

Engel	Lipinski	Rothman
Eshoo	Lofgren, Zoe	Roybal-Allard
Etheridge	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Evans	Lynch	Rush
Farr	Maloney	Ryan (OH)
Fattah	Markey	Sabo
Filner	Marshall	Salazar
Ford	Matheson	Sánchez, Linda
Frank (MA)	Matsui	T.
Gilchrest	McCarthy	Sanchez, Loretta
Gonzalez	McCollum (MN)	Sanders
Gordon	McDermott	Schakowsky
Green, Al	McGovern	Schiff
Green, Gene	McIntyre	Schwartz (PA)
Grijalva	McKinney	Scott (GA)
Gutierrez	McNulty	Scott (VA)
Harman	Meehan	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Sherman
Hereth	Meeks (NY)	Simpson
Higgins	Melancon	Skelton
Hinchey	Menendez	Slaughter
Hinojosa	Michaud	Smith (WA)
Holden	Millender-	Snyder
Holt	McDonald	Solis
Honda	Miller (NC)	Spratt
Hooley	Miller, George	Stark
Hostettler	Mollohan	Strickland
Hoyer	Moore (KS)	Stupak
Inslee	Moore (WI)	Tanner
Israel	Moran (VA)	Tauscher
Jackson (IL)	Murtha	Taylor (MS)
Jackson-Lee	Nadler	Thompson (CA)
(TX)	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
Jefferson	Neal (MA)	Tierney
Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar	Udall (CO)
Jones (NC)	Obey	Udall (NM)
Jones (OH)	Oliver	Van Hollen
Kanjorski	Ortiz	Velázquez
Kaptur	Owens	Visclosky
Kennedy (RI)	Pallone	Wasserman
Kildee	Pascarell	Schultz
Kilpatrick (MI)	Pastor	Waters
Kucinich	Payne	Watson
Langevin	Pelosi	Watt
Lantos	Peterson (MN)	Waxman
Larsen (WA)	Pomeroy	Weiner
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Wexler
Leach	Rahall	Woolsey
Lee	Rangel	Wu
Levin	Reyes	Wynn
Lewis (GA)	Ross	

NOT VOTING—22

Beauprez	Fossella	Northup
Berman	Gallegly	Paul
Boswell	Hall	Peterson (PA)
Boyd	Jindal	Shadegg
Camp	Kind	Towns
Cunningham	LaHood	Young (AK)
Davis (AL)	Miller, Gary	
Flake	Moran (KS)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Members are advised there are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 2150

Mr. SIMMONS, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 572, House Concurrent Resolution 308 is adopted.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 308

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 3058) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following correction:

In the second paragraph (relating to the Economic Development Initiative) under the

heading “Community Development Fund” in title III of division A, strike “statement of managers accompanying this Act” and insert “statement of managers correction relating to the Economic Development Initiative, dated November 18, 2005, and submitted by the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives for printing in the House section of the Congressional Record on such date”.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 572.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the House and a concurrent resolution of the following titles:

H.R. 680. An act to direct the Secretary of Interior to convey certain land held in trust for the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah to the City of Richfield, Utah, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2062. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 57 West Street in Newville, Pennsylvania, as the “Randall D. Shughart Post Office Building”.

H.R. 2183. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 567 Tompkins Avenue in Staten Island, New York, as the “Vincent Palladino Post Office”.

H.R. 3853. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 208 South Main Street in Parkdale, Arkansas, as the Willie Vaughn Post Office.

H.R. 4145. An act to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to obtain a statue of Rosa Parks and to place the statue in the United States Capitol in National Statuary Hall, and for other purposes.

H. Con. Res. 208. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of Rosa Louise Parks’ refusal to give up her seat on the bus and the subsequent desegregation of American society.

The message also announced that the Senate passed a bill of the House with an amendment of the following title:

H.R. 358. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the desegregation of the Little Rock Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which concurrence of the House is requested.

S. 1047. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of each of the Nation’s past Presidents and their spouses, respectively, to improve circulation of the \$1 coin, to create a new bullion coin, and for other purposes.

S. 1462. An act to promote peace and accountability in Sudan, and for other purposes.

S. 1785. An act to amend chapter 13 of title 17, United States Code (relating to the vessel hull design protection), to clarify the distinction between a hull and a deck, to provide factors for the determination of the protectability of a revised design, to provide guidance for assessments of substantial similarity, and for other purposes.

S. 1961. An act to extend and expand the Child Safety Pilot Program.

S. 1989. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 57 Rolfe Square in Cranston, Rhode Island, shall be known and designated as the “Holly A. Charette Post Office”.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to that report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2528) “An Act making appropriations for military quality of life functions of the Department of Defense, military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.”.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE THAT DEPLOYMENT OF FORCES IN IRAQ BE TERMINATED IMMEDIATELY

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 571) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the deployment of United States forces in Iraq be terminated immediately, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 571

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the deployment of United States forces in Iraq be terminated immediately.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 572, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

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

On October 15 of this year, 63 percent of Iraq’s eligible voters stood in the suffocating heat for hours risking their lives to suicide bombers and guns. And why? Because they dared to vote.

Do we honor their bravery by abandoning them?

Nobody wants war. War has been truly described as hell. But at the same time, things are worth fighting for and even dying for. And among those things is precious freedom. Our own freedom was born in the crucible of a 9-year war to the sounds of muskets well described as the “shots heard round the world.”

We can argue endlessly about the wisdom of getting into this war, but there should be no argument about how

this war should end. The consequences of our retreat have not been discussed here tonight, but they deserve consideration.

This debate has been a report card on JACK MURTHA, and I give him an A-plus as a truly great American. But among his many fine qualities, infallibility is not one. And on Iraq I prefer my country not to retreat, not to run to the high grass.

I prefer the counsel of JOHN MCCAIN who said last week, "If we leave Iraq prematurely, the jihadists will interpret the withdrawal as their great victory against our great power. Osama bin Laden and his followers believe that America is weak, unwilling to suffer casualties in battle. They drew this lesson from Lebanon in the 1980s and Somalia in the 1990s, and today they have their sights set squarely on Iraq."

The recently released letter from Ayman al-Zawahiri, bin Laden's lieutenant, to Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, draws out the implications.

The Zawahiri letter is predicated on the assumption that the United States will leave Iraq and that al Qaeda's real game begins as soon as we abandon the country.

In his missive, Zawahiri lays out a four-stage plan: establish a caliphate in Iraq, extend the "jihad wave" to the secular countries neighboring Iraq, clash with Israel, none of which shall commence until the completion of stage one: expel the Americans from Iraq.

Zawahiri observes that the collapse of American power in Vietnam "and how they ran and left their agents," suggests that "we must be ready starting now."

We cannot let them start, now or ever.

We must stay in Iraq until the government there has a fully functioning security apparatus that can keep Zarqawi and his terrorists at bay and ultimately defeat them.

I prefer the counsel of another war hero, my personal hero, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), who stands with the President, the Iraqi people, and freedom fighters everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for purposes of control.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution and in defense of a military hero of this Nation, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

In a few moments I will ask unanimous consent to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) the balance of the time on the Democratic side, but I would like to put this debate in its proper framework.

This is not the finest moment of the House of Representatives. We have all sat through interminable debates on inconsequential issues, but tonight we are talking about war and peace.

Fifteen years ago when we debated the first gulf war, every single Member of this body got 5 minutes to present his views. This time we are getting less than 8 seconds. What we are debating is not a serious proposal, but a cheap political ploy beneath the dignity of this body.

□ 2200

The subject of the war in Iraq deserves serious and thoughtful discussion and debate, and we are surely not having it tonight. There is no Member of this House for whom I have more respect and affection than the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the epitome of patriotism, not of the oratorical type, but patriotism on the field of battle.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) the balance of the time for him to control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think what we are doing tonight is sending a very valuable message. It is not necessarily a message to diplomats or to the President or even to our adversaries; although I am sure that they will read about it. But it is a message to that specialist in Tikrit, to that lance corporal in Fallujah, to that sergeant in Baghdad who feels by looking at the mass of press over the last several days that somehow we are slipping away from our warfighters.

We have an opportunity to do something tonight by very simply voting "no" on this question of whether we should leave Iraq immediately to at least cut through that ambiguity, to at least cut through that confusion, and you know, words mean something. Wars have been started because we said the wrong words. Confusion is not something that is good to sow among your enemy or your friends.

In this case, even those who may feel that somehow the troops are not confused by this mixed message that is coming out of the United States must agree that it is right now to send that specialist in Tikrit or that lance corporal in Fallujah or that sergeant in Baghdad a clear and convincing "no" vote on the question of whether we leave Iraq immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this resolution. I have been in this body 19 years,

and I did not support setting artificial dates to remove our troops from Bosnia, Somalia, Kosovo, East Timor, Macedonia and all the other times that we have deployed our troops.

In fact, even when we were told back in 1997, the year after we entered Bosnia, that our troops would be home by Christmas, I did not rise to bring them home. We were told in Christmas of 1998 they would be home and Christmas of 1999. The fact is we still have troops in the Balkans. They have been there 10 years, even though it was not part of the original plan.

Mr. Speaker, all of us support our troops, but I want to tell my colleagues, in my 19 years I learned a lesson of supporting the troops from the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He took me under his wing when I came here as a freshman 19 years ago. I have traveled with him around the world. I have seen his personal dedication to the men and women who serve.

Now, there are many others in this body on both sides of the aisle that we can say the same thing about, but I want to stand up as a Representative from the other side of Pennsylvania and tell the story of JACK MURTHA who epitomizes what our military's all about. I wish I could say I have been to Landstuhl, a medical facility in Germany, as many times as JACK MURTHA has been there.

I wish I could say that weekly I would go over to Walter Reed Hospital and meet with the troops as JACK MURTHA has done week after week after week.

I wish I could say I have gone and held the hands of the wives and the children of the sailors at Bethesda as JACK MURTHA has done.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say that I have done all that, but I cannot. JACK MURTHA is one of a kind. He is an example for all of us in this body, and none of us should ever think of questioning his motives, his desires or support for our American troops.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say I have been here 19 years. I have been here with Republican and Democrat Presidents. Yes, JACK MURTHA's been there. He stood up when Bill Clinton tried to cut the funding for our troops, and he stood with us on some very tough votes. He stood up with us on the tough policy questions. He was with us on missile defense. He was with us when others in his party would not be with us on defense and security issues. On some very tough leadership spots JACK MURTHA was there, and for the 5 years that President Bush has been President, I cannot count on my hands the number of times JACK MURTHA has stood with our President in supporting our troops in supporting more money, in supporting the policies that give us the kind of capability that we need.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a sad state today. We are in a tough time with our troops. They are wondering what is going on back here. It is not about JACK MURTHA trying to undermine anyone, just as I and others would not

have tried to do that in the other 40 deployments in the 19 years that I have been here, but it is wrong, Mr. Speaker, that a gentleman with the reputation and leadership of JACK MURTHA should have to wait 5 months to get a response to a letter expressing his concerns to the administration. That is not right.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope we would all come together, and I would hope that our Commander in Chief would invite the good gentleman from Pennsylvania down to the White House to have a discussion about how we can move forward together to support the troops and win the day in Iraq and Afghanistan.

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

Somebody walked by not long ago, and they said, I do not have to go to your funeral because I paid my dues today with all these people giving these accolades.

I have to tell you this story. When you start getting all these accolades, you think you are a big shot. I remember one time President Carter asked me to go to the seventh game of the World Series with him. Tip O'Neill and I went down, and there were only 4 of us and 15 Secret Service people in the plane.

We got in this helicopter and, of course, flew over all these other people going to the ballgame. Well, Carter was not the most pleasant guy to be with. He wanted to talk all business, and Tip O'Neill wanted to talk nothing but baseball.

So we get about halfway there, and it is not a very long trip to Baltimore. Tip finally got him warmed up. We land, and we only land a block away from the stadium, but we had to have an armored car drive us in. So the President said, you sit in the middle there, Murtha, and Tip sat on the left side, and the President sat on the right side. Some guy yelled out some obscenities. He said, My God, they must have recognized Murtha in the car.

Let me say, this resolution today is not what I envisioned, not what I introduced, and let me read what I introduced on November 17.

"Whereas Congress and the American people have not been shown clear, measurable progress toward establishment of stable and improving security in Iraq or of a stable and improving economy in Iraq, both of which are essential to 'promote the emergence of a democratic government';

"Whereas additional stabilization in Iraq by U.S. military forces cannot be achieved without the deployment of hundreds of thousands of additional U.S. troops, which in turn cannot be achieved without a military draft."

Now, let me say this. There were two of us who voted for a military draft, so I do not think that is an option. When you go to the high schools, they say, you are for a draft. I said, yes, but there is not too many of us, and I do not think you have to worry about it.

"Whereas more than \$277 billion has been appropriated by the United States

Congress to prosecute U.S. military action in Iraq and Afghanistan;

"Whereas, as of the drafting of this resolution, 2,079 U.S. troops have been killed in Operation Iraqi Freedom;

"Whereas U.S. forces become the target of the insurgency;

"Whereas, according to recent polls, over 80 percent of the Iraqi people want the U.S. forces out of Iraq;

"Whereas polls also indicate that 45 percent," this is a British poll, but the Defense Department support this British poll or confirm this British poll, "of the Iraqi people feel that the attacks on U.S. forces are justified."

Hear what I am saying. Forty-five percent of the Iraqi people feel it is justified to attack Americans.

"Whereas, due to the foregoing, Congress finds it evident that continuing U.S. military action in Iraq is not in the best interests of the United States of America, the people of Iraq, or the Persian Gulf Region, which were cited in Public Law 107-243 as justification for undertaking such action."

I did not say anything about intelligence. I did not say anything about the President. All these statements that have been made vilifying me today did not say anything like that.

"Therefore be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that the deployment of United States forces in Iraq, by direction of Congress, is hereby terminated and the forces involved are to be redeployed at the earliest practicable date. "Section 2. A quick-reaction U.S. force and an over-the-horizon presence of U.S. Marines shall be deployed in the region.

"The United States of America shall pursue security and stability in Iraq through diplomacy."

That is what I said. I have never had in the 32 years that I have been in Congress such an outpouring from this country, four to one in my office. You cannot even call my office if you tried, an outpouring of people crying. People are thirsting for some direction. They are thirsting for a solution to this problem. They want to support the President. I want to support the President. Everybody does.

We put into place in the Appropriations Committee a criteria for success because we were so unhappy. This was in May. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and I put a criteria for success in the bill, it was a Moran amendment, because we were not happy with the results. Nobody was talking to us. Nobody would tell us what was going on, and we felt it was absolutely necessary that we put this into writing.

I went to Iraq about 2 months ago, and I talked to the commanders, and all of you know the commanders are very hesitant to say anything that is not in the policy of the White House, and I agree, that is the way it is run by the civilians. That is the way it should be, but I could tell how discouraged the commanders were.

The one Marine commander said, I do not have troops to put on the border, the Syrian border. Now, why did they not have enough troops? Because of the deployment, because of the small number of people that are serving in our Armed Forces today.

We told them, the Armed Services Committee, under DUNCAN HUNTER's leadership, said you can take 30,000 more people. They cannot recruit to that. They have fallen 10,000 short; and not only have they fallen 10,000 short, they are now taking 20 percent category 4s, which they said in the voluntary Army would never happen.

The war's not going as advertised. The American public is way ahead of us. If you heard the World War II veterans, if you heard the Vietnam veterans, the wives and the widows on the phone crying to my staff and myself when I am talking to them, if you heard them reaching out and asking for a policy, a bipartisan policy. When I introduced this resolution, I did not introduce this as a partisan resolution.

I go by Arlington Cemetery every day, and the Vice President, he criticizes Democrats. Let me tell you, those gravestones do not say Democrat or Republican. They say American, and DICK CHENEY's a good friend of mine. He was a good Secretary of Defense.

Our military is suffering. The future of our country is at risk. We cannot continue on the present course. It is evident that continued military action in Iraq is not in the best interests of the United States of America, the Iraqi people and the Persian Gulf region. That is my opinion.

General Casey said in a September 2005 hearing, the perception of occupation in Iraq is a major driving force behind the insurgency. Hear what I am saying. General Abizaid said on the same date, reducing the size of visibility of the coalition forces in Iraq is part of our counterinsurgency strategy.

For 2½ years I have been concerned about our policy and the plan in Iraq. I have addressed my concerns to the administration and the Pentagon.

□ 2215

I have spoken out in public about my concerns in going to war.

A few days before the start of the war, I was in Kuwait. They drew a red line around Baghdad; and they said when the American forces cross the red line, they will attack us with weapons of mass destruction, meaning biological and chemical weapons. I believed that. They believed it. The military commanders believed it. And when they went in, though, they felt they had sufficient protective gear that they could overcome it. The heat would dissipate some of the gas and so forth, and it would be no problem for our forces, they felt. They even thought they had cell phones monitored so they could tell that it was there. It turned out not to be true.

Let me tell the Members this: BILL YOUNG and I have been on the Defense

Subcommittee for 25 years. We spend more money on intelligence than all the countries in the world put together and more on intelligence than most countries' GDP. But the intelligence concerning Iraq was wrong. It is not a world intelligence failure. It is a U.S. intelligence failure.

I have been visiting our wounded troops at Bethesda, and only two people, I think, visit any more than I do, and that is BILL YOUNG's wife and BILL YOUNG. They go there as often as I do, and Beverly goes more often.

Now, let me tell the Members what demoralizes the troops. Going to war with not enough troops and equipment to make the transition to peace, the devastation caused by IEDs, being deployed to Iraq when their homes have been ravaged by hurricanes, being under second and third deployment and leaving their families behind without a network of support.

