administration told us that Iraq was stockpiling weapons of mass destruction that there were weapons of mass destruction. I voted for Saddam Hussein and 9/11, and that Iraq was within a year of having a nuclear capability.

Fast-forward to the deliberations of the 9/11 Commission. They concluded that there were no weapons of mass destruction, no ties between Saddam Hussein and 9/11, and no nuclear capability.

Mr. Speaker, these votes weren’t 8–4 or 7–5, they were all 12–0 that the very basis for the war did not exist.

When I go back home, Mr. Speaker, and my constituents ask me to summarize where we are in the war on terror, I tell them this: As we approach the fifth anniversary of the worst terrorist attack in the history of our country, we have committed hundreds of billions of dollars in Iraq. More important, over 20,000 young Americans have either been killed or seriously wounded going after Saddam Hussein, who did not attack us, while Osama bin Laden, who did attack us, is still alive, free, planning another attack on our country.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the very definition of failure in the war on terror.

We went after the wrong guy. But after the invasion, did we have a responsibility to help the Iraqi people build a new government and a new way of life? The answer to that question is yes. And we have fulfilled that obligation. We have helped them through not one, not two, but three elections. It is now time for the Iraqi people to stand up and defend themselves.

There is a general rule of military engagement that says that you do not signal to your enemy what you are going to do in advance. But there are exceptions to this rule, and there are two exceptions to this rule.

Number one is that the insurgents in Iraq are using as a recruitment tool the argument that we have no intention of leaving their country, and that we’re going to steal their oil—and it is working. It is fueling the insurgency.

As for our friends in Iraq, those who want this new government and new way of life, they seem perfectly content to let our soldiers take all of the enemy fire. The problem with security in Iraq is not the system of training; it is the fact that the Iraqis are not stepping forward to defend their own government.

So, today, Mr. Speaker, my basic disagreement with the President is this: He says that we should stay in Iraq until the Iraqis declare that they are ready to defend their own country; and I propose that we announce a timetable for withdrawal, start withdrawing our troops, and make our intentions very clear to the Iraqis: if they want this new government and this new way of life, they have to come forward, volunteer, stand up, and defend it.
Mr. Speaker, it is time to bring our troops home.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am manager of the bill to the Judiciary Committee for our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself some time, and I may consume.

I want to initially present an update as to where we have been and where we are in Iraq. Many months ago an Iraqi citizen said to me, you all must remove Saddam. We can’t do it, he said, because we know what he is capable of doing to us in retaliation. I said to him if we do remove him, will you embrace us or will you kick us? He said, I don’t know.

I responded, that is my concern. I don’t know either. I believe his anti-Saddam goals, but that does represent a majority view in Iraq, but my concern proved prophetic. Our exercise in Iraq, Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, has not been without mistakes. Our entry strategy was superb. Our exit strategy was tentative at best, inept at worst.

A better response to the looting that ensued in the early days should have been in place. The disestablishment of the Army, without an alternative plan, in my opinion, was premature. Some would blame the United States for the delayed political development, but after all, our forefathers were deliberate in forming our country’s operational apparatus, so I think the political complaint is probably unfounded.

Was Saddam an evil, brutal murderer, a flagrant violator of human rights? You bet. Was he involved in international terrorism? You bet. Was he directly or indirectly involved in the 9/11 attack? I don’t know. I can neither confirm nor reject that theory. My point, Mr. Speaker, is that intelligence was flawed. Mistakes were made. But the cause for freedom is a noble one, and progress has, indeed, been realized.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, about the lack of objectivity in reporting the war on terrorism. Some liberal talk show host reports imply that no good has been accomplished. Conversely, some conservative talk show hosts portray Baghdad as moonlight and roses. Clearly these two slanted versions are inaccurate and unfair.

Let me say a word about the PATRIOT Act, Mr. Speaker, and this will be discussed in more detail subsequently.

But the PATRIOT Act was reported in the full House by the Judiciary Committee. I should say that it addressed the nexus of the sale of illicit narcotics and terrorist financing. These two shadowy worlds of narcotics trafficking and terrorism is an element of terrorism that I think is lost on many Americans. They are joined at the hip, and I am particularly pleased that the PATRIOT Act did respond to that end.

Seventeen months ago, Mr. Speaker, I publicly voted against troop withdrawal was conspicuously absent when the war on terrorism was discussed. Oh, we spoke of appropriating more funds, we spoke of dispatching additional troops, but virtually no one ever even mentioned troop withdrawal in their discussions.

Now, I am not suggesting troop withdrawal tomorrow, but I want our armed servicemen and -women home sooner rather than later. Oh, we may decree, oh, we cannot cut and run. Cut and run? We have had a presence in Iraq in excess of 3 years. 2,500 armed services Americans have given the ultimate sacrifice to the cause of freedom, Mr. Speaker. Thousands of permanent and disabling injuries have been inflicted upon members of our armed services in addition to the spending of billions of dollars.

I do not know what constitutes cutting and running, but I do know that when we have logged a wartime duration of 3 years, when 2,500 Americans have given their lives for freedom, and Lord only knows how many Americans have been injured, this does not constitute cutting and running.

The time has come, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to pass the baton to the Iraqi Government. Now, this decision will ultimately be made militarily, and properly so, by the commanders on the ground; but I do not want this matter of withdrawal to be lost in the shuffle. If freedom and peace prevail in Iraq, Mr. Speaker, history will be generous in its praise to President Bush and the Congress.

Mr. Speaker I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) who chairs the judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet and Intellectual Property.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this global war on terror resolution. The war on terror is being fought on two fronts, both abroad and here at home. We applaud the diplomatic and military achievements overseas, but we also need to remain vigilant here in our own country.

Until the terrorists are defeated, Americans will continue to be their targets as long as we stand for freedom and democracy.

One of our weapons in the war on terrorism is the USA PATRIOT Act. That bill, which originated in the Judiciary Committee, gives law enforcement officials and intelligence officials the ability to cooperate during investigations.

More than 250 people in the United States have been charged with crimes that were international terrorist investigations and have been convicted or have pled guilty because of the USA PATRIOT Act.

In response to the events of September 11, 2001, we also passed legislation creating the National Intelligence so that all of our intelligence capabilities would be coordinated by one official.

We passed the REAL ID Act which contains several antiterrorism provisions, including one that makes certain foreign nationals deportable because of their ties to terrorism.

We must continue to pass legislation that makes it more difficult for terrorists to enter the United States. That means enacting meaningful border security legislation. The House passed last December.

Those who would do us harm, Mr. Speaker, respect no borders. Potential terrorists and thousands of others continue to enter our country illegally every day.

In America, we are blessed to have the freedom that others only dream about, but freedom is never free. It must be nurtured and protected, sometimes at great cost in lives; but we will not surrender to terrorists. That only empowers them. We will fight them today so we can enjoy a better tomorrow. Any other course only resigns us to an uncertain future.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me pay tribute to the brave men and women of the 21st Congressional District of Texas who are fighting this war overseas. The most difficult action I have ever taken as an elected official is to call the families of the 14 servicemen from my district who made the ultimate sacrifice. Their families’ patriotism and love of country is almost indescribable. Their faith is great because they know our cause is great.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad this resolution has been brought to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) who fought in the Korean War and was awarded the Bronze Star.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the majority has seen fit to bring to this floor a political statement where if you vote against it, you are voting against our troops; and if you vote for it, of course you are supporting the President’s policy. But being a politician, I can understand that.

We cannot say enough about the courage and the dedication of our young people, the volunteers and the
National Guards people that are putting their lives on the line each and every day. Tragically, we reached a point that we passed the 2,500 mark in terms of loss of life, and tens of thousands are permanently maimed.

When they, as we have heard, as supporting the President’s policy, I really think this is so unfair, and why? Because with our fighting men and women, when that flag goes up, they salute it not because of a President’s policy, but because of respecting their oath to the Commander in Chief.

When I was in Korea, I do not remember any of the soldiers that were in combat questioning the wisdom of Commander in Chief President Truman. They never asked did the Congress declare war. They never asked why we were involved in a civil war between the North Koreans and the South Koreans. They never thought that the North Koreans were going to invade South Korea.

I tell you that our fighting men and women today are not saying that they challenge the Commander in Chief. They do not ask whether there were weapons of mass destruction. They do not ask whether or not Saddam Hussein was a part of al Qaeda. They do not ask those political questions, and neither did I when I was a sergeant in the infantry.

But I am not a sergeant in the infantry now. I am a Member of the United States Congress, a Member of this House of Representatives, and each one of us has the right to challenge any direction, not of the Commander in Chief, but the President of the United States. That is the most patriotic thing we can do because, in doing that, whether it is Vietnam, whether it is Korea, or whether it is Iraq, we are protecting as best we see it, the lives and the safety of the men and women that we have vowed to.

Let us face it, they did not volunteer to knock off Saddam Hussein. They volunteered because they were looking for a better way of life, the same way I did when I volunteered in 1948, and you can see where they come from. It does not take away from their patriotism, but they did not take a poli-sci course in terms of how do you bring peace in the Middle East. I mean, they were not there looking for Saddam Hussein. They were looking for a better opportunity. I guess they perceived. They come from our inner cities. They come from our rural areas. They come from the areas of high unemployment. But when they get in the military, they are patriots who do not challenge the policies of a President or Commander in Chief. So they are not advocates. They are patriots.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) who sits as a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman Coble for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from visiting our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. I witnessed the impact of Zarqawi up close and personal. I have seen the damage Zarqawi inflicted. I visited the areas where Zarqawi lived and terrorized, and I met the brave soldiers who relentlessly tracked him down and killed him.

It was Sunday evening, May 28, 2006, and I was in Amman, Jordan, with a small delegation of six Congressmen. As I walked through the metal detector to enter the hotel’s lobby, I thought of Zarqawi. It was here, in Amman, Jordan, that Zarqawi, a native of Jordan, killed 60 people by bombing three hotels on November 9, 2005.

The next day was Memorial Day, Monday, May 29, and I was in Iraq visiting with our troops. Once again, my thoughts turned to Zarqawi. I toured the Special Operations Command Center with General Stan McCrystal, a three-star general in charge of tracking down Zarqawi. All over the walls of the command center were posters of Zarqawi. General McCrystal and his team were confident that they would get Zarqawi, and they briefed us on their efforts.

That same day I flew in a Blackhawk helicopter around the area of Ba’Qubah where Zarqawi was ultimately located. I also toured Baghdad, where Zarqawi intimidated the N.C.R., by bombing their headquarters and where al Jazeera TV once broadcast a videotape showing Zarqawi personally beheading an American citizen.

A week later, Wednesday, June 7, I was at the White House with a few other Members of Congress to brief President Bush about what we saw in Iraq. At exactly 3:57 p.m., National Security Advisor Stephen Hadley slipped a note to President Bush, Vice President Cheney and Secretary of State Condi Rice. President Bush read the note, smiled and winked at Condi Rice. Zarqawi was dead.

General McCrystal later personally went to the White House and determined for himself that Zarqawi had officially been killed. President Bush already called General McCrystal to thank him and his troops, and today Congress thanks them as well.

Mr. Speaker, Amman, Jordan, is a long way from my hometown of Orlando, Florida. Tonight, thousands of people in Orlando will walk into hotel lobbies without having to go through a metal detector, unlike the hotels in Amman, Jordan. Why? Because our soldiers are taking the fight to the terrorists, like Zarqawi in the Middle East, so the rest of us can live freely in the United States.

However, one feels about the war in Iraq, realize that our troops deserve our support 100 percent. God knows they have earned it. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on House Resolution 861.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?
responsibility for the security of Iraq. Ultimately, the Iraqi people, the troops, the police officers there have to be responsible for the security of Iraq. There is only so much that our troops can do. This must continue to be a primary focus so that our brave men and women can return home as soon as possible.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 3 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), a combat veteran of the Korean war.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Ladies and gentlemen, General Anthony Zinni and other retired generals have been outspoken in their opposition to the planning and execution of our occupation of Iraq. But our administration rejected their sound recommendations which predicted exactly what would happen if we didn’t plan for the occupation. These generals explained the U.S. forces were not provided enough resources to do the job; that we alienated allies that could have helped in rebuilding Iraq; and that the Defense Department ignored planning for the postwar occupation, unaware of the growing insurgency there.

I have heard from too many military families, those children of theirs who have been wounded or killed in duty. Their grief is so much harder to bear knowing that often we did not adequately equip their sons and daughters in battle.

Back home I have met many times with Lila Lipscomb, a proud mother from Flint, Michigan, who lost her son Michael in Iraq. Initially, Mrs. Lipscomb supported the war, on the assumption that the government knew best. A week after finding out her son had died, she received a letter from her son in which he forcefully argued that we should not be in Iraq because there was no connection between Iraq and Osama bin Laden.

Cindy Sheehan lost her son Casey in Iraq and became a voice for mothers of soldiers who oppose the war. Cindy’s loss motivated her to unite with other grieving mothers in opposition to the war. And her willingness to speak truth to power has drawn attention to the misconduct of the war and the terrible price that service men and women and their families have paid.

Let me tell you this: We need to encourage our friends and allies around the globe to help with Iraqi reconstruction and peacekeeping. We just don’t have sufficient resources to manage this work on our own. We haven’t learned from the first Gulf War. If we can bring the international community into Iraq to help establish a democracy, protect its citizens, and rebuild its infrastructure, it will free American forces and resources to address the real problem we face: terrorism.

Let’s heed the advice of our colleague, Mr. MURTHA, and redeploy our troops to find Osama bin Laden and fight terrorists. If we can shatter the myth that occupying Iraq is the same thing as fighting terrorism, then these 10 hours of debate tonight will have been worth something after all.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), who sits as a member of the Judiciary, 3 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, and I appreciate the privilege to address you, Mr. Speaker, and this Chamber. If we take ourselves back to September 11, 2001, we had a lot of small problems then that we thought were big problems, and all of a sudden we had a great big problem. We were attacked by an enemy that most of us hadn’t paid much attention to, if indeed we had ever heard of that enemy. We believed that that day wouldn’t be over before on top of the attacks we knew about there would be other attacks on top of that. We believed in the following days there would be more and more attacks in this country because of an organized effort that would be continuing with suicide bomber attacks that would continue to cost the lives of Americans.

We have missed this. The President stepped up in New York at ground zero and took a leadership role. He said if you’re not with us, you’re against us. If you harbor terrorists, you are a terrorist. And he carried that out.

And as we began to get mobilized to go to Afghanistan, there were those on the other side of the political equation that said you can’t go in there and successfully invade and occupy a nation like that; that has never happened in the history of the world. The terrain is too difficult, the fighters are too tenacious, and it is a fool’s errand to go into Afghanistan and think you can succeed in there militarily. But in fact that is what happened.

They said it would be another Vietnam, but it wasn’t another Vietnam. The Afghani people voted on that soil for the first time in the history of the world, and American troops were there to see to it that they were able to do that. They have chosen their own leaders and directed their own national destiny, 25 million people.

And the advisers that put that together, both civilian and military, were the same advisers that advised President Kennedy and President Johnson, and they are almost identical: Difficult country, 25 million people, you can’t go there and succeed. The same advisers. And because some people can find one or two generals that had a different idea, they seem to believe that the President hasn’t used the best wisdom possible.

In the shortest time in the history of the world, an armored column went across the desert and invaded and occupied the largest city ever in the history of the world to be invaded and occupied successfully, that is Baghdad, 25 million people. Even though we had some people who have spoken on this floor tonight that were inclined to sur-render before the operation ever began. And now we have an operation going over there that has freed 25 million more people. And Afghanistan and Iraq are the lodestars for the Arab people in the Arab world.

When the Berlin Wall came down on November 9 of 1989, many in this place did not predict that freedom would echo across Eastern Europe for hundreds of millions of people, but it did. And freedom can echo across the Arab world for tens and hundreds of millions of people the same way that it echoed across Europe. That is the Bush doctrine. That is the vision: To free people. Because free people never go to war against other free people. We don’t, at least.

And to the extent that the world is a freer place, it is a safer place, especially a safer place for Americans. So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege and I stand with our military.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to correct some disinformation that the previous speaker put out.

It should be noted that this Chamber was near united on going into Afghanistan. Moreover, we believed strongly that is where we would go. So it wasn’t anywhere close to what he explained.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 1/2 minutes to my friend from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), who served 4 years active duty in the U.S. Navy and retired as a full bird colonel after 26 years with the Tennessee National Guard.

Mr. TANNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, our country was founded and bases itself on civilian control of the military. And when I wore the uniform of our country, I, like all other military people in uniform, followed orders. I obeyed my commanders and I tried to do whatever the mission was that was set before us. That is what you do in the military of the United States under civilian control.

But I am not in uniform anymore. I am a civilian now, and part of that civilian authority. And it is our patriotic duty as part of that civilian authority to ask questions, to constantly reexamine the strategy, to constantly reexamine the policy of this country, to do the things we can do to accomplish our mission; and, secondly, and more importantly, protect the men and women who are actually doing the fighting for us now.

That is why this debate, I would have hoped, would have been more broad; that we would have had more opportunity, because this debate in this country has to take place in this building on this floor here and in the Senate Chamber. It is the patriotic obligation and duty of civilian authority to do that, and I am proud to be here tonight.

Now, I have supported resolutions like this in the past, but I want to ask...
Mr. COBLE a question, sir. There was a news report this morning that the new Iraqi government is negotiating with some of the elements there in Iraq that are insurgents who have been murdering Americans, and this was what one of the Iraqi government officials said this morning, according to those news reports, and I quote: "There is a patriotic feeling among the Iraqi youth and the belief that these attacks on Americans are legitimate acts of resistance in defending their homeland. These people will be pardoned, definitely, I believe."

Now, unless that can be cleared up, I am not prepared to vote for a resolution which says in part that the United States and its coalition partners will continue to support Iraq. If this government in Iraq is going to grant amnesty to people who kill Americans because they feel it is their patriotic duty and they are defending their homeland, then we have to go to reassert where we stand over these people.

