during the last year. In each of those occasions, FEMA and the National Flood Insurance Program administrators have been there, paid the claims that they are obligated to pay. The residents of the gulf coast area and region deserve no less.

FEMA is quickly running out of money. The flood insurance program must be able to handle the claims resulting from the catastrophic losses. Historically, whenever the National Flood Insurance Program has borrowed from the Treasury, it has been paid back in full. We need to act to enable this stop-gap measure to cover claims from the gulf coast. We should not think of this as a new obligation. Instead, it is a necessary step to keep a legal promise that Congress has made to homeowners and business owners when Congress passed the National Flood Insurance Act.

We have a moral obligation to honor our commitments, Mr. Speaker, and to provide the coverage we promised to provide, to help victims. They need help to rebuild their homes and their lives. I ask my colleagues for their support and seek adoption of the Senate language in this bill.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise troubled, I must say, by this legislation. I appreciate the chairman's commitment to reform and also the ranking member. They have been steering, I think, a good course with Financial Services, and I am encouraged by their words that we are going to go ahead and attempt to continue the process of reforming the flood insurance program.

But today in signing off on $22 billion that cannot be supported simply by the premiums by the individuals that are covered right now, I personally think is a tremendous lost opportunity.

We heard a lot of rhetoric the last couple of days. People come to the floor talking about how to save taxpayer dollars, but we have not undertaken to make reforms that would protect taxpayers in the first place.

Our colleague from Mississippi has been focusing on the problem with flood insurance not being available to a whole range of people. No expectation they should have it. People behind levees are not required to have flood insurance. We have not dealt with subsidized insurance for areas that are vacation homes, second homes.

I am concerned that there is never really a good time to be able for us to seize this opportunity. While I say I am heartened by what I have heard from the ranking member and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), and certainly they steered a difficult course last time in being able to make some of these incremental achievements, but if there was ever a time that the attention of this Congress should be on the dangers of the way that the program works now and the people that are in harm's way, the opportunity to not just save money but save lives by these reforms.

Nonetheless, I look forward to working with the ranking member and the Chair, and I will do anything in my power, but I would hope the House does not ever again allow something like this to come forward and miss such an opportunity.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman I agree with him this is a lost opportunity, but like the book ''I Lost It At The Movies,'' we lost it at the Senate. So we are doing the best we can.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), who has worked harder in the aftermath of this than I have ever seen any Member work in trying to deal with the desperate situation imposed on the people he represents.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as I speak, one of the greatest legal scams in American history is being perpetrated on the people of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, honest Americans who purchased insurance policies to protect their families in time of a hurricane. They paid their premiums for decades. They are being told one by one ''we are not going to pay your claim.''

See, in a typical insurance policy known as a ''wind policy,'' you would think it would protect you from the 140- to 160-knot breezes of Hurricane Katrina; but somehow buried in that policy is small language that says they are not going to pay for wind-driven water.

Now, for most of us, you would think of wind-driven water as maybe the water driven under the stoop of your door in a rain storm, or if you have an older house like I had, under the windows, maybe get some curtains wet or the sheet rock under that window.

So if the wind blew a tree into your house, you could file a claim. If the wind blew a car into your house, you could file a claim. But if the wind generates a 30-foot wall of water, well, then the American insurance industry en mass is telling those people in Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and the Alabama gulf coast, You're out of luck. We took your money. You're a chump.

Our Nation has a flood insurance policy separate from that where the credibility of this Nation is at stake. I have already told you what I have thought the private sector is doing to my people. But this is us. We also collected people's money in good faith that when there was a flood of their homes that would be paid. We had an unprecedented natural disaster.

Now, two things can happen. We can go the way of the private sector which is doing everything they can to scam my constituents, and please use that word, or we can honor our claims. Because a person or a nation is only as good as its word. Our Nation gave our word that we would pay these claims if substantiated. Those claims have been substantiated. Let us set a precedent that hopefully the insurance industry will follow and pay our claims.

□ 1830

I want to commend Chairman OXLEY. I want to commend Ranking Member FRANK for bringing this to the floor in a timely manner. I very much want to commend the other body for plussing this up so that we can fulfill our obligation as a Nation for those people who had flood insurance policies, that we will pay those claims in a timely manner.

At the same time I want to go on record as saying that I think there ought to be a national registry of child molesters and, at the moment, insurance industry executives because I think Americans ought to know if they live near one.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for my remaining 30 seconds, I want to send a message to FEMA.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON) has called to our attention a delay on the part of FEMA in telling people what elevations are required for new construction or replacement construction in the flooded areas. Until they have those elevations, they cannot proceed with the construction, and the gentleman told me we have been told there is a delay of perhaps up to 2 years. That is clearly unacceptable. So had we been able to bring a substitute bill to the floor, we were going to address that issue.

I hope FEMA will listen. I think I speak for both sides. I know the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) agreed with this when we raised it in committee that FEMA will promptly do the elevations necessary so that construction can proceed.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1957

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) at 7 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 571, EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE THAT DEPLOYMENT OF FORCES IN IRAQ BE TERMINATED IMMEDIATELY

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 109–312) on the resolution (H. Res. 572) providing for consideration of 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 providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 308) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a technical correction in the enrollment of H.R. 3058, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 572 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 572

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 571) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the deployment of United States forces in Iraq be terminated immediately. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

Sec. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 308 is hereby adopted.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, given that the subject of this issue deals with the solemn subject of war, my question is, would I be in order to ask for unanimous consent that each Member of the House be allowed up to 5 minutes to speak his or her conscience on this war-related resolution?

□ 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) for 1 hour. He controls the time. He may yield for a unanimous consent request if he so chooses.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 572 provides for the consideration of House Resolution 571, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the deployment of the United States forces in Iraq be terminated immediately. Section 2 of the rule provides that upon adoption of the rule House Concurrent Resolution 308 is hereby adopted.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, this House, the people's House, stands at a crossroads. In one direction lies the forced retreat and dishonor for our troops who have placed their lives on the line for the defense of this country; and in the other direction, Mr. Speaker, we can stand together as one Nation, as one Congress, in celebration of those who have made an unparalleled commitment to their country.

For this Member of Congress who represents the eleventh district of Georgia, I know which direction I will choose. I know which course I will take. I will stand here tonight with our servicemen and -women who spend their days and nights fighting in the desert of Iraq to secure the freedom of a new democracy. Their Nation called them to arms. Their Nation called upon them for help in time of war. And, Mr. Speaker, they answered that call. They departed their country. They left their homes, their families to fight a war on foreign soil against an enemy that despises everything they and everything their country stands for.

They went to fight a tyrant by the name of Saddam Hussein who had murdered his own people, sought to conquer the Middle East for his own empire, and would have sought the destruction of the West and the values that we hold so dear. This tyrant was and is an enemy of liberty, and he had to be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, nightly on the floor of this House, some Members imply that the President misled our Nation, and they demand an immediate withdrawal of troops from Iraq, ceding victory to the enemy. And now we have to answer the call of those who would besmirch their mission, who would besmirch their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I stand prepared, along with my colleagues, to debate this rule and the underlying resolution.

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

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the speed with which the majority has sought to challenge the frank and honest appraisal of the war in Iraq offered yesterday by my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), proves that what he said resonated with the American people.

Over 60 percent of our Nation no longer believes that we are headed in the right direction in Iraq. When Mr. MURTHA spoke yesterday, he spoke for the majority of our country. Concerns such as those voiced by Mr. MURTHA are not a sign of weakness, nor are they the product of a failure of resolve or willingness to cower before adversity as many administration apologists have suggested.

Rather, they follow from a logical assessment of one of the most respected military affairs in international relations experts that we have in all of these United States, and that is exactly what has this congressional leadership and this White House so concerned.

That is why they have gone out of their way in the last 24 hours to attack the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA). It amounts to nothing more than another swift boat attack on an American hero.

After all, attacking those who have the temerity to challenge this White House is what Republicans in Congress do best. But they have chosen a formidable target in JACK MURTHA.

Unlike our President, our Vice President, our Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State or the vast, vast majority of the Members in this House, JACK MURTHA knows combat. At the age of 34, he did not have to go and fight in Vietnam, but he did. He is a decorated veteran and an American hero at a time when many others were shirking any possibility of going to Vietnam.

He knows our troops and he cares for them deeply and he has regularly visited them in the hospitals. There he has seen their wounds. He has stood by them during their time of need and listened to their hopes and fears. He has been to Iraq and seen the state of the nation with his own eyes. He is a true patriot and wants only the success of the United States and the Iraqi people, and that is why he spoke with such passion yesterday.