The threat posed by terrorism is real, but we have other threats that cannot be ignored. We must be prepared to meet all these threats. The future of our military is at risk. Our military and their families are stretched thin. A very small percentage of people in this country are serving this country at this stage in this war. Many say the Army is broken. Some of our troops are on their third deployment. Recruitment is down. Defense budgets are being cut, \$5 billion this year, \$5 billion cut from the defense budget; and the chairman and I are concerned they are going to cut another percentage point, which is \$4 billion more, from the defense budget.

Personnel costs are skyrocketing, particularly in health care. And choices have to be made. We cannot allow a promise that we have made to our military families in terms of service benefits, in terms of their health care to be negotiated away. Procurement programs that ensure our military dominance cannot be negotiated away. We must be prepared.

The war in Iraq has caused huge shortfalls in our bases in the United States. I visited four bases, four Southern bases, premier bases. Every one of them was short, short radios, short mortars, short ammunition even. Our troops were C-4, which means the lowest state of readiness, because they did not have the equipment to train right before they are deployed to Iraq. And much of our ground equipment is worn out and in need of serious overhaul.

I have said to all these CEOs that come to see me, Folks, do not think about procurement. We about bought, what, five or six ships this year, something like that. They said they are going to build 12 next year. Do not believe that. But I will tell the Members one thing we have to do is rehabilitate this equipment. A \$50 billion bill, in my estimation, and I do not know where the money is going to come from.

George Washington said: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effective means of preserving peace." I do

not know what the threat is, but I will tell you it takes 18 years to get a weapons system out there, and we had better well get those systems put together now. We had better start them right now because we do not have them. They have a system right now they are thinking of cutting back. The Europeans invested a lot of money in it. Billions of dollars have been invested in this weapon system, JSF. If they cut back the buy, the cost to increase, the Europeans will cut back on their buy, and it will skyrocket the price; and we will have to reduce the number of airplanes that we buy. We must rebuild our Army.

Our deficit is growing out of control. The Director of the Congressional Budget Office recently admitted to being "terrified" about the budget deficit in the coming decades. This is the first prolonged war we have fought with 3 years of tax cuts, without full mobilization of American industry, and without a draft. The burden of war has not been shared equally, and the military and their families are shouldering this burden.

Our military has been fighting a war in Iraq for over 2½ years. Our military has accomplished its mission and done its duty. Our military captured Saddam Hussein, captured or killed his closest associates. But the war continues to intensify. And you know the deaths and you know they estimate that not only do we have 15,500 that have been wounded, but we have 50,000 that we think may suffer from what I call battle fatigue.

I just recently visited Anbar Province, as I said, and I became convinced that we had to take some action. I became convinced that I needed to say something about what was going on. I needed to introduce a resolution which would bring this to a head so we could come to a bipartisan resolution to fight this war together, to show our troops how we support them, and that resolution calls for a redeployment of our troops. I said over a year ago now, the military and the administration agree, Iraq cannot be won militarily.

We can say it here in these air conditioned offices, but let me tell you something. It cannot be won militarily. It has got to be won politically, and we have to turn it over to the Iraqis and give them the incentive to take back their own country.

Our troops have become the primary target of the insurgency. They are united against U.S. forces. We have become the catalyst for violence. U.S. troops are the common enemy of the Sunnis, the Saddamists, and the foreign jihadists. I believe with U.S. troop redeployment, the Iraqi security forces will be incentivized to take control. A poll recently conducted shows 80 percent of the Iraqis oppose the presence of coalition troops. I believe we need to turn Iraq over to the Iraqis. I believe the Iraqi election scheduled for mid-December, the Iraqi people in the emerging government must be put on

notice: the United States will immediately redeploy. All of Iraq must know that Iraq is free, free from United States occupation. I believe this will send a signal to the Sunnis to join the political process for a good and free Iraq.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman who spends so much of his time with our Nation's wounded.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Americans can sleep well tonight because our soldiers are out there on the front line against terror making sure that we can do that. And we owe them a lot. We owe them our thanks. We owe them our appreciation. We owe them the necessary equipment to carry out their mission, to protect themselves while they are doing that, and we owe them our support. And it is important that we let them know without any doubt that we support them, that this Congress supports them. And that is why, in case there is any confusion about how we would like Members to vote on this resolution tonight, we want them to vote "no." This is not a good resolution.

Incidentally, in case the Members have not noticed, JACK MURTHA spent more time tonight speaking on the floor than he has in the last 20 years combined presenting the appropriations bills.

JACK and I have been friends for a long time, as he suggested, and we have worked together. He was my chairman for a long time. I have been his chairman for a long time. We work together for the best interest of our Nation and for those who protect our Nation. And he has received many accolades tonight and properly so.

Chairman HUNTER, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, also deserves accolades. He was willing to offer this resolution, which we all are going to vote against, I hope. Chairman HUNTER was an airborne soldier in Vietnam, and he led a platoon of Rangers in Vietnam. Chairman HUNTER deserves an awful lot of thanks and appreciation for the work that he did then and the work that he is doing tonight here on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about JACK MURTHA tonight, and it is not about DUNCAN HUNTER. This is about 296 of us who voted to support the President going into Iraq to fight terror, to fight Saddam Hussein and his vicious armies. Once you have committed to a war or to a battle, it is like some other things in life, once you are committed, you are committed, like it or not. And we got committed when we voted to send troops to Iraq.

Now, how do you get out of a commitment like that? Well, you can win. That is the preferred way. Or you can

lose. We do not like that. You could retreat, or you could surrender. I do not think we like either one of those two.

Or there is another way: we could negotiate our way out. But in a case of global terrorists, whom do you negotiate with? They hide. They sneak. Would you negotiate with Osama bin Laden, Saddam Hussein, Al-Zarqawi? Whom do you negotiate with? You do not have anybody to negotiate with because they are pure and simple terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things that have been said tonight on both sides of the aisle that are very important. There has been a little bit of spin here and there, but that is not unusual for a legislative body like this. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no place, when we are dealing with the security of our Nation and the security of the American people, there is no place for politics on either side.

So tonight, Mr. Speaker, we need to send a strong message to our troops and to their families. For those families who are dealing with the loss of a loved one, for those families who are dealing with a seriously wounded soldier or marine who might be at Walter Reed Hospital or at Bethesda Hospital or at Landstuhl in Germany, we need to let them know that we are here to support them.

In a few short days when we will be back to legislative business, there is another issue that we have to deal with, and I am going to take advantage of this extra minute to tell the Members what it is. Somebody in the Pentagon has ruled that if JACK MURTHA and I go to hospital with my wife, Beverly, which we do on occasion, and she makes us empty our wallets to help a family that is struggling to meet their expenses, some regulation at the Pentagon says that is illegal, that is bribery. What can I bribe a wounded soldier to do? He has already done everything that he can do for me. So we need to change that.

□ 2230

So we need to change that. Chairman HUNTER and I and Mr. MURTHA and I have worked together with our counterparts in the Senate, and we intend to fix this on the first legislative or appropriations bills we have access to. So that is what this is about tonight, to let our soldiers win this war against terror not only in Iraq, but in Afghanistan and anywhere else that terrorists raise their ugly heads. This is not limited to Iraq. Iraq is one of the major battlefields. Afghanistan is one of the major battlefields.

My friends, we are in it for the long haul against the threat of terrorism, and it is important that we prevail and support those on the front line against terror and vote "no" tonight on this resolution that does not do any of what I just said.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), the chairman of

the Readiness Subcommittee and does so much for the quality of life for our troops.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard from two giants of this body, men that we are all very, very proud of. If we had any sense, we would all sit down right now and take the vote; and I will give up my time if everybody else will give up theirs, and we will vote. I am told no, that is not going to work.

So let me try to be brief. Both of these gentlemen expressed the conflicting views in a most sincere way, and I think we respect both of them.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do rise today in opposition to H. Res. 571. I want us to withdraw the moment the job is done, and that is what our troops are telling us, too. They want to stay there until it is done. That is what most of the Iraqi people tell us, do not leave us until it is done.

Mr. Speaker, there are some out there insisting that the mission on Iraq has been a failure, and our presence in Iraq has not been properly run, and we are not winning the peace. Frankly, I do not think that is true, and it only serves to lower the morale of the men and women fighting in Iraq while encouraging the terrorists who hate America.

The fact is those who assert that the Iraq policy is failing frankly fail to recognize the many successes that have occurred on a daily basis over there. What we are talking about is fighting terror and liberating a people. Look at just the political successes. They have had two elections, and those two elections, most of those people had never voted in a free election in their entire lives. On October 15, they adopted a Constitution. They did not know what a Constitution was, and 78 percent of the voters backed the charter of the Constitution.

We are making enormous progress toward liberty and democracy for the Iraqi people, and by extension the people of the Middle East. I say thank you, troops, for what you are doing. We love you, and we are going to be with you until the job is done.

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

Normally the soldiers cannot speak for themselves. I do not believe we are making the progress that is articulated in many cases. Everything I see, oil production is below prewar level; electricity production is below prewar level; incidents have increased from 150 a week to 770 a week in Iraq.

But let me read a letter from a young soldier at Walter Reed. Everybody says when you go to Walter Reed, they all want to go right back, and they usually do not complain. Let me read this letter.

"I am sure you are extremely busy today with the announcement of your support for the withdrawal of troops from Iraq. We have been trying unsuccessfully to reach you by phone.

"My husband is an injured Iraq soldier who so highly commends you for

speaking out about this disastrous war and its aftermath on U.S. troops. Though we are now living in Washington, D.C., on the Walter Reed campus, we are originally from your 12th District in Pennsylvania.

"Congressman Murtha actually pinned my husband's Purple Heart. We are so proud that he was the man to honor my husband for what he did in Iraq. It may serve Mr. Murtha more to remind him that my husband is the 24-year-old guardsman who lost part of a leg in a suicide car bomb attack in April of this year.

"We were shocked and overjoyed that Murtha spoke out against the Bush administration's handling of the war. Unlike what many say is a blow to troop morale by questioning the war, his frank call for attention to the subject brought nods and applause from the injured soldiers at Walter Reed's Mologne House. It is the first that my husband and I feel that a politician has truly stuck up for the soldiers most personally affected by the war in Iraq."

We send the soldiers to the war. We are the ones that make that decision. We also have to speak out when we do not think the war is going in the right direction.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS), who served multiple tours in Vietnam.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution. I am proud to be a Vietnam veteran. I am proud to have spent almost 4 years in that country with the U.S. Army and the Central Intelligence Agency, but I was not proud when Members of Congress, Members of this body, criticized us in the course of that war publicly back here at home. Their critical comments were demoralizing and undercut our efforts. It encouraged our enemy, and it placed us at risk.

At some point in the 1970s, our national will broke down, we cut and ran. We left our friends behind, my colleagues, my counterparts. And we abandoned Southeast Asia to unprecedented slaughter and destruction.

Now 30 years later I find myself on this same floor talking about the "immediate redeployment" of our troops from a foreign battlefield where they are fully engaged in a difficult and dangerous mission.

More than anyone else, this Vietnam veteran wants to see our troops come home safely, successfully and soon. But now is not the time for immediate withdrawal. Now is the time to support our troops and the values they fight for.

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

Let me read another letter.

"We are Gold Star parents. Our son was killed October 18, 2003, south of Kirkuk with the 173rd Airborne Brigade. You and I talked for about 90 minutes on the phone in early 2004. I

have spent the better part of 2 years lobbying for improved body armor."

Do Members remember, we sent the troops to war without body armor? We found the body armor. We found the shortage and up-armored the Humvees. Congress found it, and we put the money in the bill.

"We believe the best way to support the troops is through a responsible and well-thought-out foreign policy."

Not stay the course, but a thought out, and this is from a woman whose son was killed.

"We do not have that policy today in Iraq. By staying in Iraq, we have become occupiers instead of liberators." And 80 percent of the Iraqis think that.

"Today we are called un-American because we are obligated to disagree with the President. We want better for our son's comrades. It is our obligation to stand up and be counted to support the troops, to speak for those that are not free to speak for themselves, to use their bravery and sacrifice wisely. You, sir, are a man of our heart. God knows why the rest of the Democratic Party is not rallying around you, but we are. Even as we stand alone, it is the right thing to do. Our support is unequivocal for you on matter in this dangerous and lonely time."

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and who is a colonel in the Army Reserve and a Gulf War veteran.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for Mr. MURTHA and Mr. HUNTER. And I am uncomfortable when Mr. MURTHA talks about one political party rallying round something. I do not want Republicans or Democrats rallying around anything. You moved me when I was in my office and you talked about going to Arlington. All of us have been there; all of us have been to our Nation's cemeteries and seen the white crosses and Stars of David.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN) and I were privileged to represent our country this past May, and I am sure Mr. MURTHA has been there, standing on the cliffs of Normandy at Omaha. We gave the Memorial Day address representing our Nation. I was there with my 20-year-old son, and I could feel the envy of souls because I thought about what their last thoughts may have been. And then as I strained among these thousands of graves, if I permitted the eyes of my mind to have a vision I could actually see, if I permitted the ears of my heart to listen, I could hear.

And what did they say? They said, What we did on this day was worthy. You see, they came to a continent to free it from tyranny on that day. They came to a land where they had never been to fight for a people they had never met. Does that not yet sound familiar?

And we speak of the sacrifice of what we refer to as the greatest generation. How are we now yet defining ourselves

when our men and women are faced with something very similar.

We should be here tonight talking of our strategy of victory, defined by our perseverance to an enduring freedom throughout the world. To discuss withdrawal from Iraq tonight before our mission is complete is the wrong strategy at the wrong time. Why? Because freedom is on the move.

We, the people of the United States, we are a great Nation with a great vision. We seek to preserve the blessings of liberty for our citizens and for all those around the world who recognize the God-given right of freedom.

Today our Nation is truly engaged in an epic struggle for freedom in Iraq. Whether you believe how we got there is true, the struggle among us is evident here tonight. What we do not want is what Mr. HYDE referred to as our enemies to take advantage of our weaknesses. The painful lessons, whether it was Vietnam or Lebanon or Somalia, North Korea, Iran, al Qaeda, they watch, and it is part of what they want to do to envelope our weakness.

You see, Clausewitz had it right. He said, The use of our military force is the instrumentality of a political decision. We then expect our military to act on the field of battle with great valor, courage and commitment. You see, they are an extension of us. And in return, our soldiers ask what of us? Loyalty. And they expect us to have the very same resolve that we expect of them; that in battle, they look at us and say, when it gets hard, when it gets tough, can you hang with us, Congress? That is a very pertinent question for a soldier to ask of us.

So I respect Mr. MURTHA, but this is the wrong time for your resolution, sir.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LANTOS. Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that we are debating Mr. MURTHA's resolution or Mr. HUNTER's resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pending is House Resolution 571.

Mr. LANTOS. The previous speaker referred to Mr. MURTHA's resolution. That is not before the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is a matter for debate—a matter that may be addressed by debate.

□ 2245

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Please state your parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LANTOS. We on this side of the House are under the impression that we are debating the Hunter resolution. Please correct us if we are wrong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct and he may make that point by debate.

Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. MURTHA, I apologize to you. I know you have a resolution. That is what I was referring to. I recognize we are debating Hunter, and I apologize to you, Mr. MURTHA.

Mr. MURTHA. Let me read another letter.

"In 2004, my youngest son graduated from college and was already enrolled in the Marines. He was ready to help our country and others in whatever was asked of him. It was with great distress that we have watched the administration mishandle this war. There was no plan."

What the gentleman from Indiana said about World War II, there was a plan. There was a plan when we went into Normandy. We landed 150,000 people in 24 hours. There is the conception at home that there is no plan. I hear this over and over again. That is why there was such an outpouring when I offered a plan, when people called me and said they wanted a plan.

"It was with great distress that we have watched the administration mishandle this war. There was no plan, no push to go in and win the war in total. Mission Accomplished was a joke, and even we the uniformed knew then that it was a misnomer. Losing Colin Powell from the administration was a deep blow to us. We respected his honor and his professionalism. His soldier inside. Our son has had one deployment to Iraq. He came home safely this time, and awaits his second deployment in July. Congressman MURTHA, we are a patriotic family, but I cannot abide by sending my son back into a war where there is no goal, no plan, and a war being planned by Donald Rumsfeld and Vice President CHENEY. We would feel differently if we felt our son was being used in the proper manner, and for a valiant effort. But we feel that they are clay pigeons in a carnival, just waiting for the next suicide bomber or IED. My husband and I did not feel this way 6 months ago. We thought the administration had realized their inadequacy and were making changes, and that we should stay the course. That has not happened. Things continue in disarray. This is not the best use of our military, nor respectful of the values and ideals of the servicemen and women within it. We support your views and we feel that there is a need for change."

That is what I am saying. We need to change direction in Iraq.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) who served as an Army officer in the U.S. Airborne.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I would point out first that the childish shouting from many who have not served dishonor those who serve on the front lines with quiet resolve at this time while we have a necessary debate on this war.

I am here to represent some folks who cannot speak because they are serving on the front lines right now. I received a phone call in the well of the

House this evening from one of the commanders of America's premier counterterrorism organization. He shared with me his great dismay at much of the rhetoric that had emanated from this body today, making them the pawns in a political battle over what they clearly see as they are making success on the front lines. Please, your shouting and your rhetoric sends echoes to our enemies as well as to our soldiers and our friends.

It is honest to have a debate, my friends, but when I am asked on the floor of this house, why are you doing to us what was done to so many veterans here by Members of this body during Vietnam, when I am told repeatedly of their successes, my friends who I served with over nearly 30 years ago and who are serving now on the front lines commanding the units, leading the units and who are serving as junior enlisted soldiers, hundreds of soldiers whose opinions fly in the face of the rhetoric shared tonight.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, here we are in America's House, having a debate that is altogether appropriate, because as our founders stated the goal, it was to form a more perfect union. And because we are human beings, there is always a gulf between the real and the ideal. This is not a personal debate to be personalized about the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He offered a point of view yesterday. Whatever his intent, here is how it was reported. The Washington Post called it immediate withdrawal. The New York Times called it immediate withdrawal. More ominously and sadly, Al-Jazeera called it immediate withdrawal.