Do you know whether or not this has been cleared up?

Mr. COBLE, Mr. Tanner, I do not know. I am told that it was announced that it was a mistake. But I cannot verify that, and this is a case of first impression with me, what you have just shared with me.

Mr. TANNER. Well, I don’t want to catch you off guard, but we need to clear this up before we vote on this resolution. I do not think the American people will support a government that grants amnesty to people who kill American soldiers.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), who, by the way, is the founder and chairman of the bipartisan, bicameral Anti-Terrorist Funding Task Force.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk briefly about one aspect of our fight against terrorism that is often overlooked, and that is our efforts to detect and eradicate terrorist funding networks around the world. The fight against terror finance goes hand in hand with the war on terror.

Terrorists infiltrate our financial systems to distribute the money that they need to support their evil activities around the globe. They exploit a wide variety of alternative funding networks that range from charities to commonplace criminal activity like drug peddling and illegal cigarette sales.

My colleagues would likely agree that while we may have targeted the financial resources of terrorists networks at times prior to 9/11, the fight against terror finance didn’t begin in earnest until after the 9/11 attacks.

The 9/11 hijackers used U.S. and foreign banks to transfer the approximately half-million dollars necessary to the plan to execute their attacks on America.

We fought back against terror financiers with people like Dennis Lormel, a veteran FBI agent who was tasked with tracking down the financial lifelines that enabled the 9/11 hijackers to operate.

We fought back with people like David Aufhauser, who was then general counsel at the Treasury Department who was put in charge of a small interagency terror finance group which met regularly at the White House after 9/11. And he fought back here in this House. Chairman Oxley and the ranking member, Mr. Frank, convened a Financial Services Committee hearing on terror finance just 3 weeks after the attacks.

Shortly thereafter, this body passed the PATRIOT Act, which provided critical new terror finance tools.

We have held numerous hearings since to improve the government’s antiterror finance efforts and to identify those people that have been financing threats to our nation.

In just a few years, we have made significant progress in combating terror-funding networks. We still have a long way to go, but we are on the right track.

Last December, the 9/11 Commission came out with a report card grading the government’s response to 9/11. The government’s efforts against terror finance got the highest grade of them all: an A minus.

Just last week, an al Qaeda planning document was found in al Zawqai’s hideout which lamented our successes in restricting the al Qaeda financial outflows. This House has played an important role in this effort, and it has been approached in a bipartisan way even when dealing with terror finance in Iraq.

Continued progress on this complex issue requires a sustained commitment from our government.

Last year, members from both sides of the aisle joined me in a letter pressing Syria for more action in stopping the flow of fighters and finances into Iraq.

Members from both sides of the aisle joined me in asking the government of Italy to crack down on open fundraising efforts for Islamic terrorists in their country.

As we move forward, our challenges continue to grow more daunting as terrorists perpetually adapt to methods to stop them. They are constantly finding new ways to raise and distribute money.

So we must work even harder to keep up with terrorists’ ever-changing financing techniques. We must continue pressing foreign governments to do the same.

Continued progress on this complex issue requires a sustained commitment from Congress. By stopping the flow of terror money, we can diminish the ability of terrorists to attack our citizens and our country. Fighting terror finance must remain a critical component of the War on Terror.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time for some of the veterans on the Democratic side of the aisle to have the opportunity to speak out against this sham resolution, and I yield back to him the balance of my time.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to oppose this resolution and to call for a significant reduction of U.S. forces this year and an end to the occupation in 2007.

I voted against the invasion in 2002 because I believed the war would be a strategic blunder of historic proportions. And it has been.

We owe the men and women we sent to Iraq and their loved ones more than a few hours of grandstanding on this floor and an empty resolution of support.

We must work toward a national consensus to end this war, a war born in deception and managed under a delusion. Today’s news that the American death toll has surpassed 2,500 is the grim reminder of the danger and sacrifice our Armed Forces face daily in Iraq. We need to fund our occupation of Iraq so America can rebuild our economy at home and regain respect abroad.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), who sits on the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, again we return to the people’s House to discuss the people’s business and the central question that cuts to the very core of our existence: free men and women engaged in an armed struggle to advance freedom elsewhere in the world, our all-volunteer military, standing in the breach against Islamo-fascism and terror in Afghanistan and in innumerable other places around the globe. But the central front for our discussion this evening in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, in support of the troops, in support of this mission, as I often recall the words of Mark Twain that history does not repeat it, but it rhymes. Now, as we have seen in the debate that has gone on in the people’s House today, so many willing to compare this to Vietnam. So many coming to this floor using the term “quagmire,” and yet any dispassionate, objective evaluation of what has transpired would be remiss if we did not include not one, not two, but three elections where we have seen turnover by the Iraqi people exceed on each occasion what had gone on before.

We see a nation being born, fighting terror, and we see American troops, volunteers, stepping forward. Others have made the point, Mr. Speaker, that there is no more solemn and sacred obligation than casting a
Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in qualified support of the resolution. There is much in the resolution to like. It honors those Americans who fought in the Global War on Terror, and especially those who have been wounded or died; and it expresses a commitment to a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq. And it urges that the new Iraqi Government assume these responsibilities.

But the resolution fails to fully address a key question that most Americans are asking: When are the troops coming home? Let me be clear—I have long opposed setting a “date certain” for immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces because such plans encourage our enemies and put our troops at risk.

However, speaking as a Vietnam Veteran, I believe that every unconventional conflict has a “tipping point” where the presence of foreign soldiers on sovereign soil begins to become counter-productive, and I learned that we cannot secure a foreign land all by ourselves. We must plan a transfer of authority where a sovereign state assumes the solemn task of securing their own people within their own borders.

I believe that the new Iraqi Government must understand that the American people will not allow their own sons and daughters to stay indefinitely; and that it’s time for the Iraqis to assume more of the burden of sacrifice that any war and any revolution might bring. It is time for Iraq to come together and show the American people that it is ready to defend itself, govern itself and sustain itself.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I observe in this great chamber two large portraits. One is of George Washington, our revolutionary leader; the other is France’s General Lafayette, who helped us with our revolution from 1777 to 1781. It is instructive to note that General Lafayette did not stay here forever, nor did we want him to go. Good friends know when to come; good friends know when to go.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is important to be resolute about our support for the troops. But it is also time to send a clear message that our commitment is conditional on their successes, and that our days in their country are not indefinite.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in qualified support of the Resolution. There is much in this resolution to like.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS), a Vietnam veteran and the recipient of two Bronze Stars.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in qualified support of the resolution. There is much in the resolution to like. It honors those Americans who fought in the Global War on Terror, and especially those who have been wounded and died; and it expresses a commitment to a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq. And it urges that we protect freedom.

But the resolution fails to address a key question that most Americans are asking: When are the troops coming home? Let me be clear, I have long opposed setting a “date certain” for immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces because such plans encourage our enemies and put our troops at risk.

However, speaking as a Vietnam veteran, I believe every unconventional conflict has a “tipping point” where the presence of foreign soldiers on sovereign soil begins to become counter-productive, and I learned that we cannot secure a foreign land all by ourselves. We must plan a transfer of authority where a sovereign state assumes the solemn task of securing their own people within their own borders.

I believe that the new Iraqi Government must understand that the American people will not allow their own sons and daughters to stay indefinitely; and that it’s time for the Iraqis to assume more of the burden of sacrifice that any war and any revolution might bring. It is time for Iraq to come together and show the American people that it is ready to defend itself, govern itself and sustain itself.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I observe in this great chamber two large portraits. One is of George Washington, our revolutionary leader; the other is France’s General Lafayette, who helped us with our revolution from 1777 to 1781. It is instructive to note that General Lafayette did not stay here forever, nor did we want him to. Good friends know when to come; good friends know when to go.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is important to be resolute about our support for the troops and their important mission. But it is also time to send a clear message that our commitment is conditional on their successes, and that our days in their country are not indefinite.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).
I recall being awakened one morning to learn that we had suffered the loss of our marines in Beirut. I recall the attack on the USS Cole. And then, of course, I recall with all of us the terrible tragedy of 9/11.

Say what you will about the President’s policies and say what you will about the imperfections involved, the fact of the matter is since 9/11 this President, this administration, has embarked on a strategy that says we will not wait to be attacked. We will not wait where they are deftly where they attacked us. We will change the rules of the game, and we will decide where and when we will attack.

We understand that this is a global war on terror. Those who suggest that the war in Iraq is not essential to our defense in the war on terror should only listen to the words of Mr. Zarqawi and the correspondence that he had last October where he suggested one of the very first objectives of al Qaeda was to make sure we were defeated in Iraq.

We should understand that we have done great things in response to this, on a bipartisan basis. We have given the President the tools to use, the PATRIOT Act, intelligence gathering that he did not have the capacity for before. And let me just mention a number of plots that were deterred.


The Jose Padilla plot to blow up apartment buildings in the United States in May of 2002.

The 2004 U.K. urban targets plot where the U.S. and partners disrupted a plot that involved urban targets in the United Kingdom.

The 2003 Karachi plot.

The Heathrow Airport plot in 2003.

The 2004 U.K. plot.

The 2002 Arabian Gulf shipping plot.

The 2002 Straits of Hormux plot.

The 2003 tourist site plot where the U.S. and a partner nation disrupted a plot to attack a tourist site outside the United States.

We are making progress precisely because we are playing away games, not home games. Let’s not forget that as we debate this important resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before I yield the floor to Members of Congress, our job is to protect our Nation. We have thousands of young men and women who are doing it today.

I believed in early 2003 we should do more to capture or eliminate the people who caused the 911 attacks. They were dominantly in Afghanistan, not in Iraq.

Today it seems we have a resurgent Taliban in Afghanistan and increasing attacks in Iraq on our troops and Iraqi citizens.

We have seen success in capturing Saddam and eliminating al Zarqawi. I have never doubted the ability of our young men and women in our Armed Forces. We saw what they were capable of doing in the first days of the war when they stormed Iraq and Baghdad within days, overwhelming the Iraqi forces.

The accomplishments we have seen in Iraq can be attributed directly to these troops’ discipline and persistence in fighting the insurgency.

Mistakes have been made, and the most experienced members of our Armed Forces have pointed that out. One of the individuals who spoke out was retired Marine General, Former Chief of U.S. Central Command Anthony Zinni, who said, “We grow up in a culture where accountability, learning to accept responsibility, admitting mistakes and learning from them was critical to us. When we don’t see that happening, it worries us. Poor military judgments has been used throughout this mission.”

As this war has gone on, the lack of planning and poor judgment by this administration has become more apparent.

I have here the May 1, 2003 press release from the White House in which President Bush, on board the U.S. Abraham Lincoln, declared all major combat operations have ended. We now know that this was one miscalculation among many.

Since that time, seven young men from our 29th Congressional district in Texas have lost their lives in Iraq. Across this Nation, 2,300 service personnel, men and women have lost their lives since the President made these remarks.

Reading over these remarks, it is clear that the administration had no clear plan for securing Iraq after the invasion and no clue about what was to follow the next months.

Given the size and the strength and the effectiveness of the insurgency, the administration’s intelligence should have given some indication that there would be problems down the road and done a better job of preparing both our public and, more importantly, our troops on what was to come the following month and the following years.

It is clear that we did not have enough troops on the ground immediately after the invasion, and that shortage continues.

Congress doesn’t direct troops on the ground. We are not the Commander in Chief. But we are charged with sending our sons and daughters into battle, and therefore Congress has a duty and an obligation to debate about what is occurring in Iraq.

I strongly disagree with the way the administration planned and carried out this war. I will continue, though, to vote for the defense appropriations and the supplemental dollars because we have to give our troops protections that they need, and we learn every day that they need even more.

Many brave men and women have given their lives in Baghdad and all across Iraq. We honor those families for their sacrifice, their ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, this war is not the one we wanted it to be. The President believed that it was possible to be doing in the first days of the war we were led to believe we were getting into, but I believe we must leave a secure Iraq that can defend itself and be a symbol for democracy to prosper.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, the question came up previously from a colleague about did Iraq intend to give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers, and I want to clarify that. The National Security Adviser said just earlier regarding alleged comments from the Prime Minister that supposedly amnesty would be given to some who have killed Americans. He said, “This is not the case. I am sorry to say that the Prime Minister has been misquoted and misunderstood. He did not mean to give amnesty to those who killed Americans.” So that should clarify that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are those who have said it is a quagmire in Iraq. It is a mistake for us to be there. Some made these statements from personal heartache. Some, on the other hand, were made from partisan political motivation, and some from disdain for our President and a desire to tell his efforts fall, even though it risks world stability and national security.

But our soldiers are there. They know they have done great things and will continue to accomplish more. They have seen the despair faces of Iraqi children that were never present in Vietnam. They have heard gratitude from many there in Iraq that was never heard in Vietnam.

Our valiant soldiers not only fight, protect and defend, they also see the frantic efforts of terrorists who are terrified that democracy and the people will begin to rule over them and their oppressive dictatorial ways. They keep many terrorists occupied there rather than here in America.

Mr. Speaker, as legislators, we get to ask a question that I didn’t get to ask as a judge. It was inappropriate because of the separation of powers. And that is, who will be hurt or helped by the options and, in my case as a judge, by the ruling?

Well, here in this debate as legislators we get to ask that question. Who will be hurt by pulling out? Those yearning for freedom who have it within their grasp will be hurt. And ultimately America will be hurt because of terrorist activities that would resume and multiply unabated in Iraq, and bin Laden would have been proven right, that we didn’t have the stomach to go all the way to victory.

Who would be helped by our pulling out? Well, there are some families that would not endure the heartache from losing or having a wounded soldier in
Mr. SANDERS. Three and a half years ago, we were told that there was a link between Iraq and al Qaeda. That was wrong.

Three and a half years ago, we were told that Iraq was importing depleted uranium from Niger. That was wrong.

Mr. Speaker, terrorism is a major problem for our country and the world. Unfortunately, in many respects, the war in Iraq has created more terrorists than it has stopped, and has deflected our attention away from the fight against Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda.

Mr. Speaker, let us bring our troops home as soon as possible. Let us mount a focused campaign against terrorism with well-trained intelligence capabilities and with an understanding that we need to work with the entire world.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, Iraq is a part of the global war on terrorism, and a strong democratic Iraq means a safer America.

Rather than debate the past, I choose to look at where we are today and where we will be tomorrow. In the days and weeks and months ahead, the global war on terrorism will come to a turning point. Today the question is, do we continue to fight and defeat the terrorists who will stop at nothing to destroy Iraq's democracy?

Ultimately, the success of democracy in Iraq will be decided by the Iraqis themselves, for it is they who must take their country back.

Like many of our colleagues, I have traveled to Iraq. I have visited with its leaders, including the new Prime Minister. I have also visited with our troops, including from my home State of New Jersey. I have met with members of the Signal Battalion from Westfield and our Finance Battalion in Flemington before their deployments. Their courage, their bravery, and willingness to serve inspire us all.

Difficult days still lie ahead. We acknowledge the sacrifices of our Armed Forces and their families here at home. For those Americans who have made the ultimate sacrifice, 2,500 as of today, their sacrifice is immeasurable, and America extends our hands and our hearts to their families.

Looking forward, not backwards, I believe we must stand with the Iraqis who are fighting for their country, because a strong democratic Iraq means a safer America. There can be no alternative to winning the global war on terrorism. There can be no alternative to a democratic Iraq, lest it return to tyranny and a breeding ground for international terrorists who would then seek to fight us far closer to our own shores.

Let us choose a democratic Iraq and a safer America. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. MURTHA. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, how did this happen? We have lost 2,500 American servicemen and women. They have been killed in Iraq. 18,000 U.S. soldiers grievously wounded. We have spent over one-third of a trillion dollars in Iraq on this war, so far. Yet, 80 percent of the Iraqi people want us to leave. 80 percent of the Iraqi people want us to leave. They are shooting at our soldiers, blowing up our soldiers with improvised explosive devices.

How did we get here? Oh, yeah. I remember. President Bush said that Saddam Hussein was an imminent threat to the United States and had weapons of mass destruction. So many of us voted to send our troops to Iraq to eliminate this threat of the use of weapons of mass destruction and this imminent threat to our national security.

It turned out not to be true. There were no weapons of mass destruction. Saddam Hussein was no imminent threat to the United States. Well, we deposed him and that is a good thing. But there was a huge power vacuum and many of us felt, even though we were misled into war, that we had a moral obligation to help the Iraqi people stabilize their country and bring democracy there, and we have been there now 3 years, 2,500 dead, 18,000 of our young men and women wounded, a third of $1 trillion spent. Yet, 80 percent of the Iraqis want us to leave.

I support the Murtha resolution, which says that we should withdraw most of the U.S. troops back to the United States and leave a quick reaction force in friendly countries around the region.

Some say Iraq is part of the war on terror. Nonsense. There are 25 million people in Iraq, 25 million people in Iraq, less than 1,000 foreign fighters. This is a civil war. The Iraqi Shiias, Sunnis, and Kurds cannot agree how to divide up Iraq now that we got rid of Saddam. Well, it is 3 years later. All of this American loss of life. President Bush says stay the course, and in fact, it will not be President Bush who gets rid of this war. It will be the next President. Well, you know what? Americans do not want this war without end. Deploy most of our troops back to America within 6 months. Redeploy a significant number in friendly countries around the region. The Iraqis in case other countries want to meddle.

War without end is not the American way. We met our moral obligation to
the people of Iraq. Now it is up to the Shiites, Sunnis, and Kurds in Iraq to decide whether they want to live in peace with one another or not.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY), who sits on the Financial Services and Transportation Committees.

(Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, for our families and country to truly be secure, we must prevail in the war on terror. Iraq is a central front in that war.

Mistakes have been made, but so have corrections. But the fundamental fact remains that John F. Kennedy's words have never been more true: "If men and women are in chains anywhere in the world, then freedom is in endangered everywhere."

