

PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON IRAQ

HEARING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

MARCH 20, 2007

Serial No. 110-57

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov/>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

34-237PDF

WASHINGTON : 2007

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

TOM LANTOS, California, *Chairman*

HOWARD L. BERMAN, California	ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York	CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa	DAN BURTON, Indiana
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey	ELTON GALLEGLY, California
BRAD SHERMAN, California	DANA ROHRABACHER, California
ROBERT WEXLER, Florida	DONALD A. MANZULLO, Illinois
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York	EDWARD R. ROYCE, California
BILL DELAHUNT, Massachusetts	STEVE CHABOT, Ohio
GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York	THOMAS G. TANCREDI, Colorado
DIANE E. WATSON, California	RON PAUL, Texas
ADAM SMITH, Washington	JEFF FLAKE, Arizona
RUSS CARNAHAN, Missouri	JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia
JOHN S. TANNER, Tennessee	MIKE PENCE, Indiana
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California	THADDEUS G. McCOTTER, Michigan
SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas	JOE WILSON, South Carolina
RUBÉN HINOJOSA, Texas	JOHN BOOZMAN, Arkansas
DAVID WU, Oregon	J. GRESHAM BARRETT, South Carolina
BRAD MILLER, North Carolina	CONNIE MACK, Florida
LINDA T. SANCHEZ, California	JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
DAVID SCOTT, Georgia	MICHAEL T. McCAUL, Texas
JIM COSTA, California	TED POE, Texas
ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey	BOB INGLIS, South Carolina
GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona	LUIS G. FORTUÑO, Puerto Rico
RON KLEIN, Florida	
VACANT	
VACANT	

ROBERT R. KING, *Staff Director*

YLEEM POBLETE, *Republican Staff Director*

ROBIN ROIZMAN, *Professional Staff Member/Counsel*

GENELL BROWN, *Staff Associate*

CONTENTS

	Page
WITNESSES	
The Honorable Stephen Lynch, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts	8
The Honorable John Murtha, a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania	9
The Honorable Earl Blumenauer, a Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon	19
The Honorable Sheila Jackson Lee, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas	20
The Honorable Mike Thompson, a Representative in Congress from the State of California	26
The Honorable Barbara Lee, a Representative in Congress from the State of California	30
The Honorable John Larson, a Representative in Congress from the State of Connecticut	33
The Honorable Albio Sires, a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey	34
The Honorable Lynne Woolsey, a Representative in Congress from the State of California	35
The Honorable Mark Udall, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado	38
The Honorable Mike Rogers, a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan	40
The Honorable Daniel Lipinski, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois	42
The Honorable Janice Schakowsky, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois	44
The Honorable Steven King, a Representative in Congress from the State of Iowa	47
The Honorable Howard Berman, a Representative in Congress from the State of California	56
The Honorable Patrick Murphy, a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania	57
The Honorable Joe Sestak, a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania	59
The Honorable Ellen Tauscher, a Representative in Congress from the State of California	62
The Honorable Jim McGovern, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts	63
The Honorable Sam Farr, a Representative in Congress from the State of California	65
The Honorable David Price, a Representative in Congress from the State of North Carolina	66
The Honorable Madeleine Z. Bordallo, a Representative in Congress from the Island of Guam	68
LETTERS, STATEMENTS, ETC., SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING	
The Honorable Gene Green, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas: Prepared statement	5
The Honorable John Murtha: Prepared statement	11
The Honorable Sheila Jackson Lee: Prepared statement	23
The Honorable Mike Thompson: Prepared statement	27

IV

	Page
The Honorable Lynne Woolsey: Prepared statement	36
The Honorable Mark Udall: Prepared statement	39
The Honorable Steven King: Prepared statement	49
The Honorable Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida: Articles from the <i>Washington Post</i> and <i>Los Angeles Times</i> .	52

PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON IRAQ

TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 2007

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:34 a.m. in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Tom Lantos (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Chairman LANTOS. The committee will come to order.

When our founding fathers gathered in Philadelphia more than two centuries ago, they carefully crafted a Constitution that balances the Federal Government's powers to prevent their abuse by any single person or institution. The U.S. Constitution established in its very first article a Congress of the United States as a co-equal branch of government to ensure against the repeat of the type of tyranny that the American people experienced under the arrogant rule of King George.

Now our country enters its fifth year of military operations in Iraq. For the first 4 years of the war, Congress failed to exercise its constitutionally-mandated role of limiting the power of a single institution, the Executive Branch.

Under the congressional majority at the time, oversight was scarce. There was no meaningful legislation to help set the direction of the effort in Iraq, and there was little serious debate in this institution about the conduct of the war. In short, Congress became the "Amen corner" for the administration, and the single-minded administration officials chose to turn a deaf ear to our concerns.

The November elections changed all that. The newly elected Congress has moved assertively to restore the role of Congress as a co-equal branch of government directly representing the voice of the people.

Congress has held more hearings on Iraq during the last 3 months than in the previous 4 years combined. This is almost unbelievable so I would like to repeat it. Congress has held more hearings on Iraq during the last 3 months than in the previous 4 years combined. In the past 10 weeks, this committee alone has held more than two dozen hearings on the critical foreign policies facing our nation today, including five specifically on the war in Iraq, and our work has just begun.

The members of this committee will continue to ask hard questions and refuse to accept brush-off answers. This week the House will move beyond debate on Iraq toward concrete action for the second time this session. One month ago we made it clear that we oppose escalation in Iraq, and I was proud to be the author of that

legislation along with my friend, the Armed Services Committee chairman, Ike Skelton, and Representative Walter Jones.

Later this week, we will vote to add rationality to the war effort. I strongly support the supplemental appropriations bill which will set long overdue time lines for removing most American combat troops from Iraq, and will establish benchmarks to hold the Government of Iraq accountable for reaching a political solution to the civil war that has been raging there.

In addition to this very important action on the House floor on Thursday, today our committee will begin consideration of more than 30 bills designed to deal with different aspects of the Iraq war, from promoting diplomatic solutions to ending the deployment of American troops, to stopping the mismanagement of reconstruction funds.

Just a few short months ago, these bills would not have received the hearing in this committee, but I believe that every member who has brought forth legislation on this crucial foreign policy issue deserves to be heard. The discussion here will move us closer to agreement on how our country conducts itself in Iraq from now on, and how and when our troops come home, and what we leave behind in Iraq, which conscience demands that we consider.

In that spirit, today I am introducing the Iraq Reconstruction Improvement Act, a comprehensive piece of legislation to fix our rapidly failing reconstruction effort. This program has been beset by gross corruption, and massive American and Iraqi bureaucratic confusion. The Iraqi people hoping that the fall of Saddam would bring peace and prosperity to their country have instead been handed half-built hospitals, failed water projects, and a power grid that is more off than on.

My legislation aims to improve our reconstruction program in Iraq by boosting our efforts to stamp out corruption. It will improve transparency and accountability for the use of American taxpayer dollars. It will also address the plight of Iraqi refugees and internally displaced persons, and augment our long-term capacity to prevent further reconstruction debacles.

In Jordan alone there are some three-quarters of a million Iraqi refugees. Jordan is a poor country. It is a small country, and it has most limited resources, and absorbing over 750,000 Iraqi refugees is beginning to be an unmanageable problem.

The key to reconstruction success as outlined by the Iraq Study Group and the Special Inspector General lies in building Iraq's capacity to respond to the needs of its people. I couldn't agree more. That is why my legislation provides technical assistance to Iraqi ministries to improve the administration of reconstruction programs, including programs that provide basic services to the Iraqi people.

Improving our capacity to oversee and monitor reconstruction efforts in Iraq is equally as critical. Therefore, my legislation extends the authority of the Special Inspector General and provides assistance to build the capacity of the inspector general in the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development. The more eyes we have on reconstruction in Iraq the less likely it will be that American taxpayer dollars will continue to go to waste and fraud.

While we can debate about Iraq's political and military quandary ad infinitum and ad nauseam, one thing remains indisputable: Our reconstruction effort will fail unless it takes a new and innovative approach. My legislation aims to achieve just that.

I look forward to working closely with my friend, the ranking member of this committee, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, and my other colleagues on the committee to ensure that this new initiative enjoys strong bipartisan support, and now I turn to my good friend and distinguished colleague from Florida for her opening remarks.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for the oversight and the hearings that you have afforded us on the issue of Iraq. This morning, as you have pointed out, will give us the opportunity to review the over 30 bills related to Iraq introduced in the House, and referred to our committee. Of the bills that we are referring to our committee and that we are reviewing this morning, 11 of the bills focus on withdrawal regardless of what happens on the ground. Fourteen seek to micro manage foreign and military policy in Iraq, and a few focus on supporting our troops and ensuring victory in Iraq, including a bill authored by our colleague, Congressman Sam Johnson, former Vietnam POW, and our Texas colleague will sign the discharge petition on the House floor today at 10:30 so that we can force the leadership to have his bill be taken up, and I hope that many of our members join Congressman Johnson in his leadership role and sign the discharge petition as well.

I am concerned that the majority of the bills fail to address the consequences that withdrawal from Iraq, regardless of success or failure, will have on United States national security interests. These bills and the supplemental that we might be considering this week seek to micro manage the war effort in order to compel the withdrawal of United States forces from Iraq.

All of us want our troops to come home, but it matters how that happens. My daughter-in-law, Lindsey, a marine pilot, just received orders to return for a second tour of duty in Iraq where she will be stationed until February. She will spend another Christmas and New Year's away from her family, but like her husband, my stepson Doug, also a marine pilot, Lindsey is devoted to her country, proud to wear our nation's uniform, and does not complain in any way about returning to Iraq. That is what she is trained to do.

And while Lindsey is in Iraq, too many of my colleagues are second guessing her mission, second guessing our commanders on the ground, and seeking to dictate from here what needs to be done on the battle front. Apparently we are all generals; we are all commanders in chief.

It is my hope that we don't give up on confronting the threat, and we don't give up on the Iraqi people or the ability of our armed forces to get the job done.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Congresswoman Ros-Lehtinen, and we admire the service and heroism of members of your family as we admire the service and heroism of all our military personnel. That should not prevent us from exercising judgment over the mistaken policies of this administration, the appalling mismanagement of the war, and the pathetically incompetent

reconstruction efforts which under this administration has cost the American taxpayer tens of billions of wasted dollars.

I am pleased to call on all of my colleagues for a 1-minute opening statement if they so desire. We begin with Ambassador Watson.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate you holding this very necessary hearing. Much of what we are going to hear today will be referred to by others as micro managing, but any thoughtful person would know that there is no definition for victory. It is an open-ended struggle by our courageous and brave and well-trained forces against a faceless enemy in the middle of what has to be called a civil war.

How do you fight chlorine gas? What we going to do if we don't set a time certain is to send our troops into a gas chamber now, and they are sitting in other places looking for ways to kill us in a cross fire. So we need to start withdrawing our troops and work on securing our borders, and I look forward, Mr. Chairman, to hearing those proposals to me that show thought and make sense.

Thank you very much.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much. Mr. Rohrabacher.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Whatever decisions we make shouldn't be made just based on making us feel good at the moment, and it is very easy when people are dying to say, well, we are going to feel good by stopping the situation right now, what is happening right now, and so those people won't be dying right now. If that leads to further death 10 years down the road or 5 years down the road or a shift in power in the world so that tyrannical and evil forces prevails over forces that would have been successful had we held our ground a bit longer, then we have made the wrong decision.

Again, no one wants us to be there and wants these young people to be dying, and our brothers, the young people, our American troops, our young people or other people that are dying in the civilian area in Iraq, but we have got to look at the consequences of what we are doing and be very serious about this, and let us just note as we go through this legislation and analyzing the situation there has never been a war in which people didn't make mistakes, and that there wasn't incompetency involved, and whether in World War II, I can just name you—

Chairman LANTOS. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. ROHRABACHER [continuing]. We should make sure that we don't want the mistakes cloud the strategic interests and try to do our best. Thank you.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you. Mr. Green of Texas.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask that my full statement be placed in the record.

Chairman LANTOS. Without objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for holding this hearing today. This is an important and timely hearing as we prepare to begin to debate this week on one of the most important pieces of legislation regarding Iraq since Congress authorized the use of force in 2002.

After 4 years, it is time for Congress to exercise authority over the way this war is being run. Congress is not 535 commanders in chiefs, but we must provide guidelines in what will ask the American taxpayers to fund. We have held dozens of hearings and

passed a non-binding resolution opposing the escalation or surge in the United States troops, and our vote on the supplemental this Thursday will be the next step to bring a resolution to this conflict and let the Iraqis know that our commitment is not open-ended.

We are not cutting off funding for the troops, but the language in the supplement makes known that Congress will not fund this war after next March at the latest, and sooner if the Iraqis do not make decision that need to be made for them to take control of their country.

We are saying in the supplemental that if Iraqis do not step up and make the necessary decisions to move forward, we will no longer be their crutch. We are not micro managing the war by telling the administration how to reach these benchmarks, we are setting firm benchmarks that we need to see and the Iraqis need to reach to keep our troops in Iraq through July, October or December, and to March 2008.

It has now been over 4 years since war started and over 3 years since we heard the phrase "Mission accomplished" and almost a year and a half since Iraqi elections for a permanent government. It is time for the Iraq Government to be forced to police, govern and run its country. And open-ended commitment has not forced him to do this to this point, and there is no reason to believe that it will change.

Again, I thank the chairman for holding this hearing.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Green follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GENE GREEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. Chairman, thank you for holding this hearing today—this is an important and timely hearing as we prepare to begin debate later this week on one of the most important pieces of legislation regarding Iraq since Congress authorized the use of force in 2002.

After four years, it is time Congress exercise authority over the way this war is being run. Congress is not 535 commanders in chief, but we must provide guidance on what we will ask the American taxpayers to fund.

We have held dozens of hearings this year, and passed a non-binding resolution opposing the escalation or surge in U.S. troops. Our vote on the Supplemental this Thursday will be the first step in bring a resolution to this conflict and will let the Iraqis know our commitment is not open-ended.

We are not cutting off funding for the troops, but the language in the Supplemental makes known that Congress will not fund this war after next March at latest, and sooner if the Iraqis do not make the decisions that need to be made for them to take control of their country.

What we are saying in the Supplemental is that if the Iraqis do not step up and make the necessary decisions to move forward, we will no longer be their crutch.

We're not micromanaging the war by telling the Administration how to reach these benchmarks, but we are setting firm benchmarks we need to see, and the Iraqis need to reach, to keep our troops in Iraq through July, October, December 2007, and to March 2008.

It has now been four years since this war started, over three years since we heard the phrase "mission accomplished," and almost a year and half since the Iraqi elections for a permanent government—it is time the Iraqi government be forced to police, govern, and run its country.

An open ended commitment has not forced them to do this to this point, and there is no reason to believe that will change.

Again, I thank the Chairman for holding this hearing and I look forward to hearing from my colleagues on this issue.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you. The gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Tancredo.

Mr. TANCREDO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am going to say something that I hardly hear from a member of this body, and that is that I hope that I am wrong, because I have been for some time in opposition to the surge. I spoke out against it. I believe that it was the wrong policy. I am quite concerned about the number of mistakes that I believe has occurred in Iraq during this reconstruction period, if that is what you want to call it, but certainly during this insurgency.

I hope I am wrong. I want to be wrong. I want the end result of our efforts there to be one where the Iraqi Government has in fact gained control of the country itself, that some degree of democracy begins to thrive and flourish and affects the rest of the region. I have great fear about how well we can accomplish that task, and I have every right to express those fears. I do not have a right as a Member of Congress to try to manage the war. I have a right to complain about it. I have a right to vote on its funding, but I do not have a right to manage the war, and my own concerns about our activities there, as I say, I hope I am wrong.

I wish I would hear from the other side at least once that they hope they are wrong too, and that in fact the goals of the administration, and I think of most of the American people for it, for a stable Iraq and a new chance for the Middle East are what are put in place at the end of this new strategy we have in Iraq.

I yield.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much. Congressman Faleomavaega.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I also want to thank you for your leadership in bringing these bills before the committee for consideration.

Mr. Chairman, if there is ever a classic debate that we ought to have, and it should be a debate, not a name calling or pointing fingers and saying all these fancy phrases that we keep hearing about this terrible situation that we find ourselves in right now in Iraq, if there is ever a classic debate, I would like to consider the words or the sentiments expressed by both senators, both Republicans, one from the State of Nebraska, Senator Hagle, and the other from the State of Arizona, Senator McCain.

I want to share with my colleagues what Senator Hagle said:

“Why are you so opposed to the war in Iraq? After listening to the tape recordings released in the last 1990s of the conversations in which President Lyndon Baines Johnson confided that he saw the war was pointless, that was in 1964, and LBJ feared impeachment if he tried to withdraw the troops from Vietnam.”

Quote from Senator Hagle:

“The dishonesty of it was astounding. Criminal rulings. I came to the conclusion that the seize or they use those people, used our young people, so I am very careful especially now, we had better ask all the tough questions. This administration dismissed every tough question we asked. We were assured we know what we are doing. That is what they said in Vietnam in 1964.”

And I say this to the chairman and my colleagues, we are facing the same situation that we went through in Vietnam, and guess what? We have full diplomatic relations with Vietnam, which is a communist country, and nothing ever is to be said about the tremendous, tremendous loss of lives and the efforts and the resources of our country that the waste on that terrible conflict that we were confronted with, and I say this, Mr. Chairman, because I, too, was just a grunt in Vietnam from 1967 to 1968, and I pray to God that we will never see any of these people have to go through what I went through, and I sincerely hope that members of this committee will consider that.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Poe.

Mr. POE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I waive my opening.

Chairman LANTOS. The gentlelady from California, Ms. Woolsey.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The gentleman from Colorado is not wrong, so you have got somebody that believes you are doing the right thing over here. This is not a war. It is an occupation, and we don't belong in Iraq.

So this afternoon or later this morning I will present my legislation, and my legislation is to bring our troops home and give the Iraqis back their sovereignty. It is my belief and the belief of many others per the election in November that we can do both, and we must do both.

While protecting our troops, we will not abandon the Iraqi people, and as importantly, we will commit to providing, actually through entitlement, health care, including mental health for all of our veterans.

So I look forward to sharing all that with all of you later. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much. The gentlelady from Texas, Ms. Sheila Jackson Lee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank you for keeping a commitment to the American people that this committee under your chairmanship would take up the serious foreign policy issues of the day, and particularly those addressing the question of saving lives and protecting the young men and women on the front line.

Let me thank the ranking member for joining you in this effort, and remind my colleagues that as we debate this question let us keep in front of our eyes, around our senses that young men and women are dying in Iraq.

It is interesting to look into the debate on this question and I always remind myself that I am in a safe and secure building, as safe as you could possibly be, lights and heat and air conditioning, away from harm's way, as much as you can be in this climate, and so however long we prolong this debate or decisions about bringing the troops home, those of us who debate it, although we do it in conscious and sincerity, and patriotism, we do it in safety. I am reminded of that.

I am reminded of the episode of CNN just a day or two ago regarding homeless Iraqi veterans. I am reminded of the debacle of Walter Reed.

Chairman LANTOS. The gentlelady's time has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I would only ask that we pay great attention, Mr. Chairman, to this enormous question of saving lives.

I yield back.

Chairman LANTOS. The gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have heard the comments of some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we are now trying to micromanage the war. I have read the Federalist papers, I have read the Constitution. I am pretty convinced that the frameworks of our Constitution did not intend the President could commit American forces to combat, to place them in harm's way and leave them there by himself. The frameworks intended that Congress would have a role. They were even reluctant to allow a standing army in peacetime for fear of the power it would give the President.

So it is time that Congress play a role in this. We are not, as the President seems to think, meddling. We are not sticking our nose in his war. We are doing our duty under the Constitution in considering the legislation that we will hear about today.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

We are about to embark on an unprecedented and unique exercise. As we begin the fifth year of the war, we have over 30 pieces of legislation introduced by members, covering the whole political spectrum, and the whole range of strategies. We are giving each of our colleagues who have taken the time and energy to develop legislation 5 minutes to present his proposal.

I am asking all of my colleagues on the committee to plan to submit their questions in writing because otherwise if we allow questioning of each member presenting his plan we will be here several days, and I don't think that is practical.

I will be a tough timekeeper, and I welcome all of my colleagues who are here. We will begin with Congressman Steven Lynch of Massachusetts. His legislation is H.R. 533, and titled, "The Iraq Transition Act of 2007." We are pleased to have you and you have 5 minutes, sir.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE STEPHEN LYNCH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen, good to see you. It is an honor to be before this distinguished committee.

I would like to begin by saying I have been over to Iraq half a dozen times now, once with the ranking member, and one of the critical flaws in our strategy there, I believe, is our inability or the reluctance on the part of the Iraqis to get the Iraq Government to step up and take more control over the basis government operations within Iraq.

Several months ago we were in Fallujah, the ranking member and I, and when the lights went out they asked the Iraqi city counselors came in and asked the marines to go out and get the electricity back on. The next day we were there and the water was out. They asked the Army Corps of Engineers. That is just a small ex-

ample, anecdotal about the responsibility that we have for basic government services in Iraq.

