

COMMUNICATION FROM LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF THE HONORABLE SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Aaron Sporck, Legislative Director for the Honorable SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 12, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a civil deposition subpoena, issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, for documents and testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

AARON SPORCK,  
Legislative Director.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to with an amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 409. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 60th anniversary of the ascension to the throne of his Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand.

□ 2245

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THERE MUST BE A NEW DIRECTION IN IRAQ

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it has been a day of great importance, and tomorrow, we will conclude this debate on Iraq.

When I spoke earlier today, I mentioned that the dilemma that we have is that although there has been a debate, one would wonder, with such an important topic, why the process did not allow the American people to have alternatives to the present resolution on the floor and why we were so constrained that there could not be a definitive plan that speaks to the concern of the American people, the families of soldiers and veterans, and that is, to discuss fully, without partisan rhetoric, the idea of redeployment and the opportunity for our soldiers to return home.

Now, 2 years or so ago, I had, and offered, to this administration a concept that I believe would not have placed us where we are today. I rose today to say that I support the Murtha plan and resolution, which clearly provides an opportunity for redeployment as soon as practicable. It is not the cut-and-run theory. It is a theory that we respect the idea of the military fighting for our freedom and respect the fact that the military's mission has been completed.

Having just come back from Iraq myself, and been there three times and as well to Afghanistan, I know that the boots on the ground, the leadership on the ground is, by any means, any definition, the most excellent military in the world. We thank them. We thank their families. We thank the enlisted. We thank the Reservists, we thank the National Guard and any others, civilians who are serving on those front lines.

But we are the policy-makers, and we owe them not just a debt of gratitude. So, tomorrow, in protest for no plan, I will be voting "no" on the resolution. I do so without any shame or any conceding to accusations of not being patriotic. My patriotism is exhibited by my dissent and the dissent of the American people asking us to do something, to create a plan that tracks the sovereignty of Iraq, gives them the opportunity to move toward their own freedom, to protect themselves through the Iraqi National Army and the Iraqi National Police.

Let me just simply say to the American people that what we are discussing today are these soldiers who have been willing to put their lives on the front line. These are husbands and wives and aunts and uncles and cousins. These are mothers and fathers. These are our neighbors. These are, in fact, our brothers and sisters. These are Americans, individuals who have put themselves on the front line. We, as policy-makers, should not cut and run on them.

I would just say to my colleagues that if we are to be patriotic, then we should do it by words and not by deeds.

So I would argue that what we have done to the soldier is to talk and not act. We have, in fact, devastated the United States Army, therefore, disallowing or at least causing them to be diminished and taking and causing us to put them in a position where it will take years for them to rebuild themselves.

We have undermined the military by not equipping the troops. When asked by a soldier in the field why U.S. troops did not have the right armor for their vehicles, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld said, as you know, you have to go to war with the Army you have, not the Army you want. What a callous, senseless thing to say, to throw our Army into harm's way, and careless about whether they are protected or have the armor to protect themselves, allowing families and parents to get their hard-earned pennies to send flak jackets to their children and then not taking care of our troops when they come home.

The Bush administration has not developed policies to take care of the thousands, 19,000 casualties who are injured, 2,500 of course who died, the 2,500 today.

Health care has proven inadequate, and wounded veterans have been hounded by debt collectors because of inefficiencies in the Pentagon's administrative expenses.

Mr. Speaker, this is not long enough for the catastrophic and necessity of the debate or the changes that are needed in order to change the direction of Iraq.

I, too, applaud the ending of Zarqawi's leadership of terrorism in the world, but that is not the end of the story, and we know that insurgency in Iraq is only 10 percent of the violence. The violence is between Shiite and Sunni and those young people who believe they can kill Americans with impunity and with immunity.

So I would simply say that I hope tomorrow there will be a metamorphical change. I hope someone will shine the light on this body. I hope we will rise with courage to say that there must be a new direction. I hope we will discard this senseless resolution that simply wants to make partisan or make a partisan battle about who supports the troops and who does not.

We cannot stay the course. Richard Nixon knew that we could not stay the