were honored at a reception last night, and they are visiting us here on Capitol Hill today.

We welcome them. We honor them, and we thank them and their families for their outstanding service, for their sacrifice, for their commitment to freedom, for loving this Nation and for being the embodiment of that freedom on foreign soil.

LINE-ITEM VETO BILL

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor, I am glad the Budget Committee has approved H.R. 4890, the so-called line-item veto bill. H.R. 4890 is similar to the Ryan-Stenholm amendment to H.R. 4663 from the 108th Congress. I say ''so-called'' because it does not have the constitutional defects that led the Supreme Court to strike down the line-item veto law passed in 1996.

Instead, like legislation I introduced last year, it would simply enable the President to require Congress to vote on individual spending items or targeted tax breaks included in a larger bill signed into law. Congress would still make the ultimate decision on the basis of a majority vote. There would be no need for a two-thirds vote to override the President. This bill will not solve our budget problems, but it will promote greater transparency and accountability when it comes to taxing and spending. It deserves approval.

THE SUBURBAN AGENDA ON EDUCATION, HEALTH CARE, CONSERVATION AND THE ECONOMY

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, Congress fulfills its potential when we address key problems facing American families. Most Americans in the 21st century live in the suburbs, and the House is now moving a suburban agenda.

The suburban agenda includes bipartisan legislation on education, health care, conservation and the economy. We unveiled the first seven bills for the agenda last month, and this morning I am here to report on the progress we have made.

Yesterday the House passed Congressman PORTER's bill allowing school boards across the Nation to check interstate criminal records before hiring a coach or a teacher. Next week, we will consider Congresswoman JOHNSON's bill to deploy full electronic medical records shown to reduce errors by doctors by over 80 percent.

Action is coming in this Congress to establish 401 Kids tax-deferred savings accounts and new tools for parents to fight against sexual predators who misuse Web sites like myspace.com.

The suburban agenda, it is moving through the Congress and helping this House fulfill its full potential.

SAY NO TO PRIVATIZING SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mrs. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, with so many things going on here in the House, I think it is important to remind people a year ago Democrats, all Democrats from this House, went across the country to talk about why we needed to make sure that Social Security stayed the way it was. We are hearing rumors already that in January of 2007 that they are again going to try to attack Social Security.

May I remind the American people how important Social Security is, not only to our seniors who need it to keep them out of poverty, but also to our widows who are taking care of children, for people with disability.

Social Security is the one plan that has worked since it was conceived here in Congress. Democrats will protect it. I will fight for it. The American people have answered a year ago. We want Social Security.

With everything that is going on here in the House, just remember, Democrats are keeping their eye on everything.

THE UNCHECKED UNITED NATIONS

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this morning to take issue with some of the comments by Mr. Mark Malloch Brown, the Deputy Secretary General of the U.N. Mr. Brown recently stated in a speech that there was ''too much unchecked U.N. bashing and stereotyping.''

Well, at first I was a little offended by that, and then I got to realizing we haven't been doing enough bashing of the U.N. You look at what is going on.

We have had some problems with criminality in this body. Those are being addressed. As bad as they are, that criminality shows rank amateurism compared to what is going on in the U.N.

We have got families in the U.N. profiting from their other family member's positions. We have got some of the worst violators of human rights in charge of overseeing human rights violations. We even had Libya as chairman of that group back in 2003. Six of the worst, of the worst as designated last year, are on the human rights committee now.

We have got problems with their diplomatic immunity, we have got people where they turn around and try to take credit for things like polio eradication that Rotary International did, when they cannot find anything else to take credit for.

Mr. Speaker, I would just close by saying this, it is time we did some more bashing of the U.N.

RISING COLLEGE EDUCATION COSTS

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, as a Nation, we should encourage our young people to strive to achieve their full potential. We must give them the resources and opportunities to make their dreams a reality. For many students these dreams begin with access to higher education.

But after 6 years of Republican rule, access to college is now out of reach for too many of our Nation's youths. Since 2001, tuition and fees at 4-year public colleges have increased by 40 percent. At the same time, Republicans have made drastic cuts to higher education, including underfunding Pell Grants and cutting the higher education budget by $12 billion this year alone.

These cuts not only mean that more students have to take out loans to pay for college, but they will also face higher interest rates as they pay them back unless they refinance by July 1. That is when the Department of Education will raise Federal student loan interest rates to offset the Republican cuts.

As Members of Congress, we should be doing everything in our power to make college more accessible and affordable for all students, rather than cutting critical education dollars to fund tax breaks for the wealthy few.

□ 1030

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 861, DECLARING THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL PREVAIL IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 868 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 868

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House 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. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) ten hours of debate equally divided and controlled among the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not include instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of House Resolution 861 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the resolution to a time designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and insert tabular and extraneous material into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of House Resolution 861.

Mr. Speaker, the rule is a closed rule providing 10 hours of debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

It waives all points of order against consideration of the resolution and provides one motion to recommit, which may not contain instructions.

It further provides that, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the resolution to a time designated by the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in the context of today's debate, I believe there are four relevant questions we must consider. First, should we have entered the war in Iraq? Second, with Saddam Hussein gone, what are the stakes in terms of our involvement in Iraq? Third, what are the chances for success in Iraq? And finally, where will the battle be won or lost? I would like to consider each of those questions in turn.

First, should we have entered the war in Iraq? I remind the Members of this House that it was official policy of the United States Government beginning in 1998, agreed to by both Houses of Congress, to remove Saddam Hussein from power. We had good reason to do so. This is a person who had twice launched regional wars and took over a million lives; who pursued and nearly acquired nuclear weapons on two different occasions; who developed weapons of mass destruction and had used them against his own people; who was a state sponsor of terrorism; who had systematically worked his way out from under the restrictions applied to him by the United Nations; who had expelled weapons inspectors from his own country; who was a continuing threat; and, frankly, who had terrorized and brutalized and killed hundreds of thousands of his own people. The world is better off without Saddam Hussein.

Second, with him gone, what is at stake in Iraq? For that I think we should turn to the enemies that we fight today. al Qaeda, they have designated this and other terrorist groups as the central battlefield in the war on terror. I quote from the chief theoretician of al Qaeda: ''Iraq is the greatest battlefield against the infidel and his native allies. It is not the American war machine that should be of utmost concern. What threatens the future is American democracy. To allow Iraq to build a democracy would represent our biggest defeat.'' So the stakes are certainly worth the effort.

Next, what are our chances of success in Iraq? Frankly, I think they are very good, for two reasons. First, obviously, the skill, the bravery, the professionalism of our own people which was demonstrated only last week when they cornered and killed al Zarqawi, one of the world's worst terrorists; but second, and we ought to note this, the Iraqi people themselves. It is they who stepped up under the most difficult of circumstances and turned out in successfully greater numbers at three different elections. It is they who, in the civil turmoil they are going through, have fashioned a Constitution, have created a permanent government. It is their leaders who run the risk of being killed every single day, and it is their people who are standing up literally by the thousands and fighting back to defend their own country and to move it forward to a hopeful and democratic future. So I think our chances of success in Iraq are good.