What my bill would do is create a Presidential commission with designees from the White House, the House and the Senate, both majority and minority parties, to facilitate the transition of government operations from the United States military, and we are doing everything for the Iraqis right now, 99 percent of it, over to the Iraqi Government. I think this is necessary to create the conditions for an orderly and deliberate withdrawal of our troops from Iraq.

This model is not of my own creation. This is actually modeled on a bill called the Filipino Rehabilitation act which at the end of World War II the United States military found itself in control of the Philippine Islands, and because of the Japanese occupation there was no structure there of that government, and what we did was through both the Roosevelt and Truman administrations we created a similar commission that basically handed off the government operations from the United States military to the incumbent native government, and that is a model that I think will work in this case. There are obviously differences between the two situations, but I think the structure and the operation is valid, and I think it will, as I say, create those conditions necessary for our withdrawal.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Congressman Lynch. To repeat, the number of this legislation is H.R. 533. It is entitled, "The Iraq Transition Act of 2007." We appreciate your appearing before the committee.

Mr. LYNCH. I appreciate your courtesy, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Chairman LANTOS. I am pleased to call on Chairman John Murtha, our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, whose legislation is entitled, "House Joint Resolution 18, Designated to Redeploy U.S. Forces from Iraq." We are appreciative of your appearance, Chairman Murtha. The time is yours.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN MURTHA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MURTHA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Ros-Lehtinen, I appreciate the opportunity to appear.

I wish you would read some of what I have submitted to the committee, but let me start by saying in order to achieve stability in Iraq, in my estimation, and in the region, I recommend we redeploy our United States forces from Iraq. The execution of a robust diplomatic effort—when I spoke out a year and a half ago, people forget I talked about diplomatic effort. They forget I talked about the reserve; the strategic reserve would be completely depleted by this sustained deployment.

To achieve stability and security in Iraq, I believe we must first have a responsible phased redeployment from Iraq. General William Odom, U.S. Army retired, testified, "We are pursuing the wrong war. Stability and security in the region should be overarching strategy, not a victory in Iraq."

I agree with General Odem, believe regional stability can only be accomplished through the redeployment of United States forces in Iraq. I believe only Iran and al-Qaeda want us to stay in Iraq.

As long as United States military continues to occupy Iraq, there will be no real security. Now, why is that? Because it hasn't proven effective. In May 2005, we were so concerned about the so-called progresses being made we demanded in writing in the committee that there be a report to us that says give us the progress in Iraq.

What do you measure? The oil product, well, every report has showed a below pre-war level. Electricity production, every report has showed a below pre-war level. Incidents have doubled since I spoke out, and unemployment is 60 percent. Now that is the progress report they submit to the Subcommittee on Defense, and the Armed Services Committee.

I recommended the phased redeployment of troops first from Saddam's palaces. We are in Saddam Hussein's palaces right now. Then from the Green Zone, and next from the prime real estate, and that is what we occupy. We occupy the prime real estate, the colleges and the buildings that Saddam Hussein occupied, that is where our troops are right now, in order to need to give communities back to Iraqis so they can be self-government.

We need to restore international credibility. BBC recently released a poll showing nearly three-quarters of the 25 countries disapprove U.S. policy. So why does that matter? Well, in the 1991 war, we had 170,000 troops from countries all over the world, and they paid the \$60 billion. We are paying the whole price here. They paid the \$60 billion for that war. We paid \$5 billion for the 1991 war. We need help from the international community.

Most of the results of the oil production will go to Europe. Most of the other production in Afghanistan, the drugs will go to Europe. So they have a stake in this and they are not doing their part.

Readiness is in the tank. I spoke out in September last year, I said readiness is bad. Nobody paid any attention then. Now they are starting to pay attention. You see the *New York Times*, you see the *Washington Post*, you see people realizing that readiness is so bad we cannot deploy. If we had a threat to our national security, we can't deploy, and that is because of the small number of troops we have and the fact that these troops have been deployed for such a long period of time.

A recent report by Harvard University, School of Government, put the total cost of providing medical care and disability benefits to veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan from \$350 billion to \$700 billion. We will have appropriated \$1 trillion in 1 year for defense, \$500 million for this war in Iraq and Afghanistan. It costs \$2 billion a month to transport troops and logistics to Iraq.

The public has spoken in the last election. The world has spoken. And when you say there are 145,000 troops in Iraq, these are individuals. These are individuals whose homes have been disrupted. These are individuals who are making a sacrifice. We tend to say we are making it. We are not making the sacrifice. We are not paying higher taxes. We go to Iraq every once in awhile and we say we have been to Iraq four or five times. That is not making a sacrifice. These troops and the families are the ones making the sacrifice.

When I go to the hospitals, when you go to the hospitals, I don't know how many times you have been in the hospital, but I am going to tell you something, you go to the burn center or you go to the hospitals in Bethesda or Walter Reed, you see the suffering they are putting up with. You see the wives with brain damage trying to put up with their husband or the wives trying to put up with the suffering of these troops. This is big-time stuff. This is not us. This is these young troops going back before they have a year and home, and being extended the last week that they are in Iraq.

I mean, this is uncalled for. We are breaking the very guidelines that this administration has put in place.

Let me conclude by saying historically, whether it was India, Algeria or Afghanistan, foreign occupation do not work, and in fact in Sike civil unrest, the British were in India for 75 years, and in the end there was chaos until they settled it themselves.

Our military remains the greatest military in the world, but there are limits to the ability of the United States military to control a population that considers us, and 69 percent of Iraqis consider us occupiers.

I have said before and I will continue to say there are essentially only two plans. One is to continue the occupation that has not worked, and has shown no progress toward stabilization. The other, which I advocate, is to end the occupation of Iraq and to re-strengthen our military and turn Iraq over to the Iraqis.

Thank you.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you, Chairman Murtha.

Without objection, your entire prepared testimony will be part of the record along with any other extraneous material. We appreciate your attending this hearing.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Murtha and material submitted for the record follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN P. MURTHA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Chairman, Congresswoman Ros-Lehtinen and distinguished members of this Committee, the United States currently has 145,000 troops on the ground in Iraq and over half a trillion dollars has been expended for this war. Over 3,200 of our sons and daughters have lost their lives in Iraq and close to 25,000 have been wounded. The Pentagon reports that the Iraqi Security Forces have grown in number, reaching their goal of 325,000 trained and equipped. The Iraqis have a Constitution and have held national elections. These milestones have been met, yet security in Iraq continues to deteriorate. The past four years of the Iraq War have been plagued by mischaracterization based on unrealistic *optimism instead of realism*. Reality dictates that conditions on the ground are simply moving in the wrong direction.

There are limits to military power. There is no U.S. military solution to Iraq's civil war. It is up to the Iraqis.

Beginning in May 2005, after two years of mischaracterizations and misrepresentations by this Administration, the Defense Appropriations sub-committee required the Department of Defense to submit quarterly reports to Congress on the *facts* necessary to measure stability and security in Iraq. Since July 2005, we have received these reports. They are dismal and demonstrate a clear lack of progress in vital areas of concern. Electricity, oil production, employment and potable water remain at woeful levels.

The average weekly attacks have grown from 430 in July 2005 to well over 1000 today. Attacks have increased 10 percent over the past four months. Iraqi casualties have increased from 63 per day in October 2005 to over 127 per day.

Polls this morning show that more than six in 10 Iraqis now say their lives are going badly, double the percentage who said so in late 2005. Sixty-nine percent of

the Iraqis surveyed said the presence of U.S. forces in the country makes the overall security situation worse. In January 2006, 47 percent of Iraqis approved of attacks on U.S.-led forces. When the same polling question was asked just 8 months later, 61 percent of Iraqis approved of attacks on U.S.-led forces.

The support of the American public continues to erode and there is little confidence in the current strategy. Today less than 30 percent of Americans support the war and only 11 percent support the President's plan to increase troop levels in Iraq. A February 2006 poll showed that 72 percent of American troops serving in Iraq believed U.S. should exit Iraq within the year and 42 percent said their mission was unclear.

Wars cannot be won with slogans. There must be terms for measuring progress and a clearly defined purpose, if success is ever to be achieved. General Peter Schoomaker, Chief of the United States Army, said in a recent hearing that in order for a strategy to be effective we "have to be able to measure the purpose." Yet the President sets forth a plan with no defined matrices for measuring success and a plan that in my estimation is simply more of the same plan that has not worked. A new strategy that is based on redeployment rather than further U.S. military engagement, and one that is centered on handing Iraq back to the Iraqis, is what is needed. I do not believe that Iraq will make the political progress necessary for its security and stability until U.S. forces redeploy.

In order to achieve stability in Iraq and the Region, I recommend

- 1) The redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq
- 2) The execution of a robust diplomatic effort and the restoration of our international credibility
- 3) The repairing of our military readiness and the rebuilding of our strategic reserve to face future threats.

Redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq

To achieve stability and security in Iraq, I believe we first must have a responsible phased redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq. General William Odom (U.S. Army, Retired) recently testified, "We are pursuing the wrong war."

Stability and security in the Region should be our overarching strategy, not a "victory in Iraq." I agree with General Odom and believe that Regional Stability can only be accomplished through the redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq.

Who wants us to stay in Iraq? In my opinion, Iran and Al Qaeda, because we intensify the very radical extremism we claim to be fighting against, while at the same time depleting our financial and human resources.

As long as the U.S. military continues to occupy Iraq, there will be no real security. Maintaining U.S. troop strength in Iraq or adding to the strength in specified areas, has not proven effective in the past (it did not work recently in Baghdad) nor do I believe it will work in the future. The Iraq war cannot be won by the U.S. military, predominantly because of the way our military operates. They use overwhelming force, which I advocate to save American lives, but it is counter to winning the hearts and minds of the people.

How to Re-deploy

I recommend the phased redeployment of U.S. forces, first from Saddam's palaces, then from the green zone. Next, from the prime real estate of Iraq's major cities, out of the factories and universities, and finally out of the country all together. We need to give communities back to the Iraqis so they can begin to self govern, begin economic recovery and return to some type of normality. I recommend the adoption of a U.S. policy that encourages and rewards reconstruction and regional investment and one that is dictated and administered not by the United States, but by the Iraqis themselves.

Restoration of International Credibility

I believe that a responsible redeployment from Iraq is the first step necessary in restoring our tarnished international credibility. Since the U.S. invasion of Iraq, our international credibility, even among allies, has plummeted. Stability in Iraq is important not only to the United States, but it is important to the Region and to the entire world. The BBC recently released a poll showing that nearly three-quarters of those polled in 25 countries disapprove of U.S. policies toward Iraq. More than two-thirds said the U.S. military presence in the Middle East does more harm than good. Just 29 percent of respondents said the United States has a general positive influence in the world, down from 40 percent two years ago.

How do we Restore our International Credibility

In order to restore international credibility, I believe it is necessary for the U.S. to completely denounce any aspirations of building permanent U.S. military bases in Iraq; I believe we should shut down the Guantanamo detention facility; and we must bulldoze the Abu Ghraib prison. We must clearly articulate and demonstrate a policy of “no torture, no exceptions” and directly engage countries in the region with dialogue instead of directives. This includes allies as well as our perceived adversaries.

Repairing of our Military Readiness and Rebuilding our Strategic Reserve to Face Future Threats

Our annual Defense spending budget is currently in excess of \$450 billion. Above this amount, we are spending \$8.4 billion dollars a month in the war in Iraq and yet our strategic reserve is in desperate shape. While we are fighting an asymmetric threat in the short term, we have weakened our ability to respond to what I believe is a grave long term conventional and nuclear threat.

At the beginning of the Iraq war, 80 percent of *ALL* Army units and almost 100 percent of active combat units were rated at the highest state of readiness. Today, virtually all of our active-duty combat units at home and *ALL* of our guard units are at the lowest state of readiness, primarily due to equipment shortages resulting from repeated and extended deployments to Iraq. In recent testimony given by a high ranking Pentagon official it was reported that our country is threatened because we lack readiness at home.

Our Army has no strategic reserve, and while it is true that the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Air Force can be used to project power, there is a limit to what they can achieve. Overall, our military remains capable of projecting power, but we must also be able to sustain that projection, and in this regard there is no replacement for boots on the ground.

How do we Repair Readiness and Rebuild our Strategic Reserve

We must make it a national priority to re-strengthen our military and to repair readiness. I advocate an increase in overall troop strength. The current authorized level is below what I believe is needed to maintain an optimal military. In recent testimony to the Defense Subcommittee that I chair, the Army and Marine Corps Commanders testified that they could not continue to sustain the current deployment practices without an adverse effect on the health and well-being of service members and their families.

For decades, the Army operated on a deployment policy that for every one year of deployment, two years were spent at home. This was considered optimal for re-training, re-equipping and re-constituting. Without relief, the Army will be forced to extend deployments to Iraq to over one year in country and will be forced to send troops back with less than one year at home. The Army reported that a 9-month deployment was preferable. Medical experts testified that in intensive combat, deployments of over 3 months increased the likelihood for service members to develop post traumatic stress disorders. A recent report by the Harvard University School of Government put the total cost of providing medical care and disability benefits to veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan at \$350 to \$700 billion.

We must invest in the health and well being of our service members by providing for the right amount of troops and for appropriate deployment and rotation cycles.

Our military equipment inventories are unacceptably low. The Services report that at least \$100 billion more is needed to get them back to ready state. In doing so, we must not neglect investment in military technologies of the future. While we remain bogged down in Iraq, the size and sophistication of other militaries are growing. We must not lose our capability to deter future threats.

Let me conclude by saying historically, whether it was India, Algeria or Afghanistan, foreign occupations do not work, and in fact incite civil unrest. Our military remains the greatest military in the world, but there are limits to its ability to control a population that considers them occupiers.

I have said this before and I continue to say that there are essentially only two plans. One is to continue an occupation that has not worked and that has shown no progress toward stabilization. The other, which I advocate, is to end the occupation of Iraq, redeploy and re-strengthen our military and turn Iraq over to the Iraqis.

JOHN P. MURTHA
12th DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA

COMMITTEE:
APPROPRIATIONS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-3812
March 19, 2007

Dear Colleague,

The emergency war supplemental that we will debate on the floor Thursday heavily focuses on the decline of our military readiness and the need to fix this pressing problem.

On Monday, March 19, 2007, an article in the *Washington Post* described what military officials quietly "have called a 'death spiral,' in which the ever more rapid pace of war-zone rotations have consumed 40 percent of their total gear, wearied troops and left no time to train to fight anything other than the insurgencies now at hand."

The Army's Chief of Staff, General Peter Schoomaker, said in a hearing last week, "We have a strategy right now that is outstripping the means to execute it." The Army's Vice Chief, Richard Cody described the Army's readiness as "stark." General Pace, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recently reported that because of the demands of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, there is a significant risk that the U.S. military won't be able to quickly and fully respond to another crisis. General Pace stated that he is "not comfortable" with the preparedness of Army units in the United States.

At the beginning of the Iraq war, 80% of all Army units and almost 100% of active combat units were rated at the highest levels of readiness. Just the opposite exists today. Virtually all of our active-duty combat units at home and all of our guard units are at the lowest level of readiness.

Our nation is threatened because our forces at home lack the readiness to effectively respond to future threats to our national security. We must make it a national priority to rebuild our military and to restore our military readiness. The current situation in which we find ourselves did not happen overnight, nor did it occur without warning.

On July 26, 2006, Chairman Obey and I sent a letter (attached) to the President urging him to address the continuing deterioration of our military's readiness. In September of last year, we held a press conference to discuss the continuing erosion of the Army's military readiness. Yet I still do not believe this vital issue is getting the attention it deserves.

Because of the complexity of this issue, I have attached a point paper which provides a clear description of what is meant by the term "military readiness."

Sincerely,


JOHN P. MURTHA
MEMBER OF CONGRESS

WHAT IS MILITARY READINESS?

Information and Talking Points

- Military readiness is a term used to describe how well a soldier or unit is prepared to go to war.
- The better prepared a soldier or unit is, the more likely they are to successfully complete their mission and protect themselves and the troops around them. The opposite also is true; the less prepared they are, it's more likely that the mission cannot be completed and troops will get hurt or killed.
- There are four basic components of military readiness:
 - *Equipment amounts*: Each soldier or unit is required to have certain equipment in order to perform their missions. For example, each soldier must have a rifle, a helmet, a set of body armor, and so on. Each unit must have a certain number of trucks, radios, and weapon systems.
 - *Numbers of troops*: Each unit also is required to have a specific number of trained troops with certain skills. For example, each Stryker vehicle must be manned with a commander, a driver, and a gunner. Since there are 100 Strykers in a brigade, each Stryker brigade must have 100 trained gunners. If not, the brigade is rated as less than fully capable to meet its mission.
 - *Equipment maintenance*: This component measures how well the unit's equipment is maintained and whether the unit has enough spare parts to keep the equipment running. If a Stryker vehicle's transmission keeps breaking, and there are no spare transmissions available, the vehicle will be "dead-lined"; that is, taken out of action.
 - *Training*: A unit must go through a series of training exercises to prepare for battle. The more it practices, the better a unit will perform. For example, Stryker units must practice over and over dismounting the vehicle while under enemy fire. Meeting training requirements is the most difficult military readiness measure to satisfy because a unit cannot adequately practice without being fully manned and equipped.

- In 2001, all active duty Army divisions were rated at the highest readiness levels. They were fully manned, equipped, and trained. Only some reserve units were not ready to go to war.
- Since the beginning of the Iraq war, the readiness of our forces (both active and reserves) has plummeted. In fact, Army military readiness (ground forces) has declined to levels not seen since the end of the Vietnam War.
- The vast majority of our active duty Army units at home are critically short of equipment and personnel, causing them to be rated at the lowest readiness levels. Moreover, there is NOT ONE Army National Guard combat unit that is fit for deployment. These units are either preparing to go to Iraq or serve as our forces held in reserve to fight another conflict.
- The Abu Ghraib scandal is an example of what could happen when a deployed unit was less than fully capable of meeting its mission. In this case, the unit did not have the right number of trained personnel.
- Ultimately, under-manned, under-equipped, or under-trained units are likely to experience higher casualty and accident rates in theater. This will be even more likely to occur if units are required to deploy to the theater with less than one year at home, or are kept in theater longer than one year, having lost their combat edge.
- The FY 2007 Iraq supplemental bill tries to put a stop to exposing our troops to more danger because they may lack equipment, or training, or are just plain worn out. This is done in two ways:
 - Funding: The bill provides more funds for equipment, training, and health care than was requested by the President. The bill also fully funds the increase in the number of Army soldiers (36,000) and Marines (9,000) sought.
 - Provisions: By insisting that the military meet their own guidelines - The bill requires that our troops be fully trained and equipped, and well-rested, before they are deployed to Iraq.

JERRY LEWIS, CALIFORNIA, CHAIRMAN
 C. W. BILL YOUNG, FLORIDA
 RALPH REGULA, OHIO
 HAROLD ROGERS, KENTUCKY
 FRANK R. WOLF, VIRGINIA
 TOM DELAY, TEXAS
 JIM MOHR, ARIZONA
 JAMES T. WALSH, NEW YORK
 CHARLES E. TAYLOR, NORTH CAROLINA
 DAVID L. NOBSON, OHIO
 ERNEST J. STOLCK, JR., OKLAHOMA
 HENRY SOLULLA, TEXAS
 JOE KNOWLTON, MICHIGAN
 JACK KINGSTON, GEORGIA
 RODNEY F. FREILING, NEW JERSEY
 ROBERT K. WICKER, MISSISSIPPI
 TODD TIAHIT, KANSAS
 ZACH WAMP, TENNESSEE
 TOM LATHAM, IOWA
 ANNE M. NORTHUP, KENTUCKY
 ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, ALABAMA
 JO ANN EMERSON, MISSOURI
 KAT ORAVIDA, TEXAS
 JOHN E. PETERSON, PENNSYLVANIA
 VIRGIL H. COOPER, JR., VIRGINIA
 JOHN T. DODDLE, CALIFORNIA
 RAY LAHOD, ILLINOIS
 JOHN E. SHERK, NEW YORK
 DON SHEPHERD, PENNSYLVANIA
 DAVE WILSON, FLORIDA
 MICHAEL K. SIMPSON, IDAHO
 JOHN ARNEY COLLEBORN, TEXAS
 MARK STEVEN KORN, ILLINOIS
 ANDER CRENshaw, FLORIDA
 DENNIS P. REIDGILL, MONTANA
 JOHN R. CARTER, TEXAS
 RODNEY ALEXANDER, LOUISIANA

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Committee on Appropriations
Washington, DC 20515-6015

July 26, 2006

DAVID A. GIBBY, WISCONSIN
 JOHN P. MURTHA, PENNSYLVANIA
 NORMAN D. DICKS, WASHINGTON
 MARTIN CLAY BAKER, MINNESOTA
 STEVEN K. HOFER, MARYLAND
 ALAN K. MCLELLAN, WEST VIRGINIA
 MAREY KAPLUR, UTAH
 PETER J. VUCOLOVIC, INDIANA
 NITA M. LOWEY, NEW YORK
 JOSE E. SERRANO, NEW YORK
 ROSS L. SALAJANO, CONNECTICUT
 JAMES P. MCRAE, VIRGINIA
 JERRY E. OLIVER, MASSACHUSETTS
 EU PASTOR, ARIZONA
 DAVID E. PRICE, NORTH CAROLINA
 CHET EDWARDS, TEXAS
 ROBERT E. "BOB" CHAMBER, JR., ALABAMA
 PATRICK J. KENNEDY, RHODE ISLAND
 JAMES L. CLYBURN, SOUTH CAROLINA
 MALCOLM E. KIRCHY, NEW YORK
 LUCILLE ROYAL ALLARD, CALIFORNIA
 SAM PAPP, CALIFORNIA
 JESSE L. JACKSON, JR., ILLINOIS
 CAROLYN C. YEP PATRICK, MICHIGAN
 ALLEN BOYD, FLORIDA
 CHAGA FATTAH, PENNSYLVANIA
 STEVEN R. ROTHMAN, NEW JERSEY
 SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR., GEORGIA
 MARION BERRY, ARIZONA

CLERK AND STAFF DIRECTOR
 FRANK M. CUSHING
 TELEPHONE:
 (202) 225-4771

The Honorable George W. Bush
 President of the United States
 The White House
 Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:

We are writing to recommend that you submit an emergency funding request to reverse the continuing deterioration of the U.S. Army's preparedness for war. General Schoomaker, the Army's Chief of Staff, testified before Congress that the Army needs an additional \$17 billion in fiscal year 2007 to repair and replace equipment used in the war. Without these additional funds, Army readiness most likely will continue to degrade.

