

CONGRATULATING LORRAINE C. MILLER AND DANIEL P. BEARD ON THEIR ELECTION AS OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to congratulate Lorraine C. Miller on this historic occasion as she assumes the duties of Clerk of the House, the first time an African American has held a position of leadership in terms of being an officer of the House.

The resolutions are necessary for the Office of Clerk, and so there is much fanfare associated with that. The House is equally as pleased to have the services of Daniel P. Beard as our Chief Administrative Officer of the House. Congratulations to Dan Beard.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to ten 1-minutes on each side.

AMERICA IS GOING IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I had a 1-minute prepared to talk about the debate on Iraq, but I think what is more appropriate at this time is to talk about what this House of Representatives has experienced since January 4.

The doors of this House of Representatives, indeed this country, have been opened to thought, perspectives and issues that have been stifled for the last 12 years. I want to thank the Speaker for her leadership, for the leadership of the Democratic Party, and the chairman and what they brought forward. The first woman ever elected Speaker in this country's history, the first African American to be elected Clerk. History is being made with the issues coming forth from middle America for people who are in need, for the future of this planet.

I want to thank the Speaker. America is going in the right direction.

THE RESOLUTION OF RETREAT

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the band continues to play today while Congress argues the "Resolution of Retreat" from Iraq.

This illness of defeatism is spreading. Self-proclaimed military experts are saying the war cannot be won, even with more troops. Wars have always had homegrown critics and doom-sayers, even in the military. Those in and out of the military who say we cannot win should never be placed in a position to allow us to lose. Those critics are thorns in the battlefield of hope.

This resolution, this policy of "No More Troops for the Troops" leaves our volunteers in Iraq in a precarious, vul-

nerable situation. Since no help is coming to their aid, what shall our troops now in Iraq do with less manpower? Fight a containment war? Fight not to lose? Or win? Not fight? Retreat to the hills?

This resolution is good news to the terrorists, bad news for the troops. We should find the moral will to finish our mission in Iraq and protect American interests with whatever number of troops is necessary. Duty requires such, and safety and honor demand it.

And that's just the way it is.

GENERALS AGREE THAT PRESIDENT'S TROOP ESCALATION PLAN IS NOT BEST WAY AHEAD

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, as we continue today to debate a resolution on the floor voicing this Congress' opposition to the President's plan to send 21,500 more troops to Iraq, I think it is important that we stress that Congress is not alone in opposing the President's escalation.

First of all, it is critical that we remember that the people of Iraq do not wish us to be in their country. They wish to sort this out themselves, and we need to honor that. But retired and current military leaders in our country have also expressed their opposition to this plan.

Retired General Barry McCaffrey described the President's plan as a "fool's errand." Retired General Wesley Clark said, "Without such fundamental change in Washington's approach, there is little hope that the troop surge, Iraqi promises, and accompanying rhetoric will amount to anything other than stay the course more." And this from Lieutenant General Raymond Odierno, the commander of the Multinational Corps in Iraq: "It's clear that you cannot solve this problem militarily. You have to have the combination of military, economic and diplomatic things that we need to do."

IRAQ WAR RESOLUTION

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

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the resolution that is before the House. It is a resolution in two parts. The first part says we support the troops. The second part says we are not going to reinforce the troops. That is kind of curious in a way, I suppose, isn't it? That we would support them with up-armored Humvees, with body armor, with tanks, but oh, no, we are not going to allow other troops to help the troops that we have there. It seems like you can't have it both ways. It is self-contradictory.

You picture Davey Crockett at the Alamo, and he is there and Santa Anna's army has got him back to the

wall, and he gets his BlackBerry out and he checks with the Congress, and the Congress says, yeah, Davey Crockett, we support you, but we're not going to send anybody to help. I don't think you can have it both ways.

When I was a legislator in the State of Missouri, I kept track of some of what I considered to be the silliest legislation I had seen. One of them was this lady who got so enthused about volunteering, that she created a bill called "Mandatory Volunteerism." That was odd. And here we go, we are saying support, but don't support. This is curious, and it undermines people like my son, who has served in Fallujah.

CONGRESS MUST SEND THE PRESIDENT A MESSAGE THAT THE DAYS OF A RUBBERSTAMP CONGRESS ARE OVER

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, for 4 years, President Bush has been able to run the war in Iraq any way he wanted to, without any questions or proper oversight from Congress. That changed with the November elections when the American people said they wanted a check on the President's power.

This week, the House is checking that power, debating a simple resolution that sends the President the message that this House does not agree with his plan to send more troops to Iraq.

I hope this debate serves as a wake-up call to the President, and that the status quo in Iraq is not acceptable to this new Congress. And this new plan is not a change in direction, but it is an escalation of his same failed and dangerous policy.

The President has already heard from the bipartisan Iraq Study Group and from his own generals that a military solution is no longer possible, and yet that is exactly what he has proposed.

Mr. Speaker, this week, Democrats and Republicans will send the President a strong message that we must change course in Iraq, and it is really time for the President to listen.

□ 1015

IRAQ RESOLUTION

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor America's brave men and women currently serving in the name of freedom and to oppose this resolution of retreat.

As Abraham Lincoln said famously in his second inaugural address: "Fervently do we pray that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away." As Americans we are reluctant warriors, but throughout our rich history, whenever our troops have been in

harm's way America has supported the men and women in uniform and made certain our troops have the necessary resources to accomplish their mission.

