

whether Iraq has or will establish its chemical warfare agent production facilities.”

8. There was not a real risk of an “extreme magnitude of harm that would result to the United States and its citizens from such an attack” because Iraq had no capability of attacking the United States.

Here’s what Colin Powell said at the time: “Containment has been a successful policy, and I think we should make sure that we continue it until such time as Saddam Hussein comes into compliance with the agreements he made at the end of the Gulf War.” Speaking of Iraq, Secretary of State Powell said, “Iraq is not threatening America.”

9. The aforementioned evidence did not “justify the use of force by the United States to defend itself” because Iraq did not have weapons of mass destruction, or have the intention or capability of using nonexistent WMDs against the United States.

10. Since there was no threat posed by Iraq to the United States, the enactment clause of the Senate Joint Resolution 45 was predicated on misstatements to Congress.

Congress relied on the information provided to it by the President of the United States. Congress provided the President with the authorization to use military force that he requested. As a consequence of the fraudulent representations made to Congress, the United States Armed Forces, under the direction of George Bush as Commander in Chief, pursuant to section 3 of the Authorization for the Use of Force which President Bush requested, invaded Iraq and occupies it to this day, at the cost of 4,116 lives of servicemen and -women, injuries to over 30,000 of our troops, the deaths of over 1 million innocent Iraqi civilians, the destruction of Iraq, and a long-term cost of over \$3 trillion.

President Bush’s misrepresentations to Congress to induce passage of a use of force resolution is subversive of the constitutional system of checks and balances, destructive of Congress’ sole prerogative to declare war under article I, section 8 of the Constitution, and is therefore a High Crime. An even greater offense by the President of the United States occurs in his capacity as Commander in Chief, because he knowingly placed the men and women of the United States Armed Forces in harm’s way, jeopardizing their lives and their families’ future, for reasons that to this date have not been established in fact.

In all of these actions and decisions, President George W. Bush has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and Commander in Chief, and subversive of constitutional government, to the prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States and of those members of the Armed Forces who put their lives on the line pursuant to the falsehoods of the President. Wherefore, President George W. Bush, by such conduct, is guilty of an impeachable offense warranting removal from office.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the House rules.

Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Ohio will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

STONE COLD

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, on Sunday morning Chaudhry Rashad brutally murdered his daughter for bringing, as he said, “disgrace to the family.”

Rashad’s 25-year-old daughter, Sandeela, wanted a divorce from her arranged marriage, but Rashad believed that it was more honorable for him to take a course of action to strangle her to death.

When Atlanta police arrived on the scene, Rashad was in his driveway, calmly smoking a cigarette behind a car as if it was a normal Sunday. After being arrested, then he arrogantly demanded to be served Islamic food while he was in custody.

Rashad said he has “done nothing wrong” by murdering his daughter. Yet another example of murder in the name of religion. Yet that’s the problem, that people still use the word “honor” and “killing” in the same breath. The United Nations estimates that there are approximately 5,000 supposed religious honor killings each year of women and girls. Murder is not honorable.

When the police found young Sandeela’s body, they said it was cold to the touch. However, the cold, dead body of his daughter was nothing compared to the coldness of a father’s heart who willingly steals the life of his child in the name of religion.

And that’s just the way it is.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

AMERICA’S STRATEGIC CONTEXT

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

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, yesterday I rose to speak about the need for America to embark upon a process to develop a comprehensive strategy to advance U.S. interests in the world. Today I rise to continue that theme; I want to take the conversation a bit further.

A strategy, as I said last night, describes the way we employ all elements

of national power to advance our critical interests. Ultimately, determining these critical interests depends upon the place America occupies in the world. What do we see as our role? Who do we want to be, and how do we want to interact with the rest of the globe’s inhabitants to get there? That’s the fundamental question, of course, but we are not ready to answer it yet.

Instead, we must first consider the domestic and global contexts within which we must act. As our vision of where we want to go evolves, we must have an ongoing dialogue about the effort and the sacrifices we are willing to make. We must also look at the world as it is, not as we’d like it to be, and we must acknowledge that much of the world does not necessarily see us as we would see ourselves. We must look clear-eyed beyond Iraq and Afghanistan. Only with that understanding can we determine where we want to go and how we want to get there. But as this vision develops, we must keep in mind that it is no good if we cannot provide the means to achieve it, nor is it useful if it is not a realistic fit with the rest of the world.

The global environment is ever changing. While we cannot control the sea swell of change, we must prepare ourselves to navigate those waters. Regional power is shifting; some large nation states, such as China, India, Brazil, to name a few, are ascending and verge on global power status. Russia may already be there, again. Do their interests conflict or coincide with ours? Is their rise a challenge to oppose or an opportunity to engage? Some of our traditional security arrangements may fade in importance as others take on new meaning. But nation states are not our only concern. It’s clear that a number of transnational issues will challenge us while others may provide positive potential. Fundamentalist terrorism and the proliferation of dangerous weapons are obvious examples of serious challenges, of course, but what about climate change, the fragility of increasingly connected world financial markets, or the outbreak of pandemic diseases? These are challenges that present themselves without any malicious intentional human action.

The point here is that the world around us bears significant scrutiny because it represents the context that binds whatever strategy we choose. This is not to say we cannot strive for an ideal. We can and we should. It’s how this Nation was formed. The ability to conceive a vision that is breathtaking in scope and heartbreaking in its beauty is America’s gift to the world. But while the goal may be the ideal, our understanding of our environment and our selection of the means to reach it must be firmly rooted in realism.

With that thought I close, Madam Speaker. In my next speech addressing these issues, I will talk about the need to return to the fundamentals of strategic understanding, a return to Sun