The problem is this, ladies and gentlemen, as has been articulated. Another e-mail, my colleagues:

"I am a U.S. Army captain currently serving in Iraq and I am shocked and appalled by Representative Murtha's call for immediate withdrawal. Please, please, please convince your colleagues to let us finish this critical job."

That is what is at stake. Vote "no" on immediate withdrawal.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me ask, Mr. Speaker, we have the right to close on this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Yes.

Mr. HUNTER. We have got only one speaker left, so I would ask my colleague from Pennsylvania to close on his side if he could.

Mr. MURTHA. Who has the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has the right to close.

Mr. MURTHA. This is his resolution.

The first encounter with the casualties in this war, I had two young widows come to my office. They wanted to go to Walter Reed because they had lost their husband and they wanted to talk to the soldiers and tell them how lucky they were that they were still alive. One was 23 with two children. One was 19 without any children. I thought how proud I was of them. Another young man from my district was blinded and lost his foot. They did everything they could do for him in Walter Reed. And then he went home and his father was in jail. His mother had not seen him. There was no one at home and he was by himself. The VA has done everything they could to help him. They sent him to Johns Hopkins to see if there is a possibility for him to see and found out that he could not see. And then they started sending bills. Collection agencies sent him bills. Imagine. He is by himself in his own home and a collection agency from Johns Hopkins sends him a bill. Obviously we straightened it out, but that is the kind of thing that happens when you forget about the veteran.

I had a soldier that lost both legs and an arm. Bill has seen the young fellow from Micronesia. We visited a mental health ward. You know what they said to me? Fifty thousand of them are going to have some kind of battle fatigue. They said that we don't get Purple Hearts. We don't get any recognition at all. We get shunned aside as if we were cowards.

A young woman from Notre Dame lost her arm and she was worried about her husband losing weight. She was the one that lost her arm. It makes me so proud. A Seabee was lying in intensive care with his three children and his mother and his wife in tears because he was paralyzed from the neck down. This young Marine, his father had been a Marine. His father was there. His father was rubbing his hand. He says, please get my son's brother home. He wants to see his brother. I called the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps said, he doesn't want to come home. So I went back and told his father. He said, please get him home. So I told the Marine Corps and they got him home. I said, you get him out of that country blank-blank right now, and they did.

Another Marine lost both his hands, blinded. I went to the hospital. After I talked to him, I said how proud, as I do to all of them, how proud I was of them. Is there anything you can do for them, I said? He said, yeah, get him a Purple Heart. Why wouldn't he get a Purple Heart? Because he was demobilizing from the friendly bomblets that had been dropped and hadn't exploded, thousands of them. Finally one of them blew up, blew his hands off and killed the guy behind him and blinded him. The Marine Corps said, we have regulations about Purple Hearts. It was friendly fire so he can't get a Purple Heart.

I told the commandant, If you don't give him the Purple Heart, I'm going to

give him one of mine. I was going to go out on Thursday, the commandant went out on Wednesday and he got his Purple Heart. Our troops have become the enemy.

Folks, it is easy to sit here in your air-conditioned offices and say, send them into battle. It is easy to sit here in the Capitol of the United States and say, stay the course. But when there is not a plan, when the families write to me and say there is not a plan, when they don't understand, when they believe that Captain Fishback came to see me, he says, You're complicit with the administration in torture, Congress is, because you're looking the other way. I said, We didn't know a thing about it.

And one of the things that turned the Iraqis against us was the tragedy that happened at Abu Ghraib. Because we in Congress are charged with sending our sons and daughters into battle, it is our responsibility, our obligation to speak out for them and that is why I am speaking out.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes we are going to send a message to our troops. And for our last speaker, we have a gentleman who knows a lot about freedom. He knows a lot about a lack of freedom. He knows a lot about American resolve and sometimes the lack of American resolve. He has been awarded two Silver Stars, two Legions of Merit, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Bronze Star with valor, two Purple Hearts, four air medals and three outstanding unit awards. He is one of our real heroes, SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Thank you, Mr. HUNTER. You are a great man yourself.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the American men and women in uniform and their families. I did spend 29 years in the Air Force, and I served in Korea and Vietnam and spent 7 years as a POW in Vietnam and more than half of that in solitary confinement. I know what it is like to be far from home, serving your country, risking your life, hearing that America doesn't care about you as happened in Vietnam.

□ 2300

Your Congress does not care about you. Your Congress just cut off all the funding for your war. They are packing up, going home, and leaving you here.

When I was a POW, I was scared to death when our Congress talked about pulling the plug that I would be left there forever. I know what it does to morale, I know what it does to the mission, and so help me God, I will never, ever let our Nation make that mistake again.

Our men and women in uniform need our full support. They need to know that when they are in Iraq driving from Camp Blue Diamond to Camp Victory that the Congress is behind them, to

give them the best armored trucks they can drive, the best weapons they can fire, and the best ammunition they can use. They need to have full faith that a few nay-sayers in Washington will not cut and run and leave them high and dry. They need to know these things because that is mandatory for mission success and troop morale.

America, and the Congress, must stand behind our men and women in uniform because they stand up for us every minute of every day.

Any talk, even so much as a murmur, of leaving now just emboldens the enemy and weakens the resolve of our troops in the field. That is dangerous. If you do not believe me, check out al Jazeera. The withdrawal story is on the front page. We cannot do that to our fellow Americans over there.

Mr. Speaker, we are making great progress in Iraq. Remember in January how we saw pictures from Iraq of that first election. For weeks, the media predicted gloom and doom. Remember that? What did we see? We watched people as they waited in line for hours, defying death threats just to cast their vote for democracy.

Remember the picture of the woman in the black hair cover flashing her purple finger in the "V" after voting in the first Iraqi elections? It was a breakthrough for democracy, and it was just the beginning.

Remember the recent vote on the referendum when people came out in droves to make their voices heard? You would not have known about it because there was so little mention of it in our press, but the people got out there and they voted and they showed their support for democracy, a new government, hope, and a future.

These people are thirsting for something more. They are risking their lives in the name of a new government, and we must stay the course if we want to foster a stable Iraq and create hope for millions in the Middle East.

Our work is paying off, not just at the ballot box. Remember when we were waking up that Sunday morning in shock as we caught Saddam Hussein cowering in a rathole? He is gone. And you know what? At least 46 of Hussein's 55 most-wanted regime members are either dead or incarcerated. Nationwide, thousands and thousands of police officers have been hired, and nearly 200,000 Iraqi soldiers are trained and serving their country. It is going to take time, but our guys on the ground are working with other nations to make inroads to create leadership and inspire democracy in a country that has only known hate, fear, and death from a ruler.

However, sadly, some here want to embolden the enemy by saying we just cut and run. That is just irresponsible and unconscionable.

I have to ask, what would Iraq be like if the United States pulled out, allowing dangerous people like the head of al Qaeda, Zarqawi, to run the country? What would that mean for the re-

gion, the world? Al Qaeda rules with death, fear, terror, and blood. Al Qaeda takes innocent people hostage, and then beheads them, and then brags about it on the Internet. Al Qaeda has no respect for human life. They prey on innocent people to do their dirty work, because they know we do not target schools and hospitals and mosques; yet those are the exact places they run for cover.

Al Qaeda will kidnap loved ones, especially very young children, of people trying to build democracy, to scare them out of helping the country. They are taking kids hostage because parents want a new life and a better life for their children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) be allowed to have 3 more minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. JOHNSON) is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask, What part of al Qaeda do you want operating here in America? Al Qaeda is a worldwide organization and a worldwide threat. I do not want any part of this. Americans do not want, need, or deserve al Qaeda. Our troops are over in Iraq fighting not just for our freedom and protection, but the freedom of the world.

We must fight the bad guys over there, not over here. We must support our troops to the hilt so they do not go to bed at night covered in talcum-powder-thin white sand wondering, Does America really support me?

In case people have forgotten, this is the same thing that happened in Vietnam. Peaceniks and people in Congress, and America, started saying bad things about what was going on in Vietnam, and it did a terrible thing to troop morale.

I just pray that our troops and their families can block this noise out and know that we will all fight like mad to make sure our troops have everything they need for as long as they need it to win the global war on terrorism.

Withdrawal is not an option. To our men and women in uniform, I simply say, God bless you. I salute you. All of America salutes our troops.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in support of H.J. Res. 73, To Redeploy U.S. Forces from Iraq. However, I must also speak to and oppose the cynical resolution offered by Mr. HUNTER. Mr. HUNTER's resolution calling for an immediate withdrawal from Iraq is a political stunt and an outrageous politicization of a serious proposal offered by Congressman JACK MURTHA, a respected leader in the Congress. Mr. HUNTER's resolution shows great disrespect to someone of Mr. MURTHA's stature and is a discredit to his years of service.

From the beginning, this war has been conducted without oversight. Democrats have repeatedly asked for substantive hearings on the war in Iraq. In addition, we have requested investigations on the misuse of intelligence by the Bush administration. War is too important of an issue to politicize the lives of our soldiers. Despite Democrats request for hearings on torture, contract fraud, and the leak of confidential national security information.

It goes without saying that the war in Iraq is not going as advertised. Our troops have become the primary target of the insurgency. They are united against U.S. forces and we have become a catalyst for violence. U.S. troops are the common enemy of the Sunnis, Saddamists and foreign jihadists. I believe with U.S. troop redeployment, the Iraq security forces will be incentivized to take control. A poll recently conducted shows that over 80 percent of Iraqis are strongly opposed to the presence of coalition troops, about 45 percent of the Iraqi population believe attacks against American troops are justified. I believe we need to turn Iraq over to the Iraqis. I believe before the Iraqi elections, scheduled for mid December, the Iraqi people and the emerging government must be put on notice that the United States will immediately redeploy. All of Iraq must know that Iraq is free. Free from United States occupation. I believe this will send a signal to the Sunnis to join the political process for the good of a "free" Iraq.

The U.S. needs to vacate Iraq both to splinter the insurgent factions that have united against us and to create incentives for the Iraqis to take on their own security. Not surprising is the fact that the American people have realized this for months. It is just now that some Democrats and Republicans alike are beginning to express grave concerns about the need for a course change in Iraq. With the administration so unwilling to reconsider its disastrous policies in Iraq, it was only a matter of time that Congress would begin to assert itself. Sadly, in the past week the President and the Vice President have restored to questioning people's patriotism to hide their own mistakes. The administration has no idea as to how to proceed in Iraq and they are wrong to use these "McCarthy-type" tactics.

I strongly support the Murtha Resolution. H.J. Res. 73 gives Americans a moment to pause so we can seriously discuss the future of America and our troops. This is what a democracy stands for. In addition, H.J. Res 73 calls for the:

Immediate redeployment of U.S. troops consistent with the safety of U.S. forces, creation of a quick reaction force in the region, creation of an over-the-horizon presence of marines, diplomatic pursuit of security and stability in Iraq.

Let me close by saying that the Republican cover-up Congress has refused to exercise its oversight responsibilities to protect our troops, the American taxpayers and our national security. H. Res. 571 is not a serious response to the serious question of saving the lives of our soldiers. It is time to get serious and support Mr. MURTHA's proposal now for disengagement in Iraq.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans in this House have done a heinous thing: they have insulted one of the deans of this House in an unthinkable and unconscionable way.

They took his words and contorted them; they took his heartfelt sentiments and spun

them. They took his resolution and deformed it: in a cheap effort to silence dissent in the House of Representatives.

The Republicans should be roundly criticized for this reprehensible act. They have perpetrated a fraud on the House of Representatives just as they have defrauded the American people.

By twisting the issue around, the Republicans are trying to set a trap for the Democrats. A "no" vote for this Resolution will obscure the fact that there is strong support for withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq. I am voting "yes" on this Resolution for an orderly withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq despite the convoluted motives behind the Republican Resolution. I am voting to support our troops by bringing them home now in an orderly withdrawal.

Sadly, If we call for an end to the occupation, some say that we have no love for the Iraqi people, that we would abandon them to tyrants and thugs.

Let us consider some history. The Republicans make great hay about Saddam Hussein's use of chemical weapons against the Iranians and the Kurds. But when that attack was made in 1988, it was Democrats who moved a resolution to condemn those attacks, and the Reagan White House quashed the bill in the Senate, because at that time the Republicans considered Saddam one of our own. So in 1988, who abandoned the Iraqi people to tyrants and thugs?

In voting for this bill, let me be perfectly clear that I am not saying the United States should exit Iraq without a plan. I agree with Mr. MURTHA that security and stability in Iraq should be pursued through diplomacy. I simply want to vote yes to an orderly withdrawal from Iraq. And let me explain why.

Prior to its invasion, Iraq had not one (not one!) instance of suicide attacks in its history. Research shows a 100 percent correlation between suicide attacks and the presence of foreign combat troops in a host country. And experience also shows that suicide attacks abate when foreign occupation troops are withdrawn. The U.S. invasion and occupation has destabilized Iraq and Iraq will only return to stability once this occupation ends.

We must be willing to face the fact that the presence of U.S. combat troops is itself a major inspiration to the forces attacking our troops. Moreover, we must be willing to acknowledge that the forces attacking our troops are able to recruit suicide attackers because suicide attacks are largely motivated by revenge for the loss of loved ones. And Iraqis have lost so many loved ones as a result of America's two wars against Iraq.

In 1996, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said on CBS that the lives of 500,000 children dead from sanctions were "worth the price" of containing Saddam Hussein. When pressed to defend this reprehensible position she went on to explain that she did not want U.S. Troops to have to fight the Gulf War again. Nor did I. But what happened? We fought a second Gulf War. And now over 2,000 American soldiers lie dead. And I expect the voices of concern for Iraqi civilian casualties, whose deaths the Pentagon likes to brush aside as "collateral damage" are too few, indeed. A report from Johns Hopkins suggests that over 100,000 civilians have died in Iraq since the March 2003 invasion, most of them violent deaths and most as "collateral

damage" from U.S. forces. The accuracy of the 100,000 can and should be debated. Yet our media, while quick to cover attacks on civilians by insurgent forces in Iraq, have given us a blackout on Iraqi civilian deaths at the hands of U.S. combat forces.

Yet let us remember that the United States and its allies imposed a severe policy of sanctions on the people of Iraq from 1990 to 2003. UNICEF and World Health Organization studies based on infant mortality studies showed a 500,000 increase in mortality of Iraqi children under 5 over trends that existed before sanctions. From this, it was widely assumed that over 1 million Iraqi deaths for all age groups could be attributed to sanctions between 1990 and 1998. And not only were there 5 more years of sanctions before the invasion, but the war since the invasion caused most aid groups to leave Iraq. So for areas not touched by reconstruction efforts, the humanitarian situation has deteriorated further. How many more Iraqi lives have been lost through hunger and deprivation since the occupation?

And what kind of an occupier have we been? We have all seen the photos of victims of U.S. torture in Abu Ghraib prison. That's where Saddam used to send his political enemies to be tortured, and now many Iraqis quietly, cautiously ask: "So what has changed?"

A recent video documentary confirms that U.S. forces used white phosphorous against civilian neighborhoods in the U.S. attack on Fallujah. Civilians and insurgents were burned alive by these weapons. We also now know that U.S. forces have used MK77, a napalm-like incendiary weapon, even though napalm has been outlawed by the United Nations.

With the images of tortured detainees, and the images of Iraqi civilians burned alive by U.S. incendiary weapons now circulating the globe, our reputation on the world stage has been severely damaged.

If America wants to win the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people, we as a people must be willing to face the pain and death and suffering we have brought to the Iraqi people with bombs, sanctions and occupation, even if we believe our actions were driven by the most altruistic of reasons. We must acknowledge our role in enforcing the policy of sanctions for 12 years after the extensive 1991 bombing in which we bombed infrastructure targets in direct violation of the Geneva Conventions.

We must also be ready to face the fact that the United States once provided support for the tyrant we deposed in the name of liberating the Iraqi people. These are events that our soldiers are too young to remember. I believe our young men and women in uniform are very sincere in their belief that their sacrifice is made in the name of helping the Iraqi people. But it is not they who set the policy. They take orders from the Commander-in-Chief and the Congress. It is we who bear the responsibility of weighing our decisions in a historical context, and it is we who must consider the gravest decision of whether or not to go to war based upon the history, the facts, and the truth.

Sadly, however, our country is at war in Iraq based on a lie told to the American people. The entire war was based premised on a sales pitch—that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction menacing the United States—that turned out to be a lie.

I have too many dead soldiers in my district; too many from my home state. Too many homeless veterans on our streets and in our neighborhoods.

America has sacrificed too many young soldiers' lives, too many young soldiers' mangled bodies, to the Bush war machine.

I will not vote to give one more soldier to the George W. Bush/DICK CHENEY war machine. I will not give one more dollar for a war riddled with conspicuous profiteering.

Tonight I speak as one who has at times been the only Member of this Body at antiwar demonstrations calling for withdrawal. And I won't stop calling for withdrawal.

I was opposed to this war before there was a war; I was opposed to the war during the war; and I am opposed to this war now—even though it's supposed to be over.

A vote on war is the single most important vote we can make in this House. I understand the feelings of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who might be severely conflicted by the decision we have to make here tonight. But the facts of U.S. occupation of Iraq are also very clear. The occupation is headed down a dead end because so long as U.S. combat forces patrol Iraq, there will be an Iraqi insurgency against it.

I urge that we pursue an orderly withdrawal from Iraq and pursue, along with our allies, a diplomatic solution to the situation in Iraq, supporting the aspirations of the Iraqi people through support for democratic processes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, there is concern on the floor tonight about the way in which this resolution was brought up. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, is one of the finest members of this body and has given his heart to our nation and his wisdom to this Congress. But underlying concerns about the process tonight, is the critically important issue regarding the future of U.S. involvement in Iraq. The United States' commitment to a stable and democratic Iraq is essential for the future of the region, for the larger war on terrorism and for the Iraqi people.