While we in Washington continue to spend countless hours debating U.S. national security policy in Iraq, the Middle East, and elsewhere, our national security strength – namely, the readiness of U.S. ground forces – has weakened. It is sadly ironic that as we wage war in Iraq, our ability to wage war in other potential conflict areas around the world has been seriously undermined by a lack of attention and commitment. This may be the ultimate cost of and greatest untold story regarding our occupation of Iraq. Here are some troubling facts:

- The vast majority of U.S. active duty combat units not deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan are reported to be at the lowest levels of military readiness. Were you, as the Commander-in-Chief, to call upon them to respond to a crisis, these units would have to reply, "Not ready for duty, Sir."
- The situation for the Army reserves is worse. Almost all of the non-deployed Army Guard and Reserve units are reporting to be at the lowest military readiness levels.

- Army readiness is being driven to these low levels, in part, by a lack of equipment for training and deployment overseas. Yet, thousands of the Army's main fighting vehicles and trucks are lined up at repair depots around the country, sitting in disuse for lack of maintenance funding.
- Ammunition supplies are so low that only units with deployment orders at Fort Hood, Texas are issued ammunition. No other Army units at the base have been issued ammunition for training. Further, other Army bases throughout the U.S. have been forced to severely curtail operations. In some cases, grounds maintenance has ceased completely and custodial services of public buildings have been limited to cleaning only the restrooms.


The deterioration of our Army's readiness for war has potentially dire short-term and long-term consequences to American security. Combat units experiencing equipment and personnel shortages cannot adequately train for redeployment to Iraq or Afghanistan. Under-trained and ill-equipped forces face the potential of greater casualties after being called to battle. Over the longer term, our ability to deter future conflicts is undermined by the lack of a strategic reserve to respond to international crises. We can continue to debate the role of our military in Iraq, Iran, North Korea, and elsewhere, but without a military capable of meeting strategic requirements, that debate is pointless.

We believe this national crisis must be addressed now and, as President, your attention to this matter is urgently required. As such, we strongly recommend that you and your Administration prepare for submission to the Congress an emergency funding request to cover the Army readiness and equipment maintenance shortfalls, as well as shortfalls in other U.S. ground forces. Were such a request submitted, you can be sure that we will work hard to secure its timely passage.

Sincerely,



Dave Obey
Ranking Member



John P. Murtha
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Defense

Chairman LANTOS. I am pleased to call on our distinguished colleague from Oregon, a former member of this committee, we miss him, Congressman Earl Blumenauer of Oregon. His legislation is designated H.R. 663, entitled, "New Direction for Iraq Act of 2007." Mr. Blumenauer.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE EARL BLUMENAUER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I assure you that I miss you and the committee, and I appreciate deeply you're having this hearing today.

This is an important step for the distinguished committee which has a unique role in helping us move forward. Last month we had an important bipartisan vote rejecting the President's escalation in Iraq. Then we began 100 critical days for Congress to reestablish itself as a co-equal branch of government. There have been oversight hearings on everything from the treatment of our veterans to contractor failures to provide needed services to our troops. This week there will be another important step as Congress seeks to reassert its power of the purse through the spending in Iraq with the supplemental budget. This is not micromanagement. This is what Congress should have been doing all along.

Now, this committee has an opportunity to tie the pieces together. There are so many things going on, but only the International Relations Committee is tasked with looking at the big picture and establishing policy.

I have introduced H.R. 663, a comprehensive effort to do just that. I have developed it in consultation, in part, with my experience on this committee and what didn't happen here, and with the distinguished former chair of this committee, Lee Hamilton, with experts at home and here in Washington, DC, and, frankly, with a lot of just plain citizens who are concerned and can see the deep problems that have emerged.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the committee would review the points that are set forth in this new direction for Iraq legislation. We have goals setting forth supporting the Iraqi people, preventing greater violence, reestablishing United States international credibility, and military readiness, and refocusing on real national security threats.

There are 14 specific steps, and I am not going to go into them in detail, but it ranges from making clear that we are not going to establish permanent bases in Iraq, and we are against escalation; that we want responsible redeployment of United States forces; creating jobs for Iraqis themselves, taking it away from expensive foreign contractors. I mean, what is the wisdom of paying some foreign national \$10,000 a month to drive a truck in Iraq when unemployment is verging on 40 percent and Iraqis would do it for \$400 a month?

We have the responsibility to stop fraud in terms of contracts that really look dicey, to be charitable. We need to act aggressively to punish anybody guilty of war profiteering. There is regional diplomacy, and Mr. Chairman, you and members of this committee have been active in that and in speaking out on it. We need to make sure that the United States is an honest broker promoting

Israeli/Palestinian peace efforts. We want to reengage the United States, and I would argue that it is time to go back for a new United Nations resolution to support international cooperation in stabilizing Iraq based on the situation that faces us now.

Yes, you ought to establish benchmarks for progress, deal with Iraqi reconciliation, for instance, the appointment of a special envoy to Iraq for exactly that purpose; work with Iraqi civil society reestablishment; disarming militias; and Mr. Chairman, dealing meaningfully with the tragedy of hundreds of thousands of Iraq refugees. This is a shameful blot, I think, on our record that we have not stepped forward in a meaningful way to deal with these people who are displaced.

I won't bore you at this point with a struggle that I had to bring one translator back to the United States whose life would forfeit because of her work with our troops, and the work starting with a group of high school students in Portland, Oregon, trying to push this through. It is shameful, and it needs to change because we owe it to these people.

Mr. Chairman, I see my time is about up. I deeply appreciate your starting the process here with this committee as only this committee can do. You are going to hear from a number of distinguished colleagues who have fought long and hard about their own efforts. Some are more limited, some are comprehensive, but I hope that you use the power of this committee to look for, sift through the best and the brightest ideas here to come forward with comprehensive legislation that only this committee can do because the Iraqi people need it, the American public expects it, and the time is now.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Congressman Blumenauer.

I welcome to the witness table a distinguished member of the committee, the gentlelady from Texas, Sheila Jackson Lee. She has two pieces of legislation, H. Con. Res. 15, Government of Iraq should not grant blanket amnesty to persons who have attacked United States armed forces, and H.R. 930, Military Success in Iraq and Diplomatic Surge for National and Political Reconciliation in Iraq Act of 2007.

We are pleased to have you. You may proceed as you see fit.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE SHEILA JACKSON LEE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and again let me offer my enormous appreciation for the vitality of this committee under your leadership, and how honored I am to be a new member of this committee, and how honored I am to appear before my colleagues.

I was against this war from its very beginning, but I am for this nation. I love my country. I want to acknowledge that as we debate this question and as we debate it further this week, let it be in the tone that all of us, no matter what our viewpoints are, love our country.

But I want to remind my colleagues, because forever and ever we have said this is not another Vietnam, how shameful it was for

Former Secretary Defense of Defense McNamara to write some 20-plus years later the Vietnam War was a mistake. Fifty thousand Americans, many of them our friends, our neighbors, our brothers, and some our sisters, lost their lives. For those of us of my generation, we can count young men, our colleagues, our friends, our college students, our fellow college students who went off to work and never returned.

So I believe it is important to acknowledge a very simple mistake, that was the offensive act of the war, but also to acknowledge and celebrate the United States military, and that is why my legislation is called H.R. 930, The Military Success in Iraq and Diplomatic Surge for National and Political reconciliation in Iraq Act of 2007.

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, I will just lay the groundwork for its premise, because I believe in the wisdom of our forefathers, the framers understood that while the military does the fighting, our nation goes to war, and that is why the framers lodged the power to declare war in the Congress, the branch of government closest to the people. They knew that the decision to go to war was too important to be left to the whim of a single person, no matter how wise or well-informed he or she might be.

But the authorization to use military force in Iraq passed by Congress was not a declaration war, but rather a blank check for the President to start and wage war in Iraq at a time and place and manner of his choosing. Four years later, the evidence is clear and irrefutable: The invasion of Iraq, while a spectacularly executed military operation, was a strategic blunder without parallel in the history of American foreign policy. This is what can happen when the Congress allows itself to be stampeded into authorizing a President to launch a preemptive war of choice.

So what do I say in this bill? I say that the military has been successful and we should applaud them. They have engaged in disarming Iraq of any weapons of mass destruction. They have determined that they don't exist. They changed the Iraqi regime by removing Saddam Hussein. They brought justice to any members of al-Qaeda known or found to be in Iraq bearing responsibility for the attacks on the United States citizens. They also were taken to ensure the regime of Saddam Hussein would not provide weapons of mass destruction to international terrorists, including al-Qaeda, and they did that. Then they went on to enforce all relevant United States Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.

Our military operations, at least our military personnel, our fighting men and women, have been successful, and frankly I believe this act will allow them to be brought home with dignity and to recognize the success of the military action. In other words, every objective for which the use of force in Iraq was authorized by the 2002 resolution have been achieved, and most with spectacular success and thanks to the professionalism and superior skills of our service men and women. This singular contribution of my legislation, I hope, will not fall on deaf ears. We can bring our troops home and we can bring them home with dignity.

My bill further declares that whenever the objectives set forth in the AUF have been achieved, the authorization expires automatically. I believe that is constitutionally sound.

But then I go onto the next aspect of what we need to do, very important to this committee, a diplomatic surge for political and national reconciliation. I suggest a special envoy—I know that we had many ambassadors—that focuses his or her attention on the political reconciliation of Shiites, Kurds and Sunnis. We also suggest that we begin to engage our neighbors. Over and over again our neighbors have indicated their willing—Iran, Turkey, Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

Yes, many of them we have disagreement with, but I believe it is important to focus on the humanitarian aspect of the reconciliation of this nation. Iraq can do for itself. They are bright and wonderful people. I have met with many of them as I have traveled to Iraq. I have met with women. I have met with scientists. I have met with those who control the utilities there. They simply want a chance, and the men and women of Iraq, the families of Iraq don't want occupiers. They simply want to have the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to run their country and, I hope, to reconcile.

So this legislation, H.R. 930, is a combination of thanking the United States military and going forward, going forward with political reconciliation using, first, a special envoy to focus on the Baker-Hamilton Commission report, and finally, of course, to engage our neighbors for what I think will be a safe and secure return of Iraq to the family of nations and security for their own people in that country.

I thank you so very much and I thank my colleagues for their attention.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Jackson Lee follows:]

CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE, OF TEXAS

STATEMENT BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
“PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON IRAQ”

MARCH 20, 2007

Thank you, Chairman Lantos for convening this historic hearing. There is no more important issue facing the Congress, the President, and the American people than the war in Iraq. It is a subject upon which no one is indifferent, least of all members of Congress. Beginning with our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Murtha, many good ideas have been advanced by members of Congress to bring to a successful conclusion the American military engagement in Iraq.

It is in that spirit that I am delighted to be here to discuss H.R. 930, the “Military Success in Iraq and Diplomatic Surge for National and Political Reconciliation in Iraq Act of 2007,” which I introduced on February 8, 2007.

I. Military Success in Iraq Act

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, when Congress authorized the president to use military force in Iraq in 2002, I believe it departed from the wisdom of our forefathers. The Framers understood that *while the military does the fighting, a nation goes to war*. That is why the Framers lodged the power to declare war in the Congress, the branch of government closest to the people. They knew that the decision to go to war was too important to be left to the whim of a single person, no matter how wise or well-informed he or she might be.

But the authorization to use military force in Iraq (AUMF) passed by Congress was not a declaration of war but rather a blank check for the president to start and wage war in Iraq at a time, place, and manner of his choosing. Four years later, the evidence is clear and irrefutable: the invasion of Iraq, while a spectacularly executed military operation, was a strategic blunder without parallel in the history of American foreign policy. *This is what can happen when the Congress allows itself to be stampeded into authorizing a president to launch a preemptive war of choice.*

Title I of my legislation, the “Military Success in Iraq Act of 2007” (M-S-I-A) or “Messiah,” offers an honorable deliverance from Iraq. Let me explain.

Congress authorized the President to use military force against Iraq to achieve the following objectives:

1. to disarm Iraq of any weapons of mass destruction that could threaten the security of the United States and international peace in the Persian Gulf region;
2. to change the Iraqi regime so that Saddam Hussein and his Baathist party no longer posed a threat to the people of Iraq or its neighbors;
3. to bring to justice any members of al Qaeda known or found to be in Iraq bearing responsibility for the attacks on the United States, its citizens, and interests, including the attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001;
4. to ensure that the regime of Saddam Hussein would not provide weapons of mass destruction to international terrorists, including al Qaeda; and

5. to enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.

Thanks to the skill and valor of the Armed Forces of the United States we now know for certain that Iraq does not possess weapons of mass destruction. Thanks to the tenacity and heroism of American troops, Saddam Hussein was deposed, captured, and dealt with by the Iraqi people in such a way that neither he nor his Baathist Party will ever again pose a threat to the people of Iraq or its neighbors in the region. Nor will the regime ever acquire and provide weapons of mass destruction to international terrorists.

Third, the American military has caught or killed virtually every member of al Qaeda in Iraq remotely responsible for the 911 attack on our country. Last, all relevant U.N. resolutions relating to Iraq have been enforced.

In other words, every objective for which the use of force in Iraq was authorized by the 2002 resolution has been achieved, most with spectacular success thanks to the professionalism and superior skill of our service men and women. The singular contribution of my legislation is that it recognizes and honors this fact.

The MSIA declares that the objectives which led Congress to pass the 2002 AUMF have been achieved. It further declares that whenever the objectives set forth in an AUMF have been achieved, the AUMF expires automatically. And importantly, it also provides that Congress is the ultimate arbiter as to whether the objectives set forth in a congressional AUMF have been achieved.

Because the objectives set forth in the 2002 AUMF have been achieved, my legislation provides that the authorization to use force conferred upon the President by that AUMF has now expired. My bill then makes clear that the President must obtain a new authorization to continue the use force in Iraq. Finally, my bill requires that if the Congress does not vote to reauthorize the use of force in Iraq within 90 days after determining that the objectives set forth in the 2002 AUMF have been achieved, all American armed forces in Iraq must be redeployed out of Iraq.

Thus, under my legislation, an up-or-down vote must be held by the House and Senate to continue waging war in Iraq.

II. Diplomatic Surge for Political and National Reconciliation in Iraq

Mr. Chairman, like most Americans, I believe the time has come to debate, adopt, and implement a plan for strategic redeployment. I am not talking about “immediate withdrawal,” “cutting and running,” or surrendering to terrorists. And I certainly am not talking about staying in Iraq forever or the foreseeable future.

The Armed Forces of the United States have performed magnificently. *They won the war they were sent to fight. Their civilian leadership has not succeeded in winning the peace.* Rather than undertaking a misguided and futile surge in troops, the United States should surge diplomatically and politically.

That is why Title II of H.R. 930, the “Diplomatic Surge for Political and National Reconciliation in Iraq Act,” implements twelve of the most important recommendations of the Iraq Study Group and, among other things, creates a high-level Special Envoy for National and Political Reconciliation in Iraq (SENPRI) to launch a new offensive on the diplomatic front. This Special Envoy -- who would be an individual of the stature of former Secretary of State Colin Powell, Madeleine Albright, or James Baker -- would be

commissioned to undertake the peaceful reconciliation of the major stakeholders in a free and democratic Iraq, particularly the Sunnis, Shiites, and Kurds.

The SENPRI shall meet with any and all such persons, organizations, and entities, and make such recommendations as he deems necessary and expedient for bringing about national and political reconciliation in Iraq, including recommending the assistance of a bona fide international peacekeeping force where necessary.

A real diplomatic surge requires a full-court press designed to engage all six of Iraq's neighbors - Iran, Turkey, Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait - more constructively in stabilizing Iraq. These countries are already involved in a bilateral, self-interested but disorganized way.

As the Iraq Study Group report makes clear, none of these countries wants to live with an Iraq that, after our redeployment, becomes a failed state or a humanitarian catastrophe that could become a haven for terrorists or a hemorrhage of millions more refugees streaming into their countries.

Mr. Chairman, all Americans of goodwill share the goal of bringing about a just and lasting peace in Iraq. But it is clear to most thoughtful observers that the achievement of that goal requires more American diplomatic and political engagement and less military involvement. My legislation will make diplomacy and statecraft tools of the first, rather than the last, resort as has been the case for the past four years.

In conclusion, H.R. 930, requires the Congress to provide leadership on the most important issue of our day. That is what the American people want. That is what they voted for last November. That is what has been required all along.

And providing constructive leadership that will bring peace, enhance security, and save lives is the task to which I am now, and always have been, dedicated. That is why I strongly and proudly support our magnificent, heroic, and selfless service men and women who accomplished their mission of winning military success in Iraq. The best way for us to be worthy of their sacrifice is wage the diplomatic offensive needed to achieve national and political reconciliation in Iraq. My bill, H.R. 930, will help us reach this goal and return our troops to their native land and to the families and friends who love them so much.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in light of all that the selfless men and women of the United States Armed Forces have done to rid the people of Iraq of one of history's greatest tyrants and to give them a chance to build a future of peace and freedom and prosperity for themselves and their posterity, it should go without saying that the Government of Iraq should not even consider granting blanket amnesty to persons known to have attacked, killed, or wounded members of the United States Armed Forces in Iraq. **H. Con. Res. 15**, a concurrent resolution which I introduced in January of this year, clearly expresses the sense of the Congress that any such action would be utterly unacceptable to the people of the United States.

I thank the Committee for allowing me this time to discuss H.R. 930. I invite all members to join me as co-sponsors. I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you, Congresswoman Shelia Jackson Lee.

I am pleased to call to the microphone my fellow Californian and good friend, Congressman Mike Thompson. His legislation, one of them numbered H.R. 787, The Iraq War De-Escalation Act of 2007, and H.R. 714, War Funding Accountability Act. We are pleased to have you, Mr. Thompson.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MIKE THOMPSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Madam Ranking Member and fellow members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to present my two bills to the committee today.

I believe we have completed our mission in Iraq. Now it is time for the Iraqi Government to secure the peace of their country. Our country must focus on protecting our troops, bringing them home as safely and quickly as possible, and turning Iraq's national security responsibilities over to the Iraqis. Also, I strongly believe that we have to terrorism both proactively and vigilantly wherever it exists.

As the chairman of the Intelligence Subcommittee on Terrorism, and as a combat veteran myself, I know that this is a responsibility our country must pursue for the safety of our own citizens and for the future of the civilized world.

Our presence in Iraq has our troops in the middle of a civil war. It also severely limits our ability to fight terrorist threats or address foreign crises. Our military reports that after 4 years in Iraq they don't have the personnel, equipment or training to effectively handle new conflicts. We also lack the readiness to take on threats to our homeland, such as terrorist attacks or natural disasters. As our colleague, Mr. Murtha, said before, our readiness is in the tank.

Also, our military does not have the necessary resources for their mission in Iraq. Even though we have funneled hundreds of billions of dollars into the war, our military still can't properly arm and train our troops. In addition, our presence in Iraq is fueling terrorism throughout the Middle East.

A national intelligence estimate released last year found that finding the United States presence in Iraq has become a cause celeb for Jihadists throughout the Muslim world. In a recent poll just released over the weekend by several major news organizations found that only 18 percent of the Iraqis express confidence in United States-lead forces, and 69 percent said our presence made security worse.

I believe there must be congressional action to bring this war to an end. Our troops have done an incredible job, but they can't bring peace to Iraq. Only the Iraqi Government can end the civil war and begin to mend the divisions between their own people.

We must change our focus in Iraq from a combat mission to one that fosters diplomacy, and the rebuilding of their government. It is the only way we will help the Iraqis stabilize their country.