Representative MURTHA spoke for the American people when he said that the time has come for a change in direction, and everyone in this Chamber knows that because JACK MURTHA is one of the most widely respected Members in this House. No matter the attack that this majority chooses to employ against those who would question them, the reality on the ground is obvious to all who wish to see it.

America's continued military occupation of that nation will not bring stability. Our forces are drawing fire, not suppressing it; and their presence on foreign soil is serving as a catalyst for all of those who wish to do us and Iraq harm. Insurgent attacks are on the rise, and more American and Iraqi lives are lost every single day. We can no longer continue on this failing path, unwavering with no end in sight.

We can no longer ask Americans and Iraqis to give up their lives for a goal which we are making less sustainable by the hour. We must chart a new course.

Mr. MURTHA's redeployment plan comes from an experienced statesman and soldier who has and will continue to do whatever he thinks is best for this Nation.

I implore my colleagues across this aisle to realize that continued Republican attacks which seek to dismiss and to discredit the valuable critiques

of knowledgeable legislators, as well as the heartfelt will of the American people, will succeed in silencing neither. Nor will they change the reality on the ground in Iraq.

More Republican assaults will not hide the gross management and corruption which has plagued the administration's attempt to prosecute the war, and they will not mollify America's growing concerns over flawed intelligence, broken trust, subverted values, and shameful acts of torture, all forced by the hand of an administration that answers in half-truths and obfuscations.

These cynical and all-too-typical Republican attempts to silence dissension, stifle debate, and discredit those who would dare to hold them accountable will only serve to elevate the power of the message that Mr. MURTHA is delivering to this government and to the American people and to our troops. The Republicans today by attacking him succeed only in betraying themselves.

The dramatic nature of their panicked response has clearly demonstrated how incredibly valued Mr. MURTHA's judgement is to military experts at the Pentagon, to Members of Congress, and to the American intelligence community.

And the strangest thing that I shall ever see is the people who believed that they were rewriting Mr. MURTHA's resolution. Mr. MURTHA, with a reasoned withdrawal, had nothing even remotely like the resolution we are debating this evening, which is the Republican resolution written by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) which calls for the immediate withdrawal of the troops in Iraq.

I believe they have got some explaining to do.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in strong opposition to the underlying resolution.

I too am a Vietnam veteran. I flew 116 combat missions in B–52s in Vietnam, and I was deeply troubled to hear my colleague from Pennsylvania, a fellow Vietnam veteran, yesterday call for the immediate withdrawal of our troops from Iraq. It brought to my mind the outrage that I and so many of my fellow veterans felt so many years ago as a young Air Force officer in Vietnam when we would hear the politicians in Washington undermining the war effort for political purposes.

For the past few weeks, much of the criticism of the war in Iraq, Mr. Speaker, has been nothing more than an attempt to undermine our Commander in Chief. Unfortunately, this comes at the expense of our troops in the field. How do you think this call to immediately withdraw will affect our brave soldiers fighting on the ground overseas and their families at home awaiting their return?

I will just say it is demoralizing and insulting to them. It emboldens the terrorists.

We should not misrepresent the mission in Iraq. Our troops are not occupiers. They are liberators. They are there serving the cause of freedom and freedom is not free. It is costly.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and opposition to the underlying resolution.

I am a Vietnam veteran. I flew 116 combat missions in B–52's in Vietnam. I was deeply troubled to hear my colleague from Pennsylvania, a fellow Vietnam veteran, yesterday call for our immediate withdrawal from Iraq.

It brought to mind the outrage I, and so many of my fellow veterans, felt so many years ago, as a young Air Force Officer in Vietnam, when we would hear the politicians in Washington undermining the war effort for political purposes.

For the past few weeks, much of the criticism of the war in Iraq, Mr. Speaker, has been nothing more than an attempt to undermine our Commander in Chief.

Unfortunately, this comes at the expense of our troops in the field.

How do you think this call to immediately withdraw will affect our brave soldiers fighting on the ground overseas and their families at home awaiting their return? It is demoralizing and insulting to them.

And what do you think such comments like those made yesterday do for our terrorist enemies in Iraq? It emboldens them and puts our troops at greater risk, Mr. Speaker.

How dare some of my colleagues on the left misrepresent our mission in Iraq. They call our troops occupiers rather than liberators, and it seems they're more interested in demonizing Bush than defeating terrorists and defending freedom.

History has some lessons to teach us. One is written in words on the mall. It says "freedom is not free."

While we respect those who disagree with us and who may even protest, we should always remember that our freedoms were not won with poster paint. They were won by the blood of patriots.

Winning and protecting freedom is costly. That's what our troops are doing in Iraq.

As a combat veteran who served in an unpopular conflict during another painful time in our history, I can tell you that our troops will always remember which politicians supported them, and which undermined their efforts.

Walking away from Iraq before the job is done would be surrendering Iraq to terrorism and an incredible insult to the many brave men and women who have sacrificed so much.

If the war against terrorism is lost, it will not be lost by our magnificent troops on the battlefield. It will be lost right here at home in the halls of Congress by politicians who lose their resolve.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

In the rush to the floor, the resolution before us, any country lawyer across the country could say it is flawed in the way it is written. It makes no reference whatsoever to the redeployment. It is a sad mistake when you rush to judgment to get something to the floor.

One thing that really concerns me a great deal is our friend, our colleague, the recipient of the Bronze Star, two Purple Hearts from Vietnam, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) being attacked as he has.

I remember in 1978 Congressman Sonny Montgomery who led a group of us to Vietnam to bring back remains of those who had died in combat. I remember the reverence with which the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) treated those 14 coffins of his former colleagues who were killed in action in Vietnam.

I have seen in the 29 years I have been in Congress his supporting our troops, supporting under the Constitution our duty to raise and maintain those wonderful young people who protect our freedoms. He has a resolution. He introduced it. He represents the people of Pennsylvania.

I admire his assessment of the war. We disagree on the outcome. I have a proposal myself. I sent a letter to the President on October 20 setting forth, the only person that has set a formula, for three Iraqi brigades of level number one, one American brigade may be redeployed.

It is interesting to note that there has been no hearing on this resolution, no hearing on similar issues that are of utmost importance to our country. Now, though mistakes have been made, and they have, such as allowing the looting and disbanding the Iraqi Army rather than giving them a pick and shovel and a small paycheck, and as a result many of them became insurgents against the Americans, no one here as spoken of the success that is needed in Iraq.

If we are not successful, if the Iraqi military is not successful, Iraq will be a snake pit for terrorists, every bit as bad as the Taliban had in Afghanistan, and lo and behold the problems it may raise in stability for Jordan and Saudi Arabia. It is important that we have success.

But it is also important that we have fair and full debate. It is important that we have hearings in the Committee on Armed Services on issues such as this, which we have not had. Hearings yes, but not on the war issues as we need them discussed in a full hearing with proper witnesses as we can ask questions of them.

At least, Mr. Speaker, let me say that we have wonderful young people in uniform representing us in Iraq and Afghanistan and across the globe. I am so proud of them. I am so proud of what they do in bringing the fight to a successful conclusion.

And the issue of redeployment, whether I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) or not, and I do not, because my formula

I think is the best and I have had positive results in my home State with positive unsolicited newspaper articles saying that it was a good and reasonable method of redeployment, we must do our best to have success there and proper redeployment of our troops from Iraq.

□ 2015

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, H. Res. 572, and we have talked a lot about exit strategy, about withdrawal. If I can say one thing tonight, Mr. Speaker, I want to say do not believe all the crap that you see on the TV. Do not believe all the crap that you hear in the news.

I have had an opportunity to go to Iraq. I have seen the soldiers. I have seen the leaders. I have seen the people, and I look at the faces out here tonight, Mr. Speaker, and the faces that I see, the biggest majority, are not the faces like myself, gray-haired and receding hairline.

They are 18- and 19- and 20-year-old heroes a couple of years older than my oldest son; soldiers that are getting on Blackhawks with faces painted and M–16s getting ready to go on a mission at 120 knots above the tree level, 18- and 19- and 20-year-old heroes; soldiers that are kicking in doors with NVGs, and scared to death, but they are rooting out terrorists, 18- and 19- and 20-year-old heroes; guys that are humping rucks. They are tired, and they are cold, and they miss their mama and their wife and their family and everything they know and everything they love, 18- and 19- and 20-year-old heroes.