In my ten trips to Iraq, four times outside the umbrella of the military, I've had the opportunity to speak with hundreds of Iraqis and can tell you with some certainty about their greatest fear . . . It is not the suicide bombs and other terrorist attacks brought against their countrymen. It is the concern that the United States, which has helped give them a taste of freedom and democracy, will leave them before they are ready to fend for themselves.

Tonight we have the opportunity to proclaim, "We will not leave you." When I hear the critics on this floor or in the news media say our policy is a disaster, that we are in a mess in Iraq, I think of the transfer of power in June 2004, the election in January 2005, the referendum this past October and what I believe will be a huge success in December with the election of a permanent Iraqi government. I am in awe of what the Iraqis have accomplished in such a short period of time.

Regrettably, the administration has done a very poor job explaining to the American people why we are there and when and how we intend to leave, but this does not mean we don't have an exit strategy. We have a strategy but regrettably it has had to be amended more than once.

The United States' strategy is to assist the Iraqis in creating a secure environment so

they can develop their new democratic government with a competent police, border patrol and army to defend that government. American forces will be reduced when enough Iraqi security forces can take our place and their new government is fully functioning.

Haven't we learned from the 1983 bombing of the marine barracks in Beirut that if we leave without finishing the job those that wish us harm will come at us again?

Didn't we learn any lessons from the attacks against our military personnel in Saudi Arabia and our diplomats in Africa and our sailors on the USS Cole? And didn't we learn that the Islamist extremists would come at us again when they attacked the Twin Towers, the Pentagon and attempted to attack our Capitol on September 11, 2001?

Yes they will be back again and again and again.

If we leave Iraq without completing our mission, what type of message will this send to the people who need our help? To them and the rest of the world the message will be clear . . . if you put up a strong enough resistance, the United States will eventually tire of its efforts and leave before its mission is accomplished.

JOHN MCCAIN was correct when he asked the same questions during debate of the Defense Authorization bill: "Are these the messages we wish to send? Do we wish to respond to the millions who braved bombs and threats to vote, who have put their faith and trust in American and the Iraqi Government, that our number one priority is now bringing our people home?"

Mr. Speaker, although some may feel otherwise, this is a serious debate about a serious issue. I strongly urge all members to vote against this resolution and against the premature withdrawal of our troops from Iraq.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, today's debate should not be about the character of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, whose service to his country is above reproach. It should also not be about a resolution introduced by one member ascribing it to the position of another. It should be about the profoundness of the dilemma we face in our Iraqi policy.

All wars evoke analogies to prior conflicts. Vietnam is on everyone's mind. My sense is that references to our Southeast Asian experience are somewhat oblique, but important to ponder. Of particular relevance is the advice of a former Vermont Senator, George Aiken, who suggested we just declare victory and get out of Vietnam. Aiken's advice was rooted in frustration, but wise as it was, represented more spin than reality. Given the strategies in play, victory wasn't close at hand.

For many Americans, including me, the war in Iraq has been difficult to justify. But all Americans, except perhaps a few who may be partisanly vindictive, should want as positive a result as possible, given the circumstances we now face. The decision to go to war may have been misguided and strategies involved in conducting it mistake-ridden; nonetheless there should be clarity of purpose in ending the conflict, with the goal neither to cut and run, nor simply to cut losses. At this junction of involvement we should define cogently our purposes and by so doing create a basis both for a viable future for Iraq and for a U.S. disengagement that respects the sacrifices of those who have served so valiantly in our armed forces and those of our coalition allies.

The key at this point is to recognize the WMD threat proved not to be a compelling rationalization for the war and emphasize instead the moral and philosophical case for overturning a repressive and cruel regime and replacing it with a constitutional democracy. This latter emphasis need not suggest or imply that all repressive regimes are fair game for intervention, nor that regime change is the principal American way, nor that other rationales for intervention don't exist. But it is the case for intervention that shows the most concern for the Iraqi people as they look both to their past and to the new challenges of Al Qaeda.

Accordingly, in today's circumstances, my advice, as one who voted against authorizing military intervention in Iraq, is for the Administration to emphasize its commitment to democracy, not as a rationale for continuing the war, but as the reason for disengagement.

Let me amplify.

All Americans, however wary they may be of the political judgments that have to date been made, should concur that the world is better off without Saddam Hussein and that it is positive that a dictatorial regime is being replaced with a democratically elected government. The cost of the undertaking may have been too high and the results counter-productive in many ways, but before the international situation worsens further, the administration would be wise, perhaps noting with pride the elections to be held under a constitution this December, to announce that a new sovereign circumstance allows for comprehensive troop drawdowns next year. The more definitive and forthright the plan the better, but announcing a precise time table is less important than making a firm commitment to leave, with articulation of a clear rationale for so doing. If we don't get out of Iraq at a time of our own choosing and on our own terms, we will eventually be asked to leave, possibly ignominiously, by the Iraqi government, or be seen as forced to leave because of terrorist acts, which can be expected to continue as long as we maintain a military presence in the heart of the Muslim world. The key is that we must control and be seen as controlling our own fate.

All Americans should be respectful of the sacrifices of our men and women in uniform. They have been placed in an untenable situation. If they had not been so heroic and in many cases so helpful in rebuilding neighborhoods and schools, the U.S. would face a far more difficult dilemma today.

But we have no choice except to assess whether Osama Bin Laden and his movement have not been given added momentum by our intervention in Iraq, and whether the ideologically advocated policy of establishing long-term bases or one of returning our troops home is likely to be the more effective strategy in prevailing in the world-wide war on terror.

Here, it should not be hard to understand that prolonged occupation of a country which encompasses an area of land where one of the world's oldest civilizations prospered is humiliating to a proud people and those elsewhere who share its great religion. It should also not be hard to understand that the neocon strategy of establishing a long-term military presence in Iraq with semi-permanent bases raises the risk of retaliatory terrorist attacks at home and abroad.

Indeed, according to the University of Chicago scholar, Robert Pape, in his definitive

book on suicide bombers, *Dying to Win*, the principal reason anarchists choose to wrap themselves in explosives and kill innocent civilians is to register martyred objection to the occupation of countries or territories by the armed forces of Western or other Democratic governments. Suicide bombing, by implication, will exist as long as occupations continue.

In this regard, a note about Al Qaeda is in order. Just as neither Iraq with its secular leanings nor any Iraqis were responsible for 9/11, so Saddam Hussein apparently considered Osama Bin Laden as much a rival as a soul brother. It is Western military intervention that has precipitated Al Qaeda's rapid growth in Iraq and elsewhere, creating a "cause celebre" for its singularly malevolent actions. If American withdrawal policy comes to turn on the question of anarchy—i.e., troops can't be drawn down as long as suicide bombers continue to wreak havoc—we place ourselves in a catch 22 and, in effect, hand over decision-making discretion to those who wantonly kill. We allow the radical few to use our presence as the reason for their actions and at the same time cause our involvement to be held hostage to their villainy. The irony is that as conflicted as the Iraqi police and army appear to be, we are fast reaching a stage where the anarchists may be more credibly dealt with by Iraqis themselves, particularly if the principal rationale for violence—i.e., the American presence—disappears.

Hence, the case for a change in strategy is compelling, not as the resolution under consideration tonight envisions, but in an orderly manner, protecting our troops, our values and the gains we have helped make for the Iraqi people.

Sometimes it is as difficult to know when to end as it is when to start a war. In this context I am hard pressed to believe anything except that a mistake of historical proportions will occur if the administration fails to recognize the opportunity presented by next month's elections to effectively bring our involvement in this war to a close. It may be true as the Secretary of State told the Senate several weeks ago, that democratic elections alone don't create a viable government. But the assertion of the Secretary, however valid, should not be used as a rationale for an unending American occupation.

It is possible, of course that civil strife will ensue when we withdraw, but this is just as likely to be the case in 2026 as 2006. In any regard, civil union is for the Iraqi people to manage. It's not for American troops to sustain. The authorization this Congress gave to the Executive to use force contemplated the clear prospect of military intervention in Iraq. It did not, however, contemplate prolonged occupation. If this is not understood by the Executive branch, the current overwhelming Iraqi polling sentiment favoring American troop withdrawal will be more than matched by shared American sentiment. In a democracy no one can be a leader without followers.

The issue is no longer, as is so frequently asserted, the need "to stay the course;" it is to avoid "overstaying" our presence.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, just last month, the Iraqi people, including large numbers of Sunni Iraqis, voted in a referendum on their Constitution. The Iraqi people are choosing to participate in the political process that can eventually undermine support for the indigenous insurgency in Iraq.

The next step in building Iraq's political future is elections in December under this new, completely Iraqi Constitution. Broad participation in these elections will continue to build political momentum for a new self-governing Iraq at peace with its neighbors.

While the political process moves forward, the United States and its allies must continue to train Iraqi police and security forces so that week by week, month by month, more neighborhoods, towns and provinces are patrolled and controlled by Iraqis.

We must also continue to conduct military operations against insurgents and foreign fighters in Iraq, particularly al Qaeda in Iraq. There are still difficult days ahead and much work to be done—much of it done by our men and women in the military.

I expect U.S. forces will continue to stay in Iraq through December's elections at roughly their current level. But as I've said, if political and security progress continues on roughly the course we are on, American forces should be able to start being drawn down in significant numbers during the course of next year. These redeployments should be based on conditions in the field. As the Iraqis stand up, we can stand down.

After September 11, 2001, we made a decision to play offense in fighting the war on terror, to track down enemies who would kill Americans and give them no place to hide. Our troops are doing a fantastic job, and terrorists know they have no hope of defeating our troops in the field. They know that the center of gravity in their fight is to undermine the will of the American people.

I would rather have American soldiers hunting down terrorists over there, than have American firefighters and police officers responding to attacks here at home.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our military men and women are doing a tremendous job in Iraq, as they work with Iraqis to secure their country and combat the terrorists who want so desperately to prevent freedom from taking root there. Our troops deserve to hear messages of strong support and thanks from us—not calls for withdrawal that merely give hope to the enemy. Given a chance, the Iraqi military and political system will become strong enough to defend the Iraqi people on its own. But pulling our troops out now would undermine this goal and provide an opening for al Qaeda and its terrorist brethren.

I disagree wholeheartedly with those who claim our presence there is counterproductive and those who argue that it would be best to bring America's troops home before their mission is completed. Iraq and its people have made great strides, most recently with their free vote on a constitution. But all their progress and our troops' blood and sweat will be for nothing if our forces withdrawal before Iraq's own forces are ready to defend the country.

All of us want to see our soldiers come home, but it would be a huge mistake to make their withdrawal based on an arbitrary date, rather than conditions-based. So many of our servicemen and women have sacrificed so much to ensure that Iraq does not become a haven for terrorists, and we have to make sure that mission is accomplished and that their sacrifice has not been in vain. Pulling our troops out now is akin to surrender and would be a fateful blunder.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, the debate over this fraudulent resolution is a sad comment on

the level of debate in the House of Representatives and an insult to a colleague of ours who has dedicated his career in the House to improving our national defense and supporting American soldiers, sailors and Air Force personnel. No one in this body can or should challenge the patriotism of Congressman JACK MURTHA, who is a decorated veteran who spent 37 years in the United States Marine Corps and whose experience in uniform has helped to shape his informed views on national security here in Congress. When he expressed his personal and thoughtful views on the future of our Nation's involvement in the war in Iraq he was subjected to a barrage of personal criticism that was truly excessive, including an official statement from the President's Press Secretary that trivialized the very nature of our congressional debate over a very important subject.

Today the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, usually a thoughtful Member himself, took it upon himself to introduce a caricature of a resolution that totally ignores many of the important points that Mr. MURTHA originally suggested, and it makes a mockery of the process of honest and open debate in the House of Representatives. It is difficult for me to remember a time when serious issues of national security have ever been treated with such disdain here in the House, and I am extremely disappointed in the Republican leadership of the House that has allowed this circus atmosphere to take place today.

Even more astounding to me is that the House is rushing through a rule to consider this Resolution today with the explanation that it is ostensibly a debate over the war in Iraq. Nothing could be further from the truth. We have not had an honest debate on the war in Iraq here in the House even as we have seen more than 2,000 young American die in battle. We have not had an honest debate over the quality of information that we were given before the start of the war, or about the inability of Secretary Rumsfeld and the Bush Administration to give us any serious indication of our current objectives or a time line for the ultimate re-deployment of American troops out of Iraq. I would welcome such an honest and thorough debate, as I am sure all of my colleagues in the Democratic party would. But what we are doing today is a politically motivated exercise that insults that integrity and cheapens the reputation of the House itself.

There are many troubling aspects of our involvement in Iraq that we should be debating, including the discovery just this week that some of the Iraqi security forces that we are training—paying for—were engaged in the same type of torture of Iraqi citizens that characterized the reign of Saddam Hussein himself.

What we should not be doing is considering a disingenuous resolution that is merely intended to elicit sound bites for conservative talk radio shows and which is a thinly-veiled attempt to insult one of the most courageous and dedicated members of the House, Mr. MURTHA. We can do better, Mr. Speaker, and we should resoundingly reject this measure.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA said yesterday that "our military has done everything that has been asked of them, the U.S. cannot accomplish anything further in Iraq militarily. It is time to bring them home." I know Mr. MURTHA

to be a man of honor and integrity and I am sure he is sincere in his belief that there is not more to accomplish and we must immediately withdraw our troops. I could not disagree more with his assessment.

We must stay in Iraq to finish the job and leave with honor. To cut and run now and leave with our tail between our legs would send the message to terrorists around the world that America has lost its will to win the War on Terrorism. This would merely embolden our terrorist enemies and lead to open season on America and our allies. We cannot allow this to happen. We must stay the course in Iraq and finish the job. The stakes are too high to fail.

Throughout American history, we have been tested in times of war many times. But virtually every time, we stayed the course and prevailed.

We did not experience quick victory in the American Revolution. In fact, it took our Founding Fathers years to win our hard-fought independence. We were defeated at the Battles of Long Island, Harlem Heights, White Plains and others, and we will never forget the dark days at Valley Forge, yet we did not give up our desire for freedom.

And let's not forget in World War II, where we suffered rapid and repeated defeats at Guam, Wake Island, the Philippines and Kasarine Pass.

But when General Douglas MacArthur was forced to leave the Philippines, he did not say, "We should have an immediate withdraw of all American troops." Instead, he uttered the immortal words: "I shall return."

And we aren't even losing in Iraq! We are winning, and making a difference. Because of our intervention in Iraq, a murderous dictator and a totalitarian regime have been overthrown, free elections have been held, and a new constitution has been drafted and ratified.

This is an important and emotional debate. When to send our servicemen and women to war and when to bring them home is perhaps the most difficult decision we as Member face. I have been to Iraq and everybody I met was enthusiastic, about doing their job and helping the Iraqi people.

We must fight this temptation to set an artificial timetable as to when we bring our troops home. All this will do is allow the terrorists time to regroup and lay in wait until we leave. But do not take my word for it. Take the word of a top American commander in Iraq who called setting a deadline for troop withdrawal "a recipe for disaster."

Army Maj. Gen. William Webster, whose 3rd Infantry Division is responsible for security in three-fourths of Iraq's capital said "Setting a date would mean that the 221 soldiers I've lost this year, that their lives will have been lost in vain. Iraq's armed factions would likely take a cue from a timetable for a U.S. withdrawal to lie low, gathering their strength and laying plans for renewed conflict when the Americans leave."

Gen. Webster went on to say "They believe they're doing the right thing. The soldiers believe they're helping."

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been saying that the war in Iraq has been a dismal failure and a mistake. Let me ask them, is it a sign failure that our troops have vaccinated over 3 million children under 5 to help these children fight polio. Or that we screened more than 1.3 million children under age 5 for malnutrition.

Was it a mistake to rehabilitate almost 3,000 schools? What about the 36,000 secondary school teachers and administrators, including 1000 master trainers, that have been trained by the Iraqis with the United States' help? These teachers are going to start teaching in a way that gives freedom to the children.

I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle once again, would you say accomplishing all of this constitutes failure? The millions of Iraqi men, women and children who no longer live under a brutal dictator would not think so.

We must continue to fight the terrorists and secure Iraq as a stable, secure democracy. We are making a great deal of progress on the democracy front as well. The approval of Iraq's constitution on October 15 was a historic day for Iraq and a bad day for terrorists. Millions of Iraqis turned out to vote, embracing the democratic process. Iraq now has a constitution.

On the day of the referendum, there were no suicide bombings, and attacks on polling stations were down from 108 in January to 19 in October. Sixty percent of registered voters took part in the referendum. Significantly higher turnout in Sunni a further indication that Sunnis are joining the political process.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a crossroads in Iraq. Do we cut and run or do we stay and finish the job? There is too much at stake to immediately pull out. All we would be doing is strengthening the terrorists. We must finish the job. We must stay the course and leave with honor. I urge a "no" vote on this resolution.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the unspoken inevitability we face is that U.S. troops will eventually leave Iraq.

Eighty percent of Iraqis want us to leave now. They now see us as occupiers, not liberators.

American politicians say we must save Iraqis from an even more violent civil war.

But that civil war is underway because of the American presence. It is fueling Sunni hostility toward Shia collaborators.

If the American forces weren't there, Iraqi Shia security forces would no longer be serving the interests of foreign infidels against other fellow Iraqis. It would open the door to the reenlistments of many of the best trained and experienced former Iraqi military and police professionals.

The preponderance of power now lies with the Shia and the Kurds. The Sunni fighters have only small arms and make-shift explosive devices. The insurgents don't have access to Saddam's tanks and helicopters.

Furthermore, we have equipped the Shia and Kurds with much superior weaponry and they are vastly superior in number.