The Iraq De-Escalation Act, or H.R. 787, is an achievable strategy for ending our involvement in Iraq and helping the Iraqis move

toward peace. It has 60 co-authors in the House, both Democrats and Republicans. It closely follows the bipartisan recommendations of the Iraq Study Group by requiring a phased redeployment of United States troops to begin no later than May 1, 2007, with all combat brigades out of Iraq by March 31, 2008.

My bill also allows some flexibility of the redeployment time tables as a way to encourage the Iraqi Government to make progress on specific benchmarks. It allows the President to request from Congress a brief suspension of the redeployment if there is clear evidence that the Iraqi Government is achieving certain security, diplomatic, and reconstruction milestones.

If the Iraqi Government is making progress, we should help them rebuild and stabilize their country, but bringing our troops home as quickly and as safely as possible should be our top priority. Under my bill, the President is required to submit quarterly reports to Congress, describing and assessing the Iraqi Government's progress in meeting these specific benchmarks. The legislation also conditions future economic assistance to Iraq on the progress they make toward those benchmarks.

In addition, the President must report to Congress on the progress of the redeployment. It also calls for increased diplomatic efforts in the Middle East by requiring the President to appoint a special United States envoy that will help build relationships between Iraq and its neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, my second bill addresses accountability. We need to know that U.S. taxpayer dollars are being properly spent but, unfortunately, there has been evidence of waste, fraud, and abuse. We need to support our troops and ensure that they are getting the equipment they need. We have seen countless examples of this, and these aren't isolated incidents. Reports from the GAO and the inspector general in Iraq have found evidence of billions of dollars in misspent and unaccounted for funds.

My bill requires the President through the Department of Defense, inspector general, and the Special Inspector General for Iraq reconstruction to report to Congress on all reconstruction in military spending within 30 days after any supplemental. The report must include assessments of the funding, who we are spending to, how we are hiring these people, and if any waste, fraud and abuse is found, there would be appropriate sanctions placed on them.

I think these are both important measures to help move us toward getting out of Iraq as quickly as we possibly can, and I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your thoughtful in bringing this hearing forward.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Thompson follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MIKE THOMPSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Chairman Lantos, Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to present my legislation, H.R. 787 and H.R. 714.

I believe we have completed our mission in Iraq. Now it is time for the Iraqi government to secure the peace. Our country must focus on protecting our troops, bringing them home as safely and quickly as possible, and turning Iraq's national security over to the Iraqis.

Also, I strongly believe we must fight terrorism both proactively and vigilantly, wherever it exists. As the Chairman of the Intelligence Subcommittee on Terrorism,

I know this is a responsibility our country must pursue, for the safety of our own citizens and future of the civilized world.

Our presence in Iraq has our troops in the middle of a civil war. It also severely limits our ability to fight terrorist threats or address foreign crises. Our military reports that after four years in Iraq, they do not have the personnel, equipment or training to effectively handle new conflicts. We also lack the readiness to take on threats to our homeland, such as a terrorist attack or natural disaster. Also, our military has been denied the necessary resources for their mission in Iraq. Even though we have funneled hundreds of billions of dollars into the war, our military still cannot properly arm and train our troops.

In addition, the president's failing "stay the course" strategy in Iraq is fueling terrorism throughout the Middle East. A National Intelligence Estimate released last year found that fighting the U.S.'s presence in Iraq has become a "cause celebre" for jihadists throughout the Muslim world.¹ A recent poll by several major news organizations found that only 18 percent of Iraqis expressed confidence in U.S. led forces and 69 percent said their presence made security worse.²

I believe there must be Congressional action to bring this war to an end. Our troops have done an incredible job, but they cannot bring peace to Iraq. Only the Iraqi government can end the civil war that has erupted and begin to mend the divisions between their people. We must change our focus in Iraq from a combat mission to one that fosters diplomacy and the rebuilding of their government. That is the only way we will help the Iraqis stabilize their country.

The Iraq War De-Escalation Act, H.R. 787, is an achievable strategy for ending our involvement in Iraq and helping the Iraqis move toward peace. It has received support from 60 of our colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans.

H.R. 787 closely follows the bipartisan recommendations of the Iraq Study Group by requiring a phased redeployment of U.S. troops to begin no later than May 1, 2007, with all combat brigades out of Iraq by March 31, 2008.

My bill also allows some flexibility of the redeployment timetable as a way to encourage the Iraqi government to make progress on specific benchmarks. It allows the president to request from Congress a brief suspension of redeployment—no more than 90 days—if there is clear evidence that the Iraqi government is achieving certain security, diplomatic and reconstruction milestones. If the Iraqi government is making progress, we should help them rebuild and stabilize their country. But bringing our troops home as safely and quickly as possible must be our top priority.

Under my bill, the president is required to submit quarterly reports to Congress describing and assessing the Iraqi government's progress in meeting these specific benchmarks. I've included the benchmarks for the record.

The legislation also conditions future economic assistance to Iraq on the progress they make toward those benchmarks, with exceptions for humanitarian, security and job-creation assistance. In addition, the president must report to Congress on the progress of the redeployment.

H.R. 787 also calls for increased diplomatic efforts in the Middle East. It requires the president to appoint a special U.S. envoy that will help build relationships between Iraq and its neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, my second bill addresses another priority of mine—accountability. Funding for the war in Iraq has gone outside the normal budget process. Ninety-four percent of the Iraq war spending has been by emergency and supplemental appropriations.

We need to support our troops and ensure that they are getting the equipment they need. We also need to know that U.S. taxpayer dollars are being properly spent but, unfortunately, there has been evidence of waste, fraud and abuse. One such egregious example is a report that U.S. engineers estimated it would cost \$15 million to repair a cement plant in northern Iraq, when local Iraqis were able to do this for just \$80,000. This is not an isolated incident. Reports from the GAO and the Inspector General in Iraq have found evidence of billions of dollars in misspent and unaccounted funds.^{3 4}

H.R. 714 requires the president, through the Department of Defense Inspector General and the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, to report to Congress on all reconstruction and military spending within 30 days after any supplemental passes and quarterly thereafter.

¹Declassified Key Judgments of the National Intelligence Estimate, "Trends in Global Terrorism: Implications for the United States," April 2006

²BBC, ABC News, ARD German TV and USA Today, "Iraq Poll 2007."

³General Accountability Office, "IRAQ CONTRACT COSTS," September 2006.

⁴Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, "Quarterly Report, January 30, 2007."

This report must include a thorough assessment of each funding item's purpose, which private contractors are receiving the contracts and how these contractors are chosen. The president would also be required to report on what additional funding is needed to complete military operations and reconstruction goals and what would be required to meet those needs.

If two or more of these reports are not submitted, the GAO would then conduct an audit and report to Congress within six months. Any evidence of contractors engaged in waste, fraud or war profiteering would result in sanctions against those contractors.

I believe Congressional oversight will help reduce wasteful spending by the Pentagon and price gouging by contractors. This is a responsibility we have to the men and women serving in Iraq, to their families and to the American people who are paying for the war.

HR 714 has 30 cosponsors. My bill was also included in an accountability resolution put forth by the Blue Dog Coalition.

Mr. Chairman, thank you again for the opportunity to present my legislation. These hearings are an important step toward bringing our troops home as safely and quickly as possible.

THIRTEEN BENCHMARKS—IRAQI GOVERNMENT MUST

1. Lift all restrictions concerning non-interference in operations of US forces in Iraq and do so on a continuing basis.
2. Make significant progress in reducing sectarian violence and reducing the size and operational effectiveness of sectarian militias in Iraq.
3. Make significant progress towards removing militia elements from the Iraqi Army, National Police, Facilities Protection Services, and other security forces of the Iraqi government.
4. Enact legislation or established other binding mechanisms to ensure the sharing of all Iraqi oil revenues among all segments of Iraqi society in an equitable manner.
5. Make significant progress towards making available no less than \$10 billion for reconstruction, job creation and economic development in Iraq, with safeguards to prevent corruption, by January 10, 2008.
6. Deploy at least 18 Iraqi Army and National Police brigades to Baghdad and is effectively ensuring that such units are performing their security and police functions in all Baghdad neighborhoods, regardless of their sectarian composition.
7. Enact legislation or establishes other binding mechanisms to revise its de-Baathifications laws to encourage the employment in the Government of Iraq of qualified Iraqi professionals, irrespective of ethnic or political affiliation, including ex-Baathists who were not leading figures of Saddam Hussein's regime.
8. Establish a fair process for considering amendments to the constitution of Iraq that promote lasting national reconciliation in Iraq.
9. Make significant progress towards assuming full responsibility for security in all the provinces of Iraq by November 30, 2007.
10. Make significant progress towards holding free and fair provincial elections in Iraq at the earliest date practicable, but not later than December 31, 2007.
11. Make substantial progress towards increasing the size and effectiveness of Ministry of Defense.
12. Make significant progress in reforming and strengthening the civilian ministries and other government institutions that support the Iraqi Army and National Police.
13. Make significant progress towards reforming its civilian ministries to ensure that they are not administered on a sectarian basis and that government services are delivered in an even-handed and non-sectarian manner.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Congressman Thompson.

Before recognizing my next colleague, I want to give those members of the committee who were unavoidably detained at the outset time to make their opening statement, and we will begin with my friend from Indiana, Mr. Burton.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Twenty-eight Democrat bills today, and two Republican bills, and everything I have heard so far is to beat-up-on-the-President approach. You know, George Washington was asked by some of his generals to resign because the Revolutionary War wasn't going well. Abraham Lincoln was vilified because the Civil War wasn't going well, and they said he wasn't going to be reelected until things changed right at the end. Churchill was vilified because nobody would listen to him because they thought Hitler was not going to be a real menace until he went into Poland, and everybody wanted to capitulate.

All I would like to say to my Democrat colleagues today is everything that we are hearing means withdrawal, redeploy, whatever you want to call it, but it means capitulation and creating a void in the Middle East that is going to be filled by the radical terrorists.

We are in a war against terrorism, and if we create a void over there in Iraq, it is going to be filled by Iran who is developing a nuclear capability, and it is going to leave the entire Middle East and the world vulnerable, and I would just like to say to my Democrat colleagues, and I know I am going over Mr. Chairman, I am going to stop right now, think about that. Instead of just beating up on the President, think about the ramifications of pulling out right now.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you, Mr. Burton.

Mr. Carnahan.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am going to waive doing an opening statement so we can hear from our other members.

Chairman LANTOS. I am pleased to call on my colleague, my fellow Californian and good friend, Congresswoman Lee.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE BARBARA LEE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good morning. I thank you and our ranking member for inviting me to participate in this hearing on legislation introduced in the 110th Congress on the issue of the war in Iraq. I applaud your foresight in scheduling this important hearing. For 8 years, I had the honor of serving on this committee and I am very pleased to see you, Mr. Chairman, at its helm.

This is a very significant——

Chairman LANTOS. We miss you on this committee, Barbara.

Ms. LEE. Yes, I miss this committee also, but thank you for your leadership, and the committee has expanded, and it is a committee that I think is really leading the way here in the Congress with regard to our foreign policy.

This is a very significant hearing because it complements the aggressive oversight over the war in Iraq that the Democratic-controlled Congress has been able to restore.

Yesterday we marked the fourth anniversary since the President misled this nation into an unnecessary war with Iraq that has cost us over 3,200 lives, over 24,000 wounded, and \$400 billion. It has

undermined our standing among the community of nations, and has made our world less safe, but it didn't have to be this way.

Imagine for a moment, and I want to remind this committee for those who were here and those who weren't here, it didn't have to be that way had the Congress adopted my substitute amendment which came before this committee, to the authorization to use force against Iraq in 2002, which just basically said we would allow the United Nations' inspectors to finish their job. We would have discovered what we all know now, and that is that Saddam Hussein had no weapons of mass destruction, and as we know now, which many of us knew then, there was no connection between the horrific events of 9/11 perpetrated by al-Qaeda and Iraq.

The bottom line is that Iraq would not be the catastrophic mess that it is now. Clearly, it is past time for this war to end and to bring our troops home. Without a doubt, all of the bills that you are hearing today take steps toward that end. In fact, I am the co-sponsor of many of them, including H.R. 508, To Bring Our Troops Home and Sovereignty of Iraq Restoration Act, introduced by our colleague and a great leader, and a member of this committee, Congresswoman Lynne Woolsey. Let me just mention Congresswoman Waters is also a co-sponsor of that.

But a portion of that that we are debating now with regard to the supplemental, it would complete a fully funded withdrawal within 6 months while ensuring that our troops and contractors leave safely, and accelerate the training of Iraqi security forces. This is the focus, as I said, of an amendment which we have attempted to have debated over the crafting of this supplemental which we will be voting on.

But equally as important, Mr. Chairman, when we bring our troops home we must make sure that they all come home. We must not leave permanent military bases in Iraq. That is why, along with my colleague from Maine, Congressman Tom Allen, I introduce H. Con. Res. 46, declaring that it is the policy of the United States not to establish permanent military bases in Iraq.

This is an important policy that needs to be codified into law because the perception that the United States intends to be permanently in Iraq, to occupy Iraq permanently, has been a key in recruiting insurgencies. As the national intelligence estimates last year stated, I think Congressman Thompson read this quote, but I want to read it also: "The Iraq conflict has become the cause celeb for Jihadists, breeding a deep resentment of United States' involvement in the Muslim world and cultivating supporters for the global Jihadist movement." Now, that is their quote.

What is more, a January 2006 University of Maryland program on international policy attitudes poll found that even if the Government of Iraq asked the United States to withdraw its military forces in 6 months, 76 percent of Iraqis would assume the United States would refuse to do so, a clear statement that the United States does not seek a long term and permanent presence in Iraq would send a strong signal to the people of Iraq and the international community that the United States has no designs on Iraq.

In its report last December, the bipartisan Iraq Study Group recommended the President should state, the President should state that the United States does not seek permanent military bases in

Iraq. If the Iraqi Government were to request a temporary base or bases, then the United States Government would consider that request as it would any other government.

Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, the President was asked at a press conference in 2006, "Does the United States want to maintain permanent bases in Iraq?" The President said, "Any decision about permanency in Iraq will be made by the Iraqi Government."

But yet Secretary Gates during a hearing with Senator Levin was asked the same question, and he said that we will make that decision. Secretary Gates said that.

So I think it is very important for the administration to clarify its position and its confusion because if the Secretary is saying one thing, and the President is saying another thing, we really don't know what the policy is.

You may know that last year the House of Representatives passed four separate bills prohibiting the establishment of permanent military bases in Iraq, using funds available for fiscal year 2007, including two which the President signed into law, Fiscal Year 2007 Defense Authorization, and Fiscal Year 2007 Defense Appropriations Bill.

This was an important step forward, but it was limited only to the funds appropriated in fiscal year 2007. We need to have Congress on record with a broad, unequivocal, bipartisan statement of policy. We must remove the spectrum and endless occupation, and take the targets off of our troops' backs by preventing the establishment of permanent military bases.

So, Mr. Chairman, I encourage you to bring this resolution to this committee for markup, and to help it move to the House floor for expeditious consideration. I want to thank you again, Mr. Chairman, and our ranking member for asking us to participate in this very important hearing today. I appreciate the opportunity and look forward to working with you and the entire Foreign Affairs Committee to end this war, to bring our troops home, and to ensure that there are no permanent military bases in Iraq.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

I would now like to call on my colleague from California, Mr. Gallegly, for his opening comments.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the time of the witnesses, I will waive opening statement.

Chairman LANTOS. Mr. Hinojosa.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am going to pass.

Chairman LANTOS. Very good. Mr. Chabot.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, as other members have done in light of having so many people who want testify about their particular piece of legislation, I will withhold a statement, and if so, will put one in the record in writing. Thank you.

Chairman LANTOS. Without objection.

[NOTE: The information referred to was not received prior to printing.]

Chairman LANTOS. We are pleased to have our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Mr. John Larson, to present his legislation. It is H.R. 1292. It repeals authorization for the use of military force against Iraq. Mr. Larson, we are pleased to have you.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN LARSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. LARSON. Thank you very much, Chairman Lantos, and Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen, and distinguished members of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Let me start, Mr. Chairman, by thanking you, and as was noted by Mr. Burton, there are a number of resolutions that are before this committee. For so long in this Congress American voices haven't had the opportunity to be heard. I thank you for this opportunity and the consideration that you have granted Members of Congress who have so many constructive resolutions to put forward, and I hope in the process of weighing the very important debate and dialogue that is going on that my proposal will be considered amongst those.

Let me start by saying that this cause that the chairman has pointed out for the repeal of the provisions and the resolution that got us into the war in Iraq at its outset.

Why so? Well, we have to go back to the President's historic speech at West Point. In that speech at West Point in June 2002, the President outlined what has become the doctrine of this administration. This doctrine was new to this country. The doctrine was a doctrine of preemption and unilateralism. Oddly enough, the strongest critics of this doctrine that was inaugurated in June 2002, the most outspoken critics of it were Scroft, Eagleburger, Kissinger, and Baker, because they saw in this new doctrine problematic concerns that would happen if one nation were to launch nuclear at another in a preemptive strike.

They understood far too well, as Bush, the elder, did the need for us not to go into a conflict unilaterally, but to go into a conflict with support, and in the process what the administration did alarmingly is undermine more than 50 years of foreign policy based on diplomacy, deterrence, and containment, and overturn Casper Weinberger's doctrine that the United States should never been involved in a military activity unless its vital interests are threatened, and then to make sure it had appropriate plans, including an exit strategy, and further then overturned breathtakingly the Powell corollary which says if the United States is to be involved, that it go in and use overwhelming force to secure the safety of our troops, the borders, and to be able to provide for an exit strategy. Therein is the problem that we are dealing with.

This legislation seeks to revoke this, to provide the opportunity for us not to abandon the policies of a single President, but to embrace the policies of a nation that established the Marshall Plan, that provided us with the diplomacy that created an environment where the United States enjoyed respect throughout the globe.

Today, because of these policies, we have undermined our standing in the world, throughout with Europe and with most countries around the world, and we have devastated it with the Muslim world. We need a change in direction. We had virtually the entire world behind us when we went into Afghanistan, and that has become the second front, and that is the second portion of this bill.

To unite this Congress, we stood on the steps as this chairman outlined what we needed to do in the war against terrorism, and

to actually go after the people who took down the towers, who hit the Pentagon, and but for those brave souls on Flight 93 would have hit the United States Capitol or the White House for sure.

This legislation calls for us to go after and bring to justice Osama bin Laden, to go after al-Qaeda, and to stop the Taliban that is regrouping as we speak in Afghanistan, and there we need to stand united, and that is what I believe that we need to accomplish.

More importantly, Mr. Chairman, and I thank you for bringing this opportunity to Members of Congress, there is a larger discussion that has gone in, a theme that runs through everything that is brought forward in these resolutions. Congress needs a debate, and a discussion about where we are as a nation, where we are in terms of whether or not we are still the republic that we pledge our allegiance to, or we have become an empire where we don't quite understand our role in the world, a reluctant empire, if you will, but an empire nonetheless.

Therefore, where is the proper authority with Congress in that as it relates to the War Powers Act, as it relates to our Constitution, and therefore the vital role that this committee and this Congress should enjoy and share and assert its prerogative?

That is why I have put forth this legislation, and I ask for your consideration, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Larson.

We will turn for opening remarks to Mr. Barrett of South Carolina? Mr. McCaul? Mr. Scott? Thank you very much.

I am pleased to call on the distinguished member of our committee who in the very short time he has served in Congress has already distinguished himself in many important ways, my friend, Albio Sires of New Jersey. We are pleased to have you, sir. His legislation is numbered H.R. 1325. It requires the Iraqi Government to match the amount of United States assistance awarded for Iraq reconstruction. We are pleased to have you, sir.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ALBIO SIRES, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and my colleagues for allowing me to testify before the committee today regarding my bill, H.R. 1325, The Partnership for Iraq Reconstruction Act.

The ultimate goal of this bill is to hold the Iraqi Government and its leaders accountable for their progress by giving them a greater stake in the reconstruction efforts. H.R. 1325 would require the Iraqi Government to match dollar for dollar all United States funds that are spent on reconstruction in Iraq.

The language was drafted intentionally to be general in nature and simple. The idea is not to have the Iraqi Government submit matching funds for each individual contract or grant, but simply have the United States funds matched. These funds could be used in areas where they see fit or in conjunction with a U.S.-funded project.

I understand that there are concerns that the Iraqi Government may not have enough money to match United States funding for reconstruction efforts. However, Secretary of State Condoleezza

Rice recently testified before this committee that the Iraqi Government has \$10 billion of its own funds for reconstruction.

In the upcoming supplemental appropriation bill, \$2.3 billion are going toward Iraq reconstruction. The \$10 billion that the Iraqi Government has designated for reconstruction efforts is more than enough to begin matching the funds appropriated by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, what better place is there for the Iraqi Government to invest its money besides its own infrastructure, its own people, and its own future?

I think all my colleagues can agree that the reconstruction in Iraq must continue in order to guarantee progress and to help foster economic growth for the Iraqi people. We have seen many extremist groups in the Middle East feed off the failure of governments to provide services for their citizens because of corruption and mismanagement. We have two good examples in Hamas and Hezbollah.

