

sign a peace agreement with. There is only an insurgency of fanatics who have no desire to reach peace with the United States.

Our brave men and women in the military are trying to build a democracy in a country that views U.S. troops as occupiers. Almost one-half of the Iraqi people believe it is justifiable to kill our U.S. troops. The U.S. military has been used to prop up a government being threatened by a guerrilla insurgency.

With this Iraqi insurgency, I cannot envision an event, a goal or a date when victory in Iraq can indisputably be achieved.

What has President Bush said about achieving victory in Iraq? The President said the United States will stay the course and the next President will have to withdraw our troops from Iraq. It will be 2½ years, or 30 months, before this President leaves office. Does this mean America will spend another \$300 billion on the war in Iraq? Does it mean America will suffer 18,000 more young people to war wounds and another 2,500 killed?

In October 2002, I warned that this administration would open a Pandora's box if the United States unilaterally went to war in Iraq. Mr. President, you opened Pandora's box with all its death and destruction of American and Iraqi lives. You cannot simply wash your hands of this war and leave it to the next President to withdraw our troops from Iraq.

It is time for America to demand accountability from the President and the Iraqi Government. It is time for an Iraqi accountability plan to bring this war to an end.

Because of America's sacrifice, the people of Iraq have been able to participate in a democracy by electing the leaders who will shape their young government and institute laws to protect them. This is a giant step towards accountability.

The formation of a new government in Iraq is more than just filling out a cabinet. It is an opportunity for the people of Iraq to accept responsibility for governing their country. This responsibility extends beyond voting or forming a new government or killing Abu Musab al Zarqawi. Now, is the time for Iraqis to be accountable for themselves and their developing country.

I believe that in order for the principles of democracy to take hold in Iraq, the target of the insurgency, our U.S. troops, must be removed as soon as possible!

The President must develop a strategy to bring our troops home. I believe America should demand from the Bush administration an Iraq Accountability Plan that will set clear and measurable goals. The United States has provided the Iraqis with an opportunity for freedom, democracy and self-governance. But it is the responsibility of the Iraqi people to seize the opportunity and set forth these principles in their land.

In this war, the truth lies in today's The Washington Post headline which states "Iraq Amnesty Plan May Cover Attacks on U.S. Military." The war in Iraq has boiled down to am-

nesty for insurgents who attack and kill U.S. soldiers but no amnesty for the insurgents who kill Iraqi citizens. This amnesty proposal appears to have the tacit agreement of the Bush Administration for Iraqi government Officials stated, "There's some sort of understanding between us and the UNF-I [The U.S.-led Multi-National Force-Iraq] that there is a patriotic feeling among the Iraqi youth and the belief that those attacks [on U.S. military personnel] are legitimate acts of resistance and defending their homeland. These people will be pardoned definitely, I believe."

If you vote "yes" on this Resolution, you are supporting the Iraqi Government's belief that it is "ok" to give Iraqi's amnesty for attacking and killing U.S. troops!

I cannot, and I will not support Resolution 861 which supports a government that pardons and justifies killing of 2,500 American personnel as Iraqi patriotism!

I will not support a resolution that leaves our commitment in Iraqi "open-ended"; or which allows this President to hand over the Iraq war to the next President, 30 months from now; nor a resolution that does not have a strategy to end the war in Iraq.

I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution!

H. RES. 861, IRAQ RESOLUTION

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution on the Iraqi war.

Mr. Speaker, as we discuss what to do now, we must first acknowledge the fact that we cannot discuss an exit strategy for leaving Iraq without first stating what the entry strategy was, and then stating what we are trying to accomplish now.

We were originally told we invaded Iraq because they had weapons of mass destruction. That turned out not to be true. We were then told that we invaded Iraq because the Iraqi leaders were connected with the 9/11 attacks. That turned out not to be true. The rationale that Iraq posed an imminent threat to the United States was exposed as untrue even before the invasion.

A letter from the Director of the CIA to the Chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee dated October 7, 2002, specifically stated that the CIA believed that Iraq and Saddam Hussein did not pose a terrorist threat to the United States and would not be expected to pose such a threat unless we attacked.

Mr. Speaker, after it became clear that there were no weapons of mass destruction, that Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11, and that Iraq posed no terrorist threat to the United States, we have been subjected to the excuse of the week for being in Iraq.

We were told that we needed to capture Saddam Hussein for our safety. He has been in jail for over a year, and yet we are still in Iraq.

Then the rationale changed that we needed to capture al Zarqawi. We did

that, and we are still in Iraq with no apparent plan to leave.

The rationale for this week is we are still in Iraq in order to establish a democracy. We have to recognize that the nature of a democracy is that it cannot be imposed on anyone. Further, if the purpose is to establish a democracy in Iraq, it is ironic that the citizens right here in Washington, D.C. cannot elect a representative to vote on this very resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the simple fact is that we made a mistake and the only sensible rationale for still being there is because we made a mess and we have a moral responsibility to clean up that mess. And so we have to acknowledge that we are in quagmire, and it will become clear that there are no good results that can occur.