If the Americans end their occupation, the insurgents' resistance will lose its purpose.

The foreign jihadi element in Iraq is numerically insignificant. The vast bulk of the resistance has little connection to al-Qaeda or its offshoots. The colonel in charge of cleaning out the insurgency in Tall Afar said they were fighting foreign jihadi fighters coming in from Syria. Yet, when they interrogated the more than a thousand captives, not one—not one was a foreigner—all were native Iraqi insurgents.

But al Zarqawi and his followers have benefited mightily from this misguided war because he is being given credit by American politicians for heading the resistance. We, in America, have been his best recruiting aid.

But what Zarqawi and al-Qaeda want is wholly different from what the Sunni insurgents want. Zarqawi wants to see a Muslim caliphate and a violent struggle against Christian and Jewish infidels around the world until Judgment Day.

The Sunni insurgents want an independent Iraq that will enable them to regain the wealth and power they experienced under Saddam.

Foreign fighters will be harshly treated by Iraqis once American troops leave. The jihadists need a failed state to function. That's why they were not in Iraq until we entered Iraq and broke up the effective, albeit horribly repressive government of Saddam Hussein.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to H. Res. 571, and to urge my colleagues—in the strongest possible terms—to vote against this resolution. As with other members who have risen here today, I also served in our military. I'm a veteran of the United States Navy, and served one year in the Vietnam War on swift boats. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not stand before you tonight and suggest that past military service is a requirement for one to have a credible opinion on this important issue. All Americans have a right to be heard on this matter—and should be heard.

Mr. Speaker, with all my heart and with all my mind, I believe that to pull our troops from Iraq immediately would send a clear and unmistakable message to every potential enemy worldwide that the United States has no backbone, no willingness to see a tough struggle through to the end. It would be a message to our allies that the United States does not honor its commitments. And it would send a message to the families of every member of the armed forces selflessly serving to defend our liberties, especially those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice that their service, their sacrifice, has been in vain.

Look to our past history: In the face of relentless opposition from abroad and ever here at home, the United States honored its commitments to Germany, Japan, and South Korea after World War II and the Korean War. Today they are our strongest allies. On the other hand, Osama bin Laden himself wrote that evidence of the United States' weakness could be found in our departures from Vietnam, Beirut, and Mogadishu. "The United States is a paper tiger," he was saying. "Smack them in the face and they run."

To pull our troops from Iraq immediately would be an abrogation of our responsibilities in the world.

History will not define this great nation by our decision to enter Iraq—it will define us by how we leave Iraq.

Whether or not you supported the decision to go to war against Iraq in the first place, we have an obligation to leave Iraq a safer, freer country than it was under Saddam Hussein. Spreading freedom and liberty is not something America has ever avoided, nor should it.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the definition of "immediate termination of United States forces in Iraq" must mean the following as set forth by Representative JOHN MURTHA:

"My plan calls:

—To immediately redeploy U.S. troops consistent with the safety of U.S. forces.

—To create a quick reaction force in the region.

—To create over-the-horizon presence of Marines.

—To diplomatically pursue security and stability in Iraq.

You may call this a position, a program, or an exit strategy but this is the Murtha message which set in motion the current proceedings on the floor of the House of Representatives. This is the declaration heard from Representative MURTHA by the American people and around the world. By all standards of decency and by popular decree the Republican leadership is mandated to respect the precedent setting language of this most detailed of all proposals for new and creative action in Iraq.

For this reason I urge all of my colleagues to examine closely the resolution before us. "That the deployment of United States forces in Iraq be terminated immediately." In view of the fact that the wording of this resolution distorts the plan set forth by Congressman MURTHA, I urge all Members to condemn this dirty trick by voting "present."

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, there is nothing—nothing—more serious that we will do in our lives as well as our careers than to send young American men and women to war. And there is no one in this body who understands the consequences of that decision more than JACK MURTHA who served 37 years in the Marines, won two Purple Hearts in battle, and loves without reservation our soldiers in uniform.

Over 2,070 Americans and tens of thousands of civilian Iraqis are dead, thousands more are horribly injured in this war that many of us believe to be completely unjustified. Yet the House Republicans are so morally bankrupt that they would turn to cheap political stunts in order to undercut Congressman MURTHA's conscience-driven call for an end to the Iraq war, which he calls "a flawed policy wrapped in illusion."

But there is not a person in this House who is man or woman enough to ever undercut the credibility of JACK MURTHA, no matter how many accusations they may throw at him, no matter how many names they call him, and no matter how many "clever" tactics they try.

Shame on the Republican leaders for thinking it's ok to turn this war into a game and Representative MURTHA into a political football. Shame on the Speaker for accusing JACK MURTHA of insulting and demoralizing our troops. Mr. MURTHA, this decorated war hero, is right when he says "what demoralizes them is going to war with not enough troops and equipment to make the transition to peace; the devastation caused by IEDs; being deployed to Iraq when their homes have been ravaged by hurricanes; being on their second or third deployment and leaving their families behind without a network of support."

The Republicans don't demean Mr. MURTHA, can't begin to demean Mr. MURTHA, when they make baseless allegations and engage in pointless political stunts. They demean themselves and they demean the integrity of this House of Representatives. Shame on you.

I support JACK MURTHA's resolution to stop sending our soldiers to die in Iraq. I support him when he says, "It is time to bring them home." The proper response from those who disagree with this revered Marine would be to have a serious discussion about how we got into Iraq, about the conduct of the war, and about how we get out. Instead we see the typical slash-and-burn personal attacks that are

the mainstay of the Republicans, especially when they know they are wrong. And you are wrong.

But you are no longer fooling the American people. In overwhelming numbers they think it was a mistake to go to war in Iraq; they think the Bush Administration mishandled the war; they don't trust the President to tell the truth; and they don't support this war. On the eve of Thanksgiving, even as our troops are doing their very best far from home and family, the Republicans have chosen to pull a cheap, demagogic political stunt. Shame on you.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, we went to war in Iraq in an irresponsible way; we should leave Iraq in a responsible way.

The Administration's slogan of "stay the course" is not a strategy. More of the same is unacceptable. We must change course. The Bush Administration has tried to stifle debate here at home by shamelessly challenging the patriotism of those who question their approach. The time has come for a serious debate on this issue of utmost importance to the American people. We should bring our troops home as quickly and safely as possible. But bringing our troops home is only part of a successful strategy for leaving Iraq. We must re-deploy our troops in a way that does not unleash even more bloodshed and killing in Iraq, and does not create a vacuum that will be exploited by Al Qaeda and terrorist elements.

Our nation went to war in Iraq based on false information and gross distortions of the facts made by President Bush and others in his Administration. Before the invasion, a number of us gave speeches on the floor of this House outlining the dangers of going to war in Iraq. The Bush Administration and the Congress chose to disregard the warnings that were raised by many people who had experience on foreign policy issues regarding the Persian Gulf region.

We have made many mistakes during the war, but many of the results of our invasion were predictable. As I said on this floor prior to the war:

"The President has presented a utopian vision of democracy breaking out in the Middle East after we invade Iraq. It is just as easy to imagine a scenario where difficulties in Iraq and the American action there fuel resentment toward occupying American troops and inflame the region against us, strengthening the hands of radical Islamic fundamentalists and making it more difficult to promote democracy and other U.S. goals in the region."

Now, more than two and half years after the invasion of Iraq, those predictions have unfortunately proved true. The Administration utterly failed to understand the dynamics and history of Iraq. They failed to understand the opening that Sunni grievances and old rivalries would give to our enemies, to Al Qaeda and others. The Administration built its actions on a foundation of sand—on rosy scenarios and wishful thinking. We never had a plan to deal with the forces we were unleashing in Iraq and we are dealing with the consequences now. There have been over 2,079 confirmed American deaths in Iraq. Over 15,500 have been seriously injured. There have been reports of at least 30,000 Iraqi civilian deaths.

Having invaded Iraq, the United States has a moral and national security obligation to do everything possible to prevent the situation from spiraling even farther out of control. We must devise a plan to leave Iraq in a way that

maximizes the chances for stability and minimizes the possibilities of a full scale civil war erupting.

The insurgency today consists primarily of former Baathists who lost their grip on power and who fear for their future security in a country dominated by the Shia. They have resorted to a bloody campaign of terrorist attacks to prevent the establishment of a central government. The Bush Administration has failed to develop a political strategy that will end the violence.

This conflict will not be resolved by military force. It requires a diplomatic and political solution. Any resolution must address the Sunni fears that are feeding much of the violence. At the same time, any resolution must recognize the facts on the ground—the Kurds will never again allow themselves to be victimized by a central government in Baghdad and the Shia, by virtue of their majority status, will never again allow themselves to be dominated by others.

The Bush Administration's efforts to achieve a political solution have been grossly inadequate. However, the prospects for a political and diplomatic resolution are less likely in the face of a total immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq. The more likely result would be a surge in killings of innocent Iraqis as different groups compete for power in the vacuum left by the immediate and total departure of American forces. That bloodshed would be a great stain on our nation and a terrible blow to our already shattered credibility. Moreover, just as the precipitous U.S. disengagement from Afghanistan following the Soviet withdrawal from that country opened the door to the Taliban regime, the immediate and total withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq—without a political plan in place—would most benefit extremist and terrorist groups.

Our strategy for leaving Iraq must also recognize that Iraq's neighbors—Iran, Turkey and Syria—all have strong interests in the future of Iraq. Our plan must ensure that the United Nations and the international community will work to prevent others from exploiting the situation in Iraq at the expense of the Iraqi people and the security of the region and the United States.

The Senate Democrats, under the leadership of Senators HARRY REID and CARL LEVIN have proposed a path for bringing our troops home in an orderly way that minimizes the likelihood of an outbreak of a full scale civil war in Iraq.

In the aftermath of the terrible attacks of September 11, 2001, the world rallied to our side. The international community supported our decision to go into Afghanistan to root out Al Qaeda. The Bush Administration squandered that international good will. Instead, it began a war of choice against Iraq. As many predicted before the invasion, that war has fueled the ranks of Al Qaeda and strengthened the jihadists. We must not compound the blunders of the Bush Administration by creating the conditions for even more bloodshed in Iraq and allowing it to become a haven and launching pad for terrorist activities.

This Congress has not had a serious debate on Iraq. Instead, the Republican leadership in this House has worked to hide from the American people the gross incompetence of the Bush Administration's policies on Iraq. The time is long overdue for us to have a serious discussion on this issue of the greatest impor-

tance to the American people. Our troops and their families deserve no less.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a colleague, a friend and someone whose judgment I respect. JOHN MURTHA had seen a lot of battles before he came to Congress. A decorated Vietnam Veteran with two Purple Hearts, a Bronze Star in 37 years of service in the Marines.

I did not know him then, but I know him now. He is a Member who carries with him a full life lived, a perspective shaped by experience and understanding. He has accrued wisdom, which is seldom seen in a person who carries it in such a dignified and unassuming manner.

He was one of the first gentlemen of the House to support the "Women In Military Service For America Memorial." I asked him for his support on this project, but I did not have to explain it. He understood the contributions women and other minorities have made in the military. He takes a comprehensive and inclusive view of situations. This man's actions define who he is. I find this refreshing. He speaks from a position of knowledge. I say this because tonight we are debating a severely amended version of the Murtha Resolution.

If we are going to seriously debate the war in Iraq, we must do so in the scope that represents the full spectrum of the American people. This resolution tonight is not the debate the American people have asked for or need to hear. The American people want a comprehensive and inclusive debate that reflects the complexity of the situation our country finds itself in.

While agreeing with the Murtha Resolution, I do so primarily because he has given this situation great thought and because I trust that the author had every intent of fully debating his resolution whether members agreed to it or not—and is willing to listen constructively. We should follow his lead on opening up this debate—not smothering it. Mr. Speaker, I ask that on this Friday night before we adjourn for the Thanksgiving season to be with family and mends to give thanks, let us give dignity to a true debate about this war in Iraq.

The American people deserve better.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my observations regarding the shameless acts of the Republicans who have hijacked the House of Representatives and have become so arrogant, so deaf to any voices but their own they do not hear the voices of the American people. My friend and colleague, JOHN MURTHA, a true American patriot and decorated Marine Corps veteran of Vietnam combat, spoke from his heart yesterday on behalf of those he cares most about: the men and women wearing the uniform of the United States of America and the people of this country he has served all his life.

Congressman JOHN MURTHA, the leading Democrat on the House Appropriations Committee's defense committee, reached a point where he felt this country's continued occupation of Iraq was a source of the violence in Iraq. Congressman MURTHA had the courage to do what few have been able to do. He faced the people at a press conference and described how he had come to the conclusion that: "The United States and coalition troops have done all they can in Iraq, but it is time for a change in direction. Our military is suffering. The future of our country is at risk. We

can not continue on the present course. It is evident that continued military action in Iraq is not in the best interests of the United States of America, the Iraqi people or the Persian Gulf Region."

Congressman MURTHA supported his conclusions by the now familiar truths we know. The reasons we were given for going to war were all false. There were no weapons of mass destruction and no nuclear weapons; there was no imminent danger. We were not welcomed by flowers in Baghdad. We had not brought Democracy in Iraq. Congressman MURTHA cited the key indicators in order to assess the "progress" of Iraq. According to reports recently submitted to his committee by the Secretary of Defense, Congressman MURTHA learned some disturbing news. "Oil production and energy in Iraq are below prewar levels. Our reconstruction efforts have been crippled by the security situation. Only \$9 billion appropriated for reconstruction has been spent. Unemployment remains at about 60 percent. Clean water is scarce. Only \$500 million of the \$2.2 billion appropriated for water projects has been spent. And most importantly, insurgent incidents have increased from about 150 per week to over 700 per week in the last year."

Congressman MURTHA pointed out that the American people do not want us in Iraq. A British poll found that 80 percent of Iraqis do not want us occupying their country. Of the 80 percent of the Iraqis who don't want us in Iraq, 44 percent felt attacks on Americans were justified. Drawing on his experience in Vietnam, Congressman MURTHA said there is no way to win a war with insurgents when the people tell the insurgents what moves you are going to take.

Congressman MURTHA repeated what he has been saying. The war in Iraq cannot be won militarily. The administration is now saying the same thing. Congressman MURTHA stated that our military has done its duty, but the war continues to intensify.

Congressman MURTHA's proposal was not to "cut and run" as the Republicans have said. His proposal provides for re-deployment from Iraq, the safety of our troops, and a rapid deployment force to deal with any genuine terrorist threat in the region.

To equate a criticism of the President's failed policy with a lack of support of our troops is beneath contempt. It is appalling to see the President, the Vice President, and Secretary Rumsfeld smear JOHN MURTHA with accusations of cowardice.

I think Congressman MURTHA said it just right when he was asked at his press conference yesterday how he felt about Vice President CHENEY's attempt to tell him what was good for the troops. He said he welcomed a man with five deferments attempting to tell him what was good for troops in battle. It was easy, MURTHA said, to sit in air-conditioned offices, and decide what the troops were going to do, but our soldiers have it very hard in Iraq. Very hard. When a man with the combat record of Congressman MURTHA talks about men and women in battle, I think he deserves to be heard.

Instead, the President blasted him from as far away as China. And today, the Republican House leadership pulled one of their dirtiest tricks. The Republicans introduced and put up for a vote a mockery of the Murtha Resolution, with no discussion, no consideration in com-

mittee and no input from the American people. It was a calculated move by Republicans designed to make it appear to the American people that MURTHA's reasonable resolution was a proposal to undermine the troops.

With this move, Republicans made a mockery of the people's House and the people's wishes. They smeared an American hero and a man who cares about the military and his country. The leadership of the Republican House of Representatives, acting in lock step with a failed President is perpetuating, in JOHN MURTHA's words, a "failed policy wrapped in an illusion."

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in opposition to this resolution calling for an immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq. It is a shame that some members of the House leadership have decided to turn one of the most pressing issues facing our Nation into a political stunt.

This resolution is not offered in good faith; it is a blatant effort to confront, to embarrass, and to hide anyone who has legitimate questions about how this war is being prosecuted. It is cynical and mean-spirited, and most tragically, it is a disservice to our troops who are serving valiantly and sacrificing their lives every day to accomplish the mission they were given.

Our Nation's future role in Iraq is a serious matter that affects the lives of all Americans. Consequently, the American public have legitimate questions—not necessarily about the value of our mission there, but about how we expect to achieve our goals. They want to know what victory will look like, the steps we will take to get there, and the appropriate time for our forces to leave safely. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines, their families here at home, and all Americans deserve those answers.

Yesterday, my friend and colleague, JACK MURTHA, a patriot and a decorated veteran, attempted to start that dialogue. However, instead of having a frank discussion about the potential consequences of immediate troop withdrawal or addressing the burning questions in the minds of most Americans, the Republican leadership disingenuously twisted Mr. MURTHA's words, making a mockery of the democratic principles that we hope to instill throughout the world.

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution grants Congress the right to oversee the operations of the military. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, it is a responsibility I take very seriously. Instead of seeking a plan for victory, the Republican leadership has given the American people silence and the status quo. If we do not endeavor to provide the answers that so many demand, we will have failed in our responsibilities.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution and to demonstrate that we will not play politics on an issue of such magnitude.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have been in Congress for nearly 20 years. And in all that time, I don't think I have ever been more ashamed of the House of Representatives than I am today.

Deciding issues of war and peace should be one of the most solemn obligations we confront in Congress. Instead, what is going on today is pure political gamesmanship. Such gamesmanship demeans the sacrifice of our men and women in uniform, demeans our country's tradition of democratic debate, and is

a total abdication of our responsibilities as Members of Congress. Rather than holding vigorous oversight hearings and having a full, open and honest discussion about the future of U.S. involvement in Iraq, the Republican leadership has rushed a resolution to the floor today that deliberately mischaracterizes the views of many Democrats, including the honorable Representative JACK MURTHA, a decorated marine who served in both Korea and Vietnam, who have called for a safe and orderly withdrawal of U.S. troops over the next six months to a year.