We must make sure that similar extremist groups and fractions do not start taking hold in Iraq. I believe that requiring the Iraqi Government to fund reconstruction projects will help give them credibility in the eyes of the Iraqi people. This also provides a united front by showing the factions in Iraq that the government is committed to the stabilization and progress of the country.

Mr. Chairman, the Iraqi Government believes \$100 billion, U.S. dollars, is needed over the next 4 years to rebuild the country's infrastructure. The United States has already committed more than \$38 billion to Iraq reconstruction, over one-third of the funds needed. I believe the United States must continue to help Iraq with its reconstruction efforts. However, the Iraqi Government must also show its people that the government cares and is investing in their well-being and progress.

Mr. Chairman, my bill is about progress, accountability and credibility. I believe we must help the Iraqi Government help themselves, and we can do this by creating a partnership of reconstruction in our efforts.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Sires.

I am pleased to call on my neighbor from California, Congresswoman Lynne Woolsey whose legislation is entitled, "Bring the Troops Home and Iraq Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2007." It is numbered H.R. 508. Ms. Woolsey, we are pleased to have you proceed any way you see fit.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE LYNNE WOOLSEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. WOOLSEY. Good morning and thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and my fellow members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee for allowing sunlight around all of the different proposals regarding the Iraq war that have been sitting on desks around here. Thank you. What a relief to be able to talk about our legislation. And thank you for this opportunity to explain my legislation which I introduced with Representatives Barbara Lee and Maxine Waters, which will complete a safe, orderly, fully funded

troops and contractor withdrawal from Iraq within 6 months of enactment.

H.R. 508, The Bring Our Troops Home and Iraq Sovereignty Restoration Act has five major sections. It is a proposal designed to end the occupation of Iraq and restore Iraqi sovereignty. It has 49 co-sponsors, reflecting a broad reach, and including the provisions offered in many of the previous bills that you have heard today. It is comprehensive legislation, and with the 49 co-sponsors I have to tell you I haven't even started working it yet. So once I am on the floor pushing it, we will have a lot more co-sponsors, I am sure of that.

Part I of H.R. 508 would have all U.S. troops and military contractors out of the country within 6 months of enactment. During that 6-month period we would escalate training of Iraqi security forces. Actually, H.R. 508, this section is the foundation of Barbara Lee's amendment that we have tried to have made in order to put into the supplemental spending bill that we are going to be voting on this week, the spending bill that will actually extend the cost of the Iraqi war by over \$100 billion.

Part II of H.R. 508 includes a commitment to leaving behind an Iraq that is as safe as it can possibly be. So to that end, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 508 authorizes United States support for replacement of our troops with an international stabilization force for no longer than 2 years, and only, and that is the operative word, only at the request of the Iraqi leadership.

Part III, the bill commits United States funds to assist Iraq in rebuilding its economic and physical infrastructure through use of non-military programs and people and by employing Iraqi citizens. So it takes our money, doesn't give it to Haliburton. It gives it directly to the Iraqi Government to rebuild locally.

Part IV makes veterans' health care benefits—this is crucial—makes health care benefits—both physical and mental—an entitlement for all veterans, not just Iraq and Afghanistan.

Part V includes a menu of provisions. It prohibits the establishment of permanent military bases. It turns all oil licenses back to the Iraqi people. It rescinds the President's Iraq war powers, and it establishes a commission to investigate the run-up of this occupation.

The cost of his legislation—without funding for veterans' benefits—is pennies on the dollar, Mr. Chairman, as compared to remaining in Iraq for 18 months to 3 years, and it costs 20 cents on the dollar when veterans' health care is included.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 508 invests in bringing our troops home safely, it invests in training the Iraqi security, and it helps to rebuild a nation that we have destroyed, and most importantly, it provides health care, including mental health, for all veterans.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Woolsey follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE LYNN C. WOOLSEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Good morning. Thank you very much Chairman Lantos and fellow members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, for this opportunity to explain the legislation I have introduced, with Representatives Lee and Waters, to complete a safe, orderly, fully-funded military withdrawal from Iraq within 6 months.

H.R. 508, *The Bring Our Troops Home and Iraq Sovereignty Restoration Act*, is the most comprehensive of all existing proposals designed to end the occupation of Iraq.

It has 50 co-sponsors, reflecting its broad reach and its inclusion of provisions offered in previous bills.

And it also reflects the ideas and expertise of a number of experts, most notably former Senator George McGovern and Dr. William Polk, authors of *Out of Iraq: A Practical Plan for Withdrawal Now*.

Our legislation would have all U.S. troops and military contractors out of the country within 6 months of enactment.

H.R. 508 would prohibit any further funding to deploy, or continue to deploy, U.S. troops in Iraq. Not a nickel more would be spent to send people *in*, but money would be appropriated, as necessary, to get our people *out*.

The bill also allows for increased spending insofar as it is used to accelerate the training of Iraqi security forces.

Our bill includes a commitment to leaving behind an Iraq that is as safe as it can possibly be. To that end, H.R. 508 authorizes U.S. support for replacement of our troops with an international stabilization force.

But this would not be a permanent occupying force—Iraq as a self-governing entity is a linchpin of this proposal. Rather, it would deploy only at the invitation of the Iraqi government, and it would stay no longer than two years.

H.R. 508 is not about disengagement from Iraq; it is about changing our role—from military occupier to reconstruction and reconciliation partner.

So we have included an array of bilateral, non-military assistance in Iraq, including the reconstitution of a public-health system; destruction of land mines, recovery of ancient relics; and distribution of compensatory damages for civilian casualties.

Even as we help Iraq toward self-sufficiency, we would dramatically reduce the size of the American footprint there.

The Green Zone would be dismantled, as would permanent military bases that were already works-in-progress, and the number of U.S. diplomatic personnel would be capped at 500.

Restoring Iraq's sovereignty means guaranteeing control over its own resources. Accordingly, H.R. 508 prohibits U.S. participation in any long-term Iraqi oil production sharing agreements without prior open debate in Iraq and enactment of a law by the Iraqi General Assembly.

With the recent revelations about mismanagement and poor conditions at Walter Reed, it's clear that our soldiers have suffered the consequences of executive branch incompetence even after they leave the front lines.

The philosophy behind H.R. 508 is that "supporting our troops" must be more than a talking point or rallying cry. It means actually supporting them in the most tangible of ways.

That's why we've written into our bill a guarantee of full health care funding, including mental health, for U.S. veterans of military operations in Iraq and other conflicts. It's the least we can do to repay their sacrifice and express our gratitude.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, we recently reached the 4th anniversary of the start of this war. The President and his advisers preach patience, but their policy has been given more than a fair chance to work.

It's time to change course in Iraq.

It's what Americans voted for last November.

It's what the bipartisan Iraq Study Group called for.

It's what top military and foreign policy experts believe is in the best interests of the United States, Iraq and the world.

H.R. 508 would provide that course change.

It repeals the 2002 authorization Congress gave the President to use force in Iraq.

It establishes that it is the policy of the United States to end the occupation of Iraq.

Pass H.R. 508, and our troops will be home for the holidays.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Ms. Woolsey.

I am pleased to call to the table my friend from Colorado, a distinguished colleague, Mark Udall. His legislation is designated H.R. 1183 and titled, "Iraq Contingency Planning Act." We are pleased to have you, Mr. Udall.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MARK UDALL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO

Mr. UDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen, and I would ask unanimous consent to include my whole statement in the record.

Chairman LANTOS. Without objection.

Mr. UDALL. As you pointed out, Mr. Chairman, the name of this act is the Iraq Contingency Planning Act, and the genesis of it was, if you look at the war and the lack of planning that followed on the initial invasion, I believe that we should plan for worse-case scenarios as the future unfolds in front of us.

I think, and Members of Congress wouldn't think it necessary for Congress to legislate to make sure the Pentagon plans for contingencies, but at a recent Armed Services Committee hearing I asked Secretary Gates whether he in fact was doing that. He answered in the affirmative, but the answer was vague, to say the least, and I think all of us here believe that vague reassurances aren't enough, so I followed up with this bill.

The bill is also based on the national intelligence estimate on Iraq where they said:

"We are faced with a deteriorating situation in Iraq in which Iraq's society's growing polarization, the persistent weakness of the security forces, and the state in general, and all sides ready recourse to violence are collectively driving an increase in communal and insurgent violence and political extremism."

Then the NIE goes on to warn that it may even get worse, and specifically it states that there are three prospective security paths could emerge: Chaos leading to partition, the emergency of a Shiia strongman or anarchic fragmentation of power, and those are the words right out of the report, Mr. Chairman. It is the administration's own document.

So my legislation requires that the administration by June 30 inform the House and Senate Armed Services Committees just how the Department of Defense and other agencies would respond to each of these three scenarios identified by the NIE, with an explanation of the proposed role of the U.S. troops under each scenario, including a comprehensive analysis identifying and justifying the number of U.S. troops needed in each case.

Now, let me be clear, Mr. Chairman. It does not tie the administration's hands. It is not seeking to micromanage the war's military strategy. It is designed rather to fit the constitutional responsibilities that Congress must have to provide meaningful oversight and accountability at a time of war.

In conclusion, Secretary Gates has said that we will know within months whether or not the escalation has been successful. So it isn't too soon to begin planning now for what may come next, and I think it is high time for those of us in Congress to insist that the administration is responding to that essential need.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you, and I would yield back anytime I have remaining.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Udall follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MARK UDALL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO

Chairman Lantos and Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen, thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak about the Iraq Contingency Planning Act this morning.

We are four years into a war the Bush Administration assured us would be short and decisive in the war against terror. As I speak, the president has moved forward with his "surge" plan committing an additional 28,000 troops to Iraq. Whatever may be said about the wisdom of going to war four years ago—and I am one who believed it was a mistake to do so—the fact is that we are still deeply engaged in this war. We should all agree that better planning for worst case scenarios was necessary then, and necessary today.

That is why I introduced legislation to require that Congress be informed about the extent to which the Administration is doing the planning that is needed if we are to be prepared to respond to what our intelligence agencies tell us may be further catastrophic developments in Iraq and the region. I'd like to believe that the current "surge" will bring down violence enough that political progress can be made. But after four years of this war, we can't take the chance that conditions won't deteriorate further once the additional troops are called home.

You'd think it wouldn't be necessary for Congress to legislate to make sure the Pentagon plans for contingencies. And when, at a recent Armed Services Committee hearing, I asked Secretary Gates whether they were doing that, his answer was reassuring, but vague.

But vague reassurances aren't enough, so I followed up with this bill because I don't want a repeat of the performance that led the Administration to launch a war in Iraq without a plan for what would come after initial military success.

The Bush Administration was warned—by the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Pentagon's Joint Staff, the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research, and the CIA's National Intelligence Council, among others—that U.S. troops could face significant postwar resistance.

But despite these warnings, the Bush Administration rushed ahead without a comprehensive plan in place to secure and rebuild the country once our military had achieved its initial objectives.

We all know where that has led us—to the point where, according to the recently released National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) on Iraq, we're faced with a deteriorating situation in Iraq in which "Iraqi society's growing polarization, the persistent weakness of the security forces and the state in general, and all sides' ready recourse to violence are collectively driving an increase in communal and insurgent violence and political extremism."

The NIE also warns that things may get even worse. Specifically, the NIE states that as Iraq's security environment worsens, three prospective security paths could emerge—chaos leading to partition, the emergence of a Shia strongman, or anarchic fragmentation of power.

Mr. Chairman, the NIE is the Administration's own document, and the most authoritative written judgment of the Director of National Intelligence with respect to Iraq. I think it must be taken seriously, and I think we in Congress must demand to be told—specifically and in detail—just how the Administration is preparing to respond should any one of those contingencies occur.

That is what my legislation calls for. It would require that by June 30th of this year the Administration inform the House and Senate Armed Services Committees just how the Department of Defense and other agencies would respond to each of the three scenarios identified by the NIE, with an explanation of the proposed role of U.S. troops under each scenario, including a comprehensive analysis identifying and justifying the number of U.S. troops needed in each case.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I want assurances that this Administration is thinking about and planning for troubling possibilities they themselves have depicted. No one wants chaos or increased violence in Iraq, but it would be irresponsible not to plan for those possibilities. While looking at Iraq through rose-colored glasses may make us feel better, we will only do right by our men and women in uniform if we plan for likely contingencies, however unpalatable.

This legislation is not an attempt to tie the Administration's hands. It does not seek to micro-manage the war or military strategy from afar. It is designed, rather, to fit the constitutional responsibilities that Congress must have to provide meaningful oversight and accountability at a time of war.

Defense Secretary Gates has said that we'll know within months whether or not that escalation has been successful. So it isn't too soon to begin planning now for what may come next. And it is high time for Congress to insist that the Administration is responding to that essential need.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Udall.

I am pleased to call on my friend from Michigan, Congressman Mike Rogers. His legislation is numbered H. Con. Res. 65. It disapproves of the President's decision to deploy more than 20,000 additional troops to Iraq, urges the President to consider other options for success in Iraq. You may proceed any way you choose, Mr. Rogers.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MIKE ROGERS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member, committee members. I appreciate the opportunity. It was great to hear your daughter sing in Budapest. That is diplomacy at its highest note, I think, and thank you for allowing that to happen when we were overseas.

We have spent a lot of time, even in this committee, Mr. Chairman, talking about should we or shouldn't we have. We have been talking a lot of time about setting deadlines to come home, and the debate has really missed a very important point. We have almost been blinded by our political positions going into this conflict.

My concern was that there are things that we knew had not gone well. We knew that there had been mistakes made, not necessarily by our military, they have done everything plus more that we have asked of them, but we allowed to be plopped down in the center of Baghdad a very large American-looking bureaucracy, and it is huge. It is the large Embassy in the world. You have more state employees there than you do in any other location around the world, around the globe. You have this almost dysfunctional existence between DoD and State Department. It happened over time.

My argument in this resolution was maybe you don't have to be all in and you don't have to be all out, but maybe we should focus some debate time on what we can do, the things that we can change to make this successful, to stand up for the soldiers who have given so much. And as I look around at the other resolutions, there is no resolution that offers any credible alternative in any way, and I remember the President charged us all. If you have a better way, at least have the courage to offer it, and that is really what this resolution was.

It is a compilation of conversations with military leaders, intelligence officials, officials overseas, State Department officials, and they are things that we as Member of Congress can influence for a positive outcome, and my concern was that we weren't engaging in that debate at all.

We can do some pretty important things. You know, one of the decisions I thought was terrible is that we closed all the state-owned enterprises when we came in because it didn't have an American look to it. Horrible mistake as we look back at it. It created huge percentages of unemployment that we know at least contributes to the fueling of individuals who are willing to take \$100 to place an IED. When you talk to the soldiers, the rules of engagement have become muddled, mainly because politics has crept into the battlefield in Iraq.

These are things as Members of Congress we can look at and impact for a positive outcome not only for our soldiers on the ground but for a positive outcome in Iraq so we can get our soldiers home earlier.

We have done a terrible job of identifying that there is more than one problem in Iraq today. Sectarian violence happens in Baghdad. That is a political problem of which security needs to be a part of it. But we also have a growing al-Qaeda presence in Iraq, and a Sunni insurgency that is a strategic threat to the United States.

So when someone comes and says in 6 months we should pack up and go home, they completely miss, completely miss the notion that we have some real strategic threats alive and well in Iraq that our soldiers are bravely confronting as we speak today.

So my resolution didn't say this is terrible and awful and bad. It said, Mr. President, would you reconsider some options? Would you adjust your plan? That we could provide command and control, intelligence, combat air support, special operation support to Iraqi forces working to quell sectarian violence in the City of Baghdad. But we need to reinforce, as they have asked, our fight in Anbar province against al-Qaeda and Sunni insurgencies, those are the strategic threats we know happened to the United States. The problem is we have muddled it together.

When there is a bomb in a market, many of us stand up and scream that it is awful, it is going nowhere, we are fighting a losing cause not understanding that there are very real differences between the fight against al-Qaeda in Iraq and the fight to quell sectarian violence that allows the Iraqi Government the stability it needs to get a foothold and to gain control of their own country, two very, very different things.

So I have outlined about eight alternatives, Mr. Chairman, and my argument is if you are going to be against it, if you are not going to be for it, you have to be for something. Offer some alternatives for success, and I just want to cover briefly a couple of those.

We have lost about 1-2 million middle-class Iraqis have fled Iraq, and if we can empower them to come back, if we can be the leaders that allow them to repatriate themselves, that is the class that will bring back stability to Iraq, and without them we are in trouble, and more importantly, Iraq is in trouble. We could be that leader along with our allies in the neighborhood to come together for a repatriation program for those 1-2 million Iraqis. They are doctors, they are lawyers, they are engineers, they are the entrepreneurs of that society who have fled. They are teachers. They are professors. These are the folks we must get back to Iraq if they are going to have a successful future.

As I talked earlier about the unemployment problem, these state-owned enterprises, now since the introduction of this resolution I do know the Department of Defense did send some level of secretary to look at what the state-owned enterprise system is, and see if we can't get it back on its feet so we can get some sense of employment back, and I know that they have looked at rules of engagement that have handcuffed our soldiers from doing the mission that we know they must do in places like Al Anbar and Fallujah

and Ramadi, and other places, they tell us that those are under review today, and those are positive outcomes.

I don't expect this necessarily to become law, but we need to start driving the debate to real solutions, and I think, again, packing up and coming home is not a good solution for the strategic threat to the United States we know that al-Qaeda opposes in Iraq.

The other part of this, I think, Mr. Chairman, is that the politics of this debate, it is listened to by our soldiers, and we all know that words have consequences. You have a young sergeant who is risking his life in Fallujah trying to command those soldiers. It is really important that they understand they have a very clear line of communication with their men—very, very important.

We need to make sure that we don't muddle that.

Chairman LANTOS. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. I appreciate it, and I would thank you for your time and consideration, Mr. Chairman, and again I would hope that we can get away from this "should we/shouldn't we" debate and move onto some concrete alternatives that we know can win for Iraq and bring our soldiers home soon. Thank you, Mr. President.

Chairman LANTOS. We appreciate your presentation, Mr. Rogers.

I am pleased to call on my friend from Illinois, Congressman Daniel Lipinski. His legislation is numbered H. Res. 152, calls on the President to transmit to Congress detailed report on the situation in Iraq; help create an international peacekeeping force for Iraq; and seek to convene a peace conference to encourage national reconciliation, security and governance. We are pleased to have you, Mr. Lipinski.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DANIEL LIPINSKI, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. LIPINSKI. I would like to thank Chairman Lantos and Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen and the rest of the members of the committee for inviting me here to speak today.

H. Res. 152, which I introduced earlier this year, calls upon the President to engage in a diplomatic offensive on Iraq and to provide Congress with the information that we need to reassert our previously neglected oversight role.

Up to this point the Bush administration's Iraq policy appears to be one of America's worst foreign policy blunders. We have had more than 3,200 brave soldiers killed and more than 24,000 have been wounded, many very seriously. Hundreds of billions of dollars have been spent and in some cases wasted. But, it is a time not to look to the past but to look forward, and to move forward we need a new plan for bringing stability to Iraq and bringing our troops home.

H. Res. 152 calls on the President to take the following three actions: First, encourage achievement of important goals and national reconciliation, security and governance by arranging a peace conference for Iraq's ethnic and religious factions similar to the conference that led to the Dayton Accords; second, seriously engage everyone with an interest in the region, which would include countries all around the world, to seek solutions and cooperation on Iraq; third, require the administration to provide Congress with de-

tailed reports on the situation so that we can make informed decisions about America's involvement.

I will include more details of the three-part plan in my written testimony, but I will provide a brief outline right here.

First, the United States should join with other nations to arrange a peace conference of Iraqi leaders. The purpose will be the achievement of agreements on important goals such as a reasonable distribution of oil revenue, fair and just law enforcement, and plans for provincial and local elections in addition to other reconciliation initiative.

Broad-based pressure from a variety of international forces resulted in the 1995 Dayton Accords that ended the war in Bosnia. Much like the current conflict in Iraq, the war in Bosnia was fueled by ethnic and religious divisions. With similar international pressure, Iraq's warring factions could be brought to the table. Peace discussions could take place in a country seen as a neutral arbitrator such as El Salvador, which has proven its commitment to Iraq's stability. El Salvador could provide an easily secured environment and a special standing because of its own experience with a civil war.

The second action the administration should take is a concerted effort to utilize America's considerable diplomatic resources to rally positive international involvement. Iraq's oil reserves, strategic location in the Middle East, and its potential to become a failed-state breeding ground for international terrorism dictate that much of the world has an interest in Iraq's success.

There has been some progress made on this front with the March 10 conference, but a much more serious effort must be made by the U.S. to arrange a larger, longer lasting conference that includes higher ranking officials. In rallying support, the United States must talk to all of Iraq's neighbors, including Iran and Syria.

Engagement does not require ceding to all parties' demands, but talks are necessary if we are to have the possibility of increased international cooperation. An international conference should work on regional security issues as well as bringing together an international reconstruction plan.

Inadequate infrastructure and economic hardships remain despite America spending hundreds of billions of dollars. Clearly, it is time for Iraq and other countries to step up the reconstruction efforts.