Men and women in the chains of tyranny, without hope, provide the breeding grounds for terrorists that endanger America and the entire civilized world. Terrorism can only be defeated by bringing hope to harsh places.

America has always found that the best way to make our families secure is to confront tyranny and expand the frontiers of freedom. That is our mission in Iraq. And with a democratically elected government and Iraqi troops increasingly taking over for our troops, we are on a path to success, and a path to bringing our troops home.

Others offer a different path, a path that says, get out now, no matter what the commanders on the ground think; get out now whether or not milestones are achieved; get out now, whether or not Iraq becomes a sanctuary for terrorists to regroup and attack America again; get out now, no matter what signal it sends to our friends and enemies that would endanger our security.

Cutting and running is one path. But it is the wrong path.

The only path for security for our families is victory in the War on Terror. Mr. Speaker, beyond the lessons of history, the whereas clauses of the resolution and an Iraqi army and police force increasingly taking over for our troops, we are on a path to success.

Our troops and the American people.

Leadership that the President owes our men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, beyond the lessons of history, I look to what the soldiers on the ground are saying.

The soldiers I have spoken to on the ground in Iraq, at places like Camp Victory in Baghdad, many of them men and women from the Minnesota Army National Guard, want to come home as soon as possible. However, they realize better than most that if they come home before they have defeated the terrorist threat, there will be no lasting peace—there will be no victory in the War on Terror. They know that if we don't finish the job in Iraq, we'll have to finish it somewhere else.

Like them, I want to finish the job in Iraq, because if we don't finish it, the horror of 9/11 should inform us that the war will be brought to us here at home.

Mr. Speaker, let us remember in our thoughts and prayers those who have sacrificed, as well as those who continue to stand in harm's way around the world fighting the War on Terror. Let us deserve the bravery and selflessness of our men and women in uniform.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the American people are increasingly aware of where things stand in Iraq, despite the glib assurances and political spin we get from sources like the White House and Defense Department. We must bear in mind that Mr. Bush's plan would begin with an initial near-term drawdown of U.S. forces to send a clear message to the Iraqis that our presence is coming to an end. We also need to hear a pledge from the President to rededicate long-term bases on Iraqi soil.

And, finally, we need to hear that there is a plan for filling the void left behind when our troops depart, to mobilize resources within the international community, to ensure that Iraq's neighbors do not interfere in internal Iraqi affairs, and to support the ongoing development of the Iraqi Government and security forces.

These are the elements of a responsible exit strategy. This is the type of leadership that the President owes our troops and the American people.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HEGEN), who sits on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, September 11, 2001, proved that our enemy is determined to kill Americans. Instead of sitting idle, our Nation went on the offense. We removed the Taliban government in Afghanistan. We removed the regime in Iraq that had invaded neighbors and financed terrorism. And we have kept terrorists on
the run, limiting their avenues of attack, disrupting their finances and eliminating safehouses around the globe. Mr. Speaker, it is not by coincidence that our Nation has not suffered another attack here at home.

Some have doubts about our mission in Iraq. But I believe Americans can find solace in the midst of sacrifice and hope in the midst of hardship. The reason is simple: we are clearly on the road to victory and success in Iraq, and our Nation is safer today because of it.

Since the fall of Saddam’s regime, 70 percent of eligible Iraqis for the first time in history elected a national unity government. They have ratified a democratic Constitution for the first time ever, and they helped us eliminate al Qaeda’s mastermind, Zarqawi.

Mr. Speaker, progress in Iraq makes America safer. Terrorists are being pursued, not harbored. We have seen movement toward real democracy in the neighboring countries. Work remains, but freedom is making progress. And freedom, Mr. Speaker, lays the foundation for a more secure future for America. Mr. Speaker, I have also had the privilege of visiting our troops in Iraq. They are outstanding young men and women, and they overwhelmingly believe in their mission. I urge my colleagues to offer their unqualified support to our troops abroad until their mission is complete.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the current administration has gotten too many things wrong in Iraq and has totally misrepresented the lessons of the post-9/11 world. It is now up to Democrats to get things right in Iraq so we can focus our military power on fighting terrorists around the world who want to harm us.

Today I ask my colleagues: Will we realistically confront terrorists and terrorism with all the elements of our national power, or will we continue to ignore a proven approach in order to follow a shop-worn, idealistic approach that drains our military of its resources and America of its goodwill with the very partners we need to fight terrorists? That is the choice that our country faces in Iraq and in our national security.

Democrats must speak out against this administration’s tendency to ‘look the other way’ and push for a policy that centers on oversight of U.S. taxpayer dollars. Unfortunately, we do not practice oversight. This Congress practices “overlook.” We must respond to public frustrations by creating a secure future for America and resting with a foundation for American efforts to fight terrorists and terrorism across the globe. Congress must confront the legacy of the waste, fraud, and abuse that plagues our efforts in Iraq.

As Democrats, we must continue our efforts, in spite of the current opposition, to bring this waste, fraud, and abuse in Iraq to light.

Some talk about cutting and running. But I say we must confront the legacy of cutting and running from veterans health care. Just as the next generation of combat veterans return home, the long-term veterans health care budget falls $8.6 billion short from what was projected. We must reject that legacy of Iraq.

And, finally, I join my colleagues in commending our U.S. military working in conjunction with Iraqi security and Iraqis themselves for locating and eliminating the terrorist Zarqawi. His terrorist violence is gone. But we have learned in Iraq that fighting a classic guerilla-type war means that a victory like killing Zarqawi cannot be celebrated too long. Much remains to be done in Iraq, and Democrats have to make sure the administration has gone wrong. Our obligations compel us to ask the tough questions that are currently ignored.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield today to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), who sits on the Ways and Means, Budget, and Joint Economic Committees.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I recently read a lecture from the most highly respected scholar on Middle East affairs and Islam in America, Bernard Lewis. He went through Osama bin Laden’s original fatwa. He went through a lot of writings of al Qaeda back in the early to mid-1990s, and what they declared is very chilling. They declared that their war was going to be against the two superpowers at the time: the Soviet Union and America. They believed they defeated the USSR in Afghanistan. I would like to think peace through strength is what beat it here and the fact that communism did not work. But they think they beat it.

Now they have one last enemy to beat before they can reach their caliphate from Spain to Indonesia: America.

Mr. Speaker, the war on terror did not begin on 9/11. It began on 2/26, February 26, 1993, when they first hit us at the World Trade Center. Then in 1996, the Khobar Towers. Then in 1998 at our two embassies in Africa. Then in 2000, the USS Cole. Then in 2001, 9/11.

Mr. Speaker, we are at war. They have said they are winning this war as long as we play home games. The sooner we realize it, the better we are. The best way to win this war is to play away games and not home games.

The good news on this front is we have not had another 9/11 since 9/11. We have not had a major terrorist attack here in America.

If Iraq becomes democratic, if Iraq becomes free, they lose. They cannot win and manifest their distorted belief. They want to have a world like what we saw on display in Afghanistan, the Taliban, throughout the entire Middle East. If democracy and freedom can persist, if it can take root, if it can succeed, as it is succeeding in many parts of the Arab world, the terrorists lose.

And the most important thing in all of this is that all of us should have in the front of our minds is will our children grow up in America with the fear of terrorism that fills the front of their mind or will it be a distant memory in history? I grew up in Jamesville, Wisconsin, as a happy kid. I want my kids to grow up in Jamesville, Wisconsin, with the same kind of happiness, not with the fear of terrorism that fills the front of their mind.

This is a global war, a war we have to win, a war that only America through its leadership can win for the rest of the world. The sooner we wake up to that, the better off we are and the more peaceful life we can leave to our children.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this resolution because its words honor our troops, but its deeds do not. It is not at all controversial that we honor and respect the heroism of those who serve us.

But they deserve so much more than the hollow words of this resolution. They deserve a plan that for the first time would achieve an intelligence alliance, it would make strikes like the one against Zarqawi on a regular basis against the leaders of the resistance.

But this resolution has no plan. They deserve a real plan to fortify and improve the Iraqi security forces so as they step forward, our troops can come home. But this resolution offers no such plan. They deserve a clear path to political stability and broadening political participation so the government of Iraq is viewed as an Iraqi Government and not a tool of any outside forces. This resolution has no such plan.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the problems that we are in today because the administration has given us slogans, not solutions. This resolution is very much in that sorry tradition. This debate is a sham, Mr. Speaker. It is a pep rally. It is not a discussion of the alternatives before the American people.

So although I join the words of the resolution in praising our troops, let’s move beyond the words to the deeds.
The way to honor those who fight for this country is to match their sacrifice with our own wisdom. This resolution falls far short of that objective and we should oppose it.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), a 25-year veteran of the U.S. Marine Corps, a Vietnam veteran who sits on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this resolution today. I have enjoyed the debate immensely. The rhetoric has been sometimes heated, the facts sometimes obscured. But I think it is healthy for the American people to see this debate. I am sorry that the gentleman from New York is not here. I wanted to have a discussion about what buck sergeants know and what they do not know in today’s Army. But I suppose we will have to let that one slide by.

But I will tell you that my son, serving in Iraq today, and his colleagues and his soldiers in the 101st and the other soldiers and marines that I have talked to, they know why they are in Iraq. They know what they are doing. They know what their mission is. And they understand that not everyone here does, that Iraq is the front line in the war against Islamist extremists in the words of the 9/11 Commission.

But it is not the numbers that count; it is the quality of the troops. It is what they are able to do. In a previous trip to Iraq in November of 2005, I had the opportunity to meet with and assess the progress of the Iraqi armed forces. I am pleased to report that I was very heartened by what I found. I think all of us now understand that the Iraqi Army is progressing with amazing speed. We know the numbers. Over 260,000 Iraqi security forces, over 100 Iraqi Army battalions, almost 30 Iraqi police stations, either leading the fight or serving with their coalition partners.

But it is not the numbers that count; it is the quality of the troops. It is what they are able to do. In a previous trip to Iraq in November of 2005, I had the opportunity to meet with and assess the progress of the Iraqi counterterrorism forces. These are special forces trained by our Special Operations Command, and they are impressive.

The Iraqi special forces have proved their mettle in combat and in training. Last month, last month a young captain became the first Iraqi to graduate from the 9th Mechanized Division, and Major General Jamal Khalid, Commander of the Iraqi Second Division. Both commanders expressed their frustration with the bureaucracy in the interim ministry of defense but both generals demonstrated a quite confidence and professionalism exhibited by seasoned battle-hardened commanders.

These two commanders demonstrated the will and the ability of the Iraqi security forces to thwart the terrorists and the insurgents who plague their country.

In our discussions, Mr. Speaker, they were blunt. They were proud of their accomplishments. They were confident in their ability to move forward, but they recognize that they continue to rely on U.S. logistical and medical assistance, that they cannot move forward by themselves. Not now.

We have made a commitment. Mr. Speaker, not only to our American forces, but to these Iraqi forces. We have got to stay with them and help them achieve their freedom and their independence.

We have made a commitment—not only to the American men and women of our Armed Forces—but to those who wear the uniform of the Iraqi Security Forces. They have shed their blood alongside our soldiers and Marines in pursuit of a stable and peaceful Iraq.

Now is not the time to abandon them, now is the time to help them. Help those who defend freedom in a land that has known only tyranny.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the rule this morning, our Republican colleagues suggested something pretty revolutionary, that is, that we do something we do not normally do around here, and that is read the resolution. They said they encouraged us to review it, and vote based on whether we agree or disagree with the legislation.

So I reviewed the resolution. And as our colleagues suggested, I intend to vote against it based on the fact that there are several things in the resolution that I strongly disagree with.

First, on page 2 of the resolution, it states as follows: ‘‘Whereas by early 2003, Saddam Hussein and his criminal Ba’athist regime in Iraq constituted a threat to global peace and security.’’

I think the only way one could conclude this would be to conclude that there were, in fact, weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. I did not vote for the war resolution because I never believed the President when he asserted that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq in the first place. I did not believe it then. It was subsequently proven not to be the case. And I most certainly cannot support a resolution that asserts it now.

Second, the resolution asserts that: ‘‘The terrorists seek to destroy the new unity government because it threatens the terrorist’s aspirations for Iraq and the broader Middle East.’’ There is probably some truth to that.

However, what is probably a lot more true is that the war in Iraq has increased, not decreased, terrorism and the resolve of the terrorists. It has created conditions in Iraq that allow terrorism to thrive.

Finally, the Resolution asserts that ‘‘Iraqi forces are, over time, taking over from United States and Coalition forces a growing proportion of independent operations and increasingly lead the fight to secure Iraq.’’ If that were true, we would have started bringing our forces home by now. At some point we’ve got to make Iraq assume responsibility for itself and its own people. I just don’t believe they or we have come to grips with that.

There obviously are a number of things in the Resolution with which I agree. But we were given no opportunity to amend the Resolution to strip out the things that are untrue and/or offensive or, for that matter, to add to the things with which we agree. My Republican colleagues have, once again, chosen to politicize a matter that should be above partisan politics. I cannot for the Resolution in this form and will, therefore, vote ‘‘no.’’

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair the amount of time on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 31 minutes, and gentleman from Pennsylvania has 37½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COBLE. I thank the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), a veteran of the U.S. Army, who sits on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution for many reasons. But one is that I know we are achieving real progress in Iraq and Afghanistan. I know this not from government reports or media sources, but from two fine Pennsylvanians. I want to quote from an e-mail I received this morning from a constituent, an Army officer in northwest Iraq commanding the military transition team.

And he writes, ‘‘There are many positive things going on here that the American public never hear about. My little 10-man team contributed over 150 boxes of school supplies to the schools in my area. Other units purchased grain to give out to small villages. I am very proud of the accomplishments of U.S. and Iraqi forces and it truly is a shame that all of the news tends to be negative towards the activities of the soldiers, both American and Iraqi who are working very hard every day to make this country safe.

I am very pleased and honored this summer to have an intern, Mike Wright, who is a soldier in the 82nd Airborne. When he arrived in Afghanistan in July 2002, the people had nothing. They had no schools, no paved roads. But in 7 months his unit helped build the first school and health clinic. When his unit came back to Afghanistan in late 2004, it was a different place. New facilities, factories, electricity, and miles of paved roads.

When arriving in the village, he tells me his unit would be greeted by small
children, smiling youngsters throwing colorful plastic flowers at them. These examples are among many that illustrate real progress, laying a foundation for future peace, shaping the world where the terrorist message will fall on deaf ears.

Mike told me this also, “The Afghani war veterans, the old-timers have asked him, why did you abandon us when the Soviets left?”

Today their biggest fear is that we will have to redeploy our troops from Iraq to fight in Afghanistan. The Afghani government has a major problem. Yesterday, Prime Minister Nouri al Maliki suggested the Taliban is basically gone; that the Afghan National Army will be able to provide security to those people who killed or who wounded our soldiers. We are going to see who are the patriots here in the future.

In a speech that Jack Murtha gave on April 20 this year, he started off by talking about President Teddy Roosevelt. He said, “There must be no criticism of the President or that we have to stand by the President right or wrong is not only unpatriotic and servile, but is morally treasonable to the American public.”

You are going to have to explain that. You made a very big mistake. I voted for the war, for the efforts of the President, the Chief, the Commander in Chief in December of 2002. And here we are a few years later, looking back at what that decision was based upon.

Talk about impunity, we have had people come on the floor in the last 2 years to impugn this gentleman’s character. The CIA impugned the very facts that this administration has tried to provide. Every day a former CIA agent says that this administration failed to listen to the advice and counsel of those folks who have boots on the ground. That is a shame.

And the other side, the other side has simply provided a rubber stamp, a rubber stamp to all of the policies. You have mindlessly rubber-stamped the mismanagement that has cost our sons, and you may laugh, these are our sons and daughters. They are our sons and daughters’ lives.

And now, here we are today—considering a partisan, political resolution that ultimately means nothing; a resolution that won’t assist our troops on the ground; a resolution that does not help us move forward in bringing our men and women home.

This is just another shameful example that the leadership of this body is not fit to serve. This Congress has failed to fulfill its most basic of duties. Shame should permeate every hallway and every hearing room.

If we were serious—truly serious—about helping our men and women in the military, we would not waste our time on this resolution.

Instead we would delve into the deception, the intelligence failures, the scapegoating of the C.I.A., and the mismanagement that has placed us where we are today. The generals, the men and women of our Armed Forces have done their job. We have voted time and time again in budgets and supplements supporting our troops.

Meetings have been held the real culprit come to this floor and demean, undermine, those who ask questions or may criticize. Teddy Roosevelt turned over from the clownish gyrations of the Congressmen or women from Ohio.

And we’re taking the H.J. Res. 73—Congressman John Murtha’s well-reasoned, essential call to redeploy our troops from Iraq.

We are faced with a choice—more of the same from the Bush administration, or Jack’s way. I believe that rapid turnover of Iraq to the Iraqi people is essential and that our troops need to be redeployed at the earliest practicable date. That is why I am proud to co-sponsor my friend’s resolution.

Today is just another sham in the House of Representatives, but that is what we’ve come to expect:

Our troops deserve better.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. Blackburn) who sits on the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know, our colleagues across the aisle are asking the American people to divorce our mission in Iraq from the global war on terrorism. I think it is impossible. I think it is irresponsible, and it is bad policy.

If only terrorism were as clear cut a problem as they want us to believe, and if only elimination of the Taliban would have been sufficient to free us from the threat of terrorism. Mr. Speaker, have we not learned anything from September 11? It should be crystal clear that terrorism went far deeper than one rogue regime in Afghanistan.

But that is where they are in this debate. They are ignoring reality. Our troops, my folks from the 101st and the 82nd Airborne, and the National Guard, know that if we are going to be free of terrorism, if the goal is to prevent terrorism from killing 2,000 Americans on our soil tomorrow or evermore, then we must bring major change to the Middle East.
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It is an unpleasant reality, but it is a reality. That is where we are in Afghanistan. That is where we are in Iraq. Progress is being made. Libya has changed, the Taliban is basically gone now, al Qaeda has significantly weakened and bin Laden is on the run.