Finally, though, where will the battle be won or lost? Finally, Iraq is a crucial theater. What happens there with our military, what happens with the Iraqis is determinative to the outcome; but I would also suggest that the United States is itself a battlefield, a political battlefield. The real question is whether or not we will sustain the will that it takes to ultimately be successful, and that decision will be made not in Iraq but in Congress and in the United States itself.

So what we are about today is a fight, I think, that involves us on the most critical battlefield of all, the battlefield of American public opinion.

Mr. Speaker, today we may hear about the ''unfairness'' of this resolution. We may hear charges of a rigged process. Let us be clear, Mr. Speaker. The minority was asked to provide their own party substitute to this resolution, and they did not choose to do so. We were ready to make this in order in the Rules Committee. They did not do so, and we moved forward with our resolution.

Mr. Speaker, if the other side of the aisle would like to argue process rather than substance, that is certainly appropriate, and that is their privilege. They should vote against this resolution. If they disagree with the resolution in substance, they should vote against it. If they disagree with the resolution because they consider it ramrodded, they should vote against it. That is their right.

Frankly, I believe their real challenge is that they have no common unified position on Iraq as a party. Whether we are right or wrong on our side of the aisle, we do have a common position, and it is expressed in the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge those on both sides of the aisle who believe that winning the campaign in Iraq is of the utmost important in achieving success in the wider global war on terror to vote for this resolution. I believe that many Members of both parties will.

Mr. Speaker, to that end, I urge the support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we will not be having a real debate on Iraq today. It will be a pretend debate, one that will have absolutely no effect on U.S. policy. No amendments, no substitutes, no chance for Members of Congress to actually do their jobs by making thoughtful changes to the resolution.

The distinguished chairman of the International Relations Committee testified before the Rules Committee that the resolution before us will at least give Members the opportunity to ''get things off our chest.''

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in therapy. I am interested in changing this failed policy.

This process is disrespectful to the men and women of our Armed Forces, disrespectful to the people we represent, and disrespectful to the traditions of this House.

The Bush administration is trying to encourage, cajole, and sometimes even strong arm the Iraqi Government into being more inclusive, to respect the rights and privileges of the minority, to embrace the democratic process. Well, I hope the government of Iraq is not watching today, because the Republican majority certainly has no intention of teaching by example.

We are all committed to a sovereign, free, secure and united Iraq. The important question remains, to achieve this goal, is the United States committed to keeping 150,000 or 100,000 or

50,000 American military men and women in Iraq for an indefinite amount of time, perhaps even decades into the future?

Under the current policy, the mission in Iraq is neverending. The resolution before us asks us not just to stay the course, but to stay forever.

The reason why so many of us, Democrats and Republicans, want to have a meaningful debate and meaningful votes on the war in Iraq is because the Bush administration has lost our confidence and our trust.

For too long this Congress has given the administration blank checks and unchecked authority. We have abdicated our responsibilities. We have not done our job, which is to legislate, to conduct oversight, and to shape the policy of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the reality of our policy in Iraq is one characterized by corruption, mismanagement, incompetence and self-delusion. 2,493 American soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen have died since the beginning of the war, 94 percent of them since the President declared, ''Mission Accomplished.''

And despite unanimous congressional agreements against permanent military base funding, the Republican majority stripped these provisions from the emergency supplemental conference report presented to the House on Tuesday.

In the period leading up to the war, the President said, ''Imagine a terrorist network with Iraq as an arsenal and as a training ground.'' Unfortunately, we do not have to imagine that anymore. The State Department now reports that Iraq is indeed a terror haven. The very thing we wanted to prevent by going to war was actually created by the war.

Certainly the death of terrorist Abu Musab al Zarqawi is welcome news. We did not create Zarqawi, but it was the war in Iraq that offered him the opportunity to kill American soldiers and innocent Iraqi civilians and to inflame sectarian hatreds.

But as we all know, foreign terrorists represent only 6 to 8 percent of those committing violence in Iraq. By far, most attacks are carried out by Iraqi Sunni insurgents and by the growing Shiia and Sunni sectarian groups battling each other.

The American-backed effort to arm tens of thousands of Iraqi soldiers and officers, coupled with a failure to curb a nearly equal number of militia gunmen, has created a galaxy of armed groups, each with its own loyalty and agenda. Sectarian violence has become almost as serious a threat as the insurgency. As former commander of U.S. Central Command General Anthony Zinni said in April, ''These militias will be a fact of life after we are gone. No one seems to have a plan for these militias.''

It is a disturbingly familiar refrain, Mr. Speaker: No one seems to have a plan.

On the ground, reconstruction is not going well. A plan to build 150 health care clinics has not resulted in much more than empty shells and uneven walls. Power blackouts remain a constant frustration. Only 19 percent of Iraqis today have working sewer connections, down from 24 percent before the war. While most Iraq reconstruction projects are way behind schedule, there is one construction effort that is right on target: the $592 million U.S. embassy, which will be the size of about 80 football fields.

The recent report by the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction found massive corruption and mismanagement of U.S. aid. Billions of dollars have been lost or squandered through fraud and corruption, much of it by a handful of corporate contractors with special, privileged ties to the administration and a near complete lack of systematic oversight of funds.

And still, Mr. Speaker, there is no accountability for this money and no accountability for this war, not within the Republican White House and not here in this Republican House.

This is a critical point, because this debate must be about more than simply how long we will stay in Iraq.

Where is the accountability for the corruption taking place in our reconstruction projects? Where is the accountability for our troops receiving faulty body armor and other equipment? Where is the accountability for the lack of funding to provide services for all the veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan who are dealing with post-traumatic stress and other needs? Where is the accountability for the creation of death squad-type militias within the Iraqi police and security forces? Where is the accountability for the abuse of prisoners and detainees which is costing the United States so much of its credibility and standing in the international community?

It is not the role of the Congress to turn a blind eye to whatever the administration wants to do. Quite the opposite. It is our responsibility to oversee every single taxpayer dollar that is being spent on this war.

The total bill for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan stands at $450 billion. If we stay in Iraq for just one more year, we will have spent, off budget, off the books, half a trillion dollars on this war, a debt that President Bush and the Republican majority intend to pass on to our children and our grandchildren.

Leadership, Mr. Speaker, requires courage. It requires taking responsibility. It requires accountability. It demands competence. In every single one of these areas, the White House, the Pentagon, this Republican Congress score an F for failure.

Instead, all the American people are getting is a world class PR and spin campaign coming out of the White House.

Make no mistake, H. Res. 861 requires no accountability from the White House or the Congress on the war in Iraq. It will not provide any increased protection for our troops on the ground. It will not protect our tax dollars from further waste, fraud, or abuse.

□ 1045

It won't demand direction, let alone a plan, from the President about how and when our troops will return home.