Instead of debating the merits of the ongoing occupation of Iraq and the White House's lack of an exit strategy, the White House and the Republican leadership in Congress have viciously attacked the integrity of both Republican and Democratic critics of the administration's Iraq war policies. Senator HAGEL, a Republican from Nebraska, was so outraged by such character assassination that he said recently, "The Bush administration must understand that each American has a right to question our policies in Iraq and should not be demonized for disagreeing with them. Suggesting that to challenge or criticize policy is undermining and hurting our troops is not democracy nor what this country has stood for, for over 200 years . . . Vietnam was a national tragedy partly because Members of Congress failed their country, remained silent and lacked the courage to challenge the Administrations in power until it was too late . . . To question your government is not unpatriotic—to not question your government is unpatriotic."

It is particularly galling when individuals like DICK CHENEY, who has never served a day in the military, let alone been shot at by enemy soldiers on behalf of our country, questions the integrity of genuine heroes like Representative MURTHA.

Let me be clear, I have not supported an immediate withdrawal from Iraq. But, I do believe that in the wake of the December parliamentary elections in Iraq that the U.S. should negotiate a timeline with the new Iraqi government for the withdrawal of U.S. troops next year.

I was heartened when millions of Iraqis, even at risk of life and limb, voted in late January to establish an interim government and constitutional assembly and again in October in support of a new Constitution. I wrote to President Bush just after the January election, suggesting that the U.S. negotiate a timeline for a phased withdrawal of U.S. troops with the newly elected government. I felt it would be an ideal time to signal to the Iraqi people in a concrete way that the U.S. has no long-term designs on their country. While the President ignored my advice earlier this year, I renew my call and ask that following the December elections in Iraq, the U.S. negotiate a timeline to withdraw from Iraq next year.

While some have argued that announcing a timeline for withdrawal would undermine our troops and allow the insurgents to wait us out, I disagree.

Negotiating a timeline for withdrawal with the Iraqi government elected next month would show that democracy ended the U.S. occupation of Iraq, not terrorist or insurgent violence, and would allow our troops to come home with honor.

Announcing the termination of the open-ended U.S. military commitment in Iraq and

providing a concrete plan, including a timeline negotiated with the Iraqi government, for withdrawal could also undermine support for insurgents who have stoked the wide variety of grievances of ordinary Iraqis arising from the occupation to generate popular support for their cause. Most importantly, establishing a withdrawal plan and timeline would remove one of the chief causes of instability in Iraq, the occupation itself, by separating nationalist Iraqi insurgents trying to end the occupation, both Sunni and Shia, from foreign elements in Iraq for their own reasons. To the extent that a specific withdrawal plan, with benchmarks for measuring success in stabilizing Iraq, would turn Iraqis, both Sunni and Shia, against the foreign terrorists operating in Iraq, it could be a key turning point in stabilizing the country. Remember, the insurgency is made up of two primary camps—nationalist Sunnis and foreign terrorists. These two camps have different motivations and different goals.

A timeline and withdrawal plan negotiated with the Iraqi government would also boost the Iraqi government's legitimacy and claim to self-rule and would force the Iraqi government to take responsibility for itself and its citizens.

Just as importantly, a specific plan and timeline for withdrawal would provide much needed relief to over-burdened military personnel and their families and provide some certainty to U.S. taxpayers regarding the ultimate financial burden they'll be forced to bear.

A plan for withdrawal could also help the United States in our broader fight against Islamic extremists with global ambitions, most notably al-Qaeda, by taking away a recruiting tool and training ground. Porter Goss, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, testified to Congress earlier this year that, "Islamic extremists are exploiting the Iraqi conflict to recruit new anti-U.S. jihadists. These jihadists who survive will leave Iraq experienced and focused on acts of urban terrorism." He went on to say, "The Iraq conflict, while not a cause of extremism, has become a cause for extremists." And, the Commander of U.S. forces in Iraq, General George Casey, testified to Congress earlier this year that "the perception of occupation in Iraq is a major driving force behind the insurgency."

Finally, establishing a firm timeline for withdrawal could accelerate the development of Iraqi security forces and deepen their commitment to defending their own country and their own government by eliminating the conflicted feelings they now feel by working with an occupying force. It would allow them to be defending a sovereign Iraqi government, rather than fighting on the side of an occupation force.

The House should be debating this important issue and strategies for moving forward in Iraq instead of politically motivated straw man resolutions.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I want our troops home as soon as anyone here, but I will not let the sacrifices of those who will never come home from Iraq and Afghanistan be wasted or forgotten.

Our brave men and women went to battle to bring freedom to Iraq and Afghanistan, and to take the fight to the terrorists so that we do not have to fight them here at home. This is a fight for the free world. It is a fight that we must win, and it is a fight that we will win only when we support our troops.

Let us work across the aisle to help them succeed and get them home safely, and let us

honor their sacrifice by continuing to support their vital mission.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in disgust at the level of cynicism that is represented by this resolution.

This exercise by the House Republican leadership is about as un-American and contemptuous as it gets.

I support Mr. MURTHA's resolution to bring about an end to U.S. operations in Iraq in—and I quote—"at the earliest practicable date."

The resolution before us is not about that.

This resolution is a blatant political effort to make it look like the President's Iraq policy has broad support in Congress and among the public—which it obviously does not.

Worse, it transforms the sacrifice of our brave troops into crass political exercise.

Mr. Speaker, I have opposed this war from the beginning.

I wasn't convinced of the need for it and deeply concerned about the potential fallout that it could precipitate.

Sadly, many of my concerns have been borne out, as nearly 2,100 brave Americans have lost their lives and many thousands more have been wounded.

Today, the insurgency continues unabated and now Iraq is a hotbed of terrorist activity.

We are less secure today than before we invaded.

As a result, America's position and influence in the world have suffered greatly in the process.

I believe it is long past time that the administration produce an exit strategy for Iraq and am deeply disappointed that all we have seen is more of the same arrogance and incompetence that got us here in the first place.

I am not surprised by Representative MURTHA's statement yesterday.

Mr. MURTHA's distinguished military career, and his decades of public service, have given him a level of expertise on defense issues virtually unparalleled in today's Congress.

He understands the troops and their leadership, and the challenges faced by the military in times of war and peace far better than most.

I am sure his announcement is the result of long and careful consideration and demands the attention of all thinking Americans.

I am shocked, but not surprised, by the shameful response of some of my Republican colleagues in Congress and by officials in the White House who have sought to besmirch Mr. MURTHA's motivations and accumen.

Today's action by the House leadership is more of the same—an attempt to smear a man of honor who commits the unpardonable sin of disagreeing with them.

Fortunately, I know that as time goes on Mr. MURTHA's call for a serious reassessment of our position in Iraq will be recognized as thoughtful analysis of a policy in deep trouble and need for change.

I only hope that President Bush and his administration will discover that truth before more lives are lost in this very tragic situation.

Speaker J. DENNIS HASTERT declared: "MURTHA and Democratic leaders have adopted a policy of cut and run. They would prefer that the United States surrender to the terrorists who would harm innocent Americans. To add insult to injury, this is done while the President is on foreign soil."

Majority Leader ROY BLUNT informed MURTHA that his views "only embolden our en-

emies" and lamented that "Democrats undermine our troops in Iraq from the security of their Washington, DC, offices."

At a rival news conference called four hours after MURTHA's appearance, Representative J.D. HAYWORTH, who like HASTERT and BLUNT does not have military service on his résumé, alerted the 73-year-old MURTHA that "the American people are made of sterner stuff." And Representative JOHN CARTER said the likes of MURTHA want to take "the cowardly way out and say, 'We're going to surrender.'"

The White House accused a senior House Democrat—and a decorated Vietnam veteran—who called for a swift withdrawal from Iraq of advocating surrender, comparing him to anti-war filmmaker Michael Moore.

In a broadside issued Thursday night, Bush spokesman Scott McClellan said that it is "baffling that [Pennsylvania Representative JOHN MURTHA] is endorsing the policy positions of Michael Moore and the extreme liberal wing of the Democratic party."

MURTHA, whose brand of hawkishness has never been qualified by the word "chicken," was expecting the attacks. "I like guys who've never been there to criticize us who've been there. I like that," the burly old marine said, hands in pocket. Referring to Vice President CHENEY, he continued: "I like guys who got five deferments and never been there, and send people to war, and then don't like to hear suggestions about what needs to be done."

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, tonight I am disappointed by the limitation placed on debate on the U.S. role in Iraq.

Congress needs to have a real and meaningful debate on the future role of the U.S. military in Iraq as we approach the third anniversary of our invasion of Iraq. Congress should take seriously its obligation to oversee our military forces.

I voted against giving the President the authority to go to war in Iraq. I have been an outspoken critic of the President's handling and planning for the Iraq War, and have criticized both the pre-war intelligence used by the President and the failure of the President to plan a realistic transition from a dictatorship to a democracy in Iraq with our allies.

I commend the Senate for the debate it had this week in which real policy options were reviewed in a serious and responsible manner. I agree that 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, and that Iraqi security forces must take the lead in protecting its citizens. U.S. military forces should not stay in Iraq any longer than required, and Congress must insist on measurable benchmarks for bringing our troops home.

Our soldiers have paid the heaviest price in Iraq: thousands are dead, and tens of thousands are wounded. The American taxpayer has already invested hundreds of billions of dollars. Mr. Speaker, our soldiers deserve better than the resolution we are considering this evening. The American people deserve a Congress that will give serious consideration to how we can safely bring our soldiers home.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, which is nothing more than an effort to politicize one of the most serious policy issues facing the United States today. It is nothing more than an effort to disguise—in a cloak of partisan rhetoric—the fact that our Iraq policy is failing.

The facts are clear: Even as our brave men and women in uniform have done their best,

the Administration has failed at every turn to execute the war in Iraq competently. The President rushed to war based on false and faulty intelligence against the protests of the vast majority of our allies. Warnings from U.S. commanders about troop levels and equipment went unheeded, haphazard decisions were made at the earliest stages which seriously damaged our efforts to restore peace and security in Iraq. Our troops have become targets of an ever-strengthening insurgency. This Administration's horrendous judgment has put us in an untenable situation—damaging our ability to deal with other emerging threats around the world and threatening the stability of the Middle East.

The solution to Iraq's problems will be political in nature, not military. The various factions in Iraq need to come together to decide what shape the future of their country will take and to execute that decision. Every diplomatic avenue must be pursued to engage the international community in bringing stability and security to Iraq and reconstructing critical infrastructure. We must assure the Iraqi people that we do not intend to stay in Iraq indefinitely, and that we will redeploy troops in a way that assures their safety and on a schedule pegged to successes in security force training and other criteria. Iraqi security forces must take control of their own country as soon as they are able.

This redeployment must be carried out in a way that does not leave Iraq as a playground for Iran, Syria, and al-Qaeda. It must be carried out at the earliest possible time we are reasonably assured that the conditions exist to ensure redeployment will leave U.S. interests in the Middle East and around the world more, rather than less, secure.

Mr. Speaker, hasty decision-making is what got us into this mess in the first place. The war in Iraq, and the men and women in uniform who are fighting the war, deserve more than ad hoc, 11th-hour debates over political power plays. I urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, this Republican withdrawal resolution was drafted in haste.

No matter how you felt about getting into this war, our kids are there now. They're in the middle of harm's way, right now. As many thousands of families, friends and loved ones can tell you—they've been over there a long time.

I'm a member of the Armed Services Committee. I voted against going to war with Iraq without exhausting all our diplomatic efforts. But here we are. We didn't do that.

I've been to Iraq. I've sat through scores of hearings on Iraq. I've spoken to the Secretary of Defense. I've spoken with our military commanders. Like everyone here tonight, I've lost sleep over it. I've given it a lot of thought. I know my colleagues have too. I know that.

Let's calm down for a second. Let's look at the choice before us tonight.

On one hand, House Republican DUNCAN HUNTER is asking us to withdraw our troops immediately without protection or support. On the other hand, the White House is asking us just to keep our troops on the same course.

I can't choose either of these options in good conscience. Honestly, I don't see how any of us can.

To put it simply, we have more options than "all or nothing" here tonight.

We should be looking for the "better course" not the "same course."

There is no military solution to Iraq. We've got to look to diplomacy and joint civilian-military efforts. This war has demonstrated the need for trained civilian professionals who can provide continuity and hand-in-glove partnerships with Iraqi citizens.

Everywhere I've gone and everyone I've talked to has cited the need for this.

It was obvious early on that the future of Iraq depends on Iraqis. And yet, the administration is only now beginning to place an emphasis on training Iraq's own security forces.

James Fallows of the Atlantic Monthly wrote recently, "an orderly exit from Iraq depends on the development of a viable Iraqi security force. But the Iraqis aren't even close. The Bush administration doesn't take the problem seriously—and it never has."

We have other options besides this draconian resolution. It's too bad we're not able to have hearings on those. It's too bad we're not able to consider these other options tonight.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the men and women who are so bravely serving our country in Iraq and around the world.

Our best and bravest continue to perform selflessly and admirably. We owe them our deepest respect and appreciation.

We also have an obligation to provide them, and the American people, with a clear set of objectives, a comprehensive strategy to achieve these objectives, and a roadmap to return home once these objectives are achieved. But, the Bush Administration has not done this.

My colleagues, people all across the country, Republicans and Democrats, want to know why our intelligence was wrong. They want to know why our troops don't have the necessary body armor. They want to know what our objectives are and what progress has been made in achieving them. And, they want to know what concrete steps must be taken to achieve troop withdrawals.

Yet, the Administration's only response to these legitimate questions is to criticize those that ask them as unpatriotic and provide the empty rhetoric of "stay the course". This is irresponsible, morally reprehensible and shameful—to our troops, to the American people, and to our democracy. It demoralizes our mission and is a direct challenge to the freedom and liberty that so many of our troops have fought and died for.

It is Congress's fundamental responsibility to investigate whether faulty intelligence led us to war; to provide our troops with the necessary training, equipment, and supplies; and to ensure that our nation has a clearly defined strategy to achieve success in Iraq and provide for the return of our troops.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that Congress fulfills our obligations. Our troops have shown time and time again that when presented with a challenge, they will achieve it. They have done their part; it is time we do our part.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the sham piece of legislation before us. It is not designed to express the will of the House on Iraq. It is a political stunt intended to avoid a deeply serious, much-needed debate on the most pressing issue facing our country today.

Yesterday, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, introduced a resolution

calling for the redeployment of American forces from Iraq. The resolution would require us to maintain a sizeable quick reaction force in the region, and to reinvigorate our diplomatic efforts to bring about peace and security for the Iraqi people by truly internationalizing our efforts there.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, has correctly observed that at present, our policy in Iraq "is a flawed policy wrapped in illusion," and that we cannot continue on this present course, because to do so is to court disaster. Based on visits to Iraq, discussion with military leaders there and in Washington, he said that the continued presence of our troops does not advance our security nor that of Iraq. He also said that the American people are way out in front of the Congress on this issue. In all of these things, he spoke the truth.

But in the eyes of the majority and the Bush White House, the gentleman's resolution is, in the words of White House spokesman Scott McClellan "a surrender to the terrorists." They have accused him—as they have others who dare to question their failed policy in Iraq—of being unpatriotic. Sadly, this is a tactic we have seen before. But it is deeply corrosive and it must stop. Every American has the right to question their leaders, period.

There is a reason the majority and the President don't want to be questioned about Iraq. There are several reasons, in fact. This war was started based on faulty and misrepresented intelligence. It has been prosecuted without the number of troops or the amount of equipment that was known to be necessary before it started. And today, it continues without broad international cooperation or an exit strategy. Answering questions about any and all of these is admittedly difficult. But hiding from the answers is not only cowardly, it is irresponsible. I too have visited our troops in Iraq, and they are best served if we face the truth—with the humility that come from recognizing their valor, dedication, and sacrifice.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, things are not going as advertised in Iraq, and the American people know it. Three years of mistakes and even falsehoods—about the threat Saddam posed, about the ease of total victory, about how Iraqi oil would pay for reconstruction, about the cost to America's military and budget, among others—have finally caught up with this Administration and the Congressional leadership. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers a plan for getting us out of Iraq strategically, methodically, and successfully. It outlines a way forward for our country to deal with the number one moral and political issue confronting our nation today. We should be debating his proposal, not mocking it.

Meeting the challenge that faces us in Iraq requires courage and honesty. The actions of the majority show neither today. I am sorely disappointed that they have chosen to act so irresponsibly.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, there has never been a time like this in America's history.

Never before has a full-scale assault been launched on Americans who offer a different point of view about the policies of an administration, especially when it concerns a war on foreign soil.

Almost 3 years ago, I went to Iraq as part of a humanitarian delegation. When I said in

response to a media question that the President would mislead America into war, the White House immediately launched a relentless attack on me. They spared no political or public relations weapon, surrogate or ploy, in their attempt to silence me.

Republicans, at the direction of the White House, launched a full-scale assault on me, because they feared what might happen if the American people actually had an opportunity to consider an alternative point of view. If they could shout me down, they could silence anyone's question about the evidence before waging war.

In the last 24 hours, a similar campaign has been launched against Representative JOHN MURTHA of Pennsylvania. Here is an esteemed Member of Congress, a decorated combat veteran, a conservative known for his strong stand on defense, and the Republicans and their cronies launch an offensive that, itself, is offensive.

Representative JOHN MURTHA stood up yesterday and spoke on behalf of the American people. He called for the deployment of U.S. soldiers out of Iraq, beginning immediately. He called for a diplomatic solution. And Republicans and their surrogates have called him every foul and offensive name imaginable.