Pakistan is an ally in the war on terrorism, Iraq. Despite a 24/7 massive media campaign of negative news, is making progress, and we have eliminated al-Zarqawi. On this issue of amnesty, the Iraqi National Security Adviser corrected the record and, for the record, stated that the Prime Minister was misquoted.

I have that entire interview and the transcript for the record, and I would like to quote for my colleague’s benefit another portion, and I quote, he, as a matter of fact, if you were there, and this is the Iraqi National Security Adviser speaking, if you were there at this meeting with President Bush a couple of days ago, he looked the President in the eye and he said, thank you for what you have done for our country. I thank the American wives, the women, the American mothers for the treasure and the blood that they have invested in this country. It is worth investing for liberating 30 million people in this country. And we are ever so grateful.

And we will—the blood of the Iraqi soldier and blood of Iraqi civilian soldier is as sacred to us as the American soldier. We are fighting the same war, we are fighting together, and this is a joined responsibility. And we will never give amnesty to those who have killed American soldiers or killed Iraqi soldiers. There is no deal.

Mr. MURTHA. Let me ask the gentleman, my good friend, how many more speakers he has?

Mr. COBLE. I say to my good friend from Pennsylvania, I have two more speakers, Mr. Murtha, Mr. Murtha. I will be the last speaker.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize for 2 minutes the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Shays), who is the chairman of the National Security Subcommittee of the Government Reform Committee, and who has been to Iraq 12 times.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have been listening to this debate all day. The argument I am hearing most from the opponents of this resolution is we shouldn’t have gone into Iraq to remove Saddam Hussein in spite of the fact that many of them voted to go into Iraq.

I am hearing from opponents that there was and is no connection between Islamist terrorists and the war in Iraq.
in spite of the fact that the prince of al-Qaeda, al Zarqawi, did his gross handiwork in Iraq. Fortunately, he is dead.

I am hearing from opponents of this resolution that we have made many mistakes in Iraq, as if that is justification for arguing that we need to leave. We have made a number of mistakes. We permitted the looting of government buildings. We didn’t secure the munitions depot. We disbanded their army, their border patrol and police, and then asked the 150,000 coalition forces, American and international, to protect and defend 26 million Iraqis living in a country the size of California.

These were mistakes, but mistakes do not justify leaving prematurely. They help explain why things could be better, and why, because we learn from our mistakes, we are doing better.

Since the transfer of power to Iraq in June of 2004, we have seen considerable progress, three free elections that put our citizens in the United States to shame, the training of hundreds and hundreds of thousands of Iraqi security forces, the establishment of a government chosen by a national assembly comprised of 30 percent women. I agree with the President, we will lose the war in Iraq. I am deeply concerned we will lose the war in Iraq here at home. Our efforts to remove Saddam Hussein from power and help bring democracy to the most troubled part of the world is truly a dear and noble effort that must succeed.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I was just out to a hospital a week or so ago, and a young woman whose husband was in the bed right next to her, and she said, I didn’t join the Army to fight for Iraq. He joined to fight for the United States.

We don’t send people to fight for other countries. We send them to fight for the United States’ national security. That is the first lesson we learn, and then we send them with overwhelm force and then we have an exit strategy.

What we are looking for is all the same thing. All of us want the same thing. We want a resolution. We want a positive resolution to what is going on in Iraq. We want a plan. We want a plan that we can live with. It is not enough to say stay the course. We need somebody to tell us exactly how we are going to do this.

When you talk about the amount of money this is costing us per month, and I think about $8 billion, which almost as long as I have been on the Defense Subcommittee, and all of the money that I have seen in the Defense Subcommittee, and I can’t recognize what $1 billion is, $450 billion at the end of this year.

Then I think how long did it take us to pay for the Vietnam War? It took almost 18 years at 18 percent interest rates to pay for the Vietnam War. There were a lot more people, a lot more of a cross-section of people fighting in the Vietnam War, and yet a plurality of people still supported the Vietnam War to the very end.

Let me read something. People say they don’t want a time schedule. Nobody has said they don’t want a time. Let me quote from some of the people that traveled back from the President from Iraq recently. She says in her news release, here is Bush Tuesday night on the way home on Air Force One discussing his conversation with Iraqi leaders. There are some concerns and keeping our troops there. They are worried almost to a person that we will leave before they are capable of defending themselves. I assured them they didn’t need to worry.

That is what we hear back here all the time. But apparently what he says almost to a person, not including the President and the Vice President, the President and Vice President of Iraq. The Associated Press reports this morning, President has asked President Bush for a timeline for the withdrawal of foreign forces from Iraq. The Iraqi President’s office said, the Vice President, a Sunni, made the request during his meeting with Bush on Tuesday. The President made a surprise visit to Iraq. I supported him in this. This is the President of Iraq. I supported him, said the President, in a statement released Wednesday. Now, 80 percent of the Iraqis who are killing Americans think it is all right to kill Americans.

We have diverted ourselves away from the war of terrorism. All of us agree about the war on terrorism. All of us have the same goals in the war on terrorism. We are concerned about is we are caught in a civil war in Iraq. There is only 1,000 al-Qaeda or less in Iraq. We destroyed the leader of al-Qaeda.

What we are worried about is the Sunnis and the Shias. The Shias are 100,000, and there are 2,000 Sunnis fighting with each other. The way we have to do it is one of the biggest problems we have. When you fight a military operation, you have to destroy everything in the neighborhood. We put 300,000 people outside their homes and only 100,000 came back. That is nation building. Yet we are trying to make friends in that country. You can’t make friends if you operate the way the military does.

And I agree with the military. To protect American lives, we have to go in with overwhelming force. When you go in with overwhelming force, you are going to inadvertently kill civilians.

Then when you send in people who are untrained and they go into a country, into a job like a prison and they don’t know what they are doing, they don’t know how to handle it, untrained people that caused us a terrible public relations disaster.

So you have this combination of untrained troops, inadequate forces, and then on top of that, you have no plan to remove the military. Every military leader I have talked to has said the same thing. They have said, we can’t win this militarily.

All of us want the same thing. We want a resolution to this thing. We want to not only bring our troops home. Internationally, it is important to have stability in the Middle East. There is no question. All of us want the same thing. It is how we get it. And we have to have international cooperation.

I had mentioned, and I will end with this, in the first war we had international cooperation. We had 160,000 international troops and 400,000 American troops. And $60 billion came from the international community and we paid between 4 and $5 billion.

In this particular war, so far, we have spent $450 billion and not only the financial treasure but the human treasure that we have lost in the United States.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, our final speaker from this side tonight is the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina who sits on the Armed Services Committee, vice chairman of the Special Forces Subcommittee and is a leader on the bipartisan congressional delegation to Iraq and Afghanistan, Mr. HAYES. I yield 2 minutes.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding and I rise today to engage in this discussion on Iraq. But I don’t think this is solely a discussion on Iraq because what happens in Iraq will have far-reaching ramifications across the Middle East and around the world.

When I asked about a timeline for removing our troops, my answer is not a day more than we need to ensure victory. We could leave tomorrow. We could set an arbitrary deadline, 6 months, a year, and tell the terrorists how long they need to stick it out before we leave. But what would the ramifications of that be?

Unfortunately, I think there is a perception in this country that we are fighting a broad-based resistance from the Iraqi people, and we are not. Iraqis and our new government want to have a peaceful, free and democratic existence.

I don’t think it is a coincidence that violence escalated from the terrorist factions when the new government formed. While the violence in Iraq will not cease overnight, it is apparent to me that real progress has been made in the year since I last talked firsthand to our soldiers in Iraq.

One of the most compelling changes made since last year is the lack of significant forces on the internet, and are more involved in planning and executing missions to stop terrorist activity. In a briefing with Special Forces
leaders, we learned that more than 30 percent of all day-to-day missions are planned and carried out by the Iraqis themselves. This is significant because it frees our soldiers to focus on capturing and eliminating key figures in Iraq, not to deal with the IRAQI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve today to engage in this discussion on Iraq. But I don't think this is solely a discussion on Iraq, because what we are asking today is what we want to leave behind in this region, because that is the fundamental question we are asking today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to engage in this discussion on Iraq. But I don't think this is solely a discussion on Iraq, because what we are asking today is what we want to leave behind in this region, because that is the fundamental question we are asking today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to engage in this discussion on Iraq. But I don't think this is solely a discussion on Iraq, because what we are asking today is what we want to leave behind in this region, because that is the fundamental question we are asking today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to engage in this discussion on Iraq. But I don't think this is solely a discussion on Iraq, because what we are asking today is what we want to leave behind in this region, because that is the fundamental question we are asking today.
must finish our mission to leave a secure Iraq that can defend itself and be a symbol that democracy can prosper in the Muslim world.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of America. I rise in support of our active troops and those who have given their lives and risk their lives that we will prevail in this Global War on Terrorism. These troops are part of an all-volunteer force that is the envy of the world.

I rise to reassure the American and Iraqi people that we reject any timetable for the withdrawal or redeployment of U.S. forces in Iraq. Al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations have attacked our families, neighbors and friends numerous times over the last three decades. What has been the response? For the most part, there has not been an adequate response. And Mr. Speaker, that is hard to admit. Some would tell you we didn’t respond due to lack of political will, others would say America just didn’t have the stomach. From the killing of 241 U.S. service members in Beirut in 1983 to the attack on the USS Cole in 2000, America responded in a cautious manner.

This is no longer the case. Due to the events of September 11, 2001 our country was forced to reevaluate our defensive and offensive strategies. Led by our Commander in Chief and with the support of the Congress, our goal is not to take it off to fight to every cave the enemy hides in—sending an unmistakable message. We will fight the enemy overseas and prevent him from reaching our shores.

Having been to Iraq during the recent Memorial Day holiday, I am pleased to report the message is getting across. Our enemies are starting to realize that America and its allies are not leaving and are not intimidated. I say to the Iraqi people—we will not abandon you. We are committed to the completion of the mission to create a sovereign, free, secure and united Iraq.

During my 4 trips to Iraq in the last 3 years I have been heartened by the continued resolve of our forces. After receiving briefings from the Generals, I always make sure to spend an equal amount of time with the senior enlisted men and junior officers who are leading at the tip of the spear. The casualty count among this group is rising—and that is hard to grapple with—but it is for a purpose.

A man who was responsible for so many of these casualties—Zarqawi—is now dead. He was killed by a 500 pound bomb dropped from an F-16. This weapon and this method of employment were thoroughly developed and tested at Eglin Air Force Base in Okaloosa County, Florida. The dedicated air force active duty, civilian and contractor expertise during exercises from the Test and Evaluation Community and the Air Force Research Laboratory can be equally proud.

I would like to remind my colleagues and the American people of the courage it must take to vote in a country that has never known democracy while under the threat of destruction simply for making one’s voice heard. This courage is commendable and is a cause worth fighting for.

Mr. Speaker, America and her citizens are strong. It is the hope of those who wish to lead the way in showing the Iraqi people how to establish a free and democratic nation and we and they will never forget the sacrifice of those who made their democracy possible.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give strong support to H. Res. 861. For more than three years, the man Osama bin Laden called “the prince of al-Qaeda” orchestrated terrorist attacks that killed thousands of Iraqis, American troops and coalition forces. Now, thanks to hard work and dedication of the U.S. military and our coalition partner Abu Musab al-Zarqawi’s reign of terror is over.

Since the U.S. and our coalition partners liberated Iraq, bin Laden has sought to defeat the efforts of the people of Iraq to transform their nation into a peace-loving democracy so he can create a Muslim state where al-Qaeda calls the shots. The air strike that killed Zarqawi has dealt bin Laden’s organization a crucial blow by eliminating the man he trusted to wage his jihad in Iraq. It is a major victory in the War on Terror.

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the House VA Economic Opportunities Subcommittee, I feel strongly about coming to the floor today to honor our brave servicemen and women who are defending our homeland in the Global War on Terror. They have fought valiantly since the terrorist attacks of 9/11. They liberated the people of Afghanistan from the Taliban, an abusive regime that once harbored Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaeda leadership. The terrorists no longer have a safe haven and are on the run. Their hopes of creating a state in Iraq that can defend itself and be a symbol that democracy can prosper in the Muslim world.

The Iraqi people need us to finish our mission to leave a secure Iraq, their nation into a peace-loving democracy so that others may wonder where we draw our energy from. It is important that our friends and enemies realize one important and crucial fact: the war on terror is spurred on by the hearts and minds of every American who will not let the hateful, senseless thing that happened on that tragic day in September.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, today we come to the floor to debate the merits of H. Res. 841, legislation honoring the men and women of our armed forces and declaring our commitment to the continued surveillance and eventual defeat of al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and their allies in Iraq. As our country continues to engage Al Qaeda and other international terrorist organizations around the globe, it is important that we convey the depth of our resolve. We cannot allow Osama Bin Laden and his lieutenants to succeed in their attempt to drive our forces from Iraq and topple that country’s democratically elected government.

Today, we are engaged in what I hope will be the first of many public debates on our national strategy to combat the growth and development of global terrorist networks. In Iraq and Afghanistan, as was clearly described by the 9/11 commission, we must stand for a better future by working with the international community to give the citizens of these countries a fighting chance to develop secure democratic institutions. These countries must never again be allowed to descend into the lawlessness that gives sanctuary to international criminals and terrorists.

Last week, coalition and Iraqi forces scored a major victory over foreign terrorists working with the Taliban and other insurgents in the Shia peoples of Iraq. Our cooperative efforts to eliminate Jordanian terrorist leader Abu Musab al-Zarqawi should stand as a landmark along the road to independent security in Iraq. It should also serve as an opportunity for this Congress to publicly expand its oversight activities to the United States of America and to those who wish us harm no more determined of a nation when our values and safety are threatened.

In order to win this war, we must support our troops who are deployed around the world to defend our nation and our allies everyday. These young men and women carry the patch of our flag on their arms and the spirit of our nation in their hearts.

We also must continue to rebuild our intelligence agencies so they do not fall into the lackluster conditions they did before and with work in the world community to stop threats before they reach our shores. There is still a great deal more work to do, but we will pursue until the job is finished. Winning this battle across the world, others may wonder where we draw our energy from. It is important that our friends and enemies realize one important and crucial fact: the war on terror is spurred on by the hearts and minds of every American who will not let the hateful, senseless thing that happened on that tragic day in September.
in the country. Last month, Iraqi security forces played an active role in 90 percent of security operations and acted independent of coalition support in nearly 40 percent of those missions.

These successes have given us the opportunity to re-evaluate the potential withdrawal of our forces and those of the 28 coalition allies who continue to support the development of a free and stable Iraq. However, in doing so, we have a responsibility to do so based on conditions on the ground, and should not be bound by an arbitrary timeline for withdrawal that could only strengthen our enemies resolve. Doing so would do a grave injustice to the brave men and women of our armed services, who have already sacrificed so much in the cause of freedom.

Ms. DOUCETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the House Resolution 861. Calling this a true debate on Iraq is a joke, and the Republican majority knows it. The Majority Leader has admitted the true motive—to use this issue in the fall elections against the Democrats. Shame on him and shame on the Republican Party for deliberately restricting a debate that should be a full debate about the most important issue facing our country. Shame on them for trying to set a political trap and not allowing amendments or a full debate. If we were allowed a fair process, the facts would be revealed and they are pretty.

After the tragedy and horror of September 11, 2001, everyone saw the threat posed by Al Qaeda. I voted for the authorization for President George W. Bush to use force against the Taliban in Afghanistan who were harboring Osama bin Laden. That is why I said I am a strong supporter of the war on terrorism.

When President Bush came to Congress and asked for authorization to invade Iraq, he made no case that that country was an imminent threat to the United States, or, in fact, related to our international fight against terrorism. So, I opposed the authorization for President Bush to use military force against Iraq in 2002, and that vote was the proudest vote I have taken in nearly 10 years in Congress.

Despite the paucity of evidence to invade a sovereign nation, Congress authorized President Bush to go forward and we invaded Iraq. Instead of remaining focused on combating terrorists, the true imminent threat to our country, we got detoured into Iraq. Our courageous men and women in uniform did a tremendous job in the effort to defeat Saddam Hussein. I have supported them every step of the way and continue to support them as I stand here today.

Having toppled its government, I felt we had an obligation to see Iraq transition to a new democratic system, and I was patient as Iraq struggled to establish a new civil society and government after years of oppression.

In the three years since the invasion, Americans have provided security and rebuilding assistance. Despite the gross mistakes, mismanagement, and misjudgments of our civilian leadership, Iraq is now a sovereign, free country, a country with a new constitution and a new government. At this point in time, we have done what we can. We’ve given the Iraqi people an opportunity. It is now their opportunity to grab freedom. It is now their country to lose.

Unfortunately our efforts have come at a tremendous cost. Major General John Batiste, a commander in Iraq and military aide to Mr. Paul Wolfowitz, noted that “Rumsfeld and his team turned what should have been a delib erate victory in Iraq into a prolonged challenge.” 2.500 of our best and brightest young people have paid the ultimate sacrifice to our country. All Americans are forever in their debt. In addition to the heartbreaking human toll, there is a financial one as well. We have now spent or appropriated, according to the Congressional Research Service, about $320 billion on the war in Iraq.

Enough is enough. Enough devastation for mothers and fathers who have lost children in Iraq; enough heartache for their loved ones and friends; enough young lives cut short; enough being forced to shortchange domestic priorities like health care and homeland security because billions are being spent on Iraq. We have given the Iraqis a chance. That is all they can ask of us and that is all we can ask of ourselves. As such, it is time to shift troops to the periphery of the conflict and redirect some resources currently being used in Iraq back to America.