So here we are, treating the issue of war and the safety of our troops with a resolution that carries the same force of law as a resolution congratulating a sports team. Quite frankly, this process is an outrage and it should be rejected by this House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2¾ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I remember the inexorable slide towards the absolute irrelevance of the international system during the decade of the 1990s and the first few years of this decade, Saddam Hussein having in fact purchased just about every relevant United Nations leader and world leader, in fact, even in our friendly continent of Europe, except of course for President Bush and Prime Minister Blair and Prime Minister Aznar. Saddam Hussein and, we must remember, Mr. Speaker, the Oil-for-Food program and its billions of dollars siphoned off to purchase world and United Nations leaders. Saddam Hussein flouted his disdain for the international community and its, according to him, silly norms, laws, and resolutions. Almost 20 of them, Mr. Speaker, he systematically ignored and laughed at.

He called in al Zarqawi of al Qaeda to Iraq, joining next door Afghanistan as a state dedicated to welcoming and fostering international terrorists. In Afghanistan, as my late father Rafael Diaz-Balart would tell me, my late father whose wisdom far exceeded his formal education of five degrees from universities in Europe and one on this continent, he would tell me, ''There in Afghanistan is the Taliban, the Taliban who torture women and who have opened that country to the training camps of international terrorists.''

And in 1993, we saw the attacks coming from those terrorists to here, to New York City, the World Trade Center, and then the bombings of American embassies in Africa, and even an attack on a United States ship, the Cole. Nothing happened. But then came 9/11, Mr. Speaker, and it became evident that we could no longer allow despots like Saddam and the Taliban to ignore international sanctions and resolutions passed by the United Nations Security Council, no matter how many billions of dollars they spent purchasing world leaders.

This is, Mr. Speaker, the debate of our era. We cannot wait until international terrorism attacks us. We must

take the war to international terrorism and defeat international terrorism before the terrorists attack us. That is the debate of our era, as President Bush has reiterated so often. And that is a debate that we as a country and as a Congress must engage in, and I am pleased to see that we are doing so today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the ranking Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. SKELTON. I rise to speak against the rule. I take a back seat to no one in supporting our American military and their families. No one. But before us is a resolution that is not the fulfillment of a promise that we were given. We were told we would be able to have a debate on Iraq. That is not the case. This resolution covers the waterfront. Iraq is a singular war that we should discuss at length by itself.

You see, there are two ongoing wars: The war against terror, which has genesis in Afghanistan, and we did the right thing going in there. We are still chasing bin Laden, and some day we will get him. We toppled the Taliban. And then, of course, we went into Iraq based upon the threat of weapons of mass destruction, and we are there.

I sent two letters to the President of the United States warning about the aftermath, warning about what might very, very well happen after our national victory, and it came to pass. We have an insurgency there which is different and distinct from terrorists.

The insurgency is composed of Baathists, Fedayeen, and Sunni, who were basically in charge under Saddam Hussein. This is their attempt to knock down the government that is there and to establish their own, far from being the terrorists that we went after in Afghanistan.

Two wars. That is why this is a disingenuous resolution before us.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding time, and I rise in support of this rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in a global war that we did not seek but that was brought to our shores by actions of terrorists on September 11, 2001. The global war on terror is unlike other past wars. In the past the United States fought a clear enemy state. Today we fight an enemy without borders that threatens our free way of life.

When George Washington was elected as our first President, there was a king in France, a czarina in Russia, an emperor in China, and a shogun in Japan. The American President was the only elected leader at that time. Today, countries in every continent elect their own leaders. The number of democracies currently stands at an all-time high and has been growing without interruption for some time. Freedom and self-government is on the march around the world.

Mr. Speaker, why is this important? It is important, Mr. Speaker, because history has shown that those countries who elect their leaders are less belligerent than those who do not. Democracy and freedom are a threat to the terrorist ideology, which is why they fight so hard to keep self-government from taking hold.

The Middle East is an area where democracy has faced significant challenge. It is a region where we have seen entrenched dictatorships, continued violence, and civil unrest.

In an article from the Washington Times on June 12, Mark Stein cites four separate and recent incidents that took place in Baghdad, London, Toronto and Mogadishu. He goes on to say, and I quote, ''The world divides those who think the above are all part of the same story and those who figure they are strictly local items of no wider significance.'' I believe that these events are all rooted in the same ideology, and the United States, as the leader of the free world, stands in the way of this ideology.

We must not forget the sacrifice our military is making for the security and support of our ideals. They are fighting the enemy abroad so we will not have to fight them here. We must continue to support our troops and stay focused on defeating terrorism in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 868 and the underlying resolution declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, which is essential to the security of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in a global war that we did not seek, but that was brought to our shores by the actions of terrorists on September 11, 2001. The Global War on Terror is unlike all other wars. In past wars the United States fought a clear enemy state—today, we fight an enemy without borders that threatens our free way of life.

When George Washington was elected the first President there was a king in France, a czarina in Russia, an emperor in China, and a shogun in Japan. The American President was the only elected leader at the time. Today, countries on every continent elect their own leaders. The number of democracies currently stands at an all-time high, and has been growing without interruption for some time. Freedom and self-government is on the march around the world. History has shown that those countries who elect their leaders are less belligerent than those that do not.

Democracy and freedom are a threat to the terrorists' ideology, which is why they fight so hard to keep self-government from taking hold. The Middle East is an area where democracy has faced significant challenges—it is a region where we see entrenched dictatorships, continued violence and civil unrest.

In an article from the Washington Times on June 12, Mark Steyn cites four separate and recent incidents that took place in Baghdad, London, Toronto and Mogadishu. He goes on to say, "The world divides into those who think the above are all part of the same story and those who figure they're strictly local items of no wider significance . . ." I believe these events are all rooted in the same ideology. The United States as the leader of the free world stands in the way of this ideology.

Mr. Speaker, this Global War on Terror is protecting the freedoms that terrorists seek to destroy by any means necessary. Throughout this war, the terrorists have been emboldened by weakness, but fortunately it is the brave actions of our military men and women who are proving to our enemy that America will persevere. We must not forget the sacrifice our military is making for our security and in support of our ideals. They are fighting the enemy abroad, so that we will not have to fight them here.

I am proud of the soldiers from my area in Central Washington who have stepped forward to defend our nation's security. In addition to contributing to the Global War on Terror in manpower—my district is home to the Yakima Training Center—where the soldiers of the Stryker Brigade train in settings designed to simulate real battlefield conditions in the War on Terror. They are helping to transform our military into a force that can meet the readiness demands of this new conflict.

As our troops employ the latest techniques to combat terrorism in this modern war—they clearly demonstrate the dedication and honor of military men and women before them. This has been apparent the two times I have traveled to Iraq, and when I visit with troops returning from the front.

Mr. Speaker, the Global War on Terror is not a war we sought, but it is one we must continue to fight and is vital we win. We face a clear choice today. Do we back down in the face of a determined enemy for a temporary reprieve, or do we stand firm and fight the terrorists abroad? I believe the answer is obvious. We must stand firm on the Global War on Terror.