When I was sworn in as a United States Congressman, I raised my right hand, put my left hand on the Bible and said I would support and defend the Constitution of the United States. I will support and defend this country. I will support and defend my soldiers. As long as I am a United States Congressman, I will not cut and run on the people of Iraq. I will not cut and run on the soldiers fighting the battle. I will not cut and run on the United States of America.

Let us not talk about an exit strategy. Let us talk about freedom. Let us talk about democracy. Let us talk about victory.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak on behalf of the 42 members of the Congressional Black Caucus. By doing so, we wish to make clear positions the Congressional Black Caucus has consistently taken from before the time the war in Iraq commenced and to put those positions in the RECORD. Our votes tonight will not be misinterpreted or mischaracterized.

As early as July 27, 2005, the top United States commander in Iraq stated that a transition of U.S. troops from Iraq could begin as early as this spring. Iraq's interim Prime Minister echoed General Casey's sentiments and added that ''the time has arrived to plan a coordinated transition from American to Iraqi military control throughout the country.''

The members of the Congressional Black Caucus reaffirm our Statement of Principles as to War against Iraq, issued in October 2002, which I would place in the RECORD at this point.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES AS TO WAR AGAINST IRAQ, OCTOBER 2002

We oppose a unilateral, first-strike action by the United States without a clearly demonstrated and imminent threat of attack on the United States.

Only Congress has the authority to declare war.

Every conceivable diplomatic option must be exhausted.

A unilateral first strike would undermine the moral authority of the United States, destabilize the Middle East region and undermine the ability of our Nation to address unmet domestic priorities.

Further, any post-strike plan for maintaining stability in the region would be costly and require a long-term commitment.

Mr. Speaker, we reaffirm our Further Statement of Principles as to President's Request for Appropriations for Efforts in Iraq issued in September 2003, which I ask to insert into the RECORD at this point.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS FURTHER STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES AS TO PRESIDENT'S REQUEST FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR EFFORTS IN IRAQ, SEPTEMBER 2003

In October 2002, before the President made the decision to proceed to war, the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) issued a ''Statement of Principles as to the War Against Iraq.''

In light of the President's request for $87 billion to pursue continuing operations in Iraq, the CBC believes that it is desirable to issue these Further Principles that will guide our evaluation of the President's request for additional funding:

1. We reaffirm our Statement of Principles issued in October 2002 (copy attached).

2. Despite the President's failure to follow our original Statement of Principles in his decisions leading to the war, we express our full resolve to support and protect our troops and their families.

3. The Administration should provide an accounting of all funds expended to date that were previously appropriated by the Congress, including details about all contracts for work in or related to Iraq.

4. The President should provide sufficient details about how the proposed funding will be spent to enable Congress and its Committees to evaluate separately funding proposed for the protection and maintenance of our troops and funding proposed for rebuilding Iraq. Congress should vote on these funding proposals separately.

5. The President should provide full details about how the efforts will be paid for, including a full accounting of Iraqi resources (recovered and anticipated) and how the President proposes to use those resources to reduce or reimburse the U.S. obligation.

6. The President should provide full details about the future obligations of the United States (personnel, funding and decision making) and about how responsibility and authority for these obligations will be shared with the United Nations and/or other nations going forward.

7. The Administration should provide to Congress full details of information relied on by the President in his decision to go to war.

8. The President should provide details of the criteria he will expect to be met before bringing U.S. troops home and of his exit strategy.

The members of the Congressional Black Caucus further urge President Bush to end the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces in Iraq expeditiously by submitting to Congress a detailed plan to withdraw U.S. forces from Iraq and redeploy those forces at the earliest practicable date;

To accelerate the training of Iraqi security forces to prepare them to accept full responsibility for maintaining internal security in Iraq and transfer responsibility for internal security to the Iraqi Government;

To incorporate the United Nations and other international organizations in the transition and reconstruction process;

To pursue security and stability in Iraq through diplomatic and economic means;

To assure that there will be no permanent military bases in Iraq;

And to ensure full support of our military families and our veterans, particularly with respect to service benefits and health care.

Our vote tonight, our votes, 42 of us, will not be misinterpreted and not be mischaracterized. This is our position. We have submitted it for the RECORD. That is what we stand on, and that is what we say to this House and to the President of the United States of America.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART), the distinguished vice chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Sometimes subtleties are lost, especially when we are dealing with very difficult, critical issues, such as war and peace, and unfortunately, the message has gone out quite clearly to the world press, as recorded throughout the world today by the media, that there is a serious diminution in support for the mission that the United States of America is engaged in in Iraq here in Congress.

So I think that this resolution today is very important to eliminate any confusion that may exist by virtue of a very clear message that has spread around the world today of a serious diminution of the mission of our troops, and that this resolution will clear up that confusion.

Let us say very clearly with this resolution, with the overwhelming defeat of the message of diminution of support, that we stand with the troops and that we stand with the mission of the troops; of being in Iraq until there is a

stable, democratic government there. That is critical for the security not only of the Iraqi people, but of all of the neighborhood in that area and of the United States.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from New York for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, bringing this resolution to the floor this evening, it is not about the withdrawal of our troops from Iraq. It is about the Republicans playing politics and questioning the patriotism of one of Congress' most decorated veterans.

The Republicans are doing what they do best, creating a smoke screen to hide the fact that this administration has misled our country into war.

This resolution was rushed to the floor in the Republicans' hopes of dividing Democrats, but unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, what it has proven to be is a device to divide Americans.

I will not stand here and let Republicans question the patriotism of Mr. MURTHA or any Democrat.

In America, it is not unpatriotic to question a war in which almost 2,100 Americans have lost their lives and some 25,000 Americans have been gravely injured.

When a mother who has lost her son camps out in Crawford, Texas, wanting only to speak to the President, she was called unpatriotic. When a POW GOP Senator offered an amendment to ban the use of torture, he was called unpatriotic. Now, when one of the most decorated veterans in America questions the planning and the direction of this war, what is he called? Unpatriotic.

I do not believe the Republican Caucus is unpatriotic, but I do believe this evening they are pathetic. Our country demands answers about how to win this war and to get our troops home safely.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, what we have before us tonight is not an attack on any one Member. It is not about politics, but it is about whether or not you support our troops who are in harm's way.

When I was in Iraq, I will never forget a nurse coming up to me in a hospital that had been pretty darn damaged and neglected by Saddam Hussein, and she said, please do not leave. I thought she was talking about me not leaving the hospital, and I said to her, I have to go. She said, no, I do not mean you; I want your troops to stay until our country is safe, until our country is secure. I will never forget that woman.

That message has been relayed time and time again from the troops who come home, who say we cannot leave prematurely. We do have an exit strategy. It is when the Iraqi people can control their own country. When the Iraqi people stand up, we will stand down. That nurse I will never disappoint.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I spent 3 years making the case against the war in Iraq, working with other Members leading a nationwide opposition to the war, developing an exit strategy once we got in, working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle on plans to withdraw from Iraq, to bring our troops home, but I will vote against this resolution because it is a fraud.

What more does anyone need to know but that the sponsor himself has called for defeat of his own proposition? If his real intention is to bring the troops home right now, why would he vote against his own resolution?

Wake up, America. The American people are fed up with politicians who say one thing and do another. Everyone of conscience and intelligence knows the magnitude of withdrawing 150,000 troops requires a plan.

The American people deserve a real debate on Iraq. Where are the WMDs? Where is Osama bin Laden? What did Iraq have to do with 9/11?

This Congress, which is a coequal branch of government, which has the war power, has the oversight responsibility and has a moral obligation to find out why almost everything of significance we were told about the war turned out to be false. Instead, those who raise questions have their military service or their honor impugned.

They took JOHN KERRY on a swift boat. We are not going to let them take JACK MURTHA on a swift boat, nor are the American people. We have to stand up and expose the fakery when we see it.

ANALYSIS OF JOINT RESOLUTION ON IRAQ BY DENNIS J. KUCINICH

The following is an analysis of the resolution which took America to war in Iraq.

October 2, 2002. Whereas in 1990 in response to Iraq's war of aggression against an illegal occupation of Kuwait, the United States forged a coalition of nations to liberate Kuwait and its people in order to defend the national security of the United States and enforce United Nations Security Council resolutions relating to Iraq;

Key issue: In the Persian Gulf war there was an international coalition. World support was for protecting Kuwait. There is no world support for invading Iraq.