The conduct of the Republican Party and its surrogates is despicable, but it is out in the open for the first time. Now, the American people understand the lengths to which the Republican Party will go to silence dissent in America. Now, the American people know that there is a war being fought in America over the war in Iraq.

The American people are demanding an end to the presence of U.S. soldiers in Iraq because the American people know there is no such thing as a military victory in an urban, guerilla warfare. There is only occupation, and the American people want no part of that flawed and futile mission.

The American people overwhelmingly want a solution for Iraq that is negotiated by diplomats from the Arab world, not dictated by a President from the western world.

Representative JOHN MURTHA has set forth a plan that resonates with the American people, and that's what frightens the White House. Therefore, the attacks will not stop unless and until Republicans can silence dissent in America.

There is a plan now for winning the peace in Iraq. It may have been submitted by a Member of Congress, but it is the voice and will of the American people. The American people get it: You are not strong on defense, by strong arming a defenseless—and senseless—war.

I support the Murtha plan to win the peace in Iraq.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, for over 2 years, the Bush administration has failed to offer the American people a truthful and meaningful dialogue on the war in Iraq. We have lost thousands of troops and we have spent billions of dollars, and yet the President refuses to offer a credible strategy for success. The President has misled the public and he refuses to acknowledge the truth of the reality in Iraq.

Hundreds of Members of Congress and millions of Americans have voiced very serious and very real concerns with the decisions being made by the White House. Although I voted against the war, once the President took

us to war, I have supported the men and women in uniform who are serving our Nation. However, I continue to believe that unless we have a clear strategy, we will continue to see the loss of American lives in Iraq with no end in sight.

Unfortunately, today, instead of having a legitimate debate about strategy and consequences, the majority has chosen to waste the time of this body and the American people by bringing forth a blatantly political resolution that is difficult to take seriously. My colleague from Pennsylvania, a Vietnam veteran decorated with two Purple Hearts and a Member of the House for three decades, Mr. MURTHA, yesterday offered a well thought out, principled resolution calling for the redeployment of the forces in Iraq at the "earliest practicable date." In addition, despite what some in the majority have characterized during today's debate as cutting and running, Mr. MURTHA's resolution calls for a continued military presence in the region through the deployment of a quick-reaction force and an over-the-horizon presence of U.S. Marines. Also, the resolution states that the U.S. shall continue to pursue security and stability in Iraq through diplomatic means.

It is important to note that the word "immediate" does not appear anywhere in Mr. MURTHA's resolution. Yet we find ourselves today debating a resolution introduced by the chair of the House Armed Services Committee that calls for the "immediate withdrawal" of American troops. The fact that this was introduced by the House Armed Services Committee and the fact that he along with colleagues in the majority will be voting against his own resolution demonstrates not only the lack of clear ideas from their side of the aisle but also a lack of willingness to have a true debate.

Today, the majority once again shunned their responsibility in having an open debate on the war in Iraq, and instead they and the President continue to attack those who disagree with them by questioning their patriotism. Rather than engaging in an open dialogue to debate the issue, the majority chose to engage in personal destruction and politicized the issue by voicing empty rhetoric. They chose to question the patriotism of those who have served in uniform and who have honorably served their country. And they chose to continue to hide from the American public the facts of this war.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on November 17, 2005, my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, the ranking Democrat on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee—a 27 year Marine and a veteran of 3 tours in Vietnam—announced that he was introducing a resolution that was meant to stimulate a thoughtful and profound debate on how we salvage a failed policy in Iraq.

Recently, a Texas soldier became the 2,000th member of the U.S. armed forces to die in Iraq since the conflict there began in March 2003. Like any milestone, the death of that soldier is an occasion to look back and see what lessons can be learned from our country's bitter sacrifice in Iraq over the past 2½ years. One such lesson, underlined anew by the continuing deaths of Americans and Iraqis, is the need to limit our country's commitment to Iraq.

Instead of creating a significant dialogue on this issue, Republican leadership has chosen to divide this House by generating phony, cyn-

ical, political, outrageously tricky and sneaky maneuvers like this.

Mr. Speaker, too often, so many of my colleagues are reluctant to challenge this Administration's policies in Iraq for fear that anything other than staying the course will somehow appear weak. But the President's course is misguided, and it is doing grave damage to our extraordinarily professional and globally admired all-volunteer United States Army. To stand by while this damage is done is not patriotic. It is not supportive. It is not tough on terrorism, or strong on national security.

Because I am proud of our men and women in uniform, and because I am committed to working with all of my colleagues to make this country more secure, I am convinced that we must change our course and I commend Mr. MURTHA for standing up for what is right.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, what the Republicans have done today is nothing more than a cheap political trick . . . a clever but appallingly undemocratic way for the Republican majority to trash an honorable American—and decorated war veteran—simply because he disagrees with them on the war in Iraq.

Yet, no one should be surprised. My 5-year old grandson could have written this tired script: whenever a Democrat criticizes a Republican policy, they attack your character and question your patriotism.

And while we're on the subject, let's just ask: what is more patriotic than opposing an unjust war? What is more patriotic than trying to save the lives of America's soldiers? What is more patriotic than questioning the Bush Administration's failed Iraq policy?

The American people deserve better than this. They deserve a thorough and substantive debate on the war and a debate on the Murtha resolution . . . not a bill that can't be amended and has been brought to the House floor for purely political reasons.

Mr. Speaker, a group of Democrats has written a discharge petition to bring the Homeland Bound legislation, H. J. Res. 55, to the House floor.

The discharge petition will allow 17 hours of debate on this vitally important issue. And, in sharp contrast to the bill the Republicans introduced today, it would be brought up under an open rule that allows amendments to be introduced to the bill.

The fact that the other party refuses to have this debate—and the insults that have been hurled at Mr. MURTHA over the last 24 hours—are an affront to our very democracy. I urge my colleagues on the other side to repudiate these appalling tactics and hold a real debate on this issue.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and oppose the underlying resolution.

Calling for an immediate withdrawal, or even a detailed planned phased withdrawal, from Iraq is a recipe for disaster, a dangerous defense policy, the wrong message for our soldiers and Marines who are truly doing the 'work of freedom.'

Frankly, I am concerned that such talk will only embolden the terrorists and demoralize our warfighters—those who put their lives on the line, literally every day.

Domestic politics should not trump our promises to the people of Iraq and Afghanistan that we would be loyal to their aspirations for freedom—that we would see them through

the difficult steps of constituting a new government, laying the groundwork for free elections.

Our only 'exit strategy' from Iraq should be victory. Anything less than that virtually guarantees the next battleground may be closer to home!"

Mr. Speaker, we have to choose where we want to fight the global war on terrorism—in Iraq and Afghanistan or on Main Street in America.

And we must never forget that it is our brave young warfighters—men and women of the Army, Marines, Navy and Air Force—who are taking the fight to the terrorists overseas!

They are all volunteers—doing the unheralded work of rebuilding shattered nations.

If not for their service, Saddam Hussein would still be in power with all his trappings—the secret police, the torture chambers, the mass graveyards. God bless these young people.

If not for their service, Iraq would be a nation engulfed in civil war or in the hands of fanatical terrorists.

The targets of these terrorists are more often than not other Muslims—worshippers at Friday prayers inside their mosque slaughtered by suicide bombers—today—and moderate Muslims who reject their extremist views and work to provide for their families, run businesses or serve in the government. Indeed, the terrorists' victims include thousands of Muslims in Iraq—many killed simply because they've chosen to be free.

Mr. Speaker, with our support, the Iraqis have made great progress. They established an interim government. They elected members of a constitutional conference. They've drafted a constitution and conducted a referendum to endorse that constitution. And in 3 weeks, they will hold a full-fledged parliamentary election.

None of this would have been possible without the contribution of our young warfighters.

Of course, at times like these, we are reminded that freedom is not free. America has paid a heavy price.

Many of us visit soldiers at Walter Reed Army Medical Center and the Bethesda Naval Medical Center on a regular basis. Many of us have attended painful funerals and comforted grieving families. Time and again, those families of wounded soldiers speak proudly of their loved ones' service in Iraq—their humanitarian efforts to protect the innocent, rebuild schools and hospitals, repair the infrastructure of a civil society.

Let's support our troops—and their families. And let's applaud their service and heroism.

I urge adoption of this rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership today demonstrates that they have no sense of decency left. No question before Congress requires a more measured, thoughtful discussion than matters of war and peace. Our national security and the lives of our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines depend on our ability to fulfill our constitutional responsibilities with dignity and respect.

That measured, thoughtful discussion will not occur today, because the Republican leadership does not want it to occur. They want a quick vote, with limited debate, on a same-day resolution that they hope will divide Democrats. They have taken Representative JACK MURTHA's proposal, rewritten to make it irre-

sponsible, and brought it to the floor for a vote.

Almost everything we were told by the advocates of invading Iraq before the war has turned out to be false. This administration and its congressional allies hyped the threat and manipulated American intelligence about Iraq's nuclear program and its alleged connection to al Qaeda.

Today, there is only one question about our occupation of Iraq. It weighs on the minds of almost all Americans, especially those with loved ones in the military. That question is, simply, when and under what conditions will we withdraw our troops and bring them home?

Opinions differ. After 2½ years, over 2,000 deaths and 15,000 wounded, millions of Americans and many Members of Congress believe it is time for us to start the process of withdrawal from Iraq. Some believe in a date certain for beginning or completing the withdrawal. Some believe our withdrawal should be tied to achievement of certain benchmarks of progress. President Bush appears to believe that only total "victory over the terrorists," whatever that is, would justify withdrawal.

The historic task of this Congress in foreign policy is to participate in a constructive debate that will inform the decisions of the administration and others.

The Republican leadership has dishonored the people's House by foregoing debate on alternatives, not just debate but hearings, in favor of bringing one resolution to the floor in the hope of dividing critics of the administration's "stay the course" war strategy.

I voted against giving President Bush the authority to invade Iraq without building a broad international coalition and obtaining explicit U.N. authority. I did not believe he would do anything, given the authority from Congress, but rush to war. And that is what he did.

No Member of Congress is more respected or more knowledgeable about the American military than JACK MURTHA of Pennsylvania. His statement yesterday calling for withdrawal of our troops from Iraq, including his conviction that we cannot accomplish more militarily, deserves thoughtful consideration. He will not get that today.

Instead, JACK MURTHA, decorated Marine, distinguished Member of Congress, has been vilified by the Speaker of this House, who wrongly accused him of adopting "a policy of cut and run" and preferring that "the United States surrender to the terrorists." The White House spokesman accused Mr. MURTHA of endorsing "Michael Moore and the extreme liberal wing of the Democratic Party."

I doubt that JACK MURTHA knows Michael Moore, and no one here that I know ever called him a liberal. We call him Mr. MURTHA because he is one tough Marine.

If I were the author of his resolution, I would have written it somewhat differently. I would have called for the withdrawal of American forces to begin next year and be concluded except for a very small training force of advisors in 2007. We cannot allow Iraq to become a failed state where al Qaeda forces can be trained with impunity. Therefore, some rapid reaction force in the region, as JACK MURTHA suggested, should be available.

But on the big picture, JACK MURTHA is right. Our troops have become not only the targets of the insurgents, but the inspiration for the in-

surgency. Political success for the Iraqi government and people is still possible, but it will have to be won largely by political means. The Administration is, as he said, pursuing "a flawed policy wrapped in illusion."

The Republican Leadership has rigged this debate to serve their own political interests. I believe that the Murtha resolution calling for withdrawal is the right policy going forward, though we should continue to debate timing and benchmarks. A vote against the Murtha resolution, if it were offered, could be interpreted as support for the Administration's flawed and failed "stay the course" policy.

JACK MURTHA is on the right track. The President is not. Our national security and the lives and well-being of our troops depend on changing course, not doing the same old thing in Iraq.

If the Murtha Resolution had been brought to the floor today, I would have voted in favor of it.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I voted to give President Bush the authority to go into Iraq. I'm not on the left; I'm not on the right. I'm on the side of our country and I'm on the side of our troops. I can't imagine why the Republicans have brought this Bush-Hunter resolution to the floor. How does this help our troops serving in Iraq? How does this help make our Nation safer?

For the past two years, the Republicans have taken any criticism of this war and labeled it as unpatriotic and as an attack on our troops. Criticizing the way the war has been prosecuted—criticizing the way it has been bungled—is not unpatriotic. It is the ultimate act of patriotism.

JOHN MURTHA is a 37-year veteran of the Marine Corps. He served in Vietnam. He was awarded the bronze star. He received two purple hearts. Now Mr. MURTHA has provoked an important debate—one we should be having in this body. Mr. MURTHA has the right to have these ideas discussed. Our troops have the right to have these ideas discussed. The American public has the right to have these ideas discussed.

We send young men and women to war. We are responsible for them. We must be diligent in our oversight. That's our duty.

What we are doing here tonight is a waste of time and does a tremendous disservice to our troops. Talk about patriotism—this is not patriotism. This is a cheap political stunt and an affront to those serving our Nation so far from home.

The President wants to stay the course. What does that mean? 700 attacks a week against our troops; no winning strategy; no plan; no end in sight.

Let us not embarrass ourselves any further, and vote against the Hunter resolution.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am disgusted by the course of events today. As the daughter of a veteran of two wars I am offended and outraged by this personal assault on decorated war veteran Congressman JOHN MURTHA.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority has lost any sense of decorum or decency. Their abuse of power is obscene. There will be a reckoning though. Because the American people want accountability, not more Republican cover-ups. The American people want honesty, not more misleading and manipulation. They want to end this unnecessary and senseless war, not a policy of 'stay the course' that has no goals, no benchmarks, no plans, and no end.

The Republican majority's effort in distorting and politicizing the resolution offered by a decorated war veteran is nothing short of despicable. The reality is that these are desperate actions by a desperate majority and a desperate administration. This last minute effort isn't about a debate on the issues the Murtha resolution raises. It isn't about how intelligence was misused by the administration. But it should be. It isn't about how we are going to bring our troops home. But it should be. This resolution is just about politics.

I support the Murtha resolution and this is not the Murtha resolution. Reject this cynical and disgraceful stunt from a party devoid of ideas on ending the war in Iraq and how to safely bring our troops home. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the resolution.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, today's House debate on Iraq was sharply partisan and not what our soldiers deserve. Our future course in Iraq must be determined thoughtfully and strategically. The partisan shouting match that broke out was unnecessarily launched by House leaders who rushed to the floor a flawed resolution which was more of a political stunt than a serious reflection of views in the Congress.

Our brave soldiers have put their lives on the line in serving in Iraq. Each of them deserves so much more from Congress by way of effective leadership than the shrill squabbling that broke out on the House floor today. We need to come together on an exit strategy for our soldiers based upon the transition of security to the Iraqis themselves in order to give the new democratic government of the people of Iraq a fair chance of success.

It is my hope the partisan screamers holding forth on the House floor today would lower their voices, travel to the area, learn as much as possible and then participate constructively in the difficult decisions we face on Iraq.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives is sinking to a new low today. What is happening on the floor is not intended to be an open and honest debate on our policy in Iraq. It is about the politics of personal destruction—a swift-boat attack by Congressional Republicans on a 37-year veteran of the Marine Corps for giving his honest assessment about the situation in Iraq.

Republicans will try to claim—falsely—that this is about an idea, not a person—but everyone here in this room—whether or not they will admit it—knows the truth of what is going on today. This is about changing the subject and dodging responsibility. House Republicans are exposed and embarrassed by the Senate's recent vote to demand benchmarks from the White House. The President refuses to level with the American people on Iraq, or present his ideas, and apparently House Republicans are of the same mind. They would rather tear someone down.

Our troops—putting their lives on the line—deserve better from this country. Today is clearly not about these brave men and women. It is about political attacks.

JACK MURTHA is one of the most respected members of the U.S. Congress on U.S. military policy—an expertise he has built from his first-hand knowledge of military and defense issues. He is a 37-year veteran of the Marine Corps, who retired at the rank of colonel in 1990. He is one of the most respected members of the U.S. Congress on the U.S. military,

on a bipartisan basis. To question JACK MURTHA's commitment—his patriotism to this nation—or our troops is ludicrous. No one has been as devoted as JACK to our men and women in the military—he's made weekly visits to Walter Reed, visits to Iraq and has poured over the Defense Department's own assessments of the situation on the ground in Iraq.

I will vote against the GOP's characterization of Congressman MURTHA's opinions on Iraq, because I cannot support personal, political attacks and I believe that we should have a free and open debate on this issue.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this Republican stunt and their efforts to embarrass a decorated Vietnam War Veteran.

Yesterday, Congressman JOHN MURTHA, a Democrat with impeccable military credentials and an honored military record, suggested that U.S. troops leave Iraq at the earliest practicable date. Today, I cosponsored that resolution. His knowledgeable and respected voice joins the loud and clear pleas of the Out of Iraq Caucus—of which I am a proud member. His voice joins former generals, intelligence officers, Presidents, and mothers and fathers across America who know that we are mired in a war that cannot be won and to truly honor our troops, we need to bring them home.

Unfortunately, tonight the Republican leadership refused to bring Mr. Murtha's resolution to a vote. I can only presume because Mr. Murtha's resolution made too much sense. Instead, the Republican leadership is offering a sham-resolution in an attempt to embarrass and insult a member of Congress who has served his country nobly in uniform—something most of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle know nothing about.

Perhaps the Republican Leadership's time would be better spent in an effort to finish the business of this country instead of wasting hours attempting to besmirch the record of a decorated Vietnam War Veteran and demagogue an issue that demands honest consideration.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I served in a war during which too many national leaders played too much politics. Tonight is a disgraceful period in the history of our great country and this House of Representatives.

To wage a political war against one of the greatest military champions Congress has known is no less than unpatriotic. Advocates of this measure are cheapening the job our brave men and women serving in Iraq are doing; the men and women putting their lives on the line to serve our country.