Cut and run, bad result. Stay the course to prove we have resolve, bad result. Don't worry, be happy, bad result. Continue to pretend that success is around the corner, bad result. I use "quagmire" lightly because this administration's poor planning has strained our troops with many units in their second and third tours. Attacks on the United States are increasing, not decreasing. During the course of our occupation, the number of insurgents has dramatically increased, and our presence in Iraq has been counterproductive, just as the CIA predicted. As of today, 2,500 servicemembers have been killed and many more wounded.

Our military equipment is wearing out much faster than normal. Emergency reserve stocks have been stripped. We have endured the embarrassment of torture at Abu Ghraib prison and questionable detention policies at Guantanamo Bay, and we have not begun to effectively deal with the issue of corruption in private contracts.

Despite spending billions of dollars on electricity and reconstruction, over half of the Iraqi households lack clean water, and 85 percent lack reliable electricity.

Mr. Speaker, we have to be reminded when we first invaded Iraq the administration instructed the Budget Committee not to even budget for the war because it would cost so little. But now we have appropriated almost \$400 billion, not including future medical costs for injured troops, and that has to be compared with the \$7.4 billion that it cost us to defeat Iraq in the Persian Gulf war.

Meanwhile, we have problems at home. There are shortfalls in the Department of Veterans Affairs, cuts in first responder grants, only 5 percent of our containers in our ports are being screened, and the administration has failed to adequately implement the 9/11 Commission's recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, we are not more secure. We are less secure as a result of the war.

Many experts have concluded that the military has done as much as it can, and so our exit strategy must include the use of diplomacy and politics

using the lessons we have learned from our mistakes.

But today, instead of honestly assessing what we are going to do in Iraq, we are considering this resolution which repeats all of the disparaged reasons for the invasion and proclaims its success, not a civil war is just around the corner, and that we should follow the strategy of don't worry, be happy.

In contrast, any real debate would have us start with an honest assessment of our situation. But without articulating why we invaded in the first place and what we want to accomplish now that we are there, we cannot have an exit strategy. There can be no coherent discussion of an exit strategy while we are being directed by this resolution to accept the smiling face, don't worry be happy description of our situation in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we should defeat the resolution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. KELLY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BALDWIN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IRAQ RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the time here tonight. There has been so much discussion today about the resolution on which we will vote tomorrow that we wanted to address that. And I have a friend with whom I went to Iraq in April, Congressman SHAYS from Connecticut, who will also be assisting in this hour.

I would just like to clarify for those who are interested what this resolution involves. Because the time is short remaining, I won't read all of the whereases, but I will go straight to what is normally referred to as wherefores.

Resolved that the House of Representatives honors all of those Americans who have taken an active part in the global war on terror, whether as first responders protecting the home-

land, as servicemembers overseas, as diplomats and intelligence officers, or in other roles.

□ 2330

Honors the sacrifices of the United States Armed Forces and our partners in the coalition and of the Iraqis and Afghans who fight alongside them, especially those who have fallen or been wounded in the struggle, and honors as well the sacrifices of their families and others who risk their lives to help defend freedom.

Number 3, declares that it is not in the national security interests of the United States to set an arbitrary date for the withdrawal or redeployment of the United States Armed Forces from Iraq.

Number 4, declares that the United States is committed to the completion the mission to create a sovereign, free secure and United Iraq.

Five, congratulates Prime Minister Nouri Al-Maliki and the Iraqi people on the courage they have shown by participating, in increasing millions, in the elections of 2005 and on the formation of the first government under Iraq's new Constitution.

Number 6, calls upon the nations of the world to promote global peace and security by standing with the United States and other coalition partners to support the efforts of the Iraqi and Afghan people to live in freedom.

And 7, declares that the United States will prevail in the global war on terror, the noble struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary.

And I think that last point, Mr. Speaker, is the one on which there is so much dissension from the other side and there are a few Members on our side that are concerned, but it declares, we actually believe, and a positive vote tomorrow will indicate, we believe we are going to prevail in the global war on terror. And the truth of the matter is we don't have a choice. It is either prevail on the global war on terror, or be prepared to give up so many freedoms that I do not want to see this Nation give up. Far too many people have given their lives to get us what we have.

Now, one note I would like to address that has been brought up time and time again, well, the President lied to us about WMDs. There are no weapons of mass destruction. Well, we know there were at one time. But to hear it said over and over, and hear again today, during the day today, over and over, well, the President lied to us about weapons of mass destruction. The President lied to us about weapons of mass destruction. His administration lied to us about weapons of mass destruction. And I think the jury is still out. We are finding documents that apparently refer to things that were taken to Syria. There may be things that turn up that we haven't yet found.

But let's say, for argument purposes, that there are no weapons of mass destruction. You know, being a Christian