Whereas after the liberation of Kuwait in 1991, Iraq entered into a United Nations sponsored cease-fire agreement pursuant to which Iraq unequivocally agreed, among other things, to eliminate its nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons programs and the means to deliver and develop them, and to end its support for international terrorism;

Whereas the efforts of international weapons inspectors, United States intelligence agencies, and Iraqi defectors led to the discovery that Iraq had large stockpiles of chemical weapons and a large scale biological weapons program, and that Iraq had an advanced nuclear weapons development program that was much closer to producing a nuclear weapon than intelligence reporting had previously indicated;

Key issue: UN inspection teams identified and destroyed nearly all such weapons. A lead inspector, Scott Ritter, said that he believes that nearly all other weapons not found were destroyed in the Gulf War. Furthermore, according to a published report in the Washington Post, the Central Intelligence Agency has no up to date accurate report on Iraq's WMD capabilities.

Whereas Iraq, in direct and flagrant violation of the cease-fire, attempted to thwart the efforts of weapons inspectors to identify and destroy Iraq's weapons of mass destruction stockpiles and development capabilities, which finally resulted in the withdrawal of inspectors from Iraq on October 31, 1998;

Key issues: Iraqi deceptions always failed. The inspectors always figured out what Iraq was doing. It was the United States that withdrew from the inspections in 1998. And the United States then launched a cruise missile attack against Iraq 48 hours after the inspectors left. In advance of a military strike, the U.S. continues to thwart (the Administration's word) weapons inspections.

Whereas in 1998 Congress concluded that Iraq's continuing weapons of mass destruction programs threatened vital United States interests and international peace and security, declared Iraq to be in ''material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations'' and urged the President ''to take appropriate action, in accordance with the Constitution and relevant laws of the United States, to bring Iraq into compliance with its international obligations'' (Public Law 105–235);

Whereas Iraq both poses a continuing threat to the national security of the United States and international peace and security in the Persian Gulf region and remains in material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations by, among other things, continuing to possess and develop a significant chemical and biological weapons capability, actively seeking a nuclear weapons capability, and supporting and harboring terrorist organizations;

Key issues: There is no proof that Iraq represents an imminent or immediate threat to the United States. A ''continuing'' threat does not constitute a sufficient cause for war. The Administration has refused to provide the Congress with credible intelligence that proves that Iraq is a serious threat to the United States and is continuing to possess and develop chemical and biological and nuclear weapons. Furthermore there is no credible intelligence connecting Iraq to Al Qaida and 9/11.

Whereas Iraq persists in violating resolutions of the United Nations Security Council by continuing to engage in brutal repression of its civilian population thereby threatening international peace and security in the region, by refusing to release, repatriate, or account for non-Iraqi citizens wrongfully detained by Iraq, including an American serviceman, and by failing to return property wrongfully seized by Iraq from Kuwait;

Key issues: This language is so broad that it would allow the President to order an attack against Iraq even when there is no material threat to the United States. Since this resolution authorizes the use of force for all Iraq related violations of the UN Security Council directives, and since the resolution cites Iraq's imprisonment of non-Iraqi prisoners, this resolution would authorize the President to attack Iraq in order to liberate Kuwaiti citizens who may or may not be in Iraqi prisons, even if Iraq met compliance with all requests to destroy any weapons of

mass destruction. Though in 2002 at the Arab Summit, Iraq and Kuwait agreed to bilateral negotiations to work out all claims relating to stolen property and prisoners of war. This use-of-force resolution enables the President to commit U.S. troops to recover Kuwaiti property.

Whereas the current Iraqi regime has demonstrated its capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction against other nations and its own people;

Whereas the current Iraqi regime has demonstrated its continuing hostility toward, and willingness to attack, the United States, including by attempting in 1993 to assassinate former President Bush and by firing on many thousands of occasions on United States and Coalition Armed Forces engaged in enforcing the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council;

Key issue: The Iraqi regime has never attacked nor does it have the capability to attack the United States. The ''no fly'' zone was not the result of a UN Security Council directive. It was illegally imposed by the United States, Great Britain and France and is not specifically sanctioned by any Security Council resolution.

Whereas members of al Qaida, an organization bearing responsibility for attacks on the United States, its citizens, and interests, including the attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, are known to be in Iraq;

Key issue: There is no credible intelligence that connects Iraq to the events of 9/11 or to participation in those events by assisting Al Qaida.

Whereas Iraq continues to aid and harbor other international terrorist organizations, including organizations that threaten the lives and safety of American citizens;

Key issue: Any connection between Iraq support of terrorist groups in Middle East, is an argument for focusing great resources on resolving the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. It is not sufficient reason for the U.S. to launch a unilateral preemptive strike against Iraq.

Whereas the attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001 underscored the gravity of the threat posed by the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction by international terrorist organizations;

Key issue: There is no connection between Iraq and the events of 9/11.

Whereas Iraq's demonstrated capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction, the risk that the current Iraqi regime will either employ those weapons to launch a surprise attack against the United States or its Armed Forces or provide them to international terrorists who would do so, and the extreme magnitude of harm that would result to the United States and its citizens from such an attack, combine to justify action by the United States to defend itself;

Key issue: There is no credible evidence that Iraq possesses weapons of mass destruction. If Iraq has successfully concealed the production of such weapons since 1998, there is no credible evidence that Iraq has the capability to reach the United States with such weapons. In the 1991 Gulf War, Iraq had a demonstrated capability of biological and chemical weapons, but did not have the willingness to use them against the United States Armed Forces. Congress has not been provided with any credible information, which proves that Iraq has provided international terrorists with weapons of mass destruction.

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 678 authorizes the use of all necessary means to enforce United Nations Security Council Resolution 660 and subsequent relevant resolutions and to compel Iraq to cease certain activities that threaten international peace and security, including the development of weapons of mass destruction and refusal or obstruction of United Nations weapons inspections in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687, repression of its civilian population in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 688, and threatening its neighbors or United Nations operations in Iraq in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 949;

Key issue: The UN Charter forbids all member nations, including the United States, from unilaterally enforcing UN resolutions.

Whereas Congress in the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102–1) has authorized the President ''to use United States Armed Forces pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 678 (1990) in order to achieve implementation of Security Council Resolutions 660, 661, 662, 664, 665, 666, 667, 669, 670, 674, and 677'';

Key issue: The UN Charter forbids all member nations, including the United States, from unilaterally enforcing UN resolutions with military force.

Whereas in December 1991, Congress expressed its sense that it ''supports the use of all necessary means to achieve the goals of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 as being consistent with the Authorization of Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102–1), '' that Iraq's repression of its civilian population violates United Nations Security Council Resolution 688 and ''constitutes a continuing threat to the peace, security, and stability of the Persian Gulf region,'' and that Congress, ''supports the use of all necessary means to achieve the goals of United Nations Security Council Resolution 688'';

Key issue: This clause demonstrates the proper chronology of the international process, and contrasts the current march to war. In 1991, the UN Security Council passed a resolution asking for enforcement of its resolution. Member countries authorized their troops to participate in a UN-led coalition to enforce the UN resolutions. Now the President is asking Congress to authorize a unilateral first strike before the UN Security Council has asked its member states to enforce UN resolutions.

Whereas the Iraq Liberation Act (Public Law 105–338) expressed the sense of Congress that it should be the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove from power the current Iraqi regime and promote the emergence of a democratic government to replace that regime;

Key issue: This ''Sense of Congress'' resolution was not binding. Furthermore, while Congress supported democratic means of removing Saddam Hussein it clearly did not endorse the use of force contemplated in this resolution, nor did it endorse assassination as a policy.

Whereas on September 12, 2002, President Bush committed the United States to ''work with the United Nations Security Council to meet our common challenge'' posed by Iraq and to ''work for the necessary resolutions,'' while also making clear that ''the Security Council resolutions will be enforced, and the just demands of peace and security will be met, or action will be unavoidable'';

Whereas the United States is determined to prosecute the war on terrorism and Iraq's ongoing support for international terrorist groups combined with its development of weapons of mass destruction in direct violation of its obligations under the 1991 ceasefire and other United Nations Security Council resolutions make clear that it is in the national security interests of the United States and in furtherance of the war on terrorism that all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions be enforced, including through the use of force if necessary;

Key issue: Unilateral action against Iraq will cost the United States the support of the world community, adversely affecting the war on terrorism. No credible intelligence exists which connects Iraq to the events of 9/11 or to those terrorists who perpetrated 9/11. Under international law, the United States does not have the authority to unilaterally order military action to enforce UN Security Council resolutions.