This leads to the third part of the resolution requiring the administration to give Congress comprehensive reports addressing critical issues such as security conditions and the progress of reconstruction.

One of the reasons we have reached this point is that Congress gave the administration free rein without asking questions. The new Congress has acted differently and must continue to do so, not for the sake of politics but for accountability. We should require the administration to provide monthly written detailed reports in addition to appearing before committees to answer questions. This will allow Congress to make informed decisions regarding America's Iraq policy.

As the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops stated, "A search for genuine justice and peace in Iraq requires moral urgency, sub-

stantive dialogue, and new directions.” I believe that if the President follows the guidance in this resolution, a diplomatic offensive, in cooperation with congressional oversight, we will be able to leave Iraq a stable, secure country, which is needed not just for Iraqis and Americans, but for the world.

I thank the committee for this opportunity and for your consideration of my resolution.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you, Congressman Lipinski.

I am pleased to call on my friend and colleague from Illinois, Congresswoman Janice Schakowsky. Her legislation is numbered H.R. 897, and titled, “Iraq and Afghanistan Contractor Sunshine Act.” We are pleased to have you.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JANICE SCHAKOWSKY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman, and Ranking Member. I appreciate the opportunity to present my legislation, H.R. 897, the Iraq and Afghanistan Contractor Sunshine Act, which would require transparency for the monitoring and regulation of contractors.

I introduced my bill because no Member of Congress has been able to get accurate answers to the following simple and obvious questions: How many contractors and subcontractors at any level are employed in Iraq and Afghanistan? What is the total cost of those contracts? How many of these contractors were killed—we think about 800, but we don’t know—or wounded? Have any host country, international or U.S. laws been broken by contractors, or what disciplinary actions have been taken against contractors by the U.S. Government, their employers or a host nation?

A December 2006 GAO report revealed that “DoD continues to have limited visibility over contractors because information on the number of contractors at deployed locations or the services they provide is not aggregated by any organization within DoD or its components.”

The Bush administration’s support for the privatization of government functions, coupled with the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, has accelerated the use of private security services. Contractors compose the second largest force in Iraq after the United States military. In December 2006, the *Washington Post* reported that there are approximately 100,000 government contractors operating in Iraq, not counting subcontractors, a total that is approaching the size of the United States military force there. As many as 25,000 of these contractors are armed security contractors, the article said.

We know that 100 percent of the interpreters and 50 percent of the jail workers at Abu Gharib were contractors. As of January 2, 2007, the FBI released new allegations of detainee abuse at Guantanamo Bay prison. The FBI’s disclosures, which is based on eyewitness reports, referred several times to contractors directing the Army’s interrogation efforts at Guantanamo. In at least one case FBI agents were told that detainees may have been mistreated on orders from a contractor.

In Afghanistan, Dyn Corp. International received \$1.1 billion to train the new police force, and extremely sensitive task. However,

according to a joint State Department and Pentagon Inspector General audit, program managers could not say how many officers were actually on duty or where thousands of trucks and other police equipment paid for by U.S. taxpayers have gone.

Blackwater USA, who was known to have lost four of its employees in the notorious Fallujah incident, currently has approximately 2,300 personnel deployed in nine countries, and the company brags they have another 20,000 contractors at the ready, and has a fleet of more than 20 aircraft, including helicopter gun ships, and a private intelligence division.

These private contractors, along with those who are engaged in military operations, intelligence gathering, law enforcement and criminal justice are performing what are traditionally viewed as inherently governmental functions. Civilians have taken on many of the responsibilities and duties once performed exclusively by uniformed personnel. As a result, today's advancement of key U.S. foreign policy goals rely far more on private, non-state actors than at any other time in American history, yet the American taxpayer has been virtually left in the dark about what this multi-billion dollar industry is doing.

In order to lift the veil of secrecy, the Iraq and Afghanistan Contractor Sunshine Act would require the Department of Defense, State, Interior and the U.S. Agency for International Development to provide Congress with copies and descriptions of work performed in Iraq and Afghanistan that are part of contracts and tax orders in excess of \$5 million.

The bill also has a reporting requirement that would require that the questions I mentioned earlier be answered: How many, how much, et cetera. The Congress and the American people should begin to understand the vast impact that contractors are playing in our military operations. It is time we debate the rapidly expanding use of contractors in the war zone. The private military contractor business is the war business, and for-profit companies may not share the same mission and basic goals as U.S. military. They are in the business for profit.

As the Iraq experience makes clear, a more transparent framework for monitoring and regulation of contractors is urgently needed. Military contractors should have the same stringent accountability and oversight standards that we have for the U.S. military. After all, private contractors serve side by side with our brave troops, and these same U.S. troops are often tasked to protect our contractors who are paid with billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars.

I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this hearing. I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in co-sponsoring this bill so we can get some picture of what is really happening with contractors, private for-profit contractors in Iraq and Afghanistan, and I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Congresswoman Schakowsky.

We will now have the delayed opening comments of the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Payne.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Let me commend you for calling this very important hearing. For all the years that I have been in the U.S. Congress on the Foreign Affairs Com-

mittee, I have not ever remember such a unique hearing where Members of Congress are given an opportunity to present their views before the committee, and so I really commend you on your fairness and your judgment to allow everyone to have an opportunity to present their legislation.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you, Mr. Payne.

Mr. PAYNE. I think that it is so interesting to see the various proposals. I think that hopefully we will be able to take the best from them and somehow come up with a plan that will deal with ending the war, bringing our troops home, and then start the reconstruction. I think that we jumped into something very quickly and perhaps, as I conclude, if the memo that we have from the Congressional Research Service was read 4 years ago or before by everyone who was anxious to go into Iraq, perhaps the complexity of that country would have come forth, and that we may have tried some other approach to the situation there.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. Yield back.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you, Mr. Payne.

Pleased to call on my colleague from California, Mr. Costa, for an opening remark.

Mr. COSTA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I too, as I have said before, want to commend you for the efforts to focus this committee on the most pressing issues facing our nation today as it relates to our foreign policy, and certainly today's hearing, as we have witnessed from previous hearings, it is no exception, giving an opportunity for members to in fact lay out their thoughts as to how we can deal with the most difficult situation facing our nation's foreign policy, that is the Middle East specifically and Iraq.

My colleagues on the committee who have been here and served longer, we all, I think, are passionate about how we can best put America's best foot forward as it relates to our foreign policy, and while there are many ideas, I think some have better prospects than others. I tend to look at the circumstances that we are facing in Iraq, not as I wished it were but as to the overlying circumstances of the situation that we have to deal with at hand, in other words, the cards that we are being dealt with here, and as this Congress attempts to respond to the President's request for the supplemental appropriations, notwithstanding that many of us have differences of opinion as to the likely success of the President's proposal in January that is now being implemented, it seems to me that regardless of how we feel the fact of the matter is that the so-called surge, which has been attempted previously, is going forward. It will go forward. It will be funded. We know what the circumstances are with regards to our colleagues on the Senate.

I suspect, notwithstanding our best efforts this week, in the next 6 weeks or 2 months we are going to see probably some challenge with a straight supplemental that we will have to provide if we, in fact, do not want to have the troops without appropriate funding.

And so I guess, as I close my comment, it seems to me that if that is how we have to look at this, this will probably be the last effort that this administration has to bring under their strategy, to turn the corner and turn the direction in Iraq, and it seems to me that this committee is going to have to not only hold the President,

the administration accountable to the benchmarks, and we hope, notwithstanding our differences, that it is successful.

But if it is not, that in fact we move forward in the next 4 to 6 months on what will be bipartisan effort to deal with the facts as they are, notwithstanding the best of intentions.

So I will continue to try to do my part as a good member of this committee, Mr. Chairman, and mindful of the fact that there are going to be a number of changes, I believe, in the next 4 to 6 months, and this committee needs to be prepared to weigh in appropriately.

Thank you very much.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

I am pleased to call on my friend and colleague from New Jersey, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you for convening this very unique hearing, both you and Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen. I think it is important that we hear from members and take back to our offices information they provide. Very often we don't get to hear what members of other committees have to say, particularly if they are not on the relevant committees of jurisdiction, and there is a wealth of wisdom that can be derived from their input.

So I want to thank the members for taking the time to come here to present their recommendations, to call our attention and scrutiny to their proposals. I think there will be germs of good things that could be pulled out from various bills, and perhaps bound up in a larger piece of legislation, and I think this is a very, very good exercise.

There is no doubt that no amount of scrutiny is too much regarding the war in Iraq. We care, and I think it is bipartisan, we care deeply about what happens to our men and women who serve and about the future of Iraq, and I think this hearing moves that ball along. So again I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

I am pleased to call on my friend from Iowa, Congressman King. His legislation is numbered H. Res. 147, and titled, "U.S. Committed to Victory in Global War on Terror and on Iraq Battlefield." We are pleased to have you, Congressman King.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE STEVEN KING, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr. KING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen and other members of the committee. I very much appreciate the privilege and indeed the honor to testify before this committee, and I know that the destiny of America is directed by the policy that comes out of this committee.

I did introduce H. Res. 147 back in February, and it does support the constitutional responsibility of the Commander in Chief to conduct war, and expresses the commitment of the House to victory in Iraq, and in the global war on terror. It also, this Resolution 147, supports the commanders and troops on the ground, and who have devised and are carrying out the surge strategy for victory in Iraq.

I introduced H. Res. 147 to counterbalance what I believe is the unconstitutional move toward congressional micromanagement of the war in Iraq, and the leadership that has brought this resolution that was passed by the House, I think reflects a defeatist attitude rather than a victorious attitude, and I think we owe our military personnel and the destiny of America strong consideration to a full commitment of victory.

The resolution that passed the floor posed the President's new strategy in Iraq, and that was before the commanders on the ground had an opportunity to implement it. I reflect back on the Iraq Study Group, and the language in that report that clearly supports a surge, and General Petraeus called for that surge and asked for the troops, and was ratified, confirmed in his appointment without opposition of the United States Senate. I think that speaks loudly for support of him and his mission, and then the resolution that passed the floor of the House undermines his mission.

So I believe that we have to look at this from a constitutional perspective, and this Constitution gives Congress a couple involvements here on war, and the President, of course, is clearly in the Constitution defined as the Commander in Chief. Our founding fathers saw the nightmare of trying to fight a war by committee and trying to raise resources by committee, and they concluded they needed one strong commander in the time of war, and that is why they established the President as Commander in Chief.

But Congress has two powers. We have the power to declare war, which we have not done in this Congress since the beginning of World War II. And we have the power to raise and support armies and navies and my implication air force, and then, of course fund the war.

Beyond that, when we go to the path of micromanagement of the war, then I believe we get into dangerous constitutional ground, and it puts this Congress in a position of not only an illogical position of 435 generals in the House and 100 generals in the Senate, and the very thing that our founding fathers feared and the very reason that they defined the President as the Commander in Chief, it puts us in an untenable position of being unconstitutionally seeking to micromanage the war.

Now, I don't say the resolution does that, but I will contend that what we see coming out of the supplemental bill does do that, and I will brief some of my rationale on this: That in Van Clausewitz's book on war, which is considered to be the definitive treatise on war, he states, "The object of war is to destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war." And it is interesting that he uses the word "destroy their will" first, and their "ability" second. I think that is telling.

When I was in Iraq in one of my trips there, and the date of this was June 11, 2004, I was watching Aljazeera TV, I was actually in Kuwait City waiting to go into Iraq the next day, and on TV came Maktada al Sadar, who was speaking presumably in Arabic, with the English crawler going underneath, and he said, "If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu."

Mr. Chairman, when I saw that, it burned into my memory because I know the times that the United States didn't demonstrate resolve, gave great hope to our enemy, and it is very, very difficult to destroy the enemy's will to conduct war if we don't demonstrate the will to complete the task, and so I wrote those words down and I have many times put that on the floor of the House.

But my fear, Mr. Chairman, is that the next quote we would see if we don't complete this war in Iraq successfully will be the one that comes from Osama bin Laden, whom I think will then be saying, "If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Afghanistan the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu, and the same way they left Iraq."

That is what we are facing if we don't succeed in this war in Iraq, and the risk of what we are up against in Iraq is—I am going to paint a worst-case scenario here, which we should consider, and that worst-case scenario, Mr. Chairman, is that not just Iran getting control of the 70–80 percent of the Iraqi oil if we should pull out, not the thousands of lives that may well be sacrificed in sectarian strife, but no controlling factor in the Middle East whatsoever, no power there to limit the hegemony of Iran, and if they don't have a limit, they will move forward aggressively to complete their nuclear efforts, and if they do that, they will control 42.6 percent of the world's exportable oil. They will intimidate the entire Middle East. They will have the capability missile-wise of delivering a nuclear weapon, not just to Israel, not just to Western Europe, but to the United States within a very few short years.

So in conclusion, I would point out also this is a very little red book, not very good, but it has something in it that is important. "How We Won the War" by General Vo Nguyen Giap, the general who commanded the Vietnamese troops in Vietnam. He states in here that the beginning of the end for the United States there was when we failed to succeed in a victory in Korea. That gave him the hope and the inspiration to conduct a war that included the public relations of the United States, and the efforts of the anti-war movement in the United States and globally, that was part of their mission. He saw it as such, and that was the inspiration before Vietnam. Now we have Korean, Vietnam, Lebanon, Mogadishu and possibly Iraq.

So then the final statement, Mr. Chairman, that I would make is a quote from Plato, "Only the dead have seen the end of war."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. King follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE STEVE KING, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IOWA

I want to thank Chairman Lantos and Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen for the opportunity to address the committee today.

Mr. Chairman, on February 8, 2007, I introduced H.Res.147 a resolution that:

- Supports the constitutional responsibility of the Commander in Chief to conduct war,
- Expresses the commitment of the House to victory in Iraq and the Global War on Terror, and
- Supports the commanders and troops on the ground who have devised and are carrying out the surge strategy for victory in Iraq.

I introduced H.Res. 147 to counterbalance the unconstitutional move toward congressional micromanagement of the War in Iraq that the Democrat leadership embraced in the defeatist, non-binding resolution passed by the House on February 16th.

By passing a resolution that opposed the President's new strategy in Iraq before commanders on the ground had an opportunity to implement it, the majority party in the House began its work to actively undermine the efforts of the President and our military leaders to bring about victory in Iraq.

There is no question that Democrats benefited greatly at the polls from Americans' discontentment with the situation in Iraq. But instead of working with the President as Commander in Chief on a new strategy for victory and success in the war in Iraq, Democrats have waged a political war here at home. Instead of recognizing the importance of the fight in Iraq to regional stability and the success of the Global War on Terror, the Democrats have focused on making headlines and political hay by undermining any plan for success.

Fresh from their experience of fighting a war by legislative committee—that was often imperiled by the fickle whims of the “majority”—when writing the Constitution, the Founding Fathers intentionally created an energetic President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces who could execute tactical and strategic decisions unhindered by legislative direction or interference. The Founding Fathers understood that war-making powers are best vested in a single Executive. In fact, they specifically rejected a proposal for the executive power to be shared by a committee or council—even one wholly within the executive branch.

The majority party, using a nonbinding resolution as a starting place, has decided to usurp the President's constitutional responsibility to exercise the strategic command over our troops in combat. They have done this because they worry about the political consequences of using their own constitutional power to refuse funding for the war. I believe that the minority party has calculated that the political fallout of their decision to completely defund the war in Iraq would hurt their ability to attract voters at the polls—if for no other reason than because an effort to defund the war in Iraq must be an effort to withhold funding from the entire Department of Defense to prevent the President from exercising his constitutional ability to conduct intra-departmental transfers within the Department of Defense to ensure full funding for the mission in Iraq.

The move toward surrender in Iraq that was begun with the passage of H.Con.Res 63, the Democrats' politically-motivated, defeatist resolution, and that will be carried forward by the withdrawal timetables included in the supplemental that we will consider on the floor later this week, will lead to mass sectarian killings in Iraq. The federal government in Iraq will likely collapse. Iran will likely be enriched by gaining control of the oil-rich, southern Shia region of Iraq and will be emboldened to continue its effort to hold the region and the world hostage with nuclear and chemical weapons. Al Qaeda and other enemies of the United States will be convinced that the will of the United States to defend itself, its people, and its allies is weak and can be broken.

Radical Islam understands this well. On June 11, 2004, while I was watching Al Jazeera television in a hotel room in Kuwait City, I saw Muqtada Al Sadr make this statement: “If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu.”

Mr. Chairman, if we continue to follow the Democrats' surrender strategy, I submit we will be hearing Osama Bin Laden say much of the same very soon: “If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave AFGHANISTAN the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, they same way they left Mogadishu, the same way they left IRAQ.”

I realize that the decision makers on Capitol Hill have already made up their minds to move ahead with their plans to micromanage and undercut the war effort for political gain. But I will continue to serve as a vocal supporter of the President as Commander in Chief and the military leaders and brave men and women in uniform who have devised and are bravely and ably carrying out the mission to secure and stabilize Iraq.

Once again, I thank the Chairman and the ranking member for the opportunity to address you today. I would welcome any questions you may have, and I yield back.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Mr. King. We very much appreciate your appearance before the committee.

To bring my colleagues who have come in more recently up to date, we had well over a dozen colleagues present their legislation concerning Iraq thus far. We have an additional six or seven colleagues who are scheduled to come in the near future.

Mr. Patrick Murphy, our colleague from Pennsylvania, will be arriving momentarily, and in the meantime if any of my colleagues would like to make an observation concerning any of the presentations we have had so far, the floor is open.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, if I might.

Chairman LANTOS. Yes, I am pleased to call on my distinguished—

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Never pass up an opportunity.

Chairman LANTOS [continuing]. Ranking minority member.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Well, these were all excellent presentations. I would like to point out to the members and to the audience that this week perhaps we will be discussing the supplemental. It is supposed to be the supplemental for our war effort, and I want to point out some of the items that are included in this supplemental that have nothing to do with our war effort, programs, targeting, producers of spinach, peanuts and milk. For example, \$74 million for peanuts storage cost. It is in the supplemental. Twenty-five million dollars for spinach growers, \$25 million for livestock, \$100 million for citrus assistance, \$25 million for agriculture, business losses, and the list goes on and on.

And just for 1 further minute, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out the *Washington Post* editorial of last week and the *Los Angeles Times* where they say, in short:

“The Democratic proposal to be taken up this week is an attempt to imposed detailed management on a war without regard for the war itself. Aggressive oversight is quite different from mandating military steps according to an inflexible time line conforming to the need to capture votes in Congress or the 2008 polls. This strategy leads not toward a responsible withdrawal from Iraq, but to a constitutional power struggle with Mr. Bush.”

One more statement from the *Los Angeles Times*:

“Imagine if Dwight Eisenhower had been forced to adhere to a congressional war plan in scheduling the Normandy landing or of an 1863 President Lincoln had been forced by Congress to conclude the Civil War the following year. This is the worst kind of congressional meddling in military strategy.”

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Let me point out to my colleague that during the course of the long Republican domination of Congress we have had unrelated items included in legislative vehicles ad nauseam and ad infinitum, but perhaps I should allow Popeye to respond to the spinach proposal because he is better qualified than I.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. If I could ask to place these two editorials in the record.

Chairman LANTOS. Without objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LANTOS. Without objection.
[The information referred to follows:]

THE PELOSI PLAN FOR IRAQ

IT MAKES PERFECT SENSE, IF THE GOAL IS WINNING VOTES IN THE UNITED STATES.

Washington Post

Tuesday, March 13, 2007; Page A16

THE RESTRICTIONS on Iraq war funding drawn up by the House Democratic leadership are exquisitely tailored to bring together the party's leftist and centrist wings. For the Out of Iraq Caucus, which demands that Congress force a withdrawal of all U.S. troops by the end of this year, there is language that appears to deliver that mandate, albeit indirectly. For those who prefer a more moderate course, there is another withdrawal deadline, in August 2008. Either way, almost all American troops would be out of Iraq by the time the next election campaign begins in earnest. And there are plenty of enticements on the side: more money for wounded veterans, for children's health, for post-Hurricane Katrina reconstruction.

The only constituency House Speaker Nancy Pelosi ignored in her plan for amending President Bush's supplemental war funding bill are the people of the country that U.S. troops are fighting to stabilize. The Democratic proposal doesn't attempt to answer the question of why August 2008 is the right moment for the Iraqi government to lose all support from U.S. combat units. It doesn't hint at what might happen if American forces were to leave at the end of this year—a development that would be triggered by the Iraqi government's weakness. It doesn't explain how continued U.S. interests in Iraq, which holds the world's second-largest oil reserves and a substantial cadre of al-Qaeda militants, would be protected after 2008; in fact, it may prohibit U.S. forces from returning once they leave.

In short, the Democratic proposal to be taken up this week is an attempt to impose detailed management on a war without regard for the war itself. Will Iraq collapse into unrestrained civil conflict with "massive civilian casualties," as the U.S. intelligence community predicts in the event of a rapid withdrawal? Will al-Qaeda establish a powerful new base for launching attacks on the United States and its allies? Will there be a regional war that sucks in Iraqi neighbors such as Saudi Arabia or Turkey? The House legislation is indifferent: Whether or not any of those events happened, U.S. forces would be gone.