While more work remains—thanks to our troops, America is safer. Saddam Hussein is being brought to justice and Iraq is being stabilized so that it is not a haven for future terrorist activities. We must continue to support our troops and stay focused on defeating terrorism in Iraq and around the world in order to keep American families and communities safe at home.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying resolution that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, the distinguished ranking member of the House Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, about two centuries ago, almost, this country was facing a war that devastated it for generations. The first day, the first battle was going to be at Bull Run, not far from here in Washington, and I am sure that some Members of Congress and many other citizens of Washington packed up lunches, got in their horse and buggy, and went out to watch the fight. Suddenly, they found the Union forces

were being routed, bloodied, and were told to run for their lives.

Today, our brave Union forces are again in the field, are suffering great casualties, and what is happening today when we finally get around to talking about Iraq 4 years after it happened? We are going to have a picnic. So later today everybody will stop and go to the White House and discuss the picnic. There is something so surreal and Alice in Wonderland about all the things that have been going on around here, but let me tell you of a different time.

In 1991, leading up to the first Gulf War, this Congress had a real debate about that conflict, one that was said to be one of the best of the 20th century, because in 1991 the House was a real deliberative body. We had three resolutions to consider; actually, the minority resolution, there were two Democrats and one minority leader resolution, was the one that passed in a Democrat Congress, and every Member who wanted it had 5 minutes to speak their mind. We debated for 20 hours on that, and it was a wonderful time because we all took part in something we cared so deeply about.

Contrast that with what this Republican leadership is giving us now, a day not about policy or progress but about politics and posturing. It is a day designed to provide the majority with a chance to make cheap political attacks against Democrats in anticipation of upcoming mid-term elections at a time when Americans and Iraqis are giving their lives in one of the most brutal wars of our time.

Yesterday, an internal Republican memo was circulated outlining the party's plan of attack for today. It instructs Republicans to paint a picture of ''A Democrat Party without a coherent national security policy that sheepishly dismissed the challenges America faces in a post-9/11 world.'' We are going to hear a lot of that empty propaganda today, I am absolutely sure. But how will that divisive rhetoric help our soldiers abroad, Mr. Speaker? What can it possibly have to do with the war we are fighting?

If this memo didn't show us the real motivations behind today, last night's meeting of the Rules Committee certainly did. My fellow Democrats and I had a simple request at the meeting. We asked for the rule to be an open one. An open rule would have given any Member on any side of the House who wanted to speak a chance to do so. And what is more, an open rule would have permitted Members from both sides of the aisle to present amendments to the resolution so that we could do more than just talk, so that we could try to improve the flawed policies being pursued in Iraq.

But the committee gave us a closed rule. Not one person here from either party will be able to amend this resolution. Now, why would the Republicans do this? Could it be because they are not interested in addressing the serious questions in a forthright way? There are certainly problems to be addressed. Let me give you one example.

Yesterday, I joined a group of Democrats repeating our call for the creation of a Truman Commission to oversee the Iraqi reconstruction. Rampant construction and incompetent Iraq contracting have prolonged our mission there and cost lives, with 75 percent of oil and gas and 50 percent of electricity projects remaining unfinished.

The GAO reports that $7 billion in funds have simply been lost. The Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, Stuart Bowen, is investigating 72 cases of alleged fraud. Have Republicans dealt with these problems? They have not. They recently elected to block $1.9 billion in new reconstruction funds from being examined. They won't let Mr. Bowen and his team look at that, because he was doing the job too well. So they took the jurisdiction pretty much away from him.

I suppose it shouldn't come as a surprise that today, instead of proposing serious solutions to the problems we are facing, we are being offered a ''yes or no'' vote on a resolution drowning in patriotic rhetoric and offering us an open-ended fight against an open-ended enemy.

Debate is about choice, but there is no choice here today. What we have is less like our democracy and more like a Soviet election. Americans expect real debate in their Congress. They do not expect their representatives to passively acquiesce to the assertions of a meaningless resolution based on White House talking points. And they expect their elected officials to have a meaningful discussion on the future course of the greatest challenge to our Nation in a generation.

My friends on both sides of the aisle, we can stop this sham in its tracks by voting ''no'' on this rule. I implore every Member from both parties to realize what is at stake here. If you support the rule, you are saying you don't believe our troops and their families deserve a serious debate on the war. You are saying you don't think the massive troubles of the Iraqi people deserve more than a cursory glance. And you are saying you don't think this Congress should be anything more than the President's rubber stamp. What you are saying is that this war is just a political tool to be used at elections.

My fellow Democrats and I have said a lot about the death of democracy in this House. Over the course of the 109th Congress, of 144 different rules presented by this Republican Party, only one rule that was not an appropriations measure has been made open for debate and amendable by this leadership. One. And if there was ever a rule that should be open, if there was ever a day in which democracy should breathe freely in these halls, even if just for one day, it is this rule and it should be this day.

Your vote on this rule isn't about how you voted on the war, it is about respecting the troops. It is about respecting democracy. How can we ask the fine young men and women of our Armed Forces to die so that Iraqis can have democracy and debate when we are systematically undermining those same principles here? It is unconscionable.

□ 1100

Whether you are a Democrat or Republican, I implore every Member, everyone to take a stand for the values of democracy and the values of this Nation and vote please against this rule. Defeating this rule will show our troops that we have enough respect for them in this House to have a real debate on their lives and future and of the future of the Nation that we love.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on this day of debate while we discuss the merits and perils of our involvement in the war on terror, there is one sentiment that is shared by every Member of Congress: our admiration for our Armed Forces who risk their lives each day in defense of our freedom. Within these Halls of democracy where we passionately represent our constituents, it is important to recommend that the democratic way of life that is at the heart of what we do would not be possible without the men and women of our Armed Forces.

The brave men and women of our military are often called upon to travel great distances away from their families and loved ones to fight for the freedom that all Americans hold dear. Each time one of them enters into battle, it is with the knowledge that they may be asked to make the ultimate sacrifice for their country, giving their lives to secure our great Nation.

In recognition of these heroes, we have placed a memorial display in the Rayburn horseshoe foyer featuring the name of each and every member of our forces who has fallen as a result of the current conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan.

It is my hope that the many Members, staff, visitors, students, and constituent groups who visit the House office buildings each day will take a moment to stop by the memorial and reflect on the gift of freedom given selflessly by these honored individuals to every American.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a member of the Rules Committee.

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today's debate is long overdue. For the past 3 years, the United States has had a military presence in Iraq. In fact, when the authorization for war in Iraq was authorized,

I was not a member of this body. Yet this is the first extensive public debate Congress will have had on the most important issue of the day.

Even now, however, the rule put forth by the House leadership asks Members a simplistic question: Do you accept or renounce the President's vague appeal to stay the course and be patient? Such a narrow focus does a disservice to our role as representatives of the people.

The American people want to hear practical, well-thought-out ideas from their elected representatives. Today we could have had that honest, engaged and realistic debate.

I had hoped to discuss the reality of Iraq right now and how we may best help a political solution to emerge. This isn't a debate we should be afraid of. We can have this debate and can have it respectfully. But the House Republican leadership has decided to pass on this opportunity.