Whereas Congress has taken steps to pursue vigorously the war on terrorism through the provision of authorities and funding requested by the President to take the necessary actions against international terrorists and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations or persons who planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001 or harbored such persons or organizations;

Key issue: The Administration has not provided Congress with any proof that Iraq is in any way connected to the events of 9/11.

Whereas the President and Congress are determined to continue to take all appropriate actions against international terrorists and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations or persons who planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such persons or organizations;

Key issue: The Administration has not provided Congress with any proof that Iraq is in any way connected to the events of 9/11. Furthermore, there is no credible evidence that Iraq has harbored those who were responsible for planning, authorizing or committing the attacks of 9/11.

Whereas the President has authority under the Constitution to take action in order to deter and prevent acts of international terrorism against the United States, as Congress recognized in the joint resolution on Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40); and

Key issue: This resolution was specific to 9/11. It was limited to a response to 9/11.

Whereas it is in the national security of the United States to restore international peace and security to the Persian Gulf region;

Key issue: If by the ''national security interests'' of the United States, the Administration means oil, it ought to communicate such to the Congress. A unilateral attack on Iraq by the United States will cause instability and chaos in the region and sow the seeds of future conflicts all other the world.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This joint resolution may be cited as the ''*Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq*''.

SEC. 2. SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS

The Congress of the United States supports the efforts by the President to—

(a) strictly enforce through the United Nations Security Council all relevant Security Council resolutions applicable to Iraq and encourages him in those efforts; and

(b) obtain prompt and decisive action by the Security Council to ensure that Iraq abandons its strategy of delay, evasion and noncompliance and promptly and strictly complies with all relevant Security Council resolutions.

Key issue: Congress can and should support this clause. However Section 3 (which follows) undermines the effectiveness of this

section. Any peaceful settlement requires Iraq compliance. The totality of this resolution indicates the Administration will wage war against Iraq no matter what. This undermines negotiations.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

AUTHORIZATION.—The President is authorized to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in order to—

(1) defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq; and

(2) enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council Resolutions regarding Iraq.

Key issue: This clause is substantially similar to the authorization that the President originally sought.

It gives authority to the President to act prior to and even without a UN resolution, and it authorizes the President to use U.S. troops to enforce UN resolutions even without UN request for it. This is a violation of Chapter VII of the UN Charter, which reserves the ability to authorize force for that purpose to the Security Council, alone.

Under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, ''The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace . . . and shall make recommendations to maintain or restore international peace and security.'' (Article 39). Only the Security Council can decide that military force would be necessary, ''The Security Council may decide what measures . . . are to be employed to give effect to its decisions (Article 41) . . . [and] it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.'' (Article 43). Furthermore, the resolution authorizes use of force illegally, since the UN Security Council has not requested it. According to the UN Charter, members of the UN, such as the US, are required to ''make available to the Security Council, *on its call* and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces . . .'' (Article 43, emphasis added). The UN Security Council has not called upon its members to use military force against Iraq at the current time.

Furthermore, changes to the language of the previous use-of-force resolution, drafted by the White House and objected to by many members of Congress, are cosmetic:

In section (1), the word ''continuing'' was added to ''the threat posed by Iraq''.

In section (2), the word ''relevant'' is added to ''United Nations Security Council Resolutions'' and the words ''regarding ''Iraq'' were added to the end.

While these changes are represented as a compromise or a new material development, the effects of this resolution are largely the same as the previous White House proposal.

The UN resolutions, which could be cited by the President to justify sending U.S. troops to Iraq, go far beyond addressing weapons of mass destruction. These could include, at the President's discretion, such ''relevant'' resolutions ''regarding Iraq'' including resolutions to enforce human rights and the recovery of Kuwaiti property.

PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION.—

In connection with the exercise of the authority granted in subsection (a) to use force the President shall, prior to such exercise or as soon there after as may be feasible, but no later than 48 hours after exercising such authority, make available to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate his determination that—

(1) reliance by the United States on further diplomatic or other peaceful means alone either (A) will not adequately protect the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq or (B) is not likely to lead to enforcement of all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq, and

(2) acting pursuant to this resolution is consistent with the United States and other countries continuing to take the necessary actions against international terrorists and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations or persons who planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorists attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001.

(c) WAR POWERS RESOLUTION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) SPECIFIC STATUTORY AUTHORIZATION.—Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution, the Congress declares that this section is intended to constitute specific statutory authorization within the meaning of section 5 (b) of the War Powers Resolution.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this resolution supersedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution.

SEC. 4. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) The President shall, at least once every 60 days, submit to the Congress a report on matters relevant to this joint resolution, including actions taken pursuant to the exercise of authority granted in section 2 and the status of planning for efforts that are expected to be required after such actions are completed, including those actions described in section 7 of Public Law 105–338 (the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998).

(b) To the extent that the submission of any report described in subsection (a) coincides with the submission of any other report on matters relevant to this joint resolution otherwise required to be submitted to Congress pursuant to the reporting requirements of Public Law 93–148 (the War Powers Resolution), all such reports may be submitted as a single consolidated report to the Congress.

(c) To the extent that the information required by section 3 of Public Law 102–1 is included in the report required by this section, such report shall be considered as meeting the requirements of section 3 of Public Law 102–1.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, since the start of Operation Iraqi Freedom, the goal of this Nation has been the same, to topple the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein and to bring freedom to the Iraqi people.

Our coalition forces were successful in bringing down Saddam, and today he is facing the justice of the Iraqi people in a country that is beginning to understand and to live under the rule of law, not the rule of a barbaric and brutal dictator.

Today the people of Iraq have elected an interim government that drafted a Constitution, subsequently approved by the Iraqi people, and on December 15 they will again go to the polls to elect a permanent Parliament. None of this could have been achieved without the sacrifice of the brave men and women who serve in our armed services.

While we have been working to establish a democratic government, we have also been working to reestablish the Iraqi Army and security forces, and when the Iraqi forces are ready, our troops will come home, their mission accomplished.

The question before the Congress today is shall we pull our troops out now before their mission is complete. Let us examine just for a second the consequences of such action.

If our forces leave now, we would empower terrorists such as Zarqawi to spread violence against innocent civilians, unchecked. Iraq could then devolve into anarchy and become a base of terror operations. That is the question, and that is the risk, and I believe we must fight the terrorists at the heart of their power, not in the streets of America.

Mr. Speaker, many of the same Members who voted in 2002 to support this effort now say that the President misled them. If they actually believe such an outrageous allegation, why did the President not just simply plant weapons of mass destruction in Iraq while he was at it? This whole train of thought is absolutely nuts. They just looked at the same intelligence, and they cannot simply rewrite history.

Mr. Speaker, with our assistance Iraq is making remarkable progress, and when our American forces do come home, they will come home as heroes, and our Nation will be more secure. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I represent over 40,000 patriotic Americans who have served in Iraq. Over 200 Army soldiers have given their lives there. I revere them, their service and their sacrifice, and that is exactly why I believe a vote on war is the single most solemn responsibility we ever have as a Member of Congress.

□ 2030

Yet tonight the House leadership, on a partisan basis, has given each Member of Congress on average 7.8 seconds. That is right, 7.8 seconds to speak his or her conscience on whether or not we should keep or remove our troops from Iraq.

This process, especially without a single hearing, a single witness, on a resolution just introduced a few hours ago, does a disservice to the enormity of the issue of war and peace before us, to the integrity of this House, and to the sacrifice of our servicemen and -women now in harm's way.

In 1991, when this House debated whether to go to war in Iraq, and I was in that debate, Speaker Foley gave each Member of the House 5 minutes, and the country was mesmerized by the voices of conscience on each side. What was the result? When the vote was cast, the country was united and the troops I represented knew their Nation was behind them.

But this partisan process tonight does a disservice to our troops. It divides our Nation, and it divides this

Congress. If we are going to debate the issue, the solemn issue of war and peace, let us do it the right way. Vote ''no'' on this resolution and let every Member of the House have the right to voice his or her conscience.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI), a proud veteran.

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time.

I want to be honest with a lot of people in this House. My father served this Nation for 34 years. He has been friends with JACK MURTHA for 20 years. Our families have known each other for over 20 years.

JACK MURTHA's resolution calls for a redeployment. Jack Murtha's Web site talks about redeployment. DUNCAN HUNTER's resolution talks about immediate withdrawal. They are two separate issues. Both men do not impugn each other's character.