Without a doubt, mistakes have been made, and these mistakes are important to acknowledge, but we must go forward with a new strategy in Iraq based on quantifiable goals and measurable results. We must not retreat. At this critical time, the American people long for true leadership and resolve.

I urge my colleagues to put aside political posturing and partisanship and ensure our troops have the resources and support needed to complete this mission. Victory is the only option.

BUSH LAYS GROUNDWORK FOR ATTACK ON IRAN

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, rather than announce a diplomatic initiative similar to North Korea to resolve the stalemate over Iran's nuclear ambitions, yesterday the President said that the Iranian Government is supplying deadly weapons to fighters in Iraq, even though he cannot prove the orders came from the highest levels in Tehran.

Why is he maintaining this? I believe he is maintaining it to satisfy section 2C of the 1973 War Powers Resolution which reads in part: "The constitutional powers of the President as Commander in Chief to introduce United States Armed Forces into hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances and are exercised pursuant to a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions or its Armed Forces."

So what is going on here is that the administration is seeking a justification for a military conflict with Iran. That is why the administration is changing its emphasis. Its justification now is to protect U.S. troops in Iraq. Very significantly this justification could relieve the President of needing congressional authorization.

Contrary to his assertion, the President has been provoking Iran. The President has given U.S. military the authority to kill or capture Iranian operatives inside Iraq, but fails to present credible evidence that explosives used in Iraq have come from Iran.

He is laying the groundwork for an attack on Iran and appears to be preparing to bypass congressional authorization for a military strike against Iran.

In light of the House of Representatives' action to disapprove of the President's escalation in Iraq and the mounting opposition to the war in Iraq, the President has advanced a new justification that could be used to bypass congressional approval for a military conflict of war.

President Bush was able to exercise new flexibility to reach an agreement with North Korea to shut down its nuclear facility. This offers proof that he could negotiate with Iran as well regarding their alleged nuclear weapons program.

IRAQ RESOLUTION

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled by what is happening in this Chamber this week. We are taking full advantage of the freedoms that we have while good men and women are dying to protect us, and we are undermining their efforts.

The other side has done some very awful things for political gain in this session. But this event is the pit of hypocrisy, not the height of hypocrisy. History has shown that involvement and sending all of the resources necessary was essential to winning World War II. And we did, in fact, preserve freedom and democracy.

Many Americans were against World War II, calling for isolationism and pacifism, hoping that Hitler would stay true to his word regardless of the extensive military buildup. The United States had no choice but to enter the war to save Europe and democracy. That was the definitive conflict of that era; we are now facing the definitive conflict of ours.

Mr. Speaker, this is a tremendous disservice to our troops, their families and the American tradition of being honorable liberators fighting for democracy. This resolution is an insult to our troops and the American people.

We are leaders in our body. It is time that we came together and act as leaders, leave politics aside to fight terrorism and support our troops. We owe to it ourselves, the people we represent and future generations.

IRAQ RESOLUTION

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to be an American. I am so proud that we have first amendment freedoms and this House of Representatives has decided to step up and debate the issue of Iraq. I am not ashamed that I want my troops to come home. I am not ashamed to say that the babies that have died in Iraq that come from Cleveland and Chicago, Illinois need to come home and get out of harm's way. I am not unpatriotic; I am as patriotic as the rest. I stand here to say to America today that the Democrats in this House of Representatives and the Democrats in the Senate want a debate.

Fortunately, we have a strong leader in the House and we are debating. Somehow, the Senate cannot seem to get off the stoop to give us an opportunity to debate the issue of Iraq. I am proud to be an American. I am proud to have troops who have stood up for us, have given their lives. It is time for us to stand up for them.

Let's remember them. Let them not be numbers. Let them and their families know that we care about them.

PROGRESS IN IRAQ

(Mrs. DRAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic week in Iraq. They have passed a new budget for 2007, an overwhelming majority of the Iraq Council of Representatives voted in favor of the \$41.1 billion budget that will aid Iraq with rebuilding, security, and move them forward to be more self-sufficient.

We should celebrate this achievement as evidence that we are making progress in Iraq, and we should allow the new strategy a chance to work. The 2007 Iraq budget represents a 21 percent increase over the 2006 budget. Over \$10 billion will be dedicated to reconstruction efforts and capital investment projects this year, and over \$7 billion will be used to provide security to protect Iraq from insurgents that continue to work against the cause of freedom.

This is great news from Iraq. We are making progress. I applaud the dedication to fiscal responsibility in Iraq and urge my colleagues to celebrate the success stories like this one in Iraq.

IRAQ RESOLUTION

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

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Iraq resolution that we are debating here is bipartisan. Over the last 2 days, Democrats and Republicans have come to this floor to voice their opposition about the escalation plan for this war.

There is also strong bipartisan support for a resolution in the Senate that would express the Chamber's opposition to the President's plan there. Unfortunately, Senate Republican leaders are preventing the debate and the resolution, preferring instead to blindly follow the President.

Why have Democrats and Republicans come together to express our opposition to the President's plan? Unlike the President, we have listened to the military experts, his own generals, the American people, the troops fighting in Iraq, and the bipartisan Iraq Study Group that said this war no longer can be won militarily.

Congress must express an opinion to this President's plan. Over the last month, the House and Senate committees have conducted 52 hearings on Iraq, conducting oversight of an administration that is off course internationally. The oversight will continue and we will bring a change of course in Iraq.

CAFE STANDARDS AND ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)