What should we be debating? I believe there are several things upon which all Members can agree, Republican and Democratic alike.

The first is that the United States has no desire to control Iraq's oil supply. The second is that we will not build permanent bases in Iraq. Taken together, these statements say clearly to the Iraqi people that the United States presence in Iraq is not permanent. And it says clearly to the administration that our strategy in Iraq must reflect the fact that we will not be there forever.

But, Mr. Speaker, the focus of this House must move beyond these specific details and rapidly toward our broader policies on Iraq. We all want a free, stable and prosperous Iraq, and we have an important diplomatic role to play. But ultimately, it is up to the Iraqis to achieve those goals through the political process.

The United States should continue to offer support for Iraqi security forces; and regardless of our troop deployment, the United States must maintain its responsibility to assist in rebuilding the country's economy and infrastructure.

But beginning to draw down troops stationed in Iraq can be done while keeping all of these goals in mind. I respect several redeployment proposals put forth by Members of this body for those reasons.

The President's exhortations to ''stay the course'' remain disconnected from the reality on the ground and from a sincere engagement on the policy details.

In contrast, the proposals put forth by several Members of the House were developed after much thought. The Members struggled to mold the chaos in Iraq into a workable solution that upholds the best interests of the Iraqi people and that of the American people.

These proposals and ideas deserve to come to the floor. They deserve to be debated, and they deserve a vote. Unfortunately, under the rule reported out, this will not happen. Instead, we will have a gripping session that yields no results. Congress is part of this government. In fulfillment of its responsibilities, this House should reject this rule and bring real policy to the floor.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be here and I wish to address the first of the four points that Mr. COLE presented when he introduced this particular rule.

I, like the gentlewoman from California who just spoke, and those of us who were elected for the first time in the last two cycles, was not here for the 1998 debate and piece of legislation passed by 360 of our Members and signed by President Clinton which outlined our foreign policy objectives with Iraq; nor was I here for what I was told was the 17-hour debate on the vote that authorized use of force in Iraq.

Those two, in my opinion, should have been the definitive debate and vote on what our common policy would be as we move forward.

What I would like to talk to you about now is what I find most compelling, and that is the legal rationale for what we are doing in Iraq.

Saddam Hussein's Iraq violated 17 U.N. resolutions, three of which demanded use of force for the violation of those. Saddam Hussein's Iraq had violated the treaty he signed with the United States. His forces were shooting at American servicemen. He put a bounty on the head of every American airman that could be brought to him. He had offered a cash bonus to every family of a suicide bomber who would blow up either an Israeli or an American at the time.

When a foreign country violates its treaty with us and shoots at our servicemen, that is a legal justification for our actions. In fact, it is odd enough that we probably have a greater legal justification for this war than any other conflict with which this country has been involved in the last 50 years.

In Korea, we went in after one U.N. resolution, not 17.

In Vietnam, we made it a national priority because of a treaty we had, not with Vietnam but with an ally, France.

We bombed Serbia and went into Bosnia, not because of a legal pretext or compelling national interest, but because our European allies asked us to assist them with their particular issue.

The quarantine during the Cuban missile crisis was an aggressive act of war that was condemned by the U.N. Secretary General and protested in dozens of cities throughout the world, but was, in my mind, not a legal act but a right act of President Kennedy.

In Iraq, what we are doing is both legal and it is right.

Every war we have had has been littered with protests. Historians tell us in the Revolutionary War a third of Americans were opposed to it and a third were indifferent.

The War of 1812, Mr. MCGOVERN's State tried to secede from the Union.

In the Civil War, we had the greatest riots proportionately we have ever had in this country, and the Governor of New York inflammatorily said President Lincoln's goal was to kill all of the Irish.

In the Spanish American War, the Speaker of the House postwar resigned in protest.

In World War I, the Secretary of State prewar resigned in protest.

Only World War II has been atypical in those concepts of what we had.

As a history teacher, I see mass amounts of parallels with what we are doing now and what has happened in history. I don't have the time to go into any of those.

What I simply hope is for this House and this Nation is that we don't have the tunnel vision of short-term policy and we do not reject the lessons of history that will help us understand what should be the definition of our common potential future and policy towards Iraq.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking Democrat on the International Relations Committee.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I urge all my colleagues to reject this rule.

Mr. Speaker, as we embark on this debate, I believe it is important to recall the debate we had during the first Persian Gulf crisis.

In 1991, we were on the brink of war with Iraq over Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait. Emotions were high, and the parties were divided. We Democrats were in the majority then, and we allowed over 30 hours of debate on three different measures representing profoundly differing points of view.

I wish to repeat this, Mr. Speaker: we allowed over 30 hours of debate on three different measures representing profoundly differing points of view.

And the critical vote, Mr. Speaker, was on a proposal of the Republican minority sponsored by the Republican minority leader, Bob Michel. It was supported by some of us on the majority Democratic side, myself included, and it prevailed.

And in 1999, Mr. Speaker, as the people of Kosovo bled from the wounds of Serbian bullets, this House had a highly emotional debate over three different resolutions relating to proposed U.S. action to end the humanitarian disaster. Again, the minority was afforded an alternative which barely lost on a tie vote.

Today we are purportedly debating how to end the war, rather than whether to begin one, and an equally vital debate given the lives at stake. But the Republican leadership has thrown out all precedent and instead of giving the House a chance to work its will, they are forcing us into a charade.

Members will not be given a chance to offer amendments or alternatives to

let the House work its will. Rather, all that is offered is 82 seconds for each Member to state a view on the complex and difficult subject of the Iraq war.

Mr. Speaker, I tried to work on this resolution with my good friend, Chairman HYDE, on a bipartisan basis as I always have. But the Republican leadership expanded the original draft far beyond Iraq and rejected every one of our substantive suggestions.

Mr. Speaker, this rule should allow all Members to offer their own ideas through amendments to this resolution. At a minimum, it should allow a Democratic substitute, and it should provide enough time so that every Member has at least 5 minutes to express his or her views.

Mr. Speaker, just as the Democratic majority gave Republican minority leader Bob Michel an alternative in 1991 during the first Iraq debate, our Democratic leader, NANCY PELOSI, should have the same opportunity to offer a Democratic alternative with the same chance of prevailing in this House.

Instead, the Republican leadership has turned what could have been a serious debate into a charade.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself just 15 seconds.

I want to make note for the record, we did offer the minority an opportunity for a substitute resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. And no, I will not yield. My time is very tight, and you have time to respond.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM).

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of American efforts to rid the world of terrorism and help democracy take root in a region long controlled by hostile dictators and murderous regimes.

All around the world we are working to eradicate terrorists and their organizations. Iraq has emerged as a central battlefield of this war, a battlefield where Saddam was captured in a hole and is now in jail, where Zarqawi met his demise, and where insurgents and jihadists are fighting and losing to the might and skill of coalition forces. Most importantly, it is a battlefield far, far from the shores, schools, neighborhoods, and cities of America.