The media may have taken Mr. MURTHA's idea and spun it into immediate withdrawal, and that message may not be the message that our troops need to hear from this Congress. We need to be straight, and we need to be honest with each other.

Leading up to this, there have been individuals who have come down here and have been insightful. We have got some tough guys in the House who want to say that this President manipulated prewar intelligence. Sandy Berger said, Saddam Hussein will use his weapons of mass destruction and he will use them again probably 10 times. Madeleine Albright said, He jeopardizes stability in the region with weapons of mass destruction. The WMD Commission said they found no evidence of manipulation, and the 9/11 Commission said they found no evidence of manipulation. Those are facts.

JACK MURTHA is a great man and a patriot. DUNCAN HUNTER wants to send a message to our troops that says we are not saying we have to immediately withdraw. We need to come back after Thanksgiving, we need to think about it and go through what our strategy is in Iraq to best protect our boys and girls and to bring peace and stability to the region. And it needs to be thoughtful.

But tough guys coming down here saying that this President manipulated evidence is a bald-faced deception.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, in the last week, two Vietnam veterans, one Democrat, one Republican, one in the House, one in the Senate, came to the same conclusion: the present course is not succeeding and is not working. Both have different solutions and different recommendations. Senator HAGEL has his. Congressman MURTHA has his. Senator MCCAIN has his. Congressman SKELTON has his. But what all of them have in common is that the present course is not succeeding. Doing more of the same and expecting a different result is failing our troops and failing our country.

These policies and the policies the President has are not succeeding. But the reason each of these men has come forward with a recommendation is because all we are offered is more of the same. It is a policy void of leading us to a strategy of success and victory and departure. This is not a discussion about relitigating the past. It is a debate about how we succeed and exit, not about how we got in, but how we get out with victory.

Now, I would think that after a series of the last 2½ years, what we can be criticized for here in this House is not for raising questions but for not having raised questions. We have given the administration an appropriated $450 billion, everything they have asked for. They have gotten everything from this Congress. Our role is to appropriate. We have appropriated. What we have not done is ask the questions, and we deserve criticism for not having had oversight, not having asked questions. That is where the fault lies in this House, because we did not ask the questions.

What do we have? We appropriated $450 billion, 2,000 troops in Iraq, 200 or more in Afghanistan, 15,000 fellow citizens wounded, and we have a single Iraqi battalion to show for it?

We have a job to ask the questions in oversight. We abdicated our response. This is a course tonight to begin to ask and to begin debate because for 2½ years this Congress was silent in its role and the American people have asked us and demanded of us to speak up to the responsibility in our sworn oath and responsibilities.

Whether it is Kevlar vests; whether it is Humvees; whether it is the Secretary of Defense, who originally said only 75,000 troops were needed; whether it was the Deputy Secretary of Defense, who said this would be 7 days and a short war, our men and women deserve a policy of success and victory and exit so they can come home to their families. And tonight we are having, finally, some debate, but we also need an overture of our responsibility and some oversight of what goes on. After $450 billion, 2,000 American lives, we have a responsibility.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am here in the role of a parent. I am very proud that my oldest son served in the field artillery of the Army National Guard for a year in Iraq. He saw the progress of building a civil society in Iraq to protect American families. I am also grateful my second son is a doctor in the Navy, graduated from medical school this year. My third son graduated from signal school this year, just got back from serving a month in Egypt, again promoting democracy and freedom. My fourth son has indicated that next year he will be enlisting in the marines.

My four sons understand September 11 was the beginning of a war, a global war against terrorism. I am very proud of their participation. We understand that we must face the enemy overseas, or we will be facing them here on the streets of America.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time. I appreciate the opportunity to address this House and the opportunity for us all to sit and listen to this debate.

I hear a couple of different numbers, 25,000 wounded but 15,000 wounded coming from the same side of the aisle. I am wondering if that is indicative of some of the other statistics that we have heard.

But I ask this question: Why have I not heard any objections to our operations in Afghanistan? Twenty-five million people liberated and freed and standing on free soil, voting for their own freedom and their own national destiny, a cost of 200 American lives. Nobody set a value on that. How many is too many in Afghanistan?

Twenty-five million Iraqis free, voting on free soil for the first time in their real lives, and what does this mean to America? It means that we have erased some of the habitat that breeds terror. Do we not understand this greater mission here is to eradicate that habitat so Arab people can breathe free and that free people do not go to war against free people? Could we look at this broader mission of 50 million people freed? 2,200 American lives, tens of thousands of other lives. We have not been attacked in this country since that date for a lot of good reasons.

You cannot separate the mission from the troops. You cannot sit here and say, I support the troops. Mr. President, we ought to bring the troops home. I do not support their mission. You cannot ask somebody to put their life on the line for your freedom and not support their mission, but tell them that you support the troops.

Further more, I sat in Kuwait City and watched on television as Moqtada al-Sadr said, ''They will go home the same way they did from Vietnam, Lebanon, and Mogadishu.''

We must stay the course.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule for the consideration of House Resolution 571.

But first I want to state for the record that I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I do not believe that this resolution is about him or anyone else in this Chamber. This resolution is about our troops, our mission, and our commitment to finishing the job in Iraq. It is about communicating to the world where the Members of this Chamber stand on immediate withdrawal of our troops from Iraq.

A number of my colleagues and I visited Iraq several times and met with the women who had run for office in elections there. These women, Sunnis, Shiites, Kurds, risked their lives to help build a better Iraq. One woman lost her son and her bodyguard to assassins. Another was kidnapped and finally returned after a ransom was paid for her. Still others told harrowing stories about the pressures brought upon them simply because they were exercising the kind of rights that we take for granted.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing that these brave women told us repeatedly was this: do not leave us. Do not leave us until we have a stable government. Do not leave us like you did before in 1990 after the gulf war, and do not leave us until we have the security that a stable government will provide.

Let us honor this commitment. Let us honor our troops. Let us be clear of our intentions. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and reject the underlying resolution.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, please let us tonight think about what we have accomplished, not in terms of what we have up in front of us, but what we have accomplished so far.

Did the Members know that 47 countries have reestablished embassies in Iraq? Did the Members know that 3,100 schools have been renovated? Did the Members know that Iraq's higher education structure consists of 20 universities, 46 institutes or colleges, and four research centers, all operating? Did the Members know that 25 Iraq students departed for the United States in January to reestablish the Fulbright program? Did the Members know that the Iraqi Navy is operational? Did the Members know that the Iraqi Air Force consists of three operational squadrons? Did the Members know that Iraq has a counterterrorist unit and a commando battalion?

Did the Members know that the Iraqi police service has over 55,000 fully trained and equipped police officers? Did the Members know that there are five police academies in Iraq that produce over 3,500 new officers every 8 weeks? Did the Members know that Iraq has an independent media that consists of 75 radio stations, 180 newspapers, 10 television stations? Did the Members know that two candidates in the Iraq presidential election had a televised debate recently?

We have accomplished a great deal. We are on the road to success.

I, like every other American, I am sure everybody in this room, want every American home tomorrow. I want them home and safe. I voted for the resolution to put these people in harm's way; and, therefore, like everybody here who did the same thing, I know that you feel as I do, a knife goes through your heart every time you see something on television, every time you read a report of another American being killed in Iraq. I want them home.

□ 2045

I want them home as soon as that mission is completed, the mission we sent them on, and a mission that I do not want extended by 1 hour or 1 minute because of what we may do here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, it is not a secret to anybody in this body, I am not on the best terms with the President and the White House. Certainly I do not get invited over there any more than my colleagues on the other side of the aisle because I have been in opposition to many of his plans and proposals. However, I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to do this, and I beg them to do this: Please do not let your hatred for the President of the United States get in the way of what I know is your basic love for this country.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today my heart has ached more than it has in 12 years in being in the United States Congress. It has ached not because of this debate, because we should be having this debate, but not at this time of day, it should happen after the recess, but because the gentleman from Pennsylvania who I think is a great American, and it has hurt my heart that he has been under attack unfairly.

Surely anyone who has ever worn the uniform for this Nation should be able to express themselves. And if you have not worn the uniform, you should be able to express yourself. Our Armed Forces are in Iraq and Afghanistan tonight fighting for freedom.