The House bill lists benchmarks for Iraqi political progress and requires that President Bush certify by July 1 that progress is being made toward them. By October, Bush would have to certify that the benchmarks all had been reached. This is something of a trick, akin to the inflexible troop readiness requirements that Rep. John P. Murtha (D-Pa.) wanted to impose to "stop the surge." Everyone knows that the long list of requirements—including constitutional changes, local elections and the completion of complex legislation—couldn't be finished in six months. In that case a troop withdrawal would have to begin immediately. If there was no "progress" by July, it would have to begin then and be completed by the end of the year.

Congress should rigorously monitor the Iraqi government's progress on those benchmarks. By Mr. Bush's own account the purpose of the troop surge in Iraq is to enable political progress. If progress does not occur, the military strategy should be reconsidered. But aggressive oversight is quite different from mandating military steps according to an inflexible timetable conforming to the need to capture votes in Congress or at the 2008 polls. Ms. Pelosi's strategy leads not toward a responsible withdrawal from Iraq but to a constitutional power struggle with Mr. Bush, who has already said he will veto the legislation. Such a struggle would serve the interests of neither the Democrats nor the country.

DO WE REALLY NEED A GEN. PELOSI?

CONGRESS CAN CUT FUNDING FOR IRAQ, BUT IT SHOULDN'T MICROMANAGE THE WAR.

Los Angeles Times

March 12, 2007

AFTER WEEKS OF internal strife, House Democrats have brought forth their proposal for forcing President Bush to withdraw U.S. troops from Iraq by 2008. The plan is an unruly mess: bad public policy, bad precedent and bad politics. If the legislation passes, Bush says he'll veto it, as well he should.

It was one thing for the House to pass a nonbinding vote of disapproval. It's quite another for it to set out a detailed timetable with specific benchmarks and conditions for the continuation of the conflict. Imagine if Dwight Eisenhower had been forced to adhere to a congressional war plan in scheduling the Normandy landings or if, in 1863, President Lincoln had been forced by Congress to conclude the Civil War the following year. This is the worst kind of congressional meddling in military strategy.

This is not to say that Congress has no constitutional leverage—only that it should exercise it responsibly. In a sense, both Bush and the more ardent opponents of the war are right. If a majority in Congress truly believes that the war is not in the national interest, then lawmakers should have the courage of their convictions and vote to stop funding U.S. involvement. They could cut the final checks in six months or so to give Bush time to manage the withdrawal. Or lawmakers could, as some Senate Democrats are proposing, revoke the authority that Congress gave Bush in 2002 to use force against Iraq.

But if Congress accepts Bush's argument that there is still hope, however faint, that the U.S. military can be effective in quelling the sectarian violence, that U.S. economic aid can yet bring about an improvement in Iraqi lives that won't be bombed away and that American diplomatic power can be harnessed to pressure Shiites and Sunnis to make peace—if Congress accepts this, then lawmakers have a duty to let the president try this “surge and leverage” strategy.

By interfering with the discretion of the commander in chief and military leaders in order to fulfill domestic political needs, Congress undermines whatever prospects remain of a successful outcome. It's absurd for House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-San Francisco) to try to micromanage the conflict, and the evolution of Iraqi society, with arbitrary timetables and benchmarks.

Congress should not hinder Bush's ability to seek the best possible endgame to this very bad war. The president needs the leeway to threaten, or negotiate with, Sunnis and Shiites and Kurds, Syrians and Iranians and Turks. Congress can find many ways to express its view that U.S. involvement, certainly at this level, must not go on indefinitely, but it must not limit the president's ability to maneuver at this critical juncture.

Bush's wartime leadership does not inspire much confidence. But he has made adjustments to his team, and there's little doubt that a few hundred legislators do not a capable commander in chief make. These aren't partisan judgments—we also condemned Republican efforts to micromanage President Clinton's conduct of military operations in the Balkans.

Members of Congress need to act responsibly, debating the essence of the choice the United States now faces—to stay or go—and putting their money where their mouths are. But too many lives are at stake to allow members of Congress to play the role of Eisenhower or Lincoln.

Chairman LANTOS. Anyone else? Congressman Payne.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think the lady brings up an interesting point of these agricultural commodities that seem to have found their way into the legislation. Therefore, I would conclude that she opposes these subsidies, the citrus subsidy in Florida, the orange growers who get a tremendous amount of subsidies. I think that we ought to take a look at the whole subsidy situation of allowing our taxpayers' dollars to subsidize sugar and orange growers and grapefruit growers and spinach, I guess, too, and perhaps we should look at the DOHA Round so that developing countries in Africa will have an opportunity, \$300 billion is spent globally on subsidies for agriculture. I think that is a period that its time has passed, and that there is certainly a need, an opportunity for us to take a look at that, but I am glad the lady kind of agrees with me that we should stop the orange subsidies and the sugar subsidies.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

I call on my friend from New York, Mr. Crowley.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, thank you for holding these hearings today, and to hear from our colleagues. This is quite unique.

This is the first time in my years here that a forum like this has really presented itself, and I congratulate you for doing that.

I would note that those first eight years that I served here the Republicans did control the House, and we had very few hearings on the subject of Iraq generally speaking.

But I would also note for the gentlelady, my good friend from Florida as well, that there are other things that are incorporated into this emergency supplemental bill, including money for Katrina and the victims of Katrina, many who are still suffering, and in their position they think that their lives and what they are going through is as much an emergency as anything else that could possibly be affecting other aspects of our economy as well.

So I think that it is important that we address all the issues that may be, or at least go beyond some of the issues that you talked about in terms of the pile-on in this bill. As the chairman has noted, in just the most recent previous Congresses when we have been doing supplementals for the war, there have been ad nauseam unrelated aspects under Republican-controlled Congress of times that have been included in those supplementals that had no relationship whatsoever to the war.

So I don't think this is unique in that regard, but there are many emergencies that I think we are also attempting to address using this supplemental bill as a vehicle to do that.

So I yield back.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Any other colleague on the committee who would like to make an observation before we turn to our most distinguished senior member of this committee? I see you are asking for a comment, Ms. Watson. I will call on Ambassador Watson.

Ms. WATSON. I want to add to the things that we are heaping on the Chair. This is my first time to sit in a committee to hear the thoughts and the proposals from members of the House. I do thank you for allowing this to occur. Cuddles to you.

The other thing I want to say that I have heard all the proposals, but I have not heard a definition for victory and success, and I do hope as we continue to hear these proposals that someone will come up and tell us what it is we are seeking because from what I have heard it seems like our investment will be much an open-ended, and I really don't understand what victory is because I remember the President saying "Mission accomplished" several years ago.

Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Costa.

Mr. COSTA. Yes, Mr. Chairman, just briefly a point of fact. This has been stated. The supplemental that the President requested that includes funding for other items that our colleague indicated, we are simply following a precedent. It may not be the precedent that has been established in previous Republican Congresses. The fact of the funding for agricultural assistance relates to disasters, legitimate disasters occurred in the Midwest, that occurred in Florida, and that occurred in California where you have literally thousands and thousands of people unemployed, who have no jobs because of an impact of a freeze that occurred in California in Janu-

ary, and other related disaster impacts, and this is maybe not the best vehicle to use, but it is the only vehicle at this time to try to assist those people who are in difficult circumstances, and we want to try to address their needs.

I yield the balance of my time.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you.

The gentlelady from California, Ms. Woolsey.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind everybody that most of the funding in this bill is \$100 billion or more which will give the President at least \$8 billion to pay for the surge that the majority of—all of the Democrats but a couple voted to oppose, and gives the President \$100 billion to continue this war for another year, 18 months. That is the problem with this supplement.

Chairman LANTOS. The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Scott.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have been sitting here and I think that, and I didn't have a chance to respond, I believe it was to what I thought was a scolding of this committee by the gentleman, Mr. Burton, which of course he is entitled to his opinion, and I think so. But I think it is very important that a statement be placed into the record to counter what he has said, and to give the proper sanction to what this committee is doing, and that the American people will know how important it is that we do what we are doing.

One of the reasons why we are in this situation we are in is because we have not held this President's feet to the fire. We have not as a Congress provided what you have so importantly laid out for us today, to examine this issue. The Constitution is clear in Article 1, in Section 8, it says exclusively that the Congress has the right in foreign affairs and in military affairs to determine the purse strings, raise and support the army, and to legislate.

Hamilton and Madison were so intense on this issue, for Congress to step in, and it was written in 1787 at a time of immense pressure, so much so that Hamilton had to write under a false name, and Madison had to write under a false name. Hamilton wrote under the name of Pacificus. Madison wrote under the name of Hal Dibidus, and I wondered about that, and it was because that issue was so intense that even at that moment these great minds had to hide behind other names to give this Congress its constitutional duty to do what we are doing today.

To hear the gentleman, Mr. Burton, scold this committee for doing our job, I believe should not go at least unanswered to state that if we had been doing our job as we are doing it today, we would not be in the situation that we are in, and he used the Civil War in his statement. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if France or Germany had sent over 145,000 troops in the middle of the War Between the States, is that much different than what we are doing of shipping our troops into the middle of a civil war between Sunnis and Shiias?

So, Mr. Chairman, I just felt compelled to set the record straight because what you have laid out here today for this Foreign Affairs Committee is something that would make both Hamilton and Madison smile.

I yield back.

Chairman LANTOS. I thank my friend for his comments.

Delighted to call on my distinguished senior member of the committee, my friend from California, Mr. Berman.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE HOWARD BERMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BERMAN. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for being a little late. I am going from immigration to Iraq, and I don't know if that is going from the frying pan into the fire.

I am glad to have a chance to say a few words about H.R. 1263, which I have introduced. I call it the Iraq Benchmarks Act. This is actually a bill that I believe both Ms. Woolsey and Ms. Ros-Lehtinen should like, not because it reflects what they want but because it would be better than what they are likely to get, and let me explain why.

The bill would essentially codify, as the supplemental tries to do, the security, political and economic benchmarks for Iraq spelled out by the Bush administration and endorsed by the Iraqi prime minister. These are commitments that the Iraqi Government will provide the required number of Iraqi troops to secure Baghdad, allow United States and Iraqi forces to go after all extremists, and seriously pursue reconciliation initiatives like an enactment of a law to equitably distribute oil and gas revenues.

Beginning on July 1, and every 90 days thereafter the President would have to determine that substantial progress is being made in meeting all the benchmarks, and starting on October 1 and every 90 days thereafter the President would have to determine that there has been a substantial reduction in the level of sectarian violence. That is sort of the super benchmark.

If the President isn't able to make one of the required determinations, or if he does and a joint resolution disapproving his determination is passed under expedited procedures, no holding in committee, no filibuster in the Senate, strict time lines for a floor vote in each House, that is the expedited procedure outlined in this bill, then the bill would require the redeployment of United States troops from the non-Kurdish portions of Iraq within 180 days and prohibit the use of any funds for any further deployments after the conclusion of that period.

The only exceptions would be for protecting the United States Embassy, training Iraqi security forces, and engaging in very limited operations to kill or capture al-Qaeda terrorists that pose a real threat to United States national security.

Finally, if the President's new strategy doesn't result in tangible progress, any new proposal the President has could not be implemented until it was approved by a joint resolution of Congress.

Why do I think this bill deserves support? Let us take three groups. There are members who believe that our continued military involvement in Iraq is a disaster. I believe they should embrace my bill because it provides the means through force of law to hold the President accountable for the success of his surge strategy.

Other bills cutting war spending or ordering an immediate or date-certain withdraw won't pass the Congress, and even if one of them did, it would be vetoed by the President. Members who be-

lieve that the surge will turn the tide in Iraq should also embrace my bill. By predicating our continued military involvement on meeting the benchmarks, H.R. 1263 gives the President and General Petraeus the leverage they need to demand the full cooperation of the Maliki government. It empowers him to maximize the chances for success. If Iraqis don't cooperate, if the sectarian violence doesn't subside, my goal will leave Sunnis and Shiites to their own fate.

Finally, those members who are or were generally supportive of our involvement in Iraq but who are distressed by or at least fear the haplessness of the administration's prosecution of the war, and I put myself in this category, I think we should embrace the bill.

H.R. 1263 will light a fire under the administration and keep that fire burning. By making it clear that Congress will hold the administration accountable for meeting the benchmarks, and most importantly, for substantially reducing sectarian violence, President Bush will have no option, no denial of the facts on the ground, no hope that it is all going to work out, he will have no option but to do everything he can to force the Maliki government to cooperate now, and because H.R. 1263 holds him to account indefinitely, the President will have no excuse to let up on the pressure. If all that doesn't work, it is time to acknowledge the futility of this endeavor.

Many members philosophically oppose benchmarks, time deadlines, any indication that America's patience has limits, but that ignores reality, and there has been too much of that when it comes to Iraq. The American people and their representatives in Congress will not sit back ad infinitum while our troops are under attack for no further clear gain.

H.R. 1263 both maximizes whatever chances there are for success, and if success is not in the cards, accepts that reality.

It is true the President has the power to veto this bill, but if he does veto H.R. 1263, his message will be I don't want to be held accountable for the effectiveness of my new strategy. I don't think that is an acceptable message for a Commander in Chief to send to the American people.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to testify.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Congressman Berman.

I am very pleased to call on my friend from Pennsylvania, a new but very distinguished member of the Congress, Congressman Patrick Murphy. His legislation is designated H.R. 787, and it is entitled, "The Iraq War De-Escalation Act of 2007." We are very pleased to have you, Mr. Murphy.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE PATRICK MURPHY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Chairman Lantos, I appreciate it, Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen, and members of this distinguished committee.

The diverse voices speaking today, Democrat and Republic, blue dogs and progressives demonstrates how this Congress and this country are hungry for leadership, hungry for a change, and hungry for a new direction in Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, I spent over a decade in the United States Army, rising to the ranks of captain and a paratrooper in the 82nd Airborne Division. We had a phrase that seems particularly fitting for this Congress's task, "Lead, follow or get out of the way."

That, Mr. Chairman, is what these hearings are about, what the new Democratic Congress is all about, and what I hope the 110th Congress will be remembered for.

But, Mr. Chairman, it seems that you can't pick up a newspaper without reading a pundit's claim that we are steering this Congress and our country into uncharted territory; that never before was a Congress so keen on passing an ongoing conflict, or worse, if seems you can't turn on the TV without hearing professional political strategists rant about the problems of Congress taking on this war.

For some, this appears enough of a reason to standby idly, to let our commitment in Iraq remain open-ended so that countless more American soldiers be killed in the sands of Anbar, in the streets of Baghdad.

If those who espouse the status quo to prevail, Mr. Chairman, the history books of future generations will not treat us kindly, nor should they.

Robert Kennedy once quoted that "nothing is more difficult to take in hand, more purlieus to conduct, for more uncertain in its success than to take the lead and the introduction of a new order of things."

My colleagues, the task ahead may be uncharted, difficult and sometimes daunting, but we all know that the 110th Congress will be judged by whether we have the political courage to put forth a plan to restore accountability and oversight, bring our troops home from Iraq, and most importantly, to win the war on terror.

Mr. Chairman, I am the lead sponsor of House Resolution 97, Providing for Operation Iraqi Freedom Cost Accountability. What this bill does is to root out fraud, waste, and abuse, and restore transparency to the way we conduct this war. We need to be honest stewards of American resources, and with regard to Iraq, this administration hid, and yes, even lied about money spend, motivation, and policies. We must end war profiteering.

But I am also here today as a soldier and a congressman to talk about the future in Iraq. That is why I have introduced H.R. 787, The Iraq War De-Escalation Act of 2007, with Congressman Mike Thompson, a fellow paratrooper. You have already heard from Mr. Thompson, and many of you are already co-sponsors, so I won't waste time repeating all of the details.

But I do want to focus on the most critical component of this bipartisan piece of legislation, and that is the time line it creates to bring our troops home from Iraq. Should this bill become law we will begin a phased redeployment of United States combat troops out of Iraq no later than May 1 of this year, with a goal that all combat brigades will redeploy from Iraq by March 31, 2008.

Let me be clear. The legislation we have offered does not give a time line because we think the military cannot do the job; it gives a time line because our troops have done their job.

I was in Baghdad in 2003 and 2004, and if there is one thing that that deployment taught me is that everything in the military

works on time lines. There were time lines for training, time lines for missions, and in Iraq there were time lines for elections and establishing a Constitution. It is clear that we must set another time line, one to bring our troops home and get Iraq up on its own two feet. We must make Iraqi stand up for Iraq and bring our heroes home. Until we do that, it is going to be American soldiers running convoys up and down ambush alleys, just like I did over 3 years, and it is going to be my fellow paratroopers who are going to die refereeing a religious civil war on the streets of Baghdad.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are ahead of us on this war, so is the Iraq Study Group, and many of our military leaders. They have embraced this time line for our troops in Iraq because they know that until America set a date-certain for removing our combat troops Iraqis are going to continue to let the Americans do the heavy lifting. For those who argue against time lines, I urge you to be consistent. I recall that it was a decade ago when a Republican Congress asked for time lines in Kosovo.

Mr. Chairman, do I wish we could bring all our troops home tomorrow? Of course, I do. But America faces real challenges in an even more dangerous world, and this legislation acknowledges that. It leaves a strategic strike force in the region to continue to provide civility, train Iraqi troops, guard the borders, and protect against foreign aggression. It also addresses the necessary non-military tools for success that this administration has refused to embrace—both encouraging a special envoy to undertake a diplomatic surge in the region as well as forcing Iraqis to fulfill their promises of economic development.

But most importantly, this bill allows our military to refocus its efforts on what it should have been doing all along—tracking down and killing the members of al-Qaeda in Afghanistan where our military leaders are in desperate need of more troops in anticipation for a Taliban spring offensive.

Mr. Chairman, I have no illusions that the path ahead will be easy, but I know that the American people are craving leadership, craving diplomacy, craving accountability, and craving a new direction in Iraq. I hope that our children's history books will remember that the 110th Congress is the one who gave them that new direction, and I think House Resolution 97 and H.R. 787 will lead us down that path.

I would be happy to answer any questions on these pieces of legislation.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Congressman Murphy. Congress is much indebted to your contribution during the very short time you have been with us. We appreciate your presence.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, sir.

Chairman LANTOS. I am pleased to call on another distinguished new Member of Congress, my friend from Pennsylvania, Congressman Joe Sestak. His legislation is designated H.R. 960. It is entitled, "Enhancing America's Security through Redeployment from Iraq Act." We are delighted to have you.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOE SESTAK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SESTAK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, our military is a national treasure that should not be used recklessly, but nor should it be hoarded like miser's gold if we are to continue to be a force for peace and prosperity in this world. But the war in Iraq is a tragic misadventure because of our continuing use of your national treasure in what is an inconclusive open-ended commitment in a country where the long-term benefits do not match what we need to reap for our global security.

We need to apply our resources elsewhere in the world where terrorists come from, including Osama bin Laden who has still not been apprehended, or emerging China has growing political and economic interest and therefore influence that may challenge ours.

Unfortunately, by our involvement in Iraq, not allowing us to first finish the work needed to fully secure the peace in Afghanistan, the al-Qaeda leadership that struck the United States on September 11 is still free. Having been on the ground in Afghanistan 2 months after the war began, and then seeing it again on the ground 18 months later, it was obvious that Afghanistan is the poster child for what is wrong with this war. It harms our strategic security globally by distracting our attention from challenges such as Afghanistan and the Middle East, the Western Pacific, Northeast Asia and Iran.

There is a different strategy that can bring about a successful conclusion to the war in Iraq, and permit us to refocus on our greatest security interest globally as well as here at home. A planned end to our military engagement within Iraq at the end of this year is the needed catalyst for a change in Iraq. We must use a date-certain for our redeployment from Iraq to make it unequivocally clear to the Kurdish, Shiite and Sunni political leaders that while we will continue to support them politically with limited military effort from outside Iraq and a favorable economic relationship, they must now take the difficult political steps necessary to cease the sectarian violence in Iraq, including building coalitions among competing sects, ensuring minority rights, balancing power between provincial and central governments, ensuring revenues among all regions of Iraq.

This cannot be accomplished by continuing open-ended U.S. military commitment. Only by setting a deliberate time table for the redeployment of our armed forces from Iraq will the United States be able to ensure that the Iraqi political leaders acknowledge and accept that they must now take the necessary difficult steps to cease the violence because they will now have to bear the consequences, the personal consequences of not assuming responsibility for their country.

Therefore, my legislation, H.R. 960, mandates that not later than December 31, 2007, all United States armed forces serving in Iraq as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom will be redeployed outside of that nation to locations within the Middle East or Southwest Asia, or to other regions or nations as well as return to the United States where of grave concern. No army combat unit now has a state of readiness that would permit it to deploy to a sudden contingency if called up because of Iraq.

Funds for Operation Iraqi Freedom may be obligated or expended after December 31, 2007, to support the Iraqis by special operations forces assigned outside that country to conduct target coun-

terterrorism operations or periodic support operations of the security forces in Iraq, or air force assigned locations outside of Iraq for conducting air operations to support the Iraqi security forces.

Finally, it is imperative that the United States should take a leadership role, a leadership role in confidence, in diplomatic efforts and negotiations necessary for countries in the region, including Iran and Syria, to work together to ensure the long-term stability of Iraq which is in the best interest of such countries as well as the United States.