□ 1115

I recently traveled to Iraq with our Speaker and was able to meet with the Prime Minister and other key government officials, as well as our U.S. commanders overseeing the operations. I was impressed by what I saw, but I was more impressed by what I heard from the servicemen and women themselves. Morale is high, and they are confident in the success of this mission.

Iraqi citizens have embraced freedom and have now voted in three national elections, each garnering wider and broader support. Iraq now has a constitution, a parliament, a president, a prime minister and a fully formed cabinet. What is more, this new government reflects a broad ethic and sectarian balance, a balance that will help ensure the needs and voices of all Iraqis are represented.

Ultimately, it is that freely elected government that is the most important success of this effort, elected leaders who are Iraqi first, and all other identities second, interested, invested in the future of their own country, of their own people. These Iraqi founding fathers face great challenges, no doubt. But what opportunity is more powerful than freedom from tyranny?

We must remain committed through patience and hard work to help this new government succeed.

I support this resolution. I support the rule that is allowing this resolution to come forward and the manner in which it was created. And I urge my colleagues to join us in passing this important affirmation of the hard work of America's servicemen and women.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, let me correct something that has been said on this floor. In the testimony before the Rules Committee, the Democrats not only asked for an open rule, we asked for a substitute. We were denied that. We were shut out. It is here in black and white in the testimony.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this war was launched without an imminent threat to our families. It endangers them more every day, creating new generations of terrorists. Radical ''know it all'' ideologues here in Washington bent facts, distorted intelligence, and perpetrated lies designed to mislead the American people into believing that a third rate thug had a hand in the 9/11 tragedy and was soon to unleash a mushroom cloud.

From the start, House Democrats overwhelmingly voted against this war. But radical ideologues rushed headlong anyway, ignoring professional military advice about the number of troops and equipment needed. One general after another has indicted this Administration for its misjudgment and mismanagement.

But now, almost 3,000 Americans lie dead, with about another 20,000 seriously injured. Every day, every single day, American taxpayers are forced to spend $229 million in Iraq, and they pay again every time they go to the gas pump. All that is in sight is an endless, civil war quagmire.

Today's resolution pins these Administration failures on the coattails of our courageous servicemen and women. Administration ineptness is falsely attached to a resolution honoring our troops.

Americans are increasingly realizing there is a better way to honor our troops than by sending more of them off to be killed. Would that there were more than a little of our troops' courage right here in Washington from those, who refuse to challenge this Administration's arrogant, myth-based policies and who choose instead to cut and run from their responsibilities.

Instead of staying the course, we need to chart a smarter course. It is not weakness or retreat to recognize the Administration offers us only an endless ''spend and bleed'' policy.

When this talkathon ends, reject this fraudulent resolution, which cannot be amended or changed, to alter this Administration's deadly pursuit of a desert mirage. Neither paper resolutions, nor more Administration arrogance will defeat terrorism.

The harm from this Administration's disastrous decision to invade Iraq was apparent from the beginning. The warnings of many, as noted in my speeches, including those given on the floor on September 22, 2002 (H6410), October 9, 2002 (H7328), and October 10, 2002 (H7772), and the contemporaneous editorial below, went unheeded.

[From the Austin American-Statesman, Oct. 13, 2002]

OUR VOICES MUST WORK TO AVERT AN INVASION

(By Rep. Lloyd Doggett, U.S. House of Representatives)

I recently voted against what is really an authorization for launching a massive land invasion and military occupation of Iraq. More important than speaking with one voice, the votes of 133 Congress members against this rush to war underscored the importance of our continuing to speak as one democracy.

I sought to give voice to the thousands of Central Texans who communicated their concerns about making the terrible weapon of war a predominant instrument in our foreign policy.

With this grave decision on war and peace though, I knew I would have to answer to more than those I am privileged to represent—I would have to answer to myself, my children and to history.

War now would only increase the danger to American families. The house-to-house urban combat that would likely result from a land invasion in Iraq would kill thousands, divert precious resources from our ongoing war on terrorism and expose our families to more terrorism from among the many who would perceive this as a crusade against Islam. From the information provided to Congress, I do have some insight into issues about which so many are understandably uncertain and fearful. No evidence has been shared to connect Iraq to the Sept. 11 tragedy, nor to show that Iraq now poses an imminent threat to American families.

As former National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft said, ''Saddam Hussein is probably on Osama bin Laden's hit list.'' From Central Intelligence Agency reports, secret until last week, we know that the unfinished job of overcoming al Qaida represents the real threat. The CIA concluded that invading Iraq is more likely to drive our now separate enemies together against us and certainly more likely to make Saddam Hussein use any weapons of mass destruction that he may possess.

In addition to the cost in lives, the costs of war, to differing degrees, will touch us all. President Bush's top economic adviser, Lawrence Lindsey, estimated that the cost of waging this war may rise as high as $200 billion. At a time of chronic deficit spending,

these are precious resources no longer available for education, health care, retirement security and homeland security.

True security is more than a military second to none and effective law enforcement at home; it means working with nations to address our common security concerns. We are strong enough to defeat Iraq in combat, but we must be wise enough to rely on America's other strengths to rid the world of Saddam Hussein's danger.

No fool would trust Saddam Hussein with even one American life. Our choice is not between ''war'' and ''doing nothing'' or between ''war'' and ''appeasement.'' The prudent choice remains—first, attempt holding Iraq accountable through effective, comprehensive, international inspections.

Some of the most insightful arguments against invading Iraq were advanced by Republicans and military leaders. The first President Bush, in 1998, wrote: ''Trying to eliminate Saddam, extending the ground war into an occupation of Iraq . . . would have incurred incalculable human and political costs. . . . [We] could conceivably still be an occupying power in a bitterly hostile land. It would have been a dramatically different—and perhaps barren—outcome.''

Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf was even more direct: ''I am certain that had we taken all of Iraq, we would have been like the dinosaur in the tar pit.''

Apparently, Iraq represents only the first step in implementing the administration's recently announced ''first-strike'' defense strategy. Over-reliance on packing the biggest gun and having the fastest draw will not make us safer. Rather, it is a formula for international anarchy. A quick draw may eliminate the occasional villain, but only at the cost of destabilizing the world, disrupting the hope for international law and order, and, ultimately, endangering all of us.

President Reagan used containment effectively against another ''evil empire,'' the Soviet Union, and from Cuba to Libya, a succession of presidents has avoided nuclear Armageddon. Containment and disarmament may not end all wars, but they are clearly superior to the new ''first-strike formula'' that risks wars without end.

With the prospect of war overshadowing all of our hopes and dreams for this country and the world, we must continue to thoughtfully and respectfully voice our opposition in hopes that invasion may yet be averted.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule, H. Res. 861. I firmly believe that the installation of democratic governments in Afghanistan and Iraq, coupled with the recent completion of Iraq's National Unity Government and ratification of a Constitution, the elimination of Abu Musab al Zarqawi, and the continued success of our reconstruction efforts in these countries are tremendous accomplishments in the global war on terror.

