

harm's way America has supported the men and women in uniform and made certain our troops have the necessary resources to accomplish their mission.

Without a doubt, mistakes have been made, and these mistakes are important to acknowledge, but we must go forward with a new strategy in Iraq based on quantifiable goals and measurable results. We must not retreat. At this critical time, the American people long for true leadership and resolve.

I urge my colleagues to put aside political posturing and partisanship and ensure our troops have the resources and support needed to complete this mission. Victory is the only option.

BUSH LAYS GROUNDWORK FOR ATTACK ON IRAN

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, rather than announce a diplomatic initiative similar to North Korea to resolve the stalemate over Iran's nuclear ambitions, yesterday the President said that the Iranian Government is supplying deadly weapons to fighters in Iraq, even though he cannot prove the orders came from the highest levels in Tehran.

Why is he maintaining this? I believe he is maintaining it to satisfy section 2C of the 1973 War Powers Resolution which reads in part: "The constitutional powers of the President as Commander in Chief to introduce United States Armed Forces into hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances and are exercised pursuant to a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions or its Armed Forces."

So what is going on here is that the administration is seeking a justification for a military conflict with Iran. That is why the administration is changing its emphasis. Its justification now is to protect U.S. troops in Iraq. Very significantly this justification could relieve the President of needing congressional authorization.

Contrary to his assertion, the President has been provoking Iran. The President has given U.S. military the authority to kill or capture Iranian operatives inside Iraq, but fails to present credible evidence that explosives used in Iraq have come from Iran.

He is laying the groundwork for an attack on Iran and appears to be preparing to bypass congressional authorization for a military strike against Iran.

In light of the House of Representatives' action to disapprove of the President's escalation in Iraq and the mounting opposition to the war in Iraq, the President has advanced a new justification that could be used to bypass congressional approval for a military conflict of war.

President Bush was able to exercise new flexibility to reach an agreement with North Korea to shut down its nuclear facility. This offers proof that he could negotiate with Iran as well regarding their alleged nuclear weapons program.

IRAQ RESOLUTION

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled by what is happening in this Chamber this week. We are taking full advantage of the freedoms that we have while good men and women are dying to protect us, and we are undermining their efforts.

The other side has done some very awful things for political gain in this session. But this event is the pit of hypocrisy, not the height of hypocrisy. History has shown that involvement and sending all of the resources necessary was essential to winning World War II. And we did, in fact, preserve freedom and democracy.

Many Americans were against World War II, calling for isolationism and pacifism, hoping that Hitler would stay true to his word regardless of the extensive military buildup. The United States had no choice but to enter the war to save Europe and democracy. That was the definitive conflict of that era; we are now facing the definitive conflict of ours.

Mr. Speaker, this is a tremendous disservice to our troops, their families and the American tradition of being honorable liberators fighting for democracy. This resolution is an insult to our troops and the American people.

We are leaders in our body. It is time that we came together and act as leaders, leave politics aside to fight terrorism and support our troops. We owe to it ourselves, the people we represent and future generations.

IRAQ RESOLUTION

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to be an American. I am so proud that we have first amendment freedoms and this House of Representatives has decided to step up and debate the issue of Iraq. I am not ashamed that I want my troops to come home. I am not ashamed to say that the babies that have died in Iraq that come from Cleveland and Chicago, Illinois need to come home and get out of harm's way. I am not unpatriotic; I am as patriotic as the rest. I stand here to say to America today that the Democrats in this House of Representatives and the Democrats in the Senate want a debate.

Fortunately, we have a strong leader in the House and we are debating. Somehow, the Senate cannot seem to get off the stoop to give us an opportunity to debate the issue of Iraq. I am proud to be an American. I am proud to have troops who have stood up for us, have given their lives. It is time for us to stand up for them.

Let's remember them. Let them not be numbers. Let them and their families know that we care about them.

PROGRESS IN IRAQ

(Mrs. DRAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic week in Iraq. They have passed a new budget for 2007, an overwhelming majority of the Iraq Council of Representatives voted in favor of the \$41.1 billion budget that will aid Iraq with rebuilding, security, and move them forward to be more self-sufficient.

We should celebrate this achievement as evidence that we are making progress in Iraq, and we should allow the new strategy a chance to work. The 2007 Iraq budget represents a 21 percent increase over the 2006 budget. Over \$10 billion will be dedicated to reconstruction efforts and capital investment projects this year, and over \$7 billion will be used to provide security to protect Iraq from insurgents that continue to work against the cause of freedom.

This is great news from Iraq. We are making progress. I applaud the dedication to fiscal responsibility in Iraq and urge my colleagues to celebrate the success stories like this one in Iraq.

IRAQ RESOLUTION

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

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Iraq resolution that we are debating here is bipartisan. Over the last 2 days, Democrats and Republicans have come to this floor to voice their opposition about the escalation plan for this war.

There is also strong bipartisan support for a resolution in the Senate that would express the Chamber's opposition to the President's plan there. Unfortunately, Senate Republican leaders are preventing the debate and the resolution, preferring instead to blindly follow the President.

Why have Democrats and Republicans come together to express our opposition to the President's plan? Unlike the President, we have listened to the military experts, his own generals, the American people, the troops fighting in Iraq, and the bipartisan Iraq Study Group that said this war no longer can be won militarily.