Despite what the Republican majority suggests through this Resolution, saying it is now time to begin redeploying troops and that President Bush feels it is simply not worth more blood to achieve perfection in Iraq, they are right. It is time we in Congress listened.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution to affirm the United States of America will ultimately achieve victory in the Global War on Terrorism.

On September 11, 2001, 3,000 of our fellow Americans were brutally killed by Islamic terrorists under the leadership of Osama bin Laden. President Bush responded by declaring war against terrorism and its strongholds throughout the world. He said we would fight the enemy on their ground to prevent terrorists from once again attacking our citizens on U.S. soil.

The Bush Doctrine stated, “Any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime.” U.S. and Coalition forces have verified his words with irrefutable action. The state-sponsored “safe harbor” Al Qaeda enjoyed in Afghanistan ended when U.S. and Northern Alliance forces routed the Taliban in a decisive military victory.

Afghanistan now has a newly elected parliament, a market economy, equality for women, and millions of children attending school. Americans should be proud of what we have accomplished in Afghanistan in the name of freedom.

Although Al Qaeda remains a persistent danger to the United States. This terrorist network operates in over 60 countries around the world. It brainwashes men and women into becoming suicide bombers; destroys religious sites; bombs and beheads innocent civilians; and seeks the destruction and overthrow of America, our values, our people, our freedoms and our way of life.

We cannot allow Al Qaeda the opportunity to establish a permanent base in Iraq from which to attack the United States. The collapse of Iraq’s new democratic government would be a huge victory for Al Qaeda, drawing additional recruits for bin Laden’s brand of terrorism from the ranks of young Muslims. It is well-known that bin Laden seeks nuclear, chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction to inflict severe casualties on the United States and allied countries.

Al Qaeda conducted poison gas experiments on dogs in Afghanistan, and the government of Britain, France, and Israel have each foiled plans by Al Qaeda to use chemical weapons. U.S. intelligence sources have documented repeated attempts by Al Qaeda to purchase nuclear material, including weapons grade uranium. Nations such as Iran and North Korea are a potential risk for transferring nuclear capabilities to terrorist insurgents.

We must not fall into a sense of complacency. The continued threat from Al Qaeda to
our citizens at home and abroad is real. Thankfully, U.S. and Coalition forces have captured or killed more than three-fourths of Al Qaeda’s known pre-9/11 leaders. These include senior field commanders, masterminds of the September 11th attacks, communications coordinators, and key operational leaders. Just last week, the leader of Al Qaeda in Iraq was killed by U.S. forces.

Abu Musab al-Zarqawi had repeatedly attacked religious shrines and Iraqi political coordinators, and other key operational leaders. The February bombing of the Askariya shrine in Samarra—one of Iraq’s holiest religious sites—ignited a firestorm of reprisals that led to the deaths of over 130 Iraqis. Killing the man who incited this violence was a resounding victory toward building a safe, secure, stable Iraq.

More than 4,000 suspected Al Qaeda members have been arrested worldwide since 9/11, and Al Qaeda cells have been identified and dismantled in Europe, the Middle East, Asia and Africa. Over $140 million in terrorist financial assets have been confiscated or sanitized from over 1,400 bank accounts worldwide.

Mistakes have been made in the War on Terror, but the Bush Doctrine of dissuasion and deterrence is working. Pakistan broke its state-sponsored ties to Al Qaeda and the Taliban, and we must sustain that deterrence and disavowed terrorism. Until recently, Iran had frozen its uranium enrichment program, but is now threatening our country amid the perceived weakness that we will pull our forces out of Iraq before that nation is able to govern and protect itself from terror. This dangerous mistake has been made.

Iraqi units are taking the lead on missions to root out insurgents. And we have already brought 30,000 troops home and turned bases over to the Iraqis; but we cannot leave Iraq and allow it to be turned into a breeding ground for international terrorism. We must not leave this problem to our children or grandchil- dren. And we must never forget—we are fighting the terrorists over there so we do not have to fight them here at home! The global terrorist network is constantly recruiting, training and planning its next attack.

That is why we must continue to fight terrorism overseas to try and reach them from our doorstep. However, we must not be foolish enough to believe that they are not already here. That is why I do not understand why people would have us leave Iraq—Why they would take a defensive stand against terrorism. We had that mindset on September 10, 2001, and it cost us thousands of lives on 9/11. We must not make the same mistake. We must take the path that is easy. We must take the fight to the terrorists and continue to do so and let those overseas drug cartels and terrorists on behalf of all Americans and people fighting for freedom worldwide. Our courageous soldiers have removed a tyrannical dictatorship from power and are helping eliminate the ability of thousands of terrorists to harm innocent civilians.

The war in Iraq has been difficult, but progress is being made. Last week, al-Zarqawi, the terrorist leader in Iraq, was killed. Shiites, Sunnis, and Kurds are working through their differences. Women are now allowed to get an education.

We must not take the path that is easy. We must take the fight to the terrorists and continue to do so and secure our borders. There is no doubt that our porous borders are vulnerable to people who want to do us harm. Since the deployment of the National Guard to the border, we have already seen improvements in border security. In the first ten days of June, there has been a 21 percent decline in illegal border crossings compared to the same time period last year. Let us not forget—Terrorism is not an ideology; it is a tactic to make people fearful. Throughout history, terrorism has failed and it will fail again. People who respect and believe in freedom and democracy for all, yearn for freedom because it is a natural right of humankind. The challenge facing our generation is to help those that seek to be free. This goal is being realized in Iraq and the effects are being felt around the world. We will win the War on Terror. As we debate this war, let’s remember that we are fighting an enemy who wants us dead. This leaves no room for partisan politics. It requires a united America.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support our efforts to secure Iraq in the ongoing Global War on Terror and to honor the brave work our servicemen and women are doing to protect our freedoms at home and to promote democracy abroad.
Iraq is the central front in the Global War on Terror. Al-Qaeda views Iraq as the main battleground to spread their ideology of hate and violence against the Iraqi people and the civilized world. The simple fact is we are fighting terrorists in Iraq so we don’t have to fight them here in our homeland. I have visited Iraq and have seen firsthand the atrocities brought on by the Iraqi people and their infrastructure by Saddam Hussein’s regime. I stood in the spider hole that Saddam Hussein was cowering in before his capture and was able to meet many of the brave men and women who are serving there. Now, the “Butcher of Baghdad” is behind bars and is on trial for brutal crimes against his own people, and democracy is slowly coming to fruition in a Nation and a region of the world that has never known it.

It has been an exciting week in Iraq, with the completion of Iraq’s National Unity Government and the death of Abu-Musab al-Zarqawi, a terrorist and ally of Osama bin Laden. This week was capped off by President Bush’s surprise trip to Baghdad Tuesday to reach out to America’s commitment to securing a peaceful Iraq.

Only with our continued presence and coalition support will Iraq be able to make the transition to a peaceful and prosperous democracy. It is imperative that we remain patient and vigilant in Iraq, in the Global War on Terror.

Mr. Speaker, may God continue to bless our brave men and women serving to protect our homeland.

Mr. MINSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 861, which, above all, honors our brave men and women prosecuting the Global War on Terror and declares that the United States will prevail. I am pleased we are debating this resolution today, because it is imperative that Congress confirm to the world that Americans stand united in support of our troops. It is also imperative to leave no doubt that the U.S. has the unity and resolve to defeat the terrorists and win the War on Terror.

U.S. and coalition forces have made great strides in Iraq, and have liberated Afghanistan from the brutal Taliban and continue to support the democratically elected government of President Hamid Karzai.

We have overthrown the world’s most depraved genocidal maniac in Saddam Hussein, who now sits in a jail cell awaiting judgment before the people who not long ago suffered greatly under his brutality. And we have significantly disrupted al Qaeda’s terrorist network by systematically hunting down its leaders, its financiers and its footsoldiers. Our brave men and women have earned the gratitude of killing the murderous head of al Qaeda in Iraq, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi.

Now we are engaged in the difficult task of rebuilding Iraq and training Iraqi security forces and police officers. We need to expedite the training of Iraqi security forces so they can secure their country, and our troops can come home with their mission completed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an overwhelming “yes” vote on this resolution to show our brave troops in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere in the War on Terror that they continue to have strong bipartisan support in Congress. Our prayers are with all our brave troops. More than 2,600 Minnesota National Guard troops are serving in Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. An additional 367 are serving in Afghanistan and elsewhere. All our brave troops are in my daily prayers, along with their families who are making great sacrifices at home. We also pay tribute to our brave troops who made the ultimate sacrifice in the defense of our freedom. May these American heroes rest in peace and may God comfort their grieving families.

Mr. Speaker, great moments and triumphs in American history require bravery, valor and selfless service. The men and women of our armed forces have answered the call. Moreover, over, our troops have the skills, dedication and full support of the American people to prevail in the War on Terror. Today, the Congress can demonstrate our continuing strong support, as well.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution before us and the courageous servicemen and women that are currently serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. It is unfortunate that today’s debate was limited this is such a serious issue facing our Nation.

In addition to combating terrorism throughout these two countries, it is essential that two key components are met to achieve success in Iraq—security and stability. The Iraqis must continue to make significant progress in increasing security and providing stability in every part of the country. Moreover, over, our troops have the skills, dedication and full support of the American people to prevail in the War on Terror. Today, the Congress can demonstrate our continuing strong support, as well.
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In closing, let me just say that when I visited Iraq with my colleagues to thank our troops for all they are doing, it was they who thanked us for caring enough to visit them over there. We owe them such a debt of gratitude, and yet their spirit of service and commitment to their mission led them to thank us.

Mr. Speaker, no American troop should ever have to thank a member of Congress. They should know that we are with them, that we support them, and that our support and thanks are there for them and with them always.

Mr. Speaker, in 1991 New Jersey, Mr. Speaker, a free and prosperous Iraq is one which is no longer a breeding ground for terrorism, no longer a wealth of support for radical Islam, no longer a breeding ground for terrorism, no longer a breeding ground for terrorism, no longer a breeding ground for terrorism, no longer a breeding ground for terrorism, no longer a breeding ground for terrorism, no longer a breeding ground for terrorism, no longer a breeding ground for terrorism, no longer a breeding ground for terrorism.

Their achievement has made our hemispheric safer and brings optimism that other nations around the world will have similar triumphs over terror.

Mr. Welller. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of our Nation’s continuing dedication to the War on Terror and this resolution we are debating today. When we think of the War on Terror, we immediately think of the frontlines in Iraq and Afghanistan where our armed forces in harm’s way.

The Iraqis have had increasingly broad and successful elections. They have developed a democratic system, and near-constant state of war, they went through the enemies of civilization.

America.

Mr. Welller. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of our Nation’s continuing dedication to the War on Terror and this resolution we are debating today. When we think of the War on Terror, we immediately think of the frontlines in Iraq and Afghanistan where our soldiers are bravely fighting for the hope and freedom for the future of the Iraqi people.

The preamble of the Iraqi constitution reads: “We the people of Iraq . . . are determined to respect the rule of law, reject the policy of aggression, pay attention to women and their rights, the elderly and their cares, the children and their affairs, spread the culture of diversity and defuse terrorism.”

This is a statement rarely seen in the history of Middle Eastern nations. Iraqi legislators are determined to create a free society on par with our own. The future of Iraq is one in which men and women are free to practice their religion and speak their mind without fear of imprisonment or death.

Every景观 is designed for the parents and loved ones of the brave men and women who are serving in Iraq. Every one of us wants to see those young heroes quickly and safely return home.

I would like to read from a message I received from one of the brave young men who is serving in Iraq. He said: “There is a tough war going on here, but we can either fight the enemy here or back at home. If we were to withdraw, there would be a bloodbath of epic proportions that would only encourage the enemies of freedom.”

Now is the time that the Iraqi people may build a bright future of freedom, opportunity, and peace upon their rich cultural heritage.
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I am confident that God will grant you the strength to carry on your fight. But all Americans should rise to your support. They need to cast aside complacency and lassitude, to stand up to an administration hellbent on destroying the underpinnings of our democracy. In short, we must sound off.

With admiration and respect,

SANDFORD H. WINSTON
LTC, USA Ret.

IRAQ: WE NEED A STRATEGY, NOT EMPTY SLOGANS

God bless Representative John Murtha, the Pennsylvania Democrat. He is the only Member of Congress with the guts to tell the American people the truth about this war. He does not spin this story. He calls for the removal of our forces from Iraq ASAP on the basis that only the Iraqis themselves can heal the divisions that they thrust toward a viable government. He describes bluntly the irreconcilable mess that is Iraq with its three obdurate and competing factions—Kurds, Shiites and Sunnis. He emphasizes the failure of the U.S.-led efforts to provide essential services to the Iraqi people such as electricity and oil production that are being cut back prior to our preemptive invasion. He makes it clear that the Iraqi people really don’t want us there.

General Powell asserts that most of our more than 2,450 dead and 17,000 wounded—many of them amputees, spinal cord and head injuries—have been caused by improvised explosive devices. IEDs continue to extract a great toll on our people even after three years of war and ceaseless effort to neutralize them. Still, we have had more than enough time to devise a practical, achievable strategy for extracting our troops. There is none. Joining Mr. Murtha in the class of great American patriots are the seven retired Army and Marine generals who view the Administration’s conduct of the war as deplorable and had the guts to call for the removal of Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld.

President Bush has stated our objective in Iraq is establishing “a democracy which can defend itself, sustain itself—a country which is an asset rather than a liability which serves as a powerful example for others who desire to be free.” Religion, culture and customs combine to pose inescapable barriers to this overreach. This overreach is actually in a state of civil war now even though the Administration won’t acknowledge that fact. American-trained Iraqi soldiers were asked to prove they are capable, loyal and trustworthy. The Parliament, to this point, has refused to agree on Ministers of Defense, Interior and National Security. Without sold political backing behind appointees to these three ministries the prospects for success are remote.

The President promotes support of his war by spreading public fear. He refers to our Iraq campaign as a part of a “global war on terror.” Is there really an ongoing global war? War in the context of a government preparing to take on the United States? This thought by the President acts to promote public anxiety, but not enough for him to call for a military draft and muscles the forces we need to prevail in a global war. If he tried to do that the Congress would revolt and his approval numbers in the polls would say zero. Administration scare tactics are reinforced by the Vice President who warns that the Muslims are working to establish caliphates that extend from the coast of Spain to Pakistan and that the conglomeration of caliphates in the offing intend to attack us? If so, our country is not prepared to confront this awesome threat. Hopefully we are summoning aggressive diplomatic activity and the active support of the United Nations, the countries of Mr. Rommel’s old ally in peace-loving allies in readying our defenses.

Let’s make one thing clear. Iraq is our national disaster. It is diluting the resources we need to fight a tragic war in Iraq. The only people with a real stake in the war are apparently our men and women in uniform and their families. They represent about one percent of a population nearing 200 million. There are few signs of spontaneous patriotism other than Support Our Troops bumper stickers. While the long war continues, the Army is being torn to shreds courtesy of Mr. Rumsfeld. It is forced to pay incentives of up to $40,000 to recruit soldiers and still can’t meet its personnel quotas. It promotes unqualified officers to fill its ranks. The Marine Corps is no better off. The National Guard has been worked beyond reason with its people being sent to Iraq on multiple tours. As General Powell says, “Iraq is a failed state. The ground in Iraq saying that our involvement may last 10 years.”

Our people are being fed slogans in lieu of a strategy that supports our operations in Iraq. Some examples:

Stay the course. No mention is made of the price that must be paid to stay the course. The President does not say how many American lives he is willing to sacrifice in such a feckless pursuit. He visualizes a lengthy stay in Iraq if one takes at face value his assertions.

Joining Mr. Murtha in a Congress with the guts to tell the American people to see that we get one come this November. The new Congress can vote to cut off funding that supports the Iraq war as soon as it convenes, or it can send leaders representing both parties to stand before the Iraqi Parliament and announce that Iraq has 90 days to assume responsibility for its own fate.

To paraphrase General of the Army Omar Bradley’s warning on Vietnam, the war in Iraq is the wrong war, at the wrong time, in the wrong place. When the time comes, vote Americans, vote! Only you can end this war.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are having this debate today. Frankly, I think it is shameful it has taken us three years to have an “open” debate on the war while our soldiers are dying, their family members are praying for their safe return, and the American public is questioning what, exactly, is this policy over there. The debate were actually open. The lack of debate is even more shameful when you consider the fact we have been fighting in Iraq longer than we fought in World War I, the European Theater of World War II, and Korea. The American people deserve better, and you can bet your life the American soldier definitely deserves better than that. The American soldier deserves more than ten hours of debate on a policy that affects their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I want everyone in America to know that the Leadership of the House of Representatives wants to stifle debate and control what you hear from your government. Every single American citizen should ask themselves this, “What are they trying to hide? What are they afraid of? If a policy decision is so sound, you would think they would let it be debated. Congressman Murtha, retired Marine colonel, decorated and wounded veteran of Vietnam, with the reminder that Marines do not cut and run. I define cut and run as people taking purposeful action to avoid hazardous duty in time of war. It may sound insensitive to say so, but to me the two most prominent examples of cut and run are the Pentagon Papers and Vietnam War. Why don’t we just eliminate cut and run from our lexicon? It is Hollywood/John Wayne talk, not real world political talk.

The media does not report the positive things we do. Hogwash! The American press has done more to build and preserve our democracy than any other national institution including our armed forces. Blaming the media is the last resort of knownothings.

President Bush must tell the truth when dealing with the media.

There is a way out of the quagmire. To disengage in Iraq we need a new Congress sworn in—a Congress with guts. It is up to the American people to see that we get one come this November. The new Congress can vote to cut off funding that supports the Iraq war as soon as it convenes, or it can send leaders representing both parties to stand before the Iraqi Parliament and announce that Iraq has 90 days to assume responsibility for its own fate.