We are at a point in Iraq where we can build on these successes. We can advance democracy and freedom and stand by the Iraqi people while honoring the commitment that we have made. Or we can withdraw, as many on the other side of appeasement are suggesting, leaving the progress we have made and the future of Iraq to chance. Just as in Europe and Japan following World War II, there is only one option, Mr. Speaker, and that is to stand by the Iraqis until their government, police, military can ensure the security of their own nation. Then, and only then, will be the appropriate time to disengage, leaving a strong ally and flourishing democracy as an example of a peaceful and free nation to others in the Middle East region.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot give in to the anti-war rhetoric which only serves to embolden our enemies, while offering little hope and little vision. Rather, we must continue to advance policies which make our Nation safer, which are responsible for the liberation of over 50 million people in Iraq and Afghanistan. It has led Libya to abandon their weapons of mass destruction program, and it makes every new year worse than the previous one for the terrorists.

In this fight for the future of peace, freedom and democracy in the Middle East and around the globe, winning should be our only option.

This past Friday we heard Prime Minister Maliki of Iraq make the following statement: ''With our allies we will persevere to make Iraq a prosperous democracy in the heart of the Middle East.''

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to see great hope and potential in the Iraqi government and the Iraqi people. Unfortunately, the minority party offers no hope. All we hear are ill-conceived and shortsighted strategies which threaten any chance of Iraq becoming a bastion of democracy in the Middle East.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this rule and the resolution, which sends a clear and a positive message to the new Iraqi government and its citizens. But just as importantly, Mr. Speaker, it sends a clear message to those soldiers who have been injured or killed and their families that this Congress will never break faith with them.

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

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this rule, which I support, will allow one of the most critical actions to date in the war on terror. Hardly a charade.

This action is not military in nature. It is entirely political. But it will determine victory or defeat as surely as any battle in Iraq.

Our troops can defeat any enemy on earth. Our volunteers, our patriots, our heroes, our warriors, under any conditions they can win if we have the will, if we have the backbone to do what is right.

That is what we debate under this rule. Do we have the will to win?

Many, not all, of the other side of the aisle lack the will to win. The American people need to know precisely who they are. If there are any on this side of the aisle who hold the same view, this will allow them to be found out as well. Then the public can decide the course of this war in November by hopefully throwing the defeatists out of office.

This debate, under the rule, is as critical a fight as any our troops could have on the battlefield. No one has any doubt our soldiers will win any fight we send them to. That is not the question. The world's doubt is entirely over the backbone of this Congress.

Because of the statements of Members of this body, not their votes, but what they say today, and of the Senate, that have given substantial propaganda assistance to the enemy, this rule, this debate is absolutely essential to preserving the victories of our troops that they have won with their blood and their lives.

It is time to stand up and vote. Is it al Qaeda or is it America? Let the voters take note of this debate.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the 173rd Airborne in 1968–69 Vietnam, I saw how the words of Senators and Congressmen undermine the hard-fought victories and sacrifices of our soldiers.

Men who today sit in Congress publicly trashed the troops on the front back then, comparing our American soldiers to the barbarian Genghis Khan.

American media overlooked decades of Communist torture and atrocity against Vietnamese civilians. I couldn't overlook it. As a dental surgeon I had to reattach the tongues cut out by Viet Cong terrorists.

Where was our media? They instead chose to focus the world's attention on isolated American failure at My Lai.

Through carefully planned international media and political manipulations, the NVA and Viet Cong were encouraged to keep fighting, regardless of their defeats in the field. American media fell right into line with the enemy's public affairs plan.

Our troops and citizens were told over and over by the press and politicians that their efforts were futile, our countless victories pointless, and every reverse, no matter how slight, disastrous.

The result of this psychological warfare was that the same Nation that had prevailed in World War II against heavy odds, numerous battle defeats, and our enemies' military parity, simply walked off the field in Southeast Asia.

It was a lesson in strategy our enemies have learned well, one that is now being used against us in Iraq.

It is of great interest to note that the same reporter who ''broke'' the story on My Lai also ''broke'' the story on Abu Grahib nearly four decades later—while overlooking the thousands of executions, beheadings, and other atrocities of the enemy.

Coincidence or planned strategy?

Same players, same actions, seeking the same result—unconditional U.S. withdrawal from a war on terror we didn't start, allowing barbarians to slaughter millions of innocent civilians, with the end result our Nation humiliated and compromised on the world stage.

The lesson we should have learned from Vietnam is that we can fight our enemies in this House by sending an unmistakable message that America will not run.

The day that our enemies in Iraq believe this, the war will be won.

It's time for this body to start fighting for our soldiers.

The 173rd has been back in action in this war, and I will be darned if I will let what happened to us in Southeast Asia happen to these guys in the Middle East, if I can help it.

Let's finally bury the ghosts of Vietnam by committing to victory. In doing so, we greatly reduce the need for future military action, as potential enemies will no longer doubt our national resolve in a showdown.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I just recently sent 850 Oregonians off to Afghanistan to fight the resurgent Taliban and Osama bin Laden, the perpetrators of 9/11. September 14, this House, on a proud day, with one exception, voted to authorize the war in Afghanistan to take out the Taliban, take out the perpetrators of 9/11, al Qaeda. That was nearly unanimous.

But sadly, the Bush administration and the Republicans in Congress distracted us onto a path of a war in Iraq 1,143 days ago. 2,497 servicemen killed, 18,490 wounded. First it was weapons of mass destruction. Then it was about 9/11. Then it was about building democracy.

But now the Republicans want to pretend that it has to do all about the war on terrorism. They mentioned al Zarqawi. The Pentagon wanted to take out al Zarqawi. They had him in their sights before the war in Iraq, and the Bush White House and DICK CHENEY wouldn't let them because it would hurt recruitment for the coalition of the willing to invade Iraq, where al Qaeda did not exist.

If you strip out the rhetoric from this nonbinding resolution, with no Democratic alternative, no amendments allowed, it is a stay the course resolution with an open-ended commitment. As the President said, a future President will decide when U.S. troops will leave.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the National Security Subcommittee of Government Reform, a gentleman who has been to Iraq on 12 different occasions, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I am not afraid we will lose the war in Iraq, ... 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 a truly noble effort that must succeed.

Whether you believe al Qaeda was in Iraq when the war began, they are there now, and they think they can win because they believe we will leave too soon, before Iraqis can defend themselves.

True, we got their prince. Al Zarqawi is dead, but his fellow terrorists remain determined to succeed.

This resolution clearly links the war in Iraq with the war against Islamist terrorists. Islamist terrorists is exactly who the 9/11 Commission said we are confronting. If you agree, vote for this resolution and explain why. If you disagree, vote against the resolution and explain why.

I support the rule. I support the resolution. I support our efforts in Iraq, and I look forward to the 10 hours of debate.

When I ask individual Iraqis what is their biggest concern, it is not the bombings, the lack of electricity or anything else other than this. It is, and I quote, ''that you will leave us. That you will leave us before we can grab hold of democracy and defend ourselves.''

I pray we will not let them down. I look forward to the 10 hours of debate. I look forward to our being absolutely resolute in helping Iraqis have an opportunity they have worked so hard to achieve.