Let me share with Members what James Webb, Secretary of Navy under Ronald Reagan and Vietnam veteran, wrote me when I joined my colleagues on the other side and the Republican side in voting for the House Resolution 55, bipartisan, he wrote me this letter, and I will read three sentences. ''When American citizens are being asked to war, it is their most basic right that the strategic issues be explained in clearly understandable terms. And if the endpoint cannot be clearly explained, there is, in fact, no really strategy.''

That is what Mr. MURTHA is asking for. That is what Senator FEINGOLD is asking for. That is what WALTER JONES and RON PAUL and DENNIS KUCINICH and Neil Abercrombie are asking: Tell us what the strategy is.

I close with this. It is so ironic that we are having this debate tonight because on April 9, 1999, Governor Bush criticized President Clinton for not having a strategy. This is his quote in the Houston Chronicle: ''Victory means exit strategy, and it is important for the President to explain to us what the exit strategy is.'' That is all we are asking for.

My last quote is from the New York Times on June 6, 1999. ''I think it is also important for the President to lay out a timetable as to how long they will be involved and when they will be withdrawn.'' That is Governor Bush asking President Clinton. Tonight we are asking President Bush the same thing he asked President Clinton.

God, please bless our men and women in uniform; and please, God, bless America.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I remind the gentleman from North Carolina that this resolution is not an attack on any Member of this body. This resolution is about an attack on those Islamic Fascist terrorists who would destroy the men and women who are defending this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, calling for the immediate withdrawal or even a phased, detailed plan for withdrawal from Iraq is a recipe for absolute disaster. It is the wrong message for our soldiers and marines who are truly doing the work of freedom in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Frankly, I am concerned, as we all should be, that such talk will only embolden the terrorists and demoralize our warfighters, those who literally put their lives on the line each and 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 new governments and 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. We need to support our troops, these young troops. We cannot cut their feet out from underneath them. They need our support, and they need it tonight.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, JACK MURTHA is a decorated Vietnam war veteran. He is a United

States Marine, retired colonel. This debate is not about the Iraq war, it is about silencing the opinion of a respected veteran marine and Member of Congress.

I supported the Iraq war resolution and voted for every defense appropriation for that effort, and I am voting against this resolution. But we know with each casualty from Iraq that something is wrong. Our men and women in uniform are fighting heroically, and I honor them and their families for their sacrifice.

It is civilian leadership and this administration and the Department of Defense that did not prepare to fight this war with either material or enough troops. I may not totally agree with my colleague from Pennsylvania, but I know him as a respected, decorated war veteran and a Member of Congress, and he has earned that right to be able to give his opinion without having a resolution attack him or have the Members attack him personally.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran of two wars, I know that our military men and women fighting overseas watch what we do right here all the time. They see this on TV, they hear it on the radio, and they read our words in the newspapers. I know our brave men and women want to see their brave leaders, us, those of us in Congress here at home, have the political fortitude, yes, indeed the political stomach, to support their actions abroad.

Like many in this Chamber from both sides of the aisle, I have been to Iraq, I have been to Afghanistan, I have met with our troops there, and I have met with them as they have returned home to Nevada. They know, they see, and they hear. They read what we are doing in Congress, and they listen, and they are listening to us today.

What message do you want to send to these soldiers on the front line, a message of surrender, or do you want to send a message of support, a message that we will bring them to victory?

Some will call this vote symbolic or political. Well, call it what you want, but I want our troops overseas to read about this vote, and I want them to know that we support them.

As a veteran of two wars, I know first hand that our military men and women fighting for our freedoms overseas watch our actions at home.

They see this on TV, they hear it on radio, and they read it in the newspapers.

I know our brave men and women watch to see whether their leaders at home have the political fortitude, and the stomach to support their actions abroad.

Like many in this Chamber, from both sides of the aisle, I have been to Iraq.

I have been to Afghanistan.

I have met with our troops there, and I have met with them as they have returned home to Nevada.

They know, see, hear and read what we are doing in Congress, and they are listening to us today.

What message do you want to send these soldiers on the front line?

A message of surrender or a message of strength and support, that will bring us victory.

Some call this vote simply symbolic or political.

Well, you call it what you want, but I want our troops overseas to read about this vote.

To hear about this vote.

And I hope we can demonstrate not through just words, but our actions, that we are with them in this hour.

We will remain with them, and supply them, and support them, until the job is done, until we are victorious, and until we can proudly bring them home and applaud their victory.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, how do you withdraw from the war on terror when we have been attacked over and over and over again? We were attacked at the World Trade Centers, the first time by a bomb. Then our African embassies were attacked; the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia where our young men and women were killed; the Cole naval vessel; and then 9/11.

How do you tell Osama bin Laden and Zarqawi that we do not want to participate, we do not want to fool with fighting against terror?

The last administration tried that, and we felt the pain of death and destruction on 9/11 from terrorist murderers' hands. We have to win in Iraq. By the way, we won the war in Iraq. Now we are fighting with our allies in Iraq to defeat terror. If we do not win in Iraq, we will fail in the greater Middle East, and what happens if Pakistan falls? What happens if Saudi Arabia falls? Weapons of mass destruction in the hands of Islamic extremists will be a disaster for the world.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Member what the focus of our attention should be: David Branning, Dale Burger, Robert Guy, Jason Mileo, Adam Mooney, Bryan Nicholas Spry, William Allers, Samuel Bowen, Jarrett Thompson, Patrick Adle, Neil Prince, and Keith Mariotti.

They are the dead,
short days ago they lived,
felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
and now they lie in Flanders Field,
from my district.

What are they asking us with a sense of urgency for the living? What are the quick and the dead asking us to do: Know more than they did.

Why are our troops successful in harm's way? Because our troops bond together with an integration of integrity bound with trust.

Let us debate how to finish the war, not how to continue to fight the war.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, a little over 24 hours ago, an American military hero suggested to this country that this Congress should debate the policy, the current policy in Iraq. He had some suggestions on how that policy should be changed. He believed, as we believe him, that he was doing this for the sake of our troops, for the sake of our country, for security in the Middle East, and the security of this country.

In those 24 hours, he has come under unrelenting attack, characterizing him as an individual, as a Member of Congress, as to his motives, as to what he proposed, as opposed to what he said he proposed. Those attacks came from the President of the United States, from the Vice President of the United States, from the Speaker of the House, and from so many Members of this body who challenged his patriotism, challenged his character and challenged his integrity because he simply dared to kick open the doors of Congress and suggest that we debate the pressing question of this Nation that the people of this Nation want us to debate. Not that he would win that debate, but that he wanted that debate to take place, and that for that, all of his years of service to this country were openly challenged and mis-char-acterized and slandered.

I do not know where we went wrong. I do not know where we went wrong because I went through the debates in this Congress in Vietnam and Central America, and Mr. MURTHA and I could not be on more opposite sides of those issues. And many people I served with in the history of this Congress, but never in those debates did people assassinate the character of one another. We challenged the evidence, we challenged the assumptions. We challenged what was said, but we never ever, ever, did this to one another because we respected one another, having differing views coming from different parts of the country with different backgrounds.

□ 2100

Where did we go wrong? Maybe tonight Mr. MURTHA gave us another gift. Sometimes when you hit bottom, you change the ways you do business. Maybe Mr. MURTHA gave us this. After all that he suffered over this last 48 hours, maybe this Congress will be a better place, because everyone sitting in this Congress knows who knows JACK MURTHA what has been said about him in the last 24 hours could not be further from the truth. That man is a hero. That man is a hero to this Nation. You know it and the whole Nation knows it.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. With all due respect to my friends on the other side of the aisle, especially my friend who just finished, this is selective memory at its worst. I can remember the very people now crying these crocodile tears and the vilification that they put forward on Ronald Reagan for trying to stop the Communists in Latin America, trying to end the Cold War. He was vilified as a warmonger, et cetera, by the very people who now are making these statements.

Let me note JACK MURTHA. I have the greatest respect for him. He is a patriot. But let me thus note that how many times have the people who are saying this have been down here calling our President a liar and vilifying the President of the United States. Come on. Let's be fair to one another here. The fact is there is a disagreement on the character. Our hearts break when we see in the newspaper that four or five more Americans have lost their lives. That does not mean the cause that they are fighting for is unjust.