Congress must express an opinion to this President's plan. Over the last month, the House and Senate committees have conducted 52 hearings on Iraq, conducting oversight of an administration that is off course internationally. The oversight will continue and we will bring a change of course in Iraq.

CAFE STANDARDS AND ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I will have an opportunity to talk about the war resolution, but this morning I would like to just talk for a second about energy independence.

Several weeks ago we heard the President announce part of his agenda for making America more energy independent. But the real question is, how do we get there? The President laid out a plan to place new draconian fuel-efficiency standards on our domestic automakers, which I believe is the wrong approach to energy independence.

It is the wrong approach because it would force our domestic automakers to invest in old technology and to stifle very exciting new technologies. Our domestic auto industry is nearing innovative breakthroughs, such as the usage of alternative fuels, new battery technology, and advanced hybrid vehicles.

I believe it is in our national interest to provide Federal support to advance the auto technologies of the future to help achieve energy savings. Both General Motors and Ford recently unveiled advanced plug-in hybrids that use a lithium ion battery. Helping that technology become commercially viable will advance our efforts to conserve energy by light years and to create great new jobs here in America.

If my colleagues want true energy independence and a thriving domestic auto industry, we must focus on the technology of the future.

IRAQ RESOLUTION

(Ms. CASTOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 days Republicans who support the President's troop escalation plan have had two main message points. The first is that the resolution opposing the President's plan is nonbinding and meaningless, and the second is that the resolution will be the "end of civilization," to borrow a term from a columnist. They cannot have it both ways.

What we are doing over these 3 days of debate is having a real discussion about changing the course of the war in Iraq. For those who support the Bush-Cheney escalation, this debate serves as a prime opportunity to explain why they think this escalation will work when four other surges have not worked.

It is a shame that some have ignored the merits of the resolution and focused on political calculation. In fact, several Republicans sent out a letter saying this debate should not even be about the Iraq war today. If we let Democrats force us into a debate on the surge or the current situation in Iraq, we lose.

Far from it, Mr. Speaker. No one will lose by having a debate. In fact, our great democracy benefits and the American people win by knowing that we are charting a new direction.

IRAQ RESOLUTION

(Ms. CLARKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I am very supportive of our troops around the globe and in particular those who are in harm's way in Iraq. I wholeheartedly support H. Con. Res. 63.

Mr. Speaker, in the President's January 29, 2002, State of the Union address, in regards to protecting America, responding to terrorist threats and capturing Osama bin Laden, he said, this is a regime that agreed to international inspections, then kicked out our inspectors. This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world.

States like these and their terrorist allies constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred.

Secretary Rice, after being named Secretary to succeed Colin Powell, warned 6 months before the invasion in Iraq that Saddam Hussein could deploy a nuclear weapon, saying that the administration did not want a smoking gun. We want to know as New Yorkers, when will we find Osama bin Laden

IRAQ RESOLUTION

(Mr. MEEKS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, as the November election clearly showed, Iraq is the number one issue weighing on Americans' minds. A vast majority of people across the Nation strongly disagree with the President's plan to send nearly 21,500 additional troops into Iraq, and a bipartisan majority in this Congress has also voiced its opposition to this measure.

This week here in the people's House, we will have an opportunity to express our opinions on the troop escalation, and then we will have to vote whether or not we support the President's plan. The American people want a debate. And while there is one going on in this House, the Senate Republican leadership continues to block debate in the Senate.

One has to wonder what Senate Republican leaders are so worried about. After all, Republican Senators, like JOHN WARNER and CHUCK HAGEL, joined with Democrats to propose their own resolution opposing the troop escalation.

Are Senate Republican leaders really willing to stifle the voices of their own Republican colleagues so that they can continue to protect the Bush administration? It is time for real debate. It is time for a new direction on this war.

IRAQ RESOLUTION

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the debate taking place here in the House this week is long overdue. We are approaching our fifth year of this war. This is the first time Congress is debating the strategy President Bush wants to implement in Iraq. Congress can no longer stand on the sidelines, and the President has to know that to escalate the war in Iraq is not acceptable.

The President hopes this troop escalation plan will help secure Baghdad and reduce the sectarian violence that is ripping the country apart. But there is no evidence to support those hopes. In fact, on four different occasions, the President increased troop levels in Iraq, and every time these plans failed to calm the violence in Iraq.

Additional troops are not going to make a difference because there simply is not a military solution to the war in Iraq. The devastating sectarian violence is going to continue. But our troops should no longer be asked to serve as referees in a battle between religious sects that have been fighting for centuries.

IRAQ WAR RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 157, proceedings will now resume on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 63) disapproving of the decision of the President announced on January 10, 2007, to deploy more than 20,000 additional United States combat troops to Iraq.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on Wednesday, February 14, 2007, time for debate on the concurrent resolution on that day had expired.

Pursuant to the resolution, it is now in order for a further period of debate on the concurrent resolution.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) each will control 6 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority whip, the Honorable JAMES CLYBURN of South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the debate we join today is essentially over the matter of sending 20,000 more American troops into Iraq. Over the past 2 days, some deeply felt sentiments have been expressed in this Hall by some patriotic and honorable Americans from all walks of life and on both sides of the aisle.

□ 1030

And I respect and appreciate the intensity of those feelings.