In just 11 months, Iraqis have had three elections that put our elections to shame. They have a new government. They only need more time to develop their security, to defend themselves and a democracy they dearly love.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately rise in opposition to this rule because I believe it is a missed opportunity for this Congress to substantively have a say in the most important issue facing our country today and that is the course of the war in Iraq, but also our strategy in combating global terrorism.

But instead of offering a real policy discussion, the Republican majority today offers a political document just before the fall elections.

My question to my friends across the aisle is very simple. What are you afraid of? Why are you not allowing any other amendment to be offered during this 10-hour debate? Why are you not allowing our side to have an alternative resolution so we can get into the very troubling aspects of this administration's conduct of war in Iraq and our strategy on global terrorism.

Many of us have grave concerns about how this administration has based its decisions in Iraq. These concerns are shared by many Americans and our constituents throughout the country today. Yes, we can kill Zarqawi, but are we defeating Zarqawiism?

Many of us today have grave doubts. Yet, instead of having an open and honest debate, we get this charade. We deserve better. The American people deserve better.

I encourage my colleagues to defeat this rule.

□ 1130

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Oklahoma has 6¼ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I want to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am the last speaker on our side.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. I am prepared to close whenever you are, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me say simply in closing that we will not be having an open debate on Iraq policy today. No one from either side of this aisle will be allowed to present policy alternatives that will be debated and voted upon. No one will be able to offer amendments to increase accountability over the hundreds of billions of taxpayer dollars that have been poured into this war. Just like the last 3 years, there will be no debate that might actually affect the direction of U.S. policy in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years, Democrats and Republicans have come to the Rules Committee with amendments to the various defense bills that would have required greater accountability and modified our policies in Iraq. The Republican majority in this House has routinely denied these amendments the right of debate. They have routinely kept them from being offered on the floor of this House for votes. So when the Republican leadership says they have offered us a debate on Iraq, it is simply not true.

This is not what we asked for. We do not need therapy. We do not need time to get things off our chests. We need real debate and meaningful votes on U.S. policy in Iraq.

At best, the Republicans have structured a glorified 10-hour Special Order on Iraq. But let us not dignify it by calling it a debate when no Member will have the opportunity to vote on competing policy proposals.

Mr. Speaker, to our troops who are in harm's way, to their families and friends and to the American people, I offer my sincere regrets that once again the Republican-led Congress is failing to address the war in Iraq in the serious manner it deserves and has instead chosen to create this sham of a debate.

Mr. Speaker, the great British conservative Edmund Burke once said, ''A conscientious man would be cautious how he dealt in blood.'' Mr. Speaker, I wish the majority of this House would heed those words.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, before I get into the substance of my close, I simply want to remind my friends on the other side of the aisle the simple fact is, despite their insistence to the contrary, our side never received a substitute amendment to consider. The Rules Committee received four amendments, none of which was a Democratic substitute. We cannot make in order what is not submitted to the Rules Committee.

Let me say that I suspect that this procedural problem really represents the fact that there is not a cohesive alternative presented by the other side. We have watched again and again and again as the Democratic Party has struggled to come to grips with this issue and find a united position, and so far no united position has emerged.

As I pointed out in my opening remarks, we do indeed have a united position. It is one that you can agree with or disagree with, but it is a resolution that we can put forward and we can command the overwhelming majority of our Members to support. And, frankly, I hope and trust that many Members on the other side will also be supportive of that position.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker. What is at stake in Iraq is the war on terror, whether or not we will be successful. That is the central battlefield of this particular moment.

Everybody on both sides agrees that removing Saddam Hussein was a good thing to do. He was an evil man, a dangerous man, a tyrant to his own people, a threat to world peace. That removal was not going to come about by accident or by internal revolution. They had indeed tried to do that. Unfortunately, they had failed. It took direct military intervention by the United States of America to rid the world of one of the worst tyrants we have seen in the second half of the 20th and the opening of the 21st centuries. Once there, the terrorists, our enemies, made this the central battlefield. And, frankly, over the course of the last 3 years, they have inflicted enormous damage on the Iraqi people.

I, for one, am enormously proud of how the Iraqis have responded to that challenge. To see a people who, in the face of terror and death and destruction, have gone out to the polls not once, not twice, but three times with ever increasing numbers of participants; to see them write a constitution in the midst of turmoil and challenge; to watch them create a permanent government; to watch that government take control; and to see their people, thousands of their people, stepping forward to defend their country and fight their enemies who are also our enemies is, frankly, an inspiring and a noble sight. I think we have a terrific chance to succeed in Iraq because of the Iraqi people, because of the valor and the skill and the professionalism of the American military.

The real battle and the real arena, as my friend Mr. SHAYS suggested, is here on the floor of this Congress and in the court of public opinion in the United States. If we maintain the resolve, if we maintain the commitment, if we keep our promise to the Iraqi people, we will be successful. If we do not, we not only will fail, we will strengthen and harden our enemies and, frankly, will bring dishonor on ourselves.

I am extraordinarily proud of this President. I am extraordinarily proud of this Congress with its bipartisan commitment to succeed in Iraq.

To close, I would urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is, under an open rule, is it a requirement that a substitute or that substitutes be filed with the Rules Committee in order to have them debated and voted on the House floor? Because my understanding is it is not a requirement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is inquiring about the proceedings of the Committee on Rules, and it is not for the Chair to characterize those proceedings.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I think I made my point, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 194, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

AYES—222

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—194

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz

Waters	Waxman	Woolsey
Watson	Weiner	Wu
Watt	Wexler	Wynn

NOT VOTING—16

Burton (IN)	Lynch	Saxton
Capito	Miller (MI)	Sessions
Carter	Mollohan	Taylor (MS)
Cubin	Rahall	Weldon (PA)
Gordon	Rogers (KY)	
Johnson, E. B.	Rothman	

□ 1202

Mrs. TAUSCHER, Messrs. GUTIERREZ, MATHESON and BOUCHER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 disagreeing votes of the two Houses 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 allocated by House Resolution 868 to the ranking minority members of four committees instead be controlled by the minority leader or her designees.

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 partners since 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, having removed Saddam Hussein and his regime from power, is to establish a sovereign, free, secure, and united Iraq at peace with its neighbors;

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

Whereas the Iraqi people, with the help of the United States and other 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 and other friendly 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 assisting them who have made 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 Representatives—

(1) honors all those Americans who have taken an active part in the Global War on Terror, whether as first responders protecting the homeland, as 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, secure, and united Iraq;

(5) congratulates Prime Minister Nuri Al-Maliki and the Iraqi people on the courage they have shown by participating, in increasing millions, in the elections of 2005 and on the formation of the first government under Iraq's new constitution;

(6) calls upon the nations of the world to promote global peace and security by standing with the United States and other Coalition partners to support the efforts 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 International Relations, Armed Services, the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and 5 hours controlled by the minority leader or her designee.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is recognized to control 75 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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 Reagan's wise words are still true today.

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 not suffering 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 why they are there. 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 we 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 Khobar 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