A date-certain changes all of the incentives. The Iraqis must cease their culture of dependency or face the personal consequences of not taking the difficult political compromises needed, and the Iranians and the Syrians will have an incentive to be involved destructively in the civil war we are refereeing because we are bleeding profusely while in it, have a different set of incentives once we announce our redeployment.

They now have a strong new incentive for stability in Iraq as the 5 million Iraqis dislocated in their countries, 2 million of which have already overflowed its borders now become theirs to help address without our presence within Iraq, and neither of these two allied countries, Iran and Syria, want a proxy war to occur between the respective Shiia and Sunni majority populations because of their offering support for the different respective religious factions inside Iraq.

There is a successful strategy for Iraq, H.R. 960, and I believe that failing to follow it means significantly harming our other more important long-term interest in the world. Contrary to the Bush administration claims, Iraq is not the central front of terrorism. We did not adequately plan before we went into Iraq and we are still there because of this without a realistic strategy to get out.

The only strategy and leverage left is to use our redeployment as a catalyst for Iraqis and other regional nations to accept their responsibilities for relative peace. U.S. interests in the world do not include point endless amounts of our national treasure of lives and money into endless illusive goals when we have so much else to achieve in this world.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Congressman Sestak, and let me state for the record that the last two witnesses were distinguished members of our military who have brought professional judgment and intellectual vigor to their analysis of the situation. We are deeply in your debt.

Mr. SESTAK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, from both of us.

Chairman LANTOS. I am pleased to call on my good friend, distinguished neighbor and a most important member of the Armed Services Committee, Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher of California. Her legislation is numbered H.R. 1460. It repeals authorization for the use of military force against Iraq. It requires the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a plan for phased redeployment of United States troops, and it establishes an Iraq stabilization coordinator. We are pleased to have you, Congresswoman Tauscher.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ELLEN TAUSCHER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, let me say how pleased I am to be before your committee, and to see you sitting in that chair as chairman, Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen, and my colleagues. Thank you for inviting me to testify today on the "Change the Course in Iraq Act."

I introduced H.R. 1460 with my colleagues, Adam Smith, Jane Harman, Joe Crowley, and Arthur Davis, to accelerate the redeployment of our troops from Iraq and help stabilize the country in a clear and responsible way. Our bill complements but does not compete with the supplemental that I support, and that I hope we will pass this week.

It does not condition funding for our troops. Rather it conditions further funding, future funding for the Iraqi Government based on them meeting benchmarks laid out by the bipartisan Iraq Study Group. Our legislation also addresses a number of critical issues.

First, H.R. 1460 recognizes that the current United States military mission in Iraq has changed dramatically since Congress authorized the use of force in Iraq over 4 years ago. As the Pentagon recently reported, or perhaps more accurately, finally admitted, and I quote:

"Some elements of the situation in Iraq are properly descriptive of a civil war, including the hardening of ethno-sectarian identities and mobilization, the changing character of violence and population displacements."

Today, our mission in Iraq no longer has anything to do with regime change, enforcing U.N. sanctions or eliminating weapons of mass destruction. The existing congressional authority is clearly no longer valid by any interpretation. American troops were certainly not sent to fight an Iraqi civil war.

Second, the bill requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan for phased redeployment of our troops based on a mission that is focused on training Iraqi troops, fighting terrorism, and forced protection. These three categories are identified by the Iraq Study Group and it is long overdue that the Pentagon prepare an exit strategy for our troops.

Third, the bill requires the President to appoint a coordinator for Iraq stabilization to pursue diplomacy with regional powers, to secure Iraq's borders, encourage national reconciliation and stabilization of Iraq, and promote economic assistance. Again, this section is congruent with the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group and would ensure that Iraq's neighbors step up to the plate and contribute to Iraq's future.

Lastly, the Change the Course in Iraq Act requires the President to certify to Congress by December 31, 2007, that the Iraq Government has made significant achievements on the benchmarks recommended by the Iraq Study Group, including approving laws regarding oil, Iraqi oil sharing, de-Baathification, and disarming the militias.

Additionally, as recommended by the Iraq Study Group, Iraq security forces must be in the lead of operations and exercise control

in all of Iraqi provinces and the Iraqi Constitution must be reviewed and amended, if appropriate. If the President fails to certify that the Iraq Government has met each of these benchmarks by the end of this year, no further funds would be obligated for the Iraq Security Forces Fund or the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund until such certifications are made.

We carefully crafted this so that funding for the protective equipment for our troops is not cut, and also to send a clear message to the Iraqi Government that it is time for them to accept responsibility for governing. This final section shifts the responsibility for progress in Iraq where it belongs—on the Iraqi Government, and enables closer scrutiny of American tax dollars.

Our bill will force the Iraqi Government to take on a greater role in stabilizing Iraq because we understand that no matter how many American troops or how many Humvees we send only the Iraqi people and the Iraqi Government can bring about the political reconciliation necessary to end Iraq's civil war.

I believe our bill provides a critical mechanism to change the course in Iraq, and I look forward, Mr. Chairman, to any questions you may have, and once again, I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to testify before your committee.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Congresswoman Tauscher, for a very comprehensive presentation.

Ms. TAUSCHER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LANTOS. I am delighted to call on my friend and distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Congressman McGovern. His legislation is designated H.R. 746, and it is entitled, "Safe and Orderly Withdrawal from Iraq Act." We are pleased to have you, Mr. McGovern.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JIM MCGOVERN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. MCGOVERN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank you and members of this committee for being here, and for holding this hearing so that those of us who have different approaches and different views on Iraq can have a voice, and so I appreciate this very much.

Let me begin by telling you what my bill, H.R. 746, does. Thirty days after enactment, it requires the United States to begin a safe and orderly withdrawal of all United States armed forces in Iraq, including military contractors. The withdrawal should be completed in no more than 6 months. That is what I have been told by most military experts it would take for a safe and orderly withdrawal.

The withdrawal is paid for with already appropriated funds. When the withdrawal is completed, funding for the war will be ended. This allows various military missions in progress to continue, to wind down, to transfer their duties over to Iraqi or other forces over that period of time, around 6 months.

It requires the orderly transfer of all bases and facilities currently under United States administration to Iraqi authorities. This includes all facilities from military bases to outposts to prisons to administrative offices, et cetera.

Nothing in this bill restricts the Pentagon from determining where our U.S. forces will be redeployed. They could be redeployed to neighboring Afghanistan or to Europe or they could all come back to the United States. That decision is left in the hands of the Pentagon.

There are some exceptions of course. Personnel assigned to the security of the U.S. Embassy in Iraq, and to United States diplomatic personnel are not affected by this bill, nor are members of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers who might be engaged in the middle of reconstruction projects. If the Government of Iraq wishes for them to stay and complete those reconstruction missions, under the terms of my bill they may do so.

Finally, this bill allows for the Defense Department to continue providing financial assistance, equipment and arms to the Iraqi military and security forces, or to expand such assistance to an international force should the Iraqi Government request such a force or assistance, and nothing in this bill affects our economic and social reconstruction aid from continuing.

One last piece of this bill, it allows for the President to grant asylum or other means of protection for the many individual Iraqis who have been working with our military as translators, drivers, administrative support and other such functions. If those individuals believe that they or their families will be physically threatened by our withdrawal, then we cannot leave them behind either.

Mr. Chairman, there is no conditionality to my bill. There are no certifications. There are no ifs, ands and buts. This bill reflects the view that enough is enough. I personally believe that the war in Iraq represents a political, diplomatic and military blunder. I also believe it represents a moral blunder, and I am tired of asking our uniformed men and women to keep paying in blood for the political and policy mistakes of their elected officials, whether it is those of us elected in the United States or those elected in Iraq. They have done their job, they toppled Saddam, and they found that there were no weapons of mass destruction.

Our job right now is simply to get them out of there. I cannot believe that even those Members of Congress who authorized the use of force in Iraq believe that they were voting to keep American forces indefinitely on the ground in Iraq in the middle of a violent, escalating, sectarian civil war.

Mr. Chairman, our standing in the world has been diminished, our treasury has been drained, and we need to take a dramatically different course. It is my hope that enacting a measure such as the one that I have proposed here will dramatically change the dynamic. We will force the Iraqi Government and force others, quite frankly, who have an interest in a stable Iraq to step up to the plate and to do what is necessary to achieve a political solution. There is no military victory to be had, and I think that it is a mistake for this Congress not to come to grips with the fact that the only way we are going to achieve any kind of success in Iraq is by ending our occupation, ending our involvement, and encouraging and demanding a political solution.

So I thank the committee for giving me this opportunity, and I feel very strongly that the course that I have outlined is the right

course, and the one that this Congress and this country should take. Thank you.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Congressman McGovern.

I am delighted to call on my fellow Californian and distinguished colleague, Congressman Sam Farr. His legislation is numbered H.R. 413. It repeals the authorization for use of military force against Iraq and requires withdrawal of United States armed forces from Iraq. We are pleased to have you, Mr. Farr.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE SAM FARR, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. FARR. Thank you very much, Chairman Lantos and members of the committee, and thank you, Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen, for the opportunity to discuss this serious issue. I really want to thank this committee for allowing this transparency and discussion of all these bills. I think this is a real tribute to the process here in Congress, and I congratulate you for allowing us to have access to the committee to present our bills.

I introduced this bill on January 12, and it is a two-sentence bill. It says two things: It repeals the authorization to use force; and it mandates the safe and orderly withdrawal of troops from Iraq.

I have long felt as a returned Peace Corps volunteer, active in post-conflict issues, the need to really emphasize diplomatic and political offensive in the Middle East, and not a military offensive. Instead, the President went ahead with the troop surge when we really need a diplomatic surge. We should be focusing our efforts on pushing for a political solution to end the war in Iraq, to end the civil war in Iraq.

Again, I think the President has shown us that he won't change course despite the advice of experts, the experts that you have listened to, you have been a part of, experts like the Iraq Study Group, even his own military officials and views of the vast majority of the American public.

The President has abused the authorization which we gave him in 2002. If you look at the context, that vote was just before the November election, it was October 2002. We were all standing for election, and the global war on terrorism was very popular. Members felt that if you voted against authorization, you were not a patriot. The President failed to implement a plan for peace, and now we find our brave men and women in uniform facing a large insurgency and a civil war.

An ABC poll recently found that 51 percent of the Iraqis now say that violence against the United States forces is acceptable—acceptable—and there is a threefold increase in that violence since 2004. Ninety percent of the Sunni Arabs in Iraq now feel the exact same way.

Repealing the 2002 authorization allows Congress to take a step back, debate our next steps, and come up with a more thoughtful solution instead of the President's open-ended commitment. Bringing our troops home now would put them out of the cross hairs of the civil war, and force the Iraqi political process to move ahead.

Mr. Chairman, you have been very active in trying to find peace in the Middle East. I think once we put the emphasis on trying to

have stability rather than war, that the world will be able to have a different appreciation for America not only in the Middle East but in other countries around the world.

I thank you personally for your increased transparency in this issue and the opportunity to discuss this important bill. I would hope that we have a chance to debate it on the floor, and those who told us that it was a wrong vote back in 2002, who now have a second opinion on it, would have a chance to show for the record where they really stand. Thank you very much.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Farr.

I am delighted to call on my friend from North Carolina, a most distinguished member of this body, Congressman David Price. His legislation is designated H.R. 645, and it is entitled, "Comprehensive Strategy for Iraq Act of 2007." We are delighted to have you, Mr. Price.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DAVID PRICE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. PRICE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank the distinguished chairman and the ranking member for giving me the opportunity to testify before the committee today, and I will do so briefly to testify about legislation on the situation in Iraq that I have introduced along with one of your colleagues on the committee, Representative Brad Miller and several other co-sponsors.

My legislation, H.R. 645, is an attempt to fashion a comprehensive approach to the morass in which we find ourselves in Iraq. It is based on three fundamental recognition.

First, the President's strategy simply isn't working. The most recent assessments from the Intelligence Council and the Pentagon paint bleak and disturbing pictures about the security situation. The surge, while it may temporarily decrease violence in Baghdad, is no solution. It will only shift the epicenters of violence elsewhere.

Second, if there are any solutions left, they will be political, not military in essence. Our military commanders have repeatedly underscored the need for political solutions which is the only way to resolve the sectarian and regional power struggles driving the violence in Iraq. Without such solutions, our troops at best are serving only partially to deflect the violence. At worst, they are serving as a magnet for terrorists and a target for insurgent attacks.

Thirdly, we cannot simply pull out our troops and leave it at that. There is too much at stake. Yes, we should begin a withdrawal and begin it very soon. But as we de-escalate our military efforts, we must escalate our political and economic and diplomatic efforts. Doing so is the only way we can hope to achieve political solutions and it is our best hope for avoiding the intolerable outcome such as regional war or widespread ethnic cleansing.

So those are the basic understandings on which our legislation is built.

Now, much of the interest at home and in Congress often centers on whether a particular bill would end our combat presence in Iraq. The answer to that in the case of our bill is yes, it would. It would terminate the President's authority for conducting combat operations effective December 31, 2007, and it would require the

President to develop an exist strategy to bring our troops home by then.

But of equal importance is that while drawing down military assets our legislation would surge diplomatic, political, and economic assets while putting pressure on Iraqis to take courageous steps for reaching political agreements. It would launch a broad regional diplomatic initiative aimed at engaging Iraq's neighbors in the work of conflict mitigation and resolution, and it would launch a national reconciliation process within Iraq. It would support ongoing efforts to develop democratic institutions, particularly at the local level, which is less tainted by national sectarian politics, and it would offer Iraqis a powerful incentive, authorizing a \$6 billion Iraqi jobs program to be implemented as soon as Iraqi leaders reach critical power-sharing arrangements.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in addition to the substance, I want to highlight our bill's differences from others in terms of process because that is really what much of this debate is about now—process.

There is a growing consensus on the substance of what we should do in Iraq. There is considerable disagreement about the best way to do it. Many have suggested that we accomplish our objectives for a change in Iraq policy through the power of the purse, by simply cutting funds or restricting their use.

Our approach takes a different tack. We confront the policy questions head on, and I think that is a critical difference. Our approach claims for Congress an ongoing role in making and evaluating decisions about the use of our military force. It rejects the notion that the President as Commander in Chief has the sole authority to determine where and when military force is applied, and it certainly rejects the idea that a war once authorized somehow exists outside of Congress's mandate.

Congress does have a continuing role in making and evaluating decisions about war. We should not shy away from exercise this responsibility as though our policy arsenal were limited to funding bills and non-binding resolutions. Rather we should take clear and direct action to determine what our policy should be in Iraq. That is exactly what H.R. 645 would do.

Mr. Chairman, I know I am at the end of a long line of members who have come before you today to testify about their Iraq-related legislation, and I would say nobody has a monopoly on promising ideas, certainly don't have a monopoly on concern to do the right thing here, although I do think our bill is more comprehensive and encompassing than most.

What I do want to stay to this committee, however, is that this Congress is going to set a precedent for what role Congress plays in changing a failed military course that is going to last for years to come. So I hope very much that we can act in a way that does not surrender Congress's authorities and responsibility, and that it does make a credible determined effort to right the course.

So I want to thank you for inviting me here today. I look forward to working with you as you continue to help fashion our country's response to what I think we all understand is the central national security crisis of our time. Thank you.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Congressman Price.

I am now delighted to welcome to the witness table my good friend and distinguished colleague from Guam, Madeleine Bordallo. We are very pleased to have you.

**STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO,
A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE ISLAND OF
GUAM**

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and it is indeed an honor for me to be here to testify before you and the committee, and I do appreciate your time to discuss H.R. 744, the “Iraq Policy Revitalization and Congressional Oversight Enhancement Act” legislation that I introduced on January 31, 2007.

Iraq is today’s signature issue and it is one of the most divisive and complex ones before this Congress. The choices we make regarding Iraq will establish a legacy for the United States that will define our policy toward the Middle East region for generations to come. For that reason, it is my hope that we, as an institution and, indeed, as country, can agree upon a policy that both best protects our national interests and those of our allies and best supports those service members and civilians—and their families—who so bravely serve our country today in Iraq and elsewhere around the world. I believe that the passage of H.R. 744 would be a first step toward achieving these goals.

Section three of H.R. 744 contains a series of policy statements regarding the challenges and the consequences that face us in Iraq. Among those statements is strong language that would express Congress’s concern regarding the sectarianism and factionalism that is present today at every level of government in Iraq. H.R. 744 would convey our view that this shattered system of governance in Iraq contributes to violence against our troops and civilian personnel. It creates a barrier to national reconciliation in Iraq, and impedes completion of our mission in Iraq.

It is true the Government of Iraq must increasingly shoulder the burden of and better fulfill its obligation to govern from moderate positions, with uniformity, and with regard to the rule of law. But Mr. Chairman, I am concerned with plans that would legislate that the success of the mission in Iraq lies squarely, solely, and only upon the ability of a broken sectarian-oriented Government of Iraq to achieve a limited set of benchmarks set by us, and according to a time frame set by us.

H.R. 744 takes a different approach to the challenge of setting metrics to mark progress—or the lack thereof—in Iraq and to define the terms of completion of the mission. H.R. 744 notes the need for the Government of Iraq to achieve certain benchmarks and standards of good governance, and the provision of unbiased security for its people.

But Section four of H.R. 744 requires the President to establish benchmarks for the political, the economic, security, infrastructure and governance activities at the various levels of government in Iraq that are necessary and possible for United States and coalition military and civilian personnel to achieve in order to complete this mission.

This section also would require the President to transmit to us, the Congress, this information in a single, consolidated and com-

prehensive report, with regular updates. Essentially, such a report will provide a comprehensive definition of what is necessary and possible for our country's military and civilian personnel to achieve and help the Iraqis to achieve in order to complete this mission.

Section five, Mr. Chairman, of H.R. 744 would require the President to use these benchmarks as the foundation for a multilateral agreement to further provide for the completion of Operation Iraqi Freedom. An international agreement of this kind is needed because some of Iraq's key problems are undeniably international in nature; and they become more so—not less so—as each day passes. The multilateral agreement called for by this legislative proposal, if successful, could be utilized and expanded to form the foundation—or the beginnings—of a lasting regional security arrangement.

I am a member, Mr. Chairman, of the Committee on Armed Services. I have traveled to Iraq eight times since taking office in 2003. These trips have allowed me to observe our operations in Iraq, and to personally speak with our commanders, service members, and civilian personnel in the field. I too have also had the opportunity to speak with Iraqi leaders during these visits, and as a result, I have learned a great deal about the accomplishments made in Iraq to date. I have also learned of them any challenges that remain there. This legislation would provide us the information we need to make better informed decisions on policy with regard to Iraq, while holding the administration accountable.

I believe that an open and honest exchange of views on the substance of what our country and our allies must achieve in Iraq in order to complete Operation Iraqi Freedom is needed.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for calling this hearing today and affording members the opportunity to contribute in this forum to the broader debate on Iraq.

Finding an achievable, expeditious, and honorable way to complete Operation Iraqi Freedom should be a primary goal for all of us. We owe this to those who have sacrificed so much for this mission. But the situation in Iraq will not yield a solution easily. Nevertheless, we must endeavor to find one, and in doing so, we will be helping shape in the best way possible the legacy future generations of Americans will inherit and the one we will have to defend to history.

Like it or not, the United States assumed a moral obligation to bring order to Iraq when we preemptively attacked that country 4 years ago this month. History will judge us harshly if we abandon this obligation, and I am confident that the provisions of H.R. 744 will help bring renewed focus and direction, and help provide for appropriate and thorough congressional oversight to be exercised.

I respectfully request that my colleagues review and consider the provisions of this legislative proposal, and again, Mr. Chairman, I thank you very much for this opportunity to present this legislative proposal to the committee.

Chairman LANTOS. I thank my friend and colleague for her very comprehensive presentation.

Before calling this hearing to its close, let me just say a couple of things. First of all, I want to thank our staff for organizing an extremely complex hearing. All members have done a superb job on

the staff, but I want to single out Ms. Muriel McClain for her outstanding work. This was a many splendored hearing, and you did a great job.

Let me also say every single member who signed up for a presentation, 23 in number, appeared and made an effective and powerful presentation. I am overwhelmed by humble pride at the analytical and intellectual vitality of my colleagues across the political spectrum. This was Congress at its best, members who have given time and energy to develop important pieces of legislation, all of them have had an opportunity to present them before the Foreign Affairs Committee and the American people, and we are deeply in the debt of all of our colleagues.

Before closing, I want to turn to my distinguished friend from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman, and I also commend you for holding this hearing, and allowing all of the members to present their proposals, and because I don't get a chance often to quote from the *Los Angeles Times* editorial, I wanted to just finish with these two sentences:

"Members of Congress need to act responsibly, debating the essence of the choice the United States now faces to stay or go, and putting their money where their mouths are, but too many lives are at stake to allow Members of Congress to play the role of Eisenhower or Lincoln."

We had a few Eisenhowers and Lincolns this morning, Mr. Chairman, and I prefer to leave those decisions to the people who understand the mission at hand.

Thank you.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much. This hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:33 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