To paraphrase General of the Army Omar Bradley’s warning on Vietnam, the war in Iraq is the wrong war, at the wrong time, in the wrong place. When the time comes, vote Americans, vote! Only you can end this war.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are having this debate today. Frankly, I think it is shameful it has taken us three years to have an “open” debate on the war while our soldiers are dying, their family members are praying for their safe return, and the American public is questioning what, exactly, is this policy over there. The debate were actually open. The lack of debate is even more shameful when you consider the fact we have been fighting in Iraq longer than we fought in World War I, the European Theater of World War II, and Korea. The American people deserve better, and you can bet your life the American soldier definitely deserves better than that. The American soldier deserves more than ten hours of debate on a policy that affects their lives.
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To paraphrase General of the Army Omar Bradley’s warning on Vietnam, the war in Iraq is the wrong war, at the wrong time, in the wrong place. When the time comes, vote Americans, vote! Only you can end this war.
the goal to make Democrats look “sheepish.” In my opinion, war and the deaths of American soldiers is too serious to be used as a political tool. Don’t our soldiers deserve more respect from Congress than this? Additionally, anyone who would accuse a Member of Congress of not supporting our troops to shame them into actually voting for themselves whether anything is sacred to them anymore. They should ask themselves whether or not there is any depth to which they won’t sink in order to score political points?

Mr. Speaker, I was not a Member of Congress when the resolution passed giving the President the authority to send our fighting men and women to war. However, since I’ve been a Member of Congress I have continued my lifelong support for our troops. I have voted for every spending request, and I have been to Iraq to visit our soldiers four times. Every Member of Congress should have gone to Iraq by now, and if you haven’t, go. Whether or not you support this war you need to show your support for our soldiers, and they deserve to talk to us face to face and let us know what is really happening over there.

Mr. Speaker, how we got to Iraq should not be the point at this time. Historians, politicians, and the American public will debate that for years on end, and you can bet they will draw conclusions and hold people responsible in the history books and the public opinion of the future. However, right now we should focus on how we stabilize the country, allowing for a new, free, democratic Iraq to rein, and how we get our troops home safe as soon as possible while ensuring our future is more stable and secure.

Mr. Speaker, I support our troops. The Congress and the American public support our troops. And I think we should reaffirm our support for the troops by giving them every tool they need, like additional armor and padding for their helmets to protect them from IEDs, rather than forking over taxpayers dollars hand over fist to Halliburton and other defense contractors with little to no accountability. That, I think, would be a stronger sign of support for our troops, or the war, than any political tactic.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for both political parties to figure out that our base is America, and the American people, not the ideologues of the political fringe.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with the number of U.S. military deaths in Iraq reaching 2,500, it’s disappointing that the best the GOP leadership can do is demand more of the same. That’s exactly what this resolution does by calling for a vague open-ended deployment of American forces. Instead, this resolution allows only a phony debate on the “war on terror” which will not allow amendments that would offer alternatives to the Bush administration’s policy in Iraq.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, the lessons of history demonstrate that threats, left unchecked, become more dangerous over time. In the long-term isolationism is not an effective solution for peace-keeping nations.

Osama bin Laden, and the al Qaeda terrorist network he founded, were at war with the United States throughout the 1990s. 1993: The first attack on the World Trade Center
1998: Bin Laden claims: Muslims should kill Americans anywhere—including civilians.
May 1998: Bin Laden foreshadows the future. He warns the battle will “move to American soil.”
June 1998, a grand jury investigation issued an indictment against bin Laden.
On the 8th anniversary of the UN sanctions against Iraq, two simultaneous explosions occurred at the U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. The bomb in Kenya kills 213 people, including 12 American, injuring more than 4,500. In Tanzania, there are 288 dead—85 injured.
August 20, 1998 President Clinton orders cruise missile attacks at suspected terrorist training camps in Afghanistan and a pharmaceutical plant in the Sudan.

Soon after a new indictment was issued against bin Laden.

However, Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda were left virtually unchecked despite these and other terrorist attacks throughout the 1990s and up until 9/11.

1998: Bin Laden Keny, including the former site of the American Embassy in Nairobi. Today that site has been replaced by a park with a fountain, a memorial wall that has all the victim’s names on it, and a memorial building.

Wednesday, after receiving confirmation of Zarqawi’s death, Coalition and Iraqi Security Forces conducted 17 simultaneous raids in the Baghdad area, yielding a treasure trove of information and intelligence that is being analyzed for future use.

National Security Adviser Mouwafak al-Rubaie said today that these documents and computer records would give the Iraqi government the upper hand in its fight against al-Qaeda in Iraq.

“We believe that this is the beginning of the end of al-Qaeda in Iraq,” al-Rubaie said, adding that the documents showed al-Qaeda is in “pretty bad shape,” politically and in terms of training, weapons and media.
The War on Terror will be a long war. Yet we have mobilized to win other long wars, and we can and will win this one. Last year, I traveled to Iraq and everybody I met was enthusiastic about doing their job and helping the Iraqi people. We found our troops have high morale and a commitment to their mission. The troops told us that we are winning the war.

Because of our intervention, a murderous dictator and a totalitarian regime have been overthrown, free elections have been held, a new national unity government has been completed. Mr. Speaker, Iraq is only one theater in the overall Global War on Terror and success in Iraq is vital to victory. Much has been accomplished but much is left to be done. The question for all of us here is do we have the will to stay the course and leave with honor I believe we do. We must finish the job. The stakes are too high to fail.

Mr. NUSSELE. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to have this debate. I first of all want to thank our brave soldiers and all our brave soldiers deployed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other regions of the world. Throughout our history, our freedom and our way of life have been preserved by the grave sacrifices made by the men and women of our military. We cannot thank them enough. I want to specifically thank the many Reserve and National Guard units from my home state of Iowa serving overseas. Throughout the War on Terror, Iowa has had one of the highest overseas deployment rates of any state.

Recently, I had the opportunity to welcome back a battalion of Marine reservists from Waterloo, Iowa, in my district. I was very impressed by the brave soldiers of Charlie Company, 1st Battalion, 14th Marines who risked their lives conducting vital security operations throughout the Al Anbar province of Iraq in the dangerous areas of Ramadi, Al Asad and Falluja. They left their families and loved ones behind to serve a cause greater than themselves—the cause of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the war on terror in Iraq is a vital part of the Global War on Terror. Removing Saddam Hussein from power was a difficult but necessary step to eliminate the threat that his regime had posed for so long to the United States and the international community. We should take this opportunity to reflect on our many accomplishments in Iraq over the past three years.

Saddam Hussein’s reign of terror is over, his sons have been killed, and just last week we learned the good news that the leader of the Iraqi insurgency, the brutal terrorist Abu Musab Al-Zarqawi, has been eliminated.

The Iraqi people have taken historic strides towards establishing a free and stable democracy. They have participated in free elections for the first time, drafted a new constitution, and elected a new Prime Minister Nuri Kamal al-Mikili just announced the formation of his cabinet. In addition, the Iraqi security forces continue to increase in number and have taken a larger role in the defense their country.

Mr. Speaker, at this time it is necessary to stay the course and follow the path to a lasting peace in Iraq. We will continue to provide for our troops and ensure that they have the best training, equipment, and technology available. And we must not waver in our commitment to win the Global War on Terror and protect our homeland from brutal terrorists who wish to attack our homeland and our very way of life.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of our continued mission in Iraq as part of the Global War on Terror.

I am proud to say that throughout the Global War on Terror, thousands of Idahoans have fought valiantly side-by-side with their fellow countrymen and newly freed citizens of Iraq and Afghanistan. During the last Iraq in May 2005, I had the opportunity to visit with the brave men and women of the 116th Cavalry Brigade. I was amazed at their level of professionalism and their enthusiasm for the mission. They took great pride in their contributions and were fully committed to finishing the job. I have been similarly impressed by our nation’s military as a whole.

When I consider what action should be taken in Iraq I look to the advice of the experts, those who are on the ground fighting the war. The message I continually hear from these experts and generals is: Finish the job, complete the mission.

I know there have been many calls in the United States lately to withdraw our troops from Iraq or set some kind of artificial deadline for withdrawal. Mr. Speaker, I strongly disagree with this defeatist attitude. A premature withdrawal from Iraq could be disastrous for America.

In an interview with Osama bin Laden just prior to the 1998 terrorist attacks on the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, bin Laden referred to the United States as a “paper tiger” because of our withdrawal from Somalia after the tragic loss of 18 U.S. soldiers. Al-Qaeda learned from this, and similar events, that the United States would retreat rather than fight. During the War on Terror, Al-Qaeda has counted on Americans to similarly become demoralized and once again withdraw from the fight. It is the cornerstone of their strategy.

If we lose heart and withdraw from Iraq before the mission is complete, Iraq will become a permanent breeding ground of hate and terror for instead of the stable mid-east democracy it is becoming. Our enemies will become further emboldened by their perceived victory. A premature withdrawal from Iraq would only strengthen their resolve to use cowardly and barbarous terrorist attacks to achieve their ends. An artificial timeline for a withdrawal would only have similar results. The enemy need only sit back, wait, and then step forward to declare victory once U.S. forces have left. As a consequence, Americans and democratic societies throughout the world will be in great- er danger than before.

We simply cannot afford to back down, return home, and hope this threat will dissipate on its own. The terrorists must be confronted and must be defeated. We cannot pass this mission on to another generation. This is our job and the time is now. By stepping up and completing this mission we will in the gift of greater peace and stability to future generations.

I can understand why so many want to cut and run, it would be the easy thing to do. I do not understand how one can say that the mission in Iraq is a difficult one and it has been costly. The price for freedom is all too often painfully high. I, for one, do not ever want to receive another notice that a fellow Idahoan, or any American,
has fallen or been wounded in this war. However, quitting now would only prolong bloodshed in the long run, not end it.

Once again Mr. Speaker, I support America’s efforts to complete the mission in Iraq, and I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to commit to its completion. At such a perilous time in our nation’s history let us stand united.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the leadership allowing this important discussion on the war in Iraq and the ongoing war on terror.

We can all regret the faulty intelligence that overestimated the presence of WMDs. We can focus on the need to press the new Iraqi government to meet speedy and attainable goals for the responsibility for their own security. But, we should never underestimate what’s at stake in Iraq for their people or ours.

Nor should we ever permit the use of propaganda or terrorist barbarism to signal to the brave men and women serving this Nation in uniform that the resolve of our country is waning.

There are many thoughts that I could lay upon the record of this body about the war on terrorism, but sometimes it’s better to shut up and listen to the voices of those who know much more than you or I. One of the casualties of war in my district was a great Marine—Lance Cpl. Nowacki. Andy, 24, was a member of the Grand River Police Department and was killed by an IED in Iraq on February 26, 2005. His family, though filled with grief, determined that Andy’s spirit would live on in many ways. One way will come through the establishment of a scholarship fund at Lakeland Community College.

On March 31st of this year, friends, comrades and family gathered to honor Andy’s memory and raise funds for the scholarship. One of the people to speak that evening was Lt. Col. Mark A. Smith, the former battalion commander of Andy’s unit—the 2nd Battalion, 24th Marines. Lt. Col. Smith’s remarks, which I ask through unanimous consent to appear in the Record immediately following my own, centered on the question of “Why.” He stated in part: “...think the part that’s most lost in public discourse in the ongoing global war on terror is really the “Why.” We all know how Andy died...I’d like to spend a few minutes talking about why Andy died.”

Mr. Speaker. Lt. Col. Mark A. Smith, with the eloquence of a soldier, said it better than I could ever hope to, and I commend his words to the House:

I got a call last Saturday when I was on duty from Sheila Nowacki, Andy’s mom. And she told me a part of the ceremony was going to be a pretty moving video, and she had a slight task for me. She asked me if I’d speak for a few minutes after the video, and to be positive.

Now, as the commanding officer of 2/24th, I don’t get the option of saying no to the families of my KIA’s for when I was responsible, but in Sheila’s and Dennis’s case, I was honored that they even asked me to, so I immediately rogered up to the mission. So, here we go.

The only way I know to be positive in talking about Andy is to talk about—from my perspective and from the Marines’ perspective in this room who shared time with him in combat—why Andy died. Because I think that the thing that’s most lost in public discourse about the ongoing global war on terror is really the “Why.” We all know how Andy died. Unfortunately, he was struck by an improvised explosive device while on an ASR in our zone. I’d like to spend just a few minutes talking about why Andy died.

Andy died because he was out engaging the enemy. The single most misunderstood aspect of this war is the enemy. And a professional war-fighter focuses on one thing and one thing only—the enemy. He doesn’t focus on time-lines, he doesn’t focus on how fast he can stand up Iraqi battalions. He focuses on the enemy, and there’s a particular reason why we need to focus on this enemy. Because this enemy is real, this enemy is vile, this enemy is evil. And this enemy has a 100-year plan to destroy the United States of America—a one hundred year plan. We think in terms of the next football season and they’re thinking in terms of 100 years from now and how they’re going to destroy this Nation.

Can this enemy win this war against us? Unfortunately, I’m here to tell you absolutely he can. He can focus on two things which he focuses on every day. The first thing this enemy focuses on is breaking the will of the American people. He does that through videos, he does that through propaganda, and he does that through information. The second way he can win this war is to convince the next generation of jihadists. It’s for these reasons, and because of this enemy, that Andy was in Iraq. And while so many still fail to get it, the enemy doesn’t. The enemy understands Iraq is the focus of effort, because he understands that as long as Marines are in Iraq that the will of the American people is foremost and in his head. He also understands that that is a will that can do, at every opportunity of battle, destroy this enemy. And then the second thing is what is us being there does to this enemy. Contrary to some popular opinion, it is does not create jihadists by us being there. Quite frankly, we deprive them of the next generation of jihadists because no one is more helped and/or more impressed with the Gentle Giants of America than the kids of the Andy’s and the Billy’s. I just met two kids in very quick stories, I’ll explain why that is.

One day we were going out to conduct a raid to arrest the Sgt. Major and the operations officer of the Iraqi Army battalion that we were training. Upon moving into our cordoned positions in the raid force—hitting the objective and seizing the Sgt. Major of the Iraqi Army battalion—his very children, the children of the Sgt. Major that we had in flex cuffs and blindfolded, were running around their front yard acting as if they were holding weapons and wearing Marines. One of these Marines was asked if he could speak with the children and he said, “Ask these kids what they’re doing.” And the interpreter, who was fluent in Arabic, asked them, and the kids said, in English, “Mistah, we play U.S. Marines, Mistah. We U.S. Marines.”

I don’t think those kids are going to grow up to be jihadists. I think those kids are growing up to grow up to be the honorable people that they saw the U.S. Marines in their zone to be. Further proof of that was mentioned by your emcee when she showed you that picture of Andy and those two Iraqi kids. They say a picture tells a thousand stories...that’s not a staged picture. That is honest respect for an American Marine, who in this case was Andy Nowacki. And there are thousands of them out there affecting those Iraqi kids every day.

The second story I want to tell you about is the election—the very first Iraqi election that occurred in our zone. In order to truly understand it, you have to backtrack to the middle of 2004. The election was scheduled for 31 January of 2005. Exactly two weeks before the election was to be held, the Iraqi government said there was no way an election would be held in our zone because in that point in time there were two triangles in Iraq that were Christians predominately. One was the Sunni Triangle and one was the Triangle of Death. The Triangle of Death was the Sunni Triangle and it was so named because for four months at that time, on a daily basis, we had gone forward, we had seized terrain, we had lived the misery of the Iraqi people. We had become their neighbors and, in so doing, we had sung steel and harsh language with this enemy on a daily basis, and they did not like that. They did not like the fact that these Marines were forward—living and earning the respect of the Iraqi people. But we were told that we were not going to convene an election that as a result of the efforts of Marines like Andy, the Iraqi people would come out and vote. We couldn’t guarantee them that it wouldn’t be violent, but we guaranteed them they would come out and vote.

We spent two weeks, having to put together eight polling places. That meant that we had to tactically go out 48 hours prior and we had to seize the locations. We had to set up all the force protection that would allow the Marines to protect the Iraqi people from what we knew would be constant and sure attacks on election day. And then most importantly, we had to transport 500 workers from the city of Baghdad down to our Battalion FOB, house them for two days, and then move them safely to those eight polling sites. You can rest assured that was one big, juicy target that the terrorist wanted to hit. We were able to accomplish all that, but the most telling time in all of that is where we housed these 500 election workers was in our battalion chow hall. My battalion major...had to set up all of our chow hall to be relocated from the fleeing of our fallen Marines. At that time, there were 12 of them. He had their pictures, and we had an American and a Marine Corps flag. Now for those of you who’ve never been to Iraq, who’ve never spent time with the Iraqi people, when you get two of them together, the noise level, the amount of smoking and the amount of drinking that goes on is pretty mind-numbing. When you put 500 of them in a facility, it borders on chaos. Now we accepted that that was going to have to be the cost—that our workers were probably going to get pretty torn up. And it did, except for one spot.

Any time any of those Iraqi election workers got anywhere near the Sgt. Major’s memorial, absolute, utter respectful, solemn silence. They respected the Marines and what they were doing for them, and that was a sight that I will take with me to my grave, and that makes me challenge those who say we’re creating jihadists. I argue we are doing just the opposite. On that very election day, the mortars flew, the mortars flew intently. All eight of our sites started getting mortared and rocketed in the 30 minutes they were supposed to open. I was sitting in my COC thinking, “Well, there’s the end of my career. I just convinced the whole world that we could
have an election and they’re blowing us up before they’ve even started.” But an amazing thing happened. In spite of all the mortars, in spite of all those rockets, in spite of the Marines providing security, telling the Iraqi people to seek cover, they refused, and in broken English, continually thanked the Marines. “You will protect us. You have brought us democracy. And we will vote.”

To conclude, one story from south of our zone where one young man pushed his 70-year-old father four miles under enemy fire in a shopping cart. When asked by the Marines, “What was the American soldier doing when earth did happen what he was doing?” He said: “My father has but one wish before he dies, to show you the respect of voting as a free man.”

