

readiness of Iraq forces, the progress of the country's reconstruction and political development, and the extent of international collaboration and support.

Where there are deficiencies, and the deficiencies are serious in all of these areas, the administration must provide benchmarks by which success can be measured and a plan specifying what it will take to reach our goals.

Glib reassurances from the President are dangerous, postponing and preventing corrective action and opening wider the credibility gap with the American public.

Those who commit troops to battle on behalf of this great country owe them and us an intelligent and realistic plan to succeed.

Members of this body should demand such a plan and a frequent, truthful accounting of our success in reaching its goals from the President and his administration. A midcourse correction in Iraq is worthy of our Nation's best efforts, and the window of opportunity is closing.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time the gentleman has on his hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia). The gentleman has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Would the gentleman be willing to yield me the remainder of his time?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield the remainder of the time.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, should I just ask for unanimous consent since there are no other Members present in the Chamber?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The minority leader may reallocate the leadership hour.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to do that, to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

STRATEGY FOR SUCCESS IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 26 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise because what the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), my friend, has said is terribly important to be said. And what is even more important is that it be made available to the public at large.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important, appropriate, to inform the gentleman and the rest of the Congress who may not be aware that the elements of the strategy for success, the identical language which the minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), has requested in the form of an amendment, has actually been included in an appropriations bill, the

Iraq supplemental appropriations bill, passed earlier this year.

That language was included in an amendment that I submitted to the Iraq supplemental bill. It also included the benchmarks that the gentleman has suggested, as well as even more specific information. We have received that report on the strategy for success, Mr. Speaker.

The most important elements of that report, in fact though, were included in an addendum which was classified. And so I and those who have seen the report are not at liberty to give the kind of specific information that at least I feel should be shared with the American public.

But I would like to address what was in the body of the report, which does in part respond to the very specific questions, as to Iraq's military capability, its economic viability, and its political stability.

The American people need to know whether in fact Iraq will ever be able to fully control its borders and provide security for its society and its economy. And we need to know how successful we have been in training and equipping Iraqi forces, because we have been working at that for more than 2 years.

The American people also need to know what has happened to the tens of billions of dollars that we have appropriated for economic reconstruction.

□ 1345

Will Iraq ever be or is even close to being economically viable? Is its physical infrastructure in place so that its economy can rebound in a way that will provide economic opportunities for its population?

The American people also need to know, in addition to where Iraq is in terms of military capabilities and economic viability, how stable its government can ever be and at what point will the decisionmakers, the policymakers in Washington decide that its governance is stable enough to be able to return Iraq over to a democracy that is worthy of our military efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this war. I voted against it. I voted against most of the funding for it. I did vote for the Iraq supplemental because it included this language that I felt was vitally important, requiring what, while we do not call it an exit strategy, is certainly appropriately entitled "a strategy for success." That language was included and could only have been included if it was offered in a bipartisan, non-political context, without a whole lot of fanfare. But working with the majority we could get some answers to the questions that the American people, our constituents, are asking. We did not have those questions answered when we went to war.

I opposed the war because I felt that it was unjustified. I knew that Saddam Hussein had nothing to do with the attacks on 9/11. Suggestions to the contrary were a ruse. The reasons given were at best unjustified; at worst, deliberately deceptive.

I also opposed it because as our senior military officers will tell you we ought not go to war without a plan to win the peace. We had no plan to win the peace. And, in fact, the 41st President of the United States, George Bush, when he had the opportunity to go into Baghdad and take out Saddam when we had Saddam's Republican Guard on the run, he chose not to do so because his advisors, understanding the country, acting with foresight and knowledge of the political context within the Middle East, were afraid that we would be thrust into the role of an occupier. And they knew, and I think were absolutely right, that the United States should never be playing the role of an occupier, but always that of a liberator. So they chose not to go to Baghdad. The son chose differently with very different people advising him, and I think for different reasons.

But now that we are in Iraq, what do we do? That is what senior military officers are asking us. And it is certainly what the mothers and fathers of the young men and women who are fighting this war are demanding to know. They need to know what is our strategy. How long will we be there? How much more money is absolutely necessary to continue this military engagement? And they are getting none of those answers.

Unfortunately, I cannot disclose any of the specific information that has now been provided, but I certainly can share, at least with my constituents, the fact that in my judgment we are nowhere near being able to withdraw a substantial number of our troops in a responsible manner because, in my judgment, the Iraqi military is nowhere near being able to secure its borders. The Iraqi police forces are nowhere near being able to restore law and order in that country. The economic infrastructure is nowhere near being able to support a viable economy. And even the government is nowhere near being able to pass a Constitution that not just would be acceptable to the American people who have sacrificed so much to bring it about, but it is not even in the situation where it would be enduring and accepted by the vast majority of the Iraqi people.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a quagmire here. We need answers. We need answers from the people who put us in that quagmire. It is wrong to continue to be sending troops to a war that is this unwinnable, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I suspect what is going to happen, and it was further confirmed yesterday by the Secretary and by some of the senior military officers who have been in a consultation with them, that we will start a substantial withdrawal. But I think that withdrawal, I feel that withdrawal will be motivated more for political reasons than for military or foreign policy reasons. We have our fist in the middle of a beehive, and we are getting stung. The advisors that sent us there are not getting stung because they figure they can say or do anything

to avoid repercussions and accountability. But, boy, our young men and women are being stung every day.

We need to figure out how to extricate in a way that is responsible and will justify their sacrifice. We cannot cut and run. And yet the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), one of the most respected Members of the House, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, is afraid and, in fact, predicts that is what we will do, and we will do it for political reasons, not for substantive policy reasons.