You had an opportunity tonight to discuss that cause if you were opposed to the war. But instead what we have heard is this type of rhetoric, getting around the issue of the discussion that we should be talking about, the war, and then, in partisan terms, trying to make it partisan saying that we are being personal. No, let's discuss the war, let's discuss it honestly, and let's not obfuscate the issue.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the most profound issue that this Congress must consider is whether or not to declare and prosecute war, whether or not to send our Nation's sons and daughters into harm's way. A serious proposal has been made by the senior Member of this body, a Member who honorably served in the United States Marine Corps for nearly four decades, a Member who has served here for more than three decades, and a Member who has been one of our Nation's leaders on making our defenses the strongest they could be. That proposal raises legitimate and critical questions as to the prosecution of our Nation's war efforts in Iraq, efforts that I have always supported. It suggests an alternative course of action that deserves serious consideration and a full and fair debate. However, his proposal is not before us tonight. The Republican chairman of the Armed Services Committee offers a resolution to immediately withdraw our troops from Iraq. I don't support that. Mr. HUNTER does not support it. He offers it to avoid serious consideration of the policy our country is pursuing and proposals for possible alternatives. The majority party's response seeks to deal with this issue in a way that trivializes our consideration of how to conduct this war effort in a manner best designed to attain success. As such, this resolution is beneath the dignity and responsibility of this institution and the Members of this body.

All of us have sworn to defend the Constitution and protect this Nation and the American people. All of us, all 435, support our troops. This resolution is unworthy of our responsibility to our men and women who are now serving our Nation and who are deployed in harm's way. Unfortunately, today's process mirrors, I say to you, the superficial consideration of serious policy issues in this Congress and demonstrates a continuing unwillingness to subject policy proposals to oversight and serious and thoughtful deliberation.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I do not possess the eloquence or the vocabulary to express the magnitude of my contempt with which I view this shabby, petty political maneuver. Our responsibilities to our country and to our men and women in harm's way in the defense of freedom demands more of us. The majority leadership demonstrates today, I fear, its lack of respect for this institution and for its great responsibilities to our democracy. The American people will see this day's proceedings for what they are, the rankest of politics and the absence of a sense of shame.

I hope that we reject this rule and this resolution.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. John Adams wrote to Abigail back in the summer of 1776, ''The thing that philosophers up to now have only dreamed about is within our grasp, the concept of self-government.''

And, folks, in the cradle of mankind there in Iraq, there is within their grasp because of what we have done in the name of liberty and destroying terrorism, it is so close. This is not about one Member of Congress who was a hero in Vietnam. This is about a message that is being sent to the world. Right after the minority leader's district that she represents and leads told the world, The military is beneath us. Mamas, don't let your babies grow up to defend this Nation and the liberty. San Francisco said no recruiters in our city, a terrible message. Followed by, let's get our troops out and not support them.

Join with us as you did in singing a prayer, God Bless America. Let the terrorists know. We don't want to divide you. We want to unite you with us.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I remember roughly 4 years ago after 9/11 what the feeling was in this Chamber. Everyone was united. We had a common purpose. And it was truly a great time to be here. The other night we went out and rolled around in the mud together for a little bit, and we were united. We had a common purpose. We wanted to have a great team.

As I listen to what is going on here tonight, I am really concerned about the acrimony and the general tenor of the discussion. I realize that there is plenty of blame to be laid at everyone's feet. I with many others am concerned about what the American public perceives and what our troops perceive in regard to this discussion tonight. We can do better. We are better than this.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Many people have said tonight, this is not the Murtha resolution. I agree. It is not the Murtha resolution. Unfortunately, it is my friend JACK MURTHA's headline. In fact, Al-Jazeera today was what our troops, our constituents in Iraq woke up to today saying that a leading Member of Congress has called for the immediate withdrawal. That is what Al-Jazeera said. That is why sometimes the media that gets in the way injects itself and it brings down the morale of our troops. That is why I am going to vote ''no'' on this resolution tonight, because I think it is important to send them another message and a very clear message that we do not support immediate withdrawal.

My friend, General Webster, who leads the Third Infantry Division over there, spoke very strongly about it. He said, ''Setting a date would mean the 221 soldiers I've lost this year, that their lives will have been lost in vain. I think it's a recipe for disaster. Setting a date is a loser.'' General Webster is a soldier, not a politician. I think he would appreciate tomorrow morning reading in the paper that Congress clearly rejected an immediate withdrawal.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Army Captain Joel Cahill was buried in Arlington Cemetery today. Captain Cahill was killed in Iraq by an improvised explosive device. He grew up near Omaha. He leaves behind Mary his wife and their two little girls.

Army Specialist Darren Howe was laid to rest in Beatrice, Nebraska last week. He died of wounds from an explosive device that hit his personnel carrier. Badly burned, Specialist Howe drove to safety, then helped his men out of the rear. He was 21 and left behind his wife Nakia and their two small children.

I spoke with JoDee, Darren's mom, in what had to be some of her most difficult hours following Darren's death.

She had the gentleness of spirit, humility of heart and pride of her son's work to thank me and the Congress for the decisions that have been made, saying: We support what you are doing. Iraq is a faraway land remote from the traditions and culture of the Great Plains, the boyhood homes of Joel and Darren. Yet I am certain that in that isolated place where they gave their lives, these men understood what was at stake. That they fought for something bigger than themselves, something that transcends the snapshot of a political debate. They fought out of duty to country, they fought to defend, they fought for the soul of the free world.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the minority leader the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, as the very proud representative of the city of San Francisco in the Congress of the United States, from northern California where we have more veterans than any other part of the country per capita and we treat them with respect as the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not being treated as a distinguished veteran with respect here.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very sad day for the House of Representatives. Just when you think you have seen it all, the Republicans have stooped to a new low, even for them. They have engaged in an act of deception that undermines any shred of dignity that might be left in this Republican Congress. But deception has been the order of the day throughout the entire Iraq engagement.

□ 2115

Mr. HUNTER's resolution is a continuation of that deception. It is a political stunt, and it should be rejected by this House.

The Republican deception today is a disgrace. It is a disservice to our country and to our men and women in uniform. They and the American people deserve better. It is an insult to the integrity of JACK MURTHA, one of the most distinguished Members to ever serve in this House of Representatives.

As has been said, JACK MURTHA is a decorated war veteran: two Purple Hearts, the Bronze Star for his combat service, the Vietnam Cross of Gallantry, 37 years of active and reserve duty in the marines. His lifetime motto has been Semper Fi; and yet our Republican colleagues call him a coward and accuse him of cooperating with the enemy.

As a senior Democrat on the Defense Appropriations Committee, he is known and respected for his bipartisanship. That is why this Republican attack on him is so dishonest.

Mr. MURTHA has dealt the mighty blow of truth to the President's failed Iraq policy. The American people have rallied to JACK MURTHA's message of truth. But you cannot handle the truth. Why are the Republicans so afraid of the facts?

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Senator from Ohio, Robert Taft, who would become the Republican leader of the Senate said, ''Criticism in a time of war is essential to the maintenance of any democratic government.'' Indeed, Mr. MURTHA's courageous action to speak truth to power is a great act of patriotism.

As one who has always had the interests of America's men and women in uniform as his top priority, Mr. MURTHA has acted as he always does: in their interests. Let us all join him in saluting our troops for their courage, their patriotism, and the sacrifice that they are willing to make, and thank JACK MURTHA for his loyalty to them.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, in closing, it is important to restate for the morale of our troops that this Congress and this country remain resolved in the war against terrorism. From the streets of Iraq to the mountains of Afghanistan, America will leave no spider hole, no palace, no bunker overlooked as we help freedom-loving people fight the terrorist insurgencies of Islamofascists and protect democracy worldwide.

Our greatest loss would be to withdraw our troops, thereby ceding victory to cowardly terrorists who murder and hide under the cover of shadows.

Mr. Speaker, over 2,000 of our best and bravest have fought and sacrificed their lives in defense of democracy and in the face of these terrorists. These individuals deserve our thanks and their families need to know that they did not die in vain.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of words have been thrown about in this Chamber tonight, but talk is often cheap. And while cheap talk abounds, unfortunately, cheap talk is not bounded, it is not insulated by oceans or mountains, and certainly not by the media.

The words of this Congress and its Members echo out beyond this hallowed Chamber, beyond these hallowed Halls to every household and to every foreign shore.

Our troops are listening, Mr. Speaker. They hear those who denigrate their mission. They hear those who rely on the false pillar of semantics, seeking to divide the American people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, our troops are listening tonight, and while talk is cheap, our vote is sacrosanct. So I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to put their vote on the RECORD and put the rhetoric aside.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule. Let us have this debate for the sake of our troops.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 202, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 607]

YEAS—210

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

NAYS—202

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

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

NOT VOTING—22

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

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