One hundred years. That’s the enemy’s plan. He is prepared. Are we? As long as we have warriors, gentle warriors like Andy, the unbelievable support of parents like Dennis and Sheila who do things like this despite hav- ing sacrificed what they have sacrificed, and the support of Americans like you, we cannot lose. Sheila asked me to be positive. I don’t know how I can be anything but. If it weren’t for warriors like Andy and the other ones you see in this room here tonight, we would not be able to gather tonight to laugh, to cry and to celebrate.

Sheila asked me to be positive, I don’t know how to be anything else. I know now something I didn’t know a few years ago: Being positive does not make the world the way you wish it would be, it’s accepting the world the way it is and going out and doing what you can do to change it. I used to tell my young daughters when they’d see something on TV or read a fairy tale, I used to tell them there’s no such thing as dragons. I don’t tell them that anymore. There are dragons. There are fire-breathing, evil dragons that inhabit this world. But I tell them don’t be afraid, because for every dragon that is out there, there are 10 knights in shining armor that will go forth and suffer great hardship to protect you. And I’ve seen them, and I’ve worked with them and they’re called United States Marines. So be positive. I will be positive, Sheila, and I will be thankful and humbled that you asked me to speak tonight. I will forever thank God Almighty for Andy and all the warriors like Andy, and your amazing family, and this blessed land.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Iraq, a failure built on the lies of this Administration.

I am opposed to H. Res. 861, because contrary to what it states in this resolution, I believe that it is in the best interest of the United States to bring our troops home now. I voted against our involvement in Iraq, and I have opposed funding the conflict. For years, I have been calling for the return of our soldiers. This war has been a mistake, and our continued participation will not change this basic fact.

I have the utmost respect for our former Secretary of State Colin Powell. He was a truly outstanding Secretary of State: However, I will never forget how this great American was sent to the United Nations to sell a fabrication and to convince the world that this was a just endeavor. What we all now know were deliberately falsified evidences. This was just one part of a continuous effort to deceive the American public into believing that a conflict, that even many in our military had misgivings about, was the right thing for our nation to do.

The image of our President standing on the aircraft carrier and proclaiming “mission accomplished” is one that I continue to associate with this failed effort. Since that fabricated public relations moment, both our nation and the nation of Iraq have suffered great personal loss.

The American public no longer supports our involvement in Iraq, and we as their representatives, must respect their wishes and bring our troops home.

I am saddened and heartbroken when I think about how many brave young men and women have died in this conflict that was never in our nation’s interest. Many of these courageous young soldiers who have lost their lives came from the Bronx, from my own community, and so it is partly on their behalf that I believe I am now speaking. Too many American soldiers have died, too many innocent Iraqi civilians have suffered and lost their lives, and too many reporters have been killed—all as a result of this failed policy.

As I thought about what to say on the floor today, I went back to the remarks that I spoke on this floor on October 9, 2002, when this House was voting on the authorization for the use of military force against Iraq. At that time I certainly couldn’t anticipate what the result would be. I certainly didn’t think about how many brave young men and women would die in this conflict.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, we are fighting a war on terror, a war we did not start or choose. But to use that war as either justification for a war in Iraq, or a reason for staying, is wrong.

A lesson I’ve learned in life is you finish what you start. This Administration took us off-track from the war on terror and chose the war in Iraq. The torch of the war on terror should, and shall be, passed to future generations, but the war in Iraq was started by this Administration and should be finished by this Administration.

This Administration decided to launch the Iraq war based on, at best, shaky intelligence. Until that time, this country had historically set a high threshold in its decisions to go to war. The decision to go to war in June 2003 was done so hastily because of sometimes uncertain, and the cost in human lives is frequently high.

We who question this Administration’s decisions have faced the charge that to be candid about this war would upset military morale or bet against our troops. Now is the time for this President to be honest and forthright with the American people about its ill-conceived war. In candor, the Administration should say to the American people that no matter what course we choose now, the future in Iraq will be bloody and costly.

That is why democracies enter war as a last resort, with solid evidence and a united nation.

I have listened to our generals about their view of the future. General Casey has personally said to me that he needs until the summer of 2007 to fully train Iraqi forces. I am willing to allow General Casey the time to complete this task, but we should begin an immediate redeployment of troops.

General Casey’s projection might place Iraq on a course to embrace a self-governing democracy. However, the single most important action the newly elected Iraqi government can take to give that government legitimacy, is to ask Americans to leave and have Iraqis fight for Iraqis rather than have Americans fight for Iraqis.

As I have mentioned these days is our original mission in Afghanistan, the frontline of the real war on terror. We still have time for a complete success, but unfortunately we now do not have adequate resources in Afghanistan. In order to win, the immediate redeployment of troops from Iraq must include sending some troops to Afghanistan, or at least having some directly home from Iraq. It is time to return our attention and resources to hunting down Osama Bin Laden and ensuring Afghanistan does not again become a breeding ground for terrorism.

A little over sixty years ago, we fought a great war after Pearl Harbor. By this Thanksgiving, the Iraq war will have lasted longer than World War II. 4 long years ago many in
Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the brave men and women of our Armed Forces for their service and dedication to winning the War on Terror.

On September 11, 2001 a group of 19 hijackers commandeered 4 commercial aircraft and crashed them into the World Trade Center in New York City and the Pentagon in Washington, D.C., with the intent on destroying our way of life. Over 5,000 innocent men, women, and children lost their lives in this unprecedented attack. Sadly, the events that transpired on September 11th were the result of years of training and preparation by an enemy that does not value human life, liberty, equality, or religious freedom.

Our great Nation lost 473 American lives both civilian and military to the hands of terrorist from 1983 to 2001 for a total of 3,525 victims. With each passing decade our enemies have become more sophisticated and desperate to accomplish their aims of a global jihad. Indeed, in October, Ladens, the founder of al Qaeda, have declared war on the United States and created worldwide networks of hate to accomplish their aims.

On several occasions, bin Ladens has explained, that it should be every jihadis mission to go to Iraq, to understand and use them against the United States and its allies. The last 26 years have taught us that we must remain diligent and take every opportunity possible to find and destroy these ruthless killers wherever they reside. In order to accomplish this, I believe that the brave men and women of America’s Armed Forces have answered the call with honor and an intense dedication to the mission of preserving our way of life.

One of our most important responsibilities as members of Congress is to make sure our troops have every resource they need while advancing democracy overseas. By visiting these heroes where they serve, we’re able to get a much better understanding of what we can do to make their jobs as safe as possible. With this in mind, I decided to lead a Congressional delegation to the Middle East that traveled to Kuwait, Iraq, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Germany.

The leaders of these nations understood the importance of ensuring that we remain vigilant in fighting the Global War on Terror and expressed confidence in the abilities of the coalition forces. In Iraq, Kuwait, and Germany I had the special privilege of visiting with members of our Armed Forces and I found their moral to be high and their dedication to the cause unyielding. Soldiers like Sgt. Mark Gregory, 1st Lt. Marathana Laddy, Lt. Mike Schilling and Staff Sgt. Leonard Campe1.Vall from my home state of Nevada expressed their determination to see the mission through and understood that it will take time to achieve.

Since toppling Saddam Hussein’s ruthless government, the people of Iraq have created a 275 member parliament, confirmed the selection of the top seven posts for a national unity government, and laid a foundation for democracy. Now more than ever we must stay the course and support our Iraqi friends as they continue to strengthen the infrastructure of their government.

Last week on June 7, 2006 Coalition forces killed Abu Musab al-Zarqawi and his top lieu-

tenant and spiritual advisor Sheik Abd al-Rahman. Zarqawi was the operational com-
mander of the terrorist movement in Iraq and was personally responsible for the deaths of many American forces and thousands of inno-
cent Iraqis. The killing of Zarqawi is a testa-
ment to the notion that we must stay the course and remain committed to the mission and the Iraqi people.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and heart-
gutted that I salute the men and women of our Armed Forces and thank them for their service and dedication to our great nation.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the out of Iraq Caucus I rise in opposition to this resolution. We would not even be debating this bill if the American people were disillusioned by this war and did not want to bring our troops home.

I was among those who opposed the tragic decision to launch this war. I warned that the invasion and occupation of Iraq would plunge us into a bloody quagmire of violence that would only intensify the instability in the Middle East and leave this nation less secure and less able to protect our own interests.

The sad truth is that all the grimmest pre-
dictions have now come true and today—

The Taliban are mounting a major come-
back in Afghanistan;—

Iran is on the verge of producing a nuclear weapon;—

Somalia is dominated by an al Qaeda-in-
spired militia;—

And, here at home, our Nation is at risk.

The fundamental recommendations of the 911 Commission are still waiting.

Those who still support the Iraq war often claim it has made this Nation a safer place. That it has kept away the terrorists and stopped another 911 tragedy. Unfortunately, such wishful thinking is only a way to justify the horrendous human suffering that we have caused by our misguided mission, an effort to justify a war that was never properly planned and executed and that has wounded thou-
sands and cost the lives of two thousand five hundred American soldiers.

The toll of this war is still climbing and throughout the world terrorism is on the rise. The administration talks a lot about National security but those in Congress knows the war in Iraq has not made America a safer nation. We are appropriating millions and millions of dollars, at a time of skyrocketing Federal defi-
cits, to fortify security in the U.S. Capitol Com-
plex and at all other Federal facilities across this Nation. If Members of Congress believed this Nation is safer than it was before we captured Saddam Hussein, then why would we allow a single lost airplane to trigger the evac-
uation of the U.S. Capitol? Why does a single suspicious noise cause the lock down of the house office buildings? And just yesterday, why did the leadership of Congress upgrade our supplies of escape hoods?

No one in the leadership of Congress is be-
having like we have diminished the terrorist threat. We know the war has made U.S. more vulnerable to terrorism.

Our National security is still in danger. De-
mocracy is not flourishing in the Middle East. It is time to bring our troops home and to de-
vote our resources to our own national secu-
rity.

I commend my courageous colleague, Mr. MURTHA who has displayed tremendous patri-
otism on the battlefield, and in this chamber.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, while the war in Iraq has been grossly mismanaged, the United States has a moral obligation to the 2,500 people.

It is not the fault of our troops that the top seven posts for a national unity government, that will require the new govern-
ment to live up to its commitments, transfer responsibility for Iraq to Iraqis, and that will bring our troops home as soon as possible.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the brave men and women of our Armed Forces for their service and dedication to winning the War on Terror.

On September 11, 2001 a group of 19 hijackers commandeered 4 commercial aircraft and crashed them into the World Trade Center in New York City and the Pentagon in Washington, D.C., with the intent on destroying our way of life. Over 5,000 innocent men, women, and children lost their lives in this unprecedented attack. Sadly, the events that transpired on September 11th were the result of years of training and preparation by an enemy that does not value human life, liberty, equality, or religious freedom.

Our great Nation lost 473 American lives both civilian and military to the hands of terrorist from 1983 to 2001 for a total of 3,525 victims. With each passing decade our enemies have become more sophisticated and desperate to accomplish their aims of a global jihad. Indeed, in October, Ladens, the founder of al Qaeda, have declared war on the United States and created worldwide networks of hate to accomplish their aims.

On several occasions, bin Ladens has explained, that it should be every jihadis mission to go to Iraq, to understand and use them against the United States and its allies. The last 26 years have taught us that we must remain diligent and take every opportunity possible to find and destroy these ruthless killers wherever they reside. In order to accomplish this, I believe that the brave men and women of America’s Armed Forces have answered the call with honor and an intense dedication to the mission of preserving our way of life.

One of our most important responsibilities as members of Congress is to make sure our troops have every resource they need while advancing democracy overseas. By visiting these heroes where they serve, we’re able to get a much better understanding of what we can do to make their jobs as safe as possible. With this in mind, I decided to lead a Congressional delegation to the Middle East that traveled to Kuwait, Iraq, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Germany.

The leaders of these nations understood the importance of ensuring that we remain vigilant in fighting the Global War on Terror and expressed confidence in the abilities of the coalition forces. In Iraq, Kuwait, and Germany I had the special privilege of visiting with members of our Armed Forces and I found their moral to be high and their dedication to the cause unyielding. Soldiers like Sgt. Mark Gregory, 1st Lt. Marathana Laddy, Lt. Mike Schilling and Staff Sgt. Leonard Campe1.Vall from my home state of Nevada expressed their determination to see the mission through and understood that it will take time to achieve.

Since toppling Saddam Hussein’s ruthless government, the people of Iraq have created a 275 member parliament, confirmed the selection of the top seven posts for a national unity government, and laid a foundation for democracy. Now more than ever we must stay the course and support our Iraqi friends as they continue to strengthen the infrastructure of their government.

Last week on June 7, 2006 Coalition forces killed Abu Musab al-Zarqawi and his top lieu-

tenant and spiritual advisor Sheik Abd al-Rahman. Zarqawi was the operational com-
mander of the terrorist movement in Iraq and was personally responsible for the deaths of many American forces and thousands of inno-
cent Iraqis. The killing of Zarqawi is a testa-
ment to the notion that we must stay the course and remain committed to the mission and the Iraqi people.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and heart-
gutted that I salute the men and women of our Armed Forces and thank them for their service and dedication to our great nation.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the out of Iraq Caucus I rise in opposition to this resolution. We would not even be debating this bill if the American people were disillusioned by this war and did not want to bring our troops home.

I was among those who opposed the tragic decision to launch this war. I warned that the invasion and occupation of Iraq would plunge us into a bloody quagmire of violence that would only intensify the instability in the Middle East and leave this nation less secure and less able to protect our own interests.

The sad truth is that all the grimmest pre-
dictions have now come true and today—

The Taliban are mounting a major come-
back in Afghanistan;—

Iran is on the verge of producing a nuclear weapon;—

Somalia is dominated by an al Qaeda-in-
spired militia;—

And, here at home, our Nation is at risk.

The fundamental recommendations of the 911 Commission are still waiting.

Those who still support the Iraq war often claim it has made this Nation a safer place. That it has kept away the terrorists and stopped another 911 tragedy. Unfortunately, such wishful thinking is only a way to justify the horrendous human suffering that we have caused by our misguided mission, an effort to justify a war that was never properly planned and executed and that has wounded thou-
sands and cost the lives of two thousand five hundred American soldiers.

The toll of this war is still climbing and throughout the world terrorism is on the rise. The administration talks a lot about National security but those in Congress knows the war in Iraq has not made America a safer nation. We are appropriating millions and millions of dollars, at a time of skyrocketing Federal defi-
cits, to fortify security in the U.S. Capitol Com-
plex and at all other Federal facilities across this Nation. If Members of Congress believed this Nation is safer than it was before we captured Saddam Hussein, then why would we allow a single lost airplane to trigger the evac-
uation of the U.S. Capitol? Why does a single suspicious noise cause the lock down of the house office buildings? And just yesterday, why did the leadership of Congress upgrade our supplies of escape hoods?

No one in the leadership of Congress is be-
having like we have diminished the terrorist threat. We know the war has made U.S. more vulnerable to terrorism.

Our National security is still in danger. De-
mocracy is not flourishing in the Middle East. It is time to bring our troops home and to de-
vote our resources to our own national secu-
rity.