Mr. Speaker, those who dreamed up this strategy are derelict in their duties, absent without leave from their duty station; and people I wouldn't want to share a foxhole with.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 571 completely dishonors our troops by politicizing an issue that deserves careful deliberation. The GOP leadership of this body has brought this counterfeit legislation to the floor not to benefit our brave men and women in uniform, but to score cheap political points.

I fully support legitimate initiatives which present a thoughtful strategy for withdrawing our troops from Iraq in a manner that secures their safety and Iraq's future. I am a cosponsor of two resolutions which would support this urgent objective. Yet this phony bill chooses

politics over policy at the expense of real debate on a critical national issue.

Over 2,000 troops have been killed and over 15,500 have been seriously wounded. Reports indicate that at least 30,000 Iraqi civilians have lost their lives due to this conflict. It is a sad day for this country when, in response to this crucial issue, the best the GOP leadership can do is resort to backhanded political stunts.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, three years ago, I argued against the Bush Administration's proposal to attack Iraq for the very reasons we have seen emerge from this troubled region. We were prepared to defeat Saddam Hussein's military but the administration and congressional leaders were never prepared to win the peace.

Not only was the premise for the war flawed, but the administration has made the wrong military, political, and diplomatic choices at every turn. The members of our armed services make up the finest fighting force in the world and they have done their duty with great distinction and honor, yet the administration has failed them as well.

I take no satisfaction in my worst fears having been proven correct. The administration's spectacular failures in executing this war have set back our efforts against terrorism and left America with no good options in Iraq. But, as our military is being not just frayed but damaged and Iraq faces increasingly difficult prospects for democracy and stability, staying the course is simply not an option.

Until now, I have resisted advocating for an accelerated pullout because of my fear of the downward spiral that could occur in the aftermath. Yet this is a question that must be faced sooner rather than later, and it's hard to imagine a policy that would be more destabilizing than the administration's current mismanagement of the war effort and continued estrangement from reality.

There is no longer any basis for the hope that a sustained American military occupation will stabilize Iraq. Instead, we continue to lose credibility and influence in the region and with our allies, as well as strengthen the hands of those extremists who wish to do us harm. Even many of those who initially supported military action have come to admit that the administration's strategy has failed and that a large United States military presence inhibits the development of a stable and democratic Iraq. Iraqis in key positions are arguing for at least some withdrawal of U.S. forces. Most telling is a recent poll of Iraqis themselves, commissioned by the British Ministry of Defense, which showed that 82 percent of Iraqis were "strongly opposed" to the presence of foreign troops and less than 1 percent believe the their presence is helping to improve security.

Iraq's future depends on creating a secure space for politics and the rule of law to replace violence. This is a process at which only Iraqis themselves can succeed, with America and the international community playing a supporting role. Elections scheduled for December provide the perfect opportunity to begin the withdrawal of American troops, a refocused U.S. effort, and transfer of responsibility to Iraqis.

American forces should be redeployed out of Iraq in two phases. First, let's bring the 46,000 National Guard and Reserve forces home immediately. These elements in our total force have been most overburdened by

ever-increasing deployments and are most needed here in the United States.

Continued U.S. aid and military support must be tied to performance objectives for the Iraqi government and military. On that basis, the rest of the American forces should be withdrawn over the next one to two years, based on a detailed plan for the sector by sector transfer of security responsibility. The majority of these troops should be brought home. Others should be redeployed to Afghanistan to create a larger security footprint and help prevent the reemergence of the Taliban. A small rapid-reaction force should be left in Kuwait that can protect against any destabilizing coups.

The administration must reengage diplomatically by seeking a new United Nations resolution that supports international efforts to stabilize Iraq and by beginning a regional security dialogue with Iraq's neighbors. We should also work with the Arab League to facilitate a renewed effort towards a political solution within Iraq by engaging with nationalist faction leaders who might be a force for stability in that country if U.S. troops were withdrawn.

We must also change the nature of our economic assistance. By shifting reconstruction aid to Iraq away from large projects undertaken by foreign contractors towards small, locally oriented projects run by Iraqis, we create jobs, give Iraqis a greater investment in their success, and minimize corruption and price-gouging.

President Bush's model of "go it alone, do it cheap, and put it on a credit card" has not only led to grave instability in Iraq, it is crippling our ability to deal with the more serious strategic threats, from Iran and North Korea to a terrorist movement that we have inadvertently strengthened. We must now do our best to salvage what we still can of American credibility, military readiness, democratic ideals, and Iraqi stability through a change in strategy and the beginning of a responsible phasedown of American troops and the orderly transfer of authority to Iraqis.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the definition of "immediate termination of United States forces in Iraq" must mean the following as set forth by Representative JOHN MURTHA:

"My plan calls:

—To immediately redeploy U.S. troops consistent with the safety of U.S. forces.

—To create a quick reaction force in the region.

—To create over-the-horizon presence of Marines.

—To diplomatically pursue security and stability in Iraq."

You may call this a position, a program, or an exit strategy but this is the Murtha message which set in motion the current proceedings on the floor of the House of Representatives. This is the declaration heard from Representative MURTHA by the American people and around the world. By all standards of decency and by popular decree the Republican leadership is mandated to respect the precedent setting language of this most detailed of all proposals for new and creative action in Iraq.

For this reason I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on the resolution before us. "That the deployment of United States forces in Iraq be terminated immediately."

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution and in the strongest

possible opposition to the Republican smear campaign against my friend and colleague, Congressman JACK MURTHA.

JACK MURTHA is a patriot. He has served this country in wartime and peacetime and has earned an unparalleled record as a champion for our troops and their families.

JACK MURTHA is a retired Marine Colonel with more than thirty years of distinguished military service. He earned two Purple Hearts and a Bronze Star for action under enemy fire in Vietnam. He served as a USMC drill instructor at Parris Island, South Carolina boot camp. And as a foremost Congressional expert on defense matters, he has spent more than three decades helping to build a military force that is second to none in the entire world. I have been proud to serve in Congress with JACK MURTHA for nearly ten years, and I had the honor of hosting him in my Congressional District and of joining him in visiting wounded veterans of the Iraq war at Walter Reed Army Medical Hospital.

Yet despite his standing and stature, Congressman MURTHA has been viciously attacked by the Republican partisans for having the temerity to raise important questions about this Administration's policies regarding Iraq. Yesterday, the Republican Speaker DENNIS HASTERT, who never served in the military, called JACK MURTHA a coward. Other Republicans in Congress and the White House have called JACK MURTHA a traitor and accused him of giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican attack machine has gone too far. Regardless of one's view of the Administration's Iraq policies, Members of this Congress deserve to offer their viewpoints without having their patriotism questioned. Indeed, the American people deserve the benefit of vigorous debate about a war that has cost us more than 2,000 soldiers killed, thousands more maimed and several hundred billion dollars of public treasure expended.

The Hunter Resolution is a cheap political trick. It is not a serious attempt at crafting public policy since Mr. HUNTER has said he intends to vote against his own resolution. Rather than engage in this petty and deceitful charade, the American people deserve a Congress that conducts the people's business in a professional manner to address the challenges facing our country here at home and around the world.

I will vote against the Hunter Resolution.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my deep dismay over the resolution being brought before the House tonight. The leadership of this House has responded to criticism of the war in Iraq by forcing a meaningless vote in order to shame the man who offered that critique, my good friend JACK MURTHA.

JACK is a patriotic American of the highest order, contrary to the way our colleagues on the other side of the aisle may try to portray him. He has dedicated his life to the service of his Nation, defending it for 37 years as a marine and striving to make it a better place through his 31 years as a Member of this institution. During that time, he has earned two purple hearts, a bronze star, and the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry and become one of the most respected leaders on military and Veterans issues from either party.

Rather than listening to the wise words of a man who knows better than almost any of us what our soldiers need in a time of war, many

of my colleagues have taken to questioning his motives and even his character, and now House leadership has twisted his words and offered this resolution as a vehicle to humiliate this proud, honorable, and decent man. They are holding this House hostage and answering his principled and heart-felt proposal with a mean-spirited and empty resolution that is only one sentence, was not considered or debated, and was offered under the most egregious terms.

I will not be participating in this charade tonight; if I were, I certainly would vote against this resolution. It is not meant to spark a legitimate debate over the Iraq war. It is a personal attack rather than a policy statement. I find it reprehensible to subject this great and humble man to such indignity.

While I do not necessarily agree that immediate withdrawal from Iraq is the best course, I respect the conclusion reached by Mr. MURTHA through his soul-searching. Despite any disagreements any of us may have on policy, we should not come together tonight to single him out as the object of ridicule. I will not be a part of it, and I would hope that my colleagues would not either. I urge them to vote "no" on this shameful resolution.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my colleague from Pennsylvania, a man whom I deeply respect and admire for his lifetime of service and sacrifice to the Nation, made a serious statement about the prosecution of the war effort by the President. His speech yesterday morning and the resolution that he introduced were heartfelt expressions that he no longer believes that we can stay the course in Iraq. Mr. MURTHA believes that the continued presence of American troops in Iraq has retarded Iraqi efforts to unify the country and that Iraqis will not take the necessary steps to restore security as long as American troops remain in the country in large numbers.

But instead of addressing the serious deficiencies in the Administration's military strategy, the majority offers this counterfeit resolution that precludes any debate on how we can improve our chance of success in the war effort.

Although there are differences within our caucus as to what our course of action in Iraq should be, we are united in our belief that the present course being followed by the administration is not working, and we must find a new course.

But how have the Vice-President and the Republican Majority in this House treated the sincere misgivings of a man who has shed blood for his country and been a staunch supporter of our men and women in the military? They have launched a vicious smear attack on Mr. MURTHA's patriotism. Indeed they have gone so far as assert that anyone who questions the wisdom of any aspect of their handling of the war is unpatriotic, and willing to give aid and comfort to the enemy. Unfortunately, the administration's inability to communicate a clear strategy for success in Iraq has caused a great many Americans to question the Nation's prosecution of the war—including some of the most devoted, most patriotic and most courageous of Americans. People like former Senator Max Cleland, and now JACK MURTHA.

But I believe that Senator CHUCK HAGEL has it right—the willingness to question, to prod and to probe our government is what produces the best policy and leads to the best

outcomes, in war as well as in peace. The courage to question a powerful but imperfect government is much more the essence of patriotism than a coerced silence.

The administration's prosecution of the war effort has suffered from deficient planning that took the maxim of preparing for the worst and hoping for the best and turned it on its head. It failed to consider how the Sunni minority would react to being stripped of its privileged status, even as they underestimated the consequences of decades of totalitarian rule and the atomization of Iraqi society under Saddam Hussein.

Many of my colleagues and I have repeatedly called upon the President to do what should have been done a long time ago by laying out a strategy and vision for success in Iraq that will not condemn the Iraqi people to anarchy or turn Iraq into a haven for jihadists. We have called for proper oversight of the war effort by Congress to make certain that our troops in Iraq are properly equipped and that we are doing everything in our power to ensure their safety and success.

This House, this Congress and this Nation stand for the proposition that reasoned debate can produce wise policies that will best "provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Mr. Speaker, this resolution should be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 572, the resolution is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 3, noes 403, answered "present" 6, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 608]		
AYES—3		
McKinney	Serrano	Wexler
NOES—403		
Abercrombie	Bonilla	Chabot
Ackerman	Bonner	Chandler
Aderholt	Bono	Chocola
Akin	Boozman	Cleaver
Alexander	Boren	Clyburn
Allen	Boucher	Coble
Andrews	Boustany	Cole (OK)
Baca	Bradley (NH)	Conaway
Bachus	Brady (PA)	Conyers
Baird	Brady (TX)	Cooper
Baker	Brown (OH)	Costa
Baldwin	Brown (SC)	Costello
Barrett (SC)	Brown, Corrine	Cramer
Barrow	Brown-Waite,	Crenshaw
Bartlett (MD)	Ginny	Crowley
Barton (TX)	Burgess	Cubin
Bass	Burton (IN)	Cuellar
Bean	Butterfield	Culberson
Becerra	Buyer	Cummings
Berkley	Calvert	Davis (CA)
Berry	Cannon	Davis (FL)
Biggert	Cantor	Davis (IL)
Bilirakis	Capito	Davis (KY)
Bishop (GA)	Capps	Davis (TN)
Bishop (NY)	Cardin	Davis, Jo Ann
Bishop (UT)	Cardoza	Davis, Tom
Blackburn	Carmahan	Deal (GA)
Blumenauer	Carson	DeFazio
Blunt	Carter	DeGette
Boehrlert	Case	DeLauro
Boehner	Castle	

DeLay	Kelly	Pickering
Dent	Kennedy (MN)	Pitts
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kennedy (RI)	Platts
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kildee	Poe
Dicks	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pombo
Dingell	King (IA)	Pomeroy
Doggett	King (NY)	Porter
Doolittle	Kingston	Price (GA)
Doyle	Kirk	Price (NC)
Drake	Kline	Pryce (OH)
Dreier	Knollenberg	Putnam
Duncan	Kolbe	Radanovich
Edwards	Kucinich	Rahall
Ehlers	Kuhl (NY)	Ramstad
Emanuel	Langevin	Rangel
Emerson	Lantos	Regula
Engel	Larsen (WA)	Rehberg
English (PA)	Larson (CT)	Reichert
Eshoo	Latham	Renzi
Etheridge	LaTourette	Reyes
Evans	Leach	Reynolds
Everett	Lee	Rogers (AL)
Farr	Levin	Rogers (KY)
Fattah	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (MI)
Feeney	Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher
Ferguson	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Filner	Linder	Ross
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lipinski	Rothman
Foley	LoBiondo	Roybal-Allard
Forbes	Lofgren, Zoe	Royce
Ford	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Fortenberry	Lucas	Rush
Fox	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (OH)
Fox, Frank (MA)	E.	Ryan (WI)
Franks (AZ)	Lynch	Ryun (KS)
Frelinghuysen	Mack	Sabo
Gerlach	Maloney	Salazar
Gibbons	Manzullo	Sánchez, Linda
Gilchrest	Marchant	T.
Gillmor	Markey	Sanchez, Loretta
Gingrey	Marshall	Sanders
Gohmert	Matheson	Saxton
Gonzalez	Matsui	Schakowsky
Goode	McCarthy	Schiff
Goodlatte	McCaul (TX)	Schmidt
Gordon	McCollum (MN)	Schwartz (PA)
Granger	McCotter	Schwarz (MI)
Graves	McCrery	Scott (GA)
Green (WI)	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Green, Al	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Green, Gene	McHugh	Sessions
Grijalva	McIntyre	Shaw
Gutierrez	McKeon	Shays
Gutknecht	McMorris	Sherman
Harman	McNulty	Sherwood
Harris	Meehan	Shimkus
Hart	Meek (FL)	Shuster
Hastert	Meeks (NY)	Simmons
Hastings (FL)	Melancon	Simpson
Hastings (WA)	Menendez	Skelton
Hayes	Mica	Slaughter
Hayworth	Michaud	Smith (NJ)
Hefley	Millender-	Smith (TX)
Hensarling	McDonald	Smith (WA)
Herger	Miller (FL)	Snyder
Hereth	Miller (MI)	Sodrel
Higgins	Miller (NC)	Solis
Hinojosa	Miller, George	Souder
Hobson	Mollohan	Spratt
Hoekstra	Moore (KS)	Stark
Holden	Moore (WI)	Stearns
Holt	Moran (VA)	Strickland
Honda	Murphy	Stupak
Hooley	Murtha	Sullivan
Hostettler	Musgrave	Sweeney
Hoyer	Myrick	Tancredo
Hulshof	Napolitano	Tanner
Hunter	Neal (MA)	Tauscher
Hyde	Neugebauer	Taylor (MS)
Inglis (SC)	Ney	Taylor (NC)
Inslee	Norwood	Terry
Israel	Nunes	Thomas
Issa	Nussle	Thompson (CA)
Istook	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Thornberry
Jackson-Lee	Oliver	Tiahrt
(TX)	Ortiz	Tiberi
Jefferson	Osborne	Tierney
Jenkins	Oxley	Turner
Johnson (CT)	Pallone	Udall (CO)
Johnson (IL)	Pascrell	Udall (NM)
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor	Upton
Johnson, Sam	Payne	Van Hollen
Jones (NC)	Pearce	Velázquez
Jones (OH)	Pelosi	Visclosky
Kanjorski	Pence	Walden (OR)
Kaptur	Peterson (MN)	Walsh
Keller	Petri	Wamp

Wasserman	Weldon (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Schultz	Weldon (PA)	Wolf
Waters	Weller	Woolsey
Watson	Westmoreland	Wu
Watt	Whitfield	Wynn
Waxman	Wicker	Young (FL)
Weiner	Wilson (NM)	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6

Capuano	Hinchey	Nadler
Clay	McDermott	Owens

NOT VOTING—22

Beauprez	Fossella	Northup
Berman	Gallegly	Paul
Boswell	Hall	Peterson (PA)
Boyd	Jindal	Shadegg
Camp	Kind	Towns
Cunningham	LaHood	Young (AK)
Davis (AL)	Miller, Gary	
Flake	Moran (KS)	

□ 2333

Mr. BOEHLERT and Mr. LINDER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the resolution was not agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in the family, I was unable to vote on H. Res. 571. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I was unable to be present for the vote on final passage of H. Res. 571, the resolution that calls for an immediate withdrawal of our troops from Iraq. I strongly oppose this resolution and its underlying sentiment. Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on H. Res. 571.

PREDISASTER MITIGATION PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4324) to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to reauthorize the predisaster mitigation program, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4324

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Predisaster Mitigation Program Reauthorization Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. PREDISASTER HAZARD MITIGATION.

Section 203(m) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133(m)) is amended by striking "December 31, 2005" and inserting "September 30, 2008".

SEC. 3. STUDY REGARDING COST REDUCTION.

Section 209 of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 5121 note; 114 Stat. 1571) is