We need to get more countries involved in a real way, not in a way so that with a few troops they can list their participation. We need to go through international bodies like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO. We need to work with the United Nations, which we continue to bash and beat up on and scapegoat for our own problems in terms of our credibility throughout the world. We need to get the rest of the world involved because the rest of the world had a stake here in getting rid of a ruthless dictator, in restoring stability in Iraq, in giving Iraq some ability to seize control of its own destiny, but in a way that it chooses. That is what we should be about.

We should not be about, in my estimate, spending hundreds of millions of dollars to build an American Embassy in Baghdad that only serves to confirm what our enemies are telling their recruits, that we are there for the long run; that we are there as occupiers; that we are there to take advantage of their oil reserves; to exploit Iraq's resources, and to exploit its people for our own political purposes. They are wrong, but we have to prove that they are wrong.

We have to show the world that we have a strategy for success, a responsible one. It will leave Iraq in better shape than before we entered it. We never, as I said, should have entered, but now we have a responsibility to fix it before we leave. And that strategy for success, as I say, Mr. Speaker, is not going to be achieved unilaterally. It is going to have to be achieved by working with the rest of the world in an international context, letting the Iraqi people control their own destiny, not dictating to them.

As much as I would love for us to hand them a Constitution that made us feel good about what we have accomplished, I do not think that is going to work. They have to own that Constitution. I pray to God that they will not exclude women, that they will not continue some of the arcane habits, the laws and the regulations that only serve to support religious clerics and a very conservative, even extremist in some cases, religious system of governance, but, in fact, will open it up to a true democracy where both men and women can fully participate a free enterprise, an uncorrupted economy, and,

in fact, a strong military and police force that will provide the security to the Iraqi people that they have not had in generations.

That has got to be our objective. We cannot achieve it on our own. We have got to work with the rest of the world. We have got to sit down and maybe even eat a little humble pie and come up with an international solution for this, and to not require our soldiers to bear the brunt of the injuries and the death that they have.

Changing Iraq's leadership was more in the interest of so many other countries than it was in America's interest. We went because we had the ability to go, and I am afraid there was some political motivation involved as well. But now that we are there, we in the Congress need to require of the executive branch that they give us the answers, that they share with us and then to the American people, they need to share with the American people what is their plan, what is their strategy for success. And if they do not do that, there will be political accountability as there ought to be.

Mr. Speaker, the report that we received 2 weeks late, but that we did finally receive 2 weeks ago, is an important first step, but it is grossly inadequate. The language that I put in the appropriations bill several months ago required a 90-day update. Every one of those updates needs to be more specific, needs to be fleshed out better than the prior reports. And most importantly, Mr. Speaker, it needs to be shared with the American public. It is their money. It is their sons and daughters. That is what this war, unfortunately, is about, from their standpoint.

How do you make this worth the effort? How do you succeed in a way that their sons and daughters can be proud of what they contributed and the risk they undertook? The administration owes that to them. We will continue to insist that it provides that information, not in a classified document that can be kept from the public's eyes and ears, but within a spirit of full disclosure. And if they do not have a plan that will work, they need to come up with one.

They need to consult with the rest of the world, be willing to work with the legislative branch, with our other allies and even those we do not consider allies. It is in this planet's interest to bring about a free world, a safe world for its future generations.

So I ask the administration that has been twice elected to do the right thing, to get us out of Iraq, but to get us out in a way that we can turn back knowing that we have accomplished something that was deserving of the sacrifice, the loss, the risk that our best young men and women have been willing to undertake.

□ 1400

STEM CELL RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office last evening about 11 p.m., as was all the rest of the House of Representatives, waiting for a resolution of some of the concerns on the transportation bill so that we could vote on it, when we were looking at the "Drudge Report" on our screen and we saw there a headline that I could hardly believe, that Senator FRIST had reversed his position on embryonic stem cells and was now advocating the passage of the Senate version of H.R. 810.

I thought it would be appropriate today, with stem cells, embryonic stem cells being so much in the news, if we could spend a few minutes looking at what stem cells are and what this is all about, what was Senator FRIST talking about and what is the issue here.

I have here on the easel a chart that shows the development, not all of the stages, but it shows the development of the human embryo. It starts with the zygote. The zygote is the fertilized egg. It now has chromosomes, genes from the sperm and genes from the egg, having what we call the diploid number of chromosomes. And that develops through several stages, we will see a little later in another chart, but it goes through the blastocyst stage here and then it goes down to the gastrula stage. And by the time you get to the gastrula stage, the embryo that began as a single cell here just a few days before has now developed into a large number of cells.

What is shown here is the embryo and the part of the wall of the uterus to which it is attached. By this stage in its development, the embryo has already now developed four very specific stem cells that will go on to produce a variety of tissues and organs in the body, all of the tissues and the organs in the body, and we see those down here at the bottom.

Some of them develop into ectoderm. This is the external layer. The ectoderm becomes primarily two things in the developing baby and in the adult. It becomes the skin and the nervous system and some of the pigment cells. Most of what we are in terms of mass is all developed from the middle layer, or the mesoderm, and from that develops all of your skeletal muscle, all of your skeleton, all of your bones, all of your heart muscle, the red blood cells, the smooth muscle in your intestines and stomach and so forth.

Then a third stem cell here ultimately develops into the endoderm. And here we see that this is the lining of the lung, the thyroid gland, and pancreatic cells, nowhere near the mass that is produced by the mesoderm, but very important tissues nevertheless.