I commend my courageous colleague, Mr. MURTHA who has displayed tremendous patri-
otism on the battlefield, and in this chamber.
I support his call to implement a strategic re-
deployment from Iraq and explore the Mem-
bers of this body to have the good sense to
listen to the people of this Nation and to sup-
port the call to redeploy our U.S. troops in
Iraq.
Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to ex-
press my concerns over the Bush administra-
tion’s mismanagement of the war in Iraq.
First and foremost, I am disappointed that
the President still refuses to put forward a
strategy for a successful transition in Iraq and
a timetable for the withdrawal of American
forces.
Almost 2,500 of America’s military personnel
have lost their lives in this conflict, and thou-
sands more of our troops have been injured
and disabled. Among the most recent casual-
ties was a young man from my district and
hometown of Rialto, California. U.S. Army
Spc. Luis Daniel Santos was just 20 years old
and due to come home to his loving family—
his parents Irma and Carlos and siblings Car-
los Jr., Amy and Eric—next week. Luis was
engaged to his sweetheart from Fontana High
School, the pair looking forward to providing
a barbecue his mother was preparing for him.
Tragically, he was killed one week ago in a
roadside bombing while maneuvering his
Humvee in combat.
I offer my condolences to the Santos family
and join in mourning the death of this patriotic
young man.
Military families especially, and Americans
in general, understand the sacrifice that service
entails and the dangers involved. And we are
united in supporting our troops and honoring
their service.
However, the American public has lost con-
fidence in President Bush’s leadership. The
President has chosen to risk the lives of our
Armed Forces without providing a coherent
exit strategy, a realistic timetable, or the equi-
ipment required to complete the mission.
The American people want—and our military
forces deserve—a clear plan for completing the
Iraq transition and bringing our troops home.
As if the loss of life weren’t overwhelming
enough, the war in Iraq has cost American
taxpayers more than 300 billion dollars. Ameri-
cans have other needs and priorities, and 300
billion dollars could help solve some of the
challenges we have here at home. That same
money could have paid for 5 million additional
teachers in our schools, or 14 million four-year
college scholarships, or 2.5 million new afford-
able housing units across the country. Think
about how much money that is and how much
of a difference it could have made for working
families like those I represent in San Bernar-
dino County, California.
So I reiterate my call for the Bush adminis-
tration to plan for an orderly withdrawal of
American forces in Iraq. We must begin to
transfer security responsibilities to the Iraqi
people and allow the international community
to step in and help.
Our brave men and women in the Armed
Forces have sacrificed enough. They have
completed their mission and accomplished
what was needed. Their families have waited
for them long enough. Now it is time to bring
our troops home.
Mr. Speaker, American forces are at great
risk as they remain in Iraq without a clear ob-
jective. Their mission was to be a liberating
force, not an occupation force. We cannot
allow our troops to become targets of resent-
ment and terrorism while the administration
tries to figure out a plan.
American forces in Iraq have gone above
and beyond the call of duty. Their heroism and
compassion in the most trying of cir-
cumstances requires us to stand by and
support them in their most difficult time.
Despite inadequate equipment, despite
shifting priorities, despite swelling heat, our
military has delivered time and again. The
recent success in removing the threat posed by
terrorist al-Zarqawi is a testament to their te-
nacity and grit in the field.
But the President does not take their com-
mitment for granted and cannot expect them
to serve indefinitely. Military forces in Iraq
are already serving longer and longer deploy-
ments and a high percentage of returning
troops are falling prey to mental health dis-
orders and financial difficulty. We need a real
solution, Mr. Speaker.
I stand with my Democratic colleagues in
asking the President to provide a real solution
for peace and security in Iraq and ask my col-
leagues in Congress to recommit themselves
to providing adequate funding for our Armed
Forces, both at home and abroad, and our
veterans.
Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in sup-
port of House Resolution 861. Today’s debate
is about more than just the nation’s Iraq and
Afghanistan policy. It’s about freedom and
democracy worldwide and the fight against ter-
or and injustice. Our great nation is doing
what we have always done—fighting for the
values we hold dear and helping to spread
those values to other nations. We also have a
choice to make; do we want to continue to
fight the terrorists in the streets of America
or in Iraq and Afghanistan where al-Qaida has claimed as its
battleground to kill Americans?
The Global War on Terror hits home for me
because I have the distinct privilege of rep-
resenting the brave men and women stationed
at Fort Campbell, Kentucky. These coura-
geous Americans have been leading the way
in the Global War on Terror since September 11,
2001. In Afghanistan, these soldiers liber-
ated the country from the oppressive Taliban
regime. They helped stabilize the country and
their efforts as well as those of other units laid
the foundation for the democratic elections of
Afghanistan’s president, parliament, and pro-
vincial councils.
In Iraq, the 101st was deployed before the
war began in 2003 and were instrumental in
the success of dismantling the regime of the
criminal dictator Saddam Hussein. They were
also responsible for the location and death of
Saddam’s two sons. They liberated and rebuild
the town of Mosul, including the reconstruction
of the city’s infrastructure. The 101st is now
on its second deployment to Iraq and is in-
volved in the securing of the city of Ramadi
where some of the most violent fighting in Iraq
still exists. I have personally met with many of
the soldiers that have been involved in this
fight and they have my utmost admiration and
respect. After meeting with the soldiers of Fort
Campbell, I am convinced that they under-
stand what they are fighting for in Iraq and are
committed to the very end in order to preserve
the democracy we have helped create and to
ensure the safety of the Iraqi people.
One of my favorite sayings is that “Wounded
soldiers refuse to leave Iraq.” I’d like to share a couple
of stories from that article about soldiers from
Fort Campbell who are completely committed
to their mission in the Global War on Terror:
[From the Louisville Courier-Journal] 80634
Specialist Steven Clark from Fitzgerald,
Georgia is a soldier in the 562nd Infantry
Regiment of the 101st Airborne. He is a 25
year old young man who has been wounded
twice his age. In his time in Iraq, he has
been shot three times and has been
wounded by shrapnel from a grenade
that tore into his legs and back. He has been
awarded three Purple Hearts, with another
on the way, as well as a Bronze Star with
Letters. His Army buddies have nicknamed
him “Bullet Magnet.” You may ask why he
is still in Iraq and the answer is because he
wants to be. He says that his wounds are not
as important as the mission and he insists on
staying.
Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Kunk is a
commander in the 562nd Infantry Regiment.
One of his duties as an officer is to decide
which of his wounded soldiers can return to
duty and which soldiers get to go home. He
says this task is tougher than it should be
because his soldiers risk life and limb under
Military Regulations and argue endlessly in an effort to
stay. Colonel Kunk’s story doesn’t end there, he
was caught in the effects of a roadside bomb
that damaged the nerves and muscles in his legs causing his legs to swell and thro
from pain by the end of every day. But Colo-
 nel Kunk wouldn’t think of leaving, he says
he’s a father and a grandfather and he wants
to do right by them. So Colonel Kunk stays
and he fights because he knows it’s the right
ing thing to do.
Specialist Clark and Lieutenant Colonel
Kunk’s commitment is without compromise
and their dedication to duty should be com-
mended. Their stories are unique, but their
actions are not.
There are many soldiers that refuse to leave
when they have incurred wounds that would
allow them to come home. These service
members understand what they are fighting for
and they stay to see the mission through to
the end.
Mr. Speaker, this Congress should follow
the example of our men and women in uni-
form and stay committed to completing our
mission and winning the Global War on Terror.
If our soldiers, like Specialist Clark and Lieu-
tenant Colonel Kunk, are committed
to stay then we owe it to them to provide
our support to stay and get the mission done,
to do otherwise would undermine our soldiers’
efforts.
Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in op-
position to this simple-minded resolution.
President Bush and Republicans in Congress
would have you believe that the War on Terror
and the War in Iraq are one and the same.
But terrorism is not exclusive to a geographic
or political entity. Terrorism is the result of an accidental or
intentional trauma inflicted on humanity. Numer-
ous examples exist within our own borders.
My son is terrorized by the threat of destruc-
tion posed by the ignorance, of President
Bush in his steadfast opposition to addressing
the very real threat of global warming.
Parents are terrorized by the lack of treat-
ment for children born with diabetes, leukemia,
and multiple sclerosis. Yet right-wing evan-
gelical Pharisees dictate prohibitions on stem
cell research that could cure these and other
diseases saving lives.
Middle-class Americans are terrorized by
the outsourcing of jobs. elimination of pen-
sions and health benefits, and expansion of
by experts before the war. One former com-
mander of U.S. Central command, General
Anthony Zinni, said that “ten years worth of
planning were thrown away; troop levels dis-
missed out of hand . . . these were not tac-
tical mistakes, these were strategic mistakes,
mistakes of policy made back here.”
There are buyout our troops
than to send more of them to their death in a
poorly planned war. It’s time to shift our ap-
proach from the ineffectual policies of a Presi-
dent who only listens to advisors with pre-de-
termined hawkish mindsets. As a member of the
Coalition of the Willing, I have witnessed the in-
competence of our policies and the inability of
the Iraqi government to provide even basic
services to its citizens. Our troops are out there
fighting a war that is not only unjust, but also
ineffective and inefficient.
Representative JACK MURTHA has drafted a
resolution that encourages the Iraqi people to
take charge of their own security and lays the
groundwork for bringing our troops home.
These are the sort of options we should be
debating today if we truly want to demonstrate
our support for our troops. Instead, the Repub-
lican Leadership has put forth this political
ploy. Congress should fulfill their Constitutional
responsibility to exercise oversight instead of
continuing to place blind faith in the President
as he pursues the war in Iraq.
Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not support
this shameful attempt to provide an illusion of
oversight.
Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, America and
its allies are engaged in a war against a ter-
rorist movement that spans all corners of the
Earth. This is a war that has spread from Iraq to
other countries in the Middle East. I
recently visited with troops in Kuwait, Iraq, and
Afghanistan. I came away with several observa-
tions:
Mr. Speaker, my fellow Texas Congressman SAM
Fletcher is serving in a very re-
demanding and con-
tructive debate on Iraq, the Republican Lead-
ership decided not to allow any amendments
to their resolution. It is a travesty that the
elected representatives of the American peo-
ples are prevented today from offering policy al-
ternatives that might actually affect the shape
of U.S. policy in Iraq.
This debate had the potential to mark a
turning point to the current vacuum of con-
gressional oversight over the Bush Administra-
tion as it pursues its misguided and incom-
petently planned war in Iraq. Rather than
offering real solutions, the Republican Majority
in Congress has decided to rubber stamp the
President’s campaign in Iraq.
The American people know what has hap-
pened, and demand more than just a rubber stamp
from their representatives in Congress. Just as in
the case of Vietnam, they see a
White House which misled our country into
war. Using shoddy evidence and insinuations
about the connections between Iraq and al
Qaeda, the Bush Administration took our
country to war to face the “imminent threat”
of an Iraq with nuclear weapons.
Despite claims by the Republicans and the
Bush Administration, there was no significant
relationship between Iraq and al Qaeda. Iraq
had no weapons of mass destruction, a fact which
was confirmed by the Baghdad inspection team,
recently stated would have become clear had President Bush not ignored
our allies’ requests that we give the inspectors
a few more months before invading. After
its claims about the weapons of mass destruction
were proven to be incorrect, the Administration
has continually shifted its rationale for the
invasion.
As though it were not bad enough that we
went into a war in an incompetent and decept-
vive manner, it is unforgivable that our troops
were sent into this war without adequate plan-
ning and equipment. Our troops are out there
putting their lives on the line, yet the President
decided to follow the advice of misguided ideologues in overruling the plans developed
to the Middle East, the London bombings oc-
curred. This was yet another stark reminder
that if we don’t fight terrorists abroad, they just
get closer to our home.
Mr. Speaker, the War on Terror is a global
effort; it reaches beyond a small concentration
of trouble spots in the Middle East. I’d like
to share the story of Marine Staff Sergeant Na-
than Fletcher. Sergeant Fletcher’s wife, Mindy,
lived in Dallas and also worked for another
war hero, my fellow Texas Congressman SAM
Johnson, on Capitol Hill. He is currently expe-
riencing this third extended deployment. I stand with
my colleagues in urging Congress to urgently re-
evaluate the failed policies of the President.
Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Fletcher serves in a
very remote region in the Horn of Africa. He is part of a
Combined Joint Task Force focused on
defeating transnational terrorist groups oper-
ating in the region. Sergeant Fletcher and his
fellow troops in Africa lack amenities like run-
ing water, reliable power, and air condi-
tioning. There is no internet, television, or
even paved roads. Because they are so far
away from the main base, the troops eat off the
local economy. There are no fruits or vegeta-
bles where he is based, and so far he has
eaten camel, goat, lamb, beef, and a couple
things he could not identify. They cook their
meals over an open fire and sleep outside
every night.
Sergeant Fletcher’s wife writes, “His team is
doing well and I know they are working very
long hours. I can’t imagine going 40 days with-
out running water in temperatures over 100
degrees without air conditioning, but I know
Nathan and other servicemen and women do it
every day.” She continues, “Iraq and Af-
ghanistan get most of the focus, but our
troops are fighting the global war on terror
throughout the world. I am really proud that he
is part of making sure al-Qaeda and other ter-
orists aren’t able to expand into another part
of the world.”
Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Fletcher and the
millions of other troops fighting the War on Terror
around the world believe in what they’re doing.
They want to stay in the fight because their mis-
sion is right. We owe it to them to see this
campaign for democracy through until we are
completely victorious.
Mindy no doubt wishes that Nathan was
at home with her. Nathan no doubt wishes he
was at home sitting in the air conditioning
eating a t-bone steak rather than camel steak.
Yet they both know the reasons and the im-
portance of the mission.
Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Fletcher is enduring
these harsh conditions for our freedom. Make
no mistake—this mission is not only justified,
it is essential. Let us never forget the Pearl
Harbors, the attacks of 9/11. Let us never for-
got the freedom we have. Let us never forget
the Sergeant Fletchers and the sacrifices they
make for us.
Mr. Speaker, we must lay down our
arms now. We must press on, for freedom, for
peace.
Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I salute Congress-
man MURTHA and I salute the servicemen and
women in the field, at Walter Reed Army Med-
ical Center, and those waiting to serve.
I rise today to oppose the resolution before
us today because it does nothing to ensure a
more stable and secure Iraq nor does it do
anything to bring our troops home from Iraq.
My constituents have asked me when Con-
gress will get serious and have an open dis-
cussion about our future plans and policies in
Iraq. Today, we begin to answer their calls. But we cannot stop today. We should debate the war in Iraq everyday on the House floor. But we cannot stop today. We should debate the war in Iraq everyday on the House floor.

The students offered 8th graders from my Central New JerseyPinion. One said that the reasons for going to war were a number of observations. One said that too Iraq War in perspective. The students offered intentionally seek to divide the House. Today, this is no exception.

Earlier today, I meet with a group of 7th and 8th graders from my Central New Jersey dis-

sions. One said that the reasons for going to war were wrong, maybe even deceptive. A third said that the Iraq people are worse-off today. They are right. Their longer U.S. troops re-

main in Iraq the worse the conditions on the ground get for the Iraqi people.

I spoke with Senator BYRD (D–WV) the other day, who was here for the deceptive

Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. He says that is one vote he would like to take back. I am not say-

ing that Iraq is another Vietnam, because the two are different. But we should ask ourselves how will posterity regard Congress for giving President Bush everything he asked for with-

out any oversight or accountability.

The shifting rationales for the war in Iraq have led to the lack of a clear understanding of what the United States or how we achieved our mis-

tory. Our mission cannot be accomplished be-

cause there is no clear mission. There have been a number of rotating rationales offered for the war. One was Weapons of Mass De-

struction and the threat of a terrorist attack on one of our cities. Then it was Saddam's human rights abuses. Another was the argu-

ment that the United Nation's disarmament and containment efforts were not working and that UN resolutions were being violated. Then it was to stand up a democracy to be emu-

lated across the Middle East. Another was to protect America's strategic oil interest in the region. And as we have heard over and over today, it was to fight terrorism and a response to the terrible attacks on September 11th.

No it is not about Khobar Towers, or the USS Cole, or the terrible attacks on London. It is the World Trade Center. Today's debate is about Iraq, and this is a resolution that says "stay the course."

This is all classic misdirection. We need to remember that there were no terrorists in Iraq involved in the September 11th attacks. In fact, there were no terrorists threatening us from Iraq before we invaded. The War in Iraq is not about terrorism, except to the extent that Iraq has become a haven and a training ground for terrorists.

We must also recognize that our country was propelled into the conflict under false pre-

Bases, that has implications not only for how we got into Iraq, but for why we need to get out, and how we should view future claims of threats to America based on questionable intelli-

gence and even more questionable assumption.

The war in Iraq has warped American prior-

ities, and cost us dearly in terms of lives, money, and lost opportunities for progress at home and abroad. It has hurt our international standing and our ability to counter terrorism abroad. Numerous powder kegs around the world, have been ignored. Here at home, Hur-

ricane Katrina crystalized for the American people the fact that the President and this Congress were willing to place our attention and resources in Iraq, at great cost to our abil-

ity to help our own citizens here at home. This includes the short-changing of homeland secu-

rity measures for our ports, railroads, and chemical plants. Repeatedly, Democrats have tried to get the U.S. to invest in these areas, and repeatedly we've been told there is not enough money. And yet, we pay for the war in Iraq—to the tune of $11 billion per hour.

History will remember this war in Iraq as a colossal blunder. When we leave Iraq—as I hope we will, starting immediately—no one will wish that we'd stayed a little longer. No one will look back and think the current course could have ever been successful.

To their credit, our troops have done everything we have asked them. They are heroes. But we have placed them in the middle of a budding civil war. The President's failed strat-

gy has made their jobs impossible, and his refusal to change course has continued to make them targets on the ground.

It is time for a more sensible course of ac-

tion in Iraq. Only a negotiated settlement with broad international help will prevent civil war between the Sunnis and Shiites. We need to ensure that we work together with the commu-
nity of nations to develop a practical date. That is because the pres-

ence of our troops, who are serving valiantly and ably, is improving neither our security nor that of the Iraqis. In fact, our presence itself is unifying Saddam Hussein loyalists, al Qaeda sympathizers, and many civilians against us. Our presence is fueling the insurgency.

Redeploying our forces does not mean walking away from Iraq, Iraq's security forces and government will need our continued moral, political, intelligence and in some cases, financial support. But the hard work of securing the country and building a new soci-

eity is one that only the Iraqis can do. Reduc-

ing and refining our military and political pres-

ence in Iraq is the necessary first step in that process.

If we are to defend America and our allies from the global jihadist threat, our continued presence in Iraq defeats that purpose. It has been and remains a deadly and unnecessary misadventure that has compromised our ability to advance our interests around the world and at home to defeat the larger threat we face. To get back on course in the global war against al Qaeda, we must change course in Iraq, and now.

This war is simply not making us or the Iraqi people safer. The generals understand that. A future Iraqi government to make. In other words, if we continue to pursue the Bush Ad-

ministration's policies, we will likely have troops deployed in Iraq until at least January of 2009—that's nearly three years from now! What has been the cost of this war in terms of blood?

Nearly 320 billion so far . . .

Just think of all the good we could have done in this world or in this country if we had devoted $320 billion for health care, for edu-

cation, for fighting poverty or creating jobs.

What has been the cost of the war in terms of treasure?

2,500 U.S. troops killed.

An estimated 38,000 Iraqi civilians killed.

The Resolution before this House today en-

gages in a rhetorical fiction. The Republican Leadership has drafted into this Resolution language which confuses the War in Iraq with the War Against Terror. Iraq did not have any-

thing to do with the September 11th attacks. We did not invade Iraq because of 9–11. We invaded Iraq because the Bush Administration convinced Congress and the American people that Saddam Hussein had acquired nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruc-

tion and might use them.

The terrorists now taking place in Iraq is the direct result of the war, not its cause. To sug-

gest otherwise is to ignore the facts.

The fact is, this war was a very bad mis-

take. The Administration launched an invasion into Iraq in March of 2003 even though the Administration knew from the reports it was getting back from the IAEA and the UN in-

spectors that there where no nuclear or other WMDs at the sites identified by the CIA, by British intelligence, and by other sources.

Now we are bogged down in a quagmire with no end in sight.

In February of this year, the President was asked when we could expect all American troops to be out of Iraq, and he replied that this was a decision for a future President and a future Iraqi government to make. In other words, if we continue to pursue the Bush Ad-

ministration's policies, we will likely have troops deployed in Iraq until at least January of 2009—that's nearly three years from now! What has been the cost of this war in terms of blood?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 886, further proceedings on the resolution will be postponed.