

In the time it has taken me to give this speech, we have spent another roughly \$1 million in Iraq. \$1 million for every 5 minutes we spend in Iraq, for a war that has made us less safe and has weakened our military.

It is time to change our course in Iraq and refocus on the threats in Afghanistan, where the 9/11 attacks were planned and the al Qaeda and the Taliban continue to plot. It is time we end our mistaken war in Iraq.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE 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 California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

DISCUSSING THE WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, as the hour grows late here this evening, I and some of my fellow freshmen colleagues have gathered here on the floor to talk about the issue that is overarching everything we do in this country today, the war in Iraq.

When we were elected in November, many of us came here on a mandate for change, a mandate for a change of direction in the way the country was heading and a mandate for change in direction in Iraq. So, tonight we are here to talk about the important events of this day, the action that this House took to pass a very important bill, the Responsible Redeployment From Iraq Act, and also to talk about the report that was recently released from the White House on Iraq and the benchmarks that, sadly, are not being met.

With that, I would like to actually turn this discussion over to some of my fellow colleagues. We will begin with a statement and some commentary from the gentleman from New Hampshire, the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. PAUL HODES.

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

I am happy to be here tonight with my colleagues to speak about the issue that predominates in the minds of the people of this country, certainly in the minds of my constituents.

We are in a disastrous and unnecessary war in Iraq. I have received literally thousands of letters, phone calls and e-mails from the constituents of the Second District of New Hampshire, the people I represent, the people who sent me to Congress, telling me one thing loud and clear: They want us out of this miserable war. They want our troops out of the impossible trap of being caught in multiple sectarian conflicts.

I have only been in office for 6 months, yet I have received thousands and thousands of communications from the people I represent. It is past time to change course.

Now, when we do change course, and it is inevitable that we will change course, we must do it responsibly and with a view towards ensuring that our core values and our vital national security interests are protected. We are not talking about precipitous withdrawals. Today, when we passed the Responsible Redeployment From Iraq Act, we made sure that we set a stage for a responsible course for redeployment of our troops, not a precipitous withdrawal.

Day after day, poll after poll, letter after letter, plea after plea, the American people, and certainly the people of New Hampshire, are demanding we bring this war to a responsible end. As we sit here today, we unfortunately are witness to a stunning lack of leadership, a failure of leadership, a failure to face the reality from the Bush administration.

The President's sad and sorry statement today was counterpoint to the mistakes that have been made in the past. In the absence of leadership from the White House, Congress has the duty to pick up the ball. We have the duty to exercise the moral leadership, the courage and the boldness that the American people know will be necessary to forge a responsible and comprehensive strategy to protect our security interests and lead this country back to a place where our military is strong, where our troops are fighting the right fight against al Qaeda, and where the American people's trust is restored in their leadership.

So I am glad to be here tonight, and I yield back to you, Ms. SUTTON.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for his eloquent words about this very, very tragic subject.

At this point I yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire for her comments.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been 4 years and we are now in our fifth year of war, and once again the Nation stops to assess where are we? And probably the best indicator of where we are was the front page of the Washington Post today.

□ 2315

The first article, "CIA Said Instability Seemed Irreversible." That is the instability in Iraq.

Second article, "White House Gives Iraq Mixed Marks in Report." Unfortunately, Iraq did not meet any of the benchmarks set by the Bush administration and the Congress.

Third article, "U.S. Warns of Stronger al Qaeda." What we are talking about there is the resurgence of al Qaeda in Pakistan and in Afghanistan where it is no longer safe for girls to go to school once again, and where the drug crop is stronger than ever and where we have made no gains at all. Why haven't we made any gains after 4 years? Because we have been dragged into Iraq, into a war without end, by a President who did not understand the region, who is indifferent to the problems, the cultural differences and the problems they are experiencing, and who has not listened to the world. He has not listened to America, and has not listened to his generals and advisors on this.

Now they are asking us for more time. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, there is nothing that upsets me more than hearing somebody stand and ask for more time after 4 long years; more time for the surge, I heard today, that the surge hasn't had time to work. My question to the gentleman was: Which surge are we talking about? I lose track because we have had so many surges. Which surge are we talking about?

Then they say that the President needs more time. Then I hear General Petraeus needs more time. Always we need more time.

How about this. We have a democracy, a young democracy, the President says, in Iraq, and more than half of the people in that parliament signed a petition asking the United States to leave. Now we said we would leave if another nation like Iraq asked us to leave. And yet we hear absolute silence from the President. He will not leave despite of the fact that the government he had elected there has asked us to leave.

It costs us \$10 billion a month. When I speak to my constituents, they are all asking, why don't we have money have money for this? We need money for health care. We have a problem with infrastructure. And we just don't have the money for this; this program is being cut back. And my answer over and over is what everybody else is having to tell the good people in this country who need our resources, this is what we have to tell them, you can't have two wars, tax cuts for the top 1 percent, the greatest deficits in history, and still provide for the American people.

We have a decision to make. We have an opportunity finally to provide a responsible road map out of Iraq; and yet we have a President and an administration that is indifferent to this road map.

It is now our responsibility to respond to the American people, to respond to the world and try once again to get the President's attention and once again to ask to please end the craziness here after the thousands of deaths of American soldiers, the injuries which we will be paying for, and should pay for. It is our obligation to honor our commitments to our soldiers, but we will be paying for this for so many years. And we also have an obligation to the Iraqis. We don't even know how many have died because we don't really count them.

What we do know about Iraq is that that culture has been decimated, that those who can leave have left. The countries surrounding Iraq have a large number of refugees, and people living inside Iraq are afraid to go out on their streets.

When I was in Iraq in March, I had an opportunity to speak to Sunni and Shiite women. It was very clear to me that they were unable to resolve their differences. They were so full of mistrust and hatred for each other that they were in the midst of a civil war. Yet we stay there and we continue to put our soldiers in the middle of a civil war, and we continue to be deaf to the cries of the rest of the world.

So we are standing here tonight asking once again for the President to listen to the American people, to listen to reason, to listen to the military leaders who never talk about a military victory any more. They simply talk about stabilizing Iraq, and the question has to be stabilizing Iraq; wasn't Iraq stable 4 years ago? Is this the result we get after 4 years of war?

I thank our soldiers for their incredible commitment to this country. I have had an opportunity to see some of them leave. I have nothing but the deepest respect for them. I know that the Army is suffering under the strain of a 4-year war. The soldiers and their families are suffering under the strain. I know that they have asked us to speak up for them because they are unable to.

So we stand here once again tonight for the people, for the soldiers, and ask the President to please start a responsible road map out of Iraq.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman for her comments. Your points are well taken. After 4½ years of this tragic war, more than 3,600 brave American troops killed, more than 26,000 injured, and nearly half a trillion dollars spent, we continue down the path that the President insists on taking us.

In his defiance, he has indicated he will continue to ignore reality, as well as the facts contained in the administration's own analysis of the war that was released today.

As you point out, in January, the President sent thousands of additional troops to Iraq and promised to hold the Iraqi government accountable for meeting those benchmarks for success. Today that report makes it clear that we need a change in course.

Unity in Iraq, we know here on this floor, must be determined by the people of Iraq, and our brave troops are caught in the crossfire of a sectarian civil war without a military mission, and the President has no plan to bring them home.

Instead of rejecting calls for change and demeaning those who seek it, the President should listen to the military experts, to Congress and the American people who in their will and wisdom want to responsibly redeploy the troops home.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI).

Mr. ARCURI. I thank my friend and colleague from the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I, like so many Americans, have tried to be patient with this administration in extricating us from the difficulties we are in in Iraq. Like so many other Americans, I want to believe that our country is doing the right thing and we are taking the correct steps and doing everything that needs to be done to bring our troops home. But it is very difficult when we see and experience what we have experienced.

You know, first they told us that there were weapons of mass destruction. None were found. Yet the American people continued to be patient.

Then they told us we were in Iraq to remove a tyrant. We removed Saddam Hussein; our soldiers fought valiantly and well. Yet we are still there at the present time despite the fact that Saddam Hussein has been removed from power and has been executed.

Then they told us we were there to fight terrorism, and we have been fighting terrorism, and we continue to fight terrorism, and yet our troops remain there.

Now they tell us we are there to make our families safer. Well, I for one don't feel that my family is any safer today than they were when we went into Iraq. In fact, I think that my family is far less safe.

This administration tells us that we are there to fight terrorism, that we are there to fight al Qaeda, and yet we hear that al Qaeda is now stronger than it has been since before 9/11. So, again, I ask the question: Why are we in Iraq? Why are we sacrificing American lives? Twenty-six thousand have been injured; 3,600 Americans have been killed. Nearly a half trillion dollars has been spent, and yet still we are in Iraq and still we are no safer than we were before 9/11.

People ask me: What are we doing? How are we making our country safer? What are you doing to bring the troops home? And it is very difficult to answer because it is sort of like trying to hit a moving target. Every time that a benchmark is set, every time a question is asked, this administration moves the target. They tell us we are in Iraq on a surge that will tell us in 60 to 90 days where we will be. Then today we hear from this administration we

only now can begin the surge because only now are we fully up to speed. Yet we see our Armed Forces at the weakest point they have been in many years.

Our National Guard is not where it should be, here State side; rather, our National Guard is overseas. They are not in a position to help should we need them here. Should we have another disaster like Hurricane Katrina, our National Guard is not here. Rather, they are serving overseas. These are the things that this administration has failed the American people on.

The violence in Iraq continues. The Iraq government has failed to meet the key benchmarks endorsed by the President in January, and political reconciliation is nonexistent.

And yet we as a Nation have not engaged the neighbors of Iraq. We have not gone forward and tried to bring a settlement to this. We have not engaged Iran. We have not engaged Syria. We have just continued to send troops to Iraq. Something has to be done.

Today we took the first step to do that. I was proud to be one of the representatives who voted for the Responsible Redeployment from Iraq Act, as were 223 of my other colleagues here. It is an important step that we have taken. It is an important step for this Congress.

You know, I can't help but think, I have two teenaged children. What are we going to tell our children about why we were in Iraq? When our grandchildren read the history books and say to us, "Members of Congress, what did you do to stop this war," what are we going to tell them? Well, today we took one step in telling them that we began the process. We are beginning the process to bring this war to an end and to bring our troops home. It is necessary. It is important. It is our responsibility as Members of Congress.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman for his poignant remarks. Your point is well taken when you talk about the benchmarks and the target moving. How many more times will we hear this administration argue that we are just about to make progress? And yet here we are, 4½ years later.

I would like to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Thank you, I want to salute you for organizing this Special Order tonight on the very day where this new Congress rose to its constitutional duty and stood up for the American people who made a watershed historic change last November in terms of expecting us as Members of Congress to lead the way to a new direction in Iraq. The vote again today followed a succession which all of us here as new Members have been part of. I think it is fitting that we are here to discuss that change as the people who really made a difference in terms of changing control of this body.

The vote today was, as members of the Armed Services Committee and Ms.

SHEA-PORTER knows this, was all about what has happened to the military readiness of this country.

Chairman SKELTON is a passionate believer that this war has almost destroyed the ground forces of this country, the Army and the Marines. This was driven home to me during the July 4 recess. A young man, Army-enlist soldier, came to our district office. In one hand, he had his orders for redeployment, his fourth redeployment to Iraq. He had been to Iraq for two 1-year stints, and an additional stint of 7 months in Afghanistan. So over 4 years, 2 year and 7 months, he has been in a combat zone and barely been home for any rest time.

In his other hand, he had a bag filled with prescription medicine for anti-anxiety conditions. Zoloft was one of his prescriptions, which is a very serious medication for that type of condition. Yet we have a situation where he is being sent for the fourth time back into a combat zone. Luckily, our office was able to arrange for him to be seen by a psychiatrist, and a report was prepared which showed that he had full-blown post-traumatic stress, and we are making arrangements with the Army to ensure that he is not sent back into that situation.

But that is the dirty little secret about this surge policy, that we are forcing people who are not physically fit because they are not getting adequate rest time at home and, in many cases, who are mentally ill and being sent back into combat zone because of the taxing of our Armed Forces. It has reached the point where they have no other choice but to try and send people who again are well outside any normal guidelines in terms of rest, training and equipment which the Army has set up.

This bill today which we voted on and passed by an ever-increasing margin with each succeeding vote here, is an attempt to say as a Nation and as a Congress, which has the constitutional duty to raise the Armed Forces, that we have a duty to change course in Iraq to ensure that we have Armed Forces that are capable of addressing the real national security interests of this country.

□ 2330

Certainly being in the middle of a civil war in Iraq is not consistent with the national security interests of this country.

As Congresswoman SHEA-PORTER pointed out today, the front page of the Washington Post has pointed out that al Qaeda now has reached the level of strength that it had before the events of 9/11, that there are training camps in Pakistan that have been allowed to flourish because our eye was taken off the ball with the invasion of Iraq when we should have finished the job in Afghanistan back in 2002 and 2003.

We are now in a situation, as Mr. ARCURI just said, we are, in fact, as exposed and as vulnerable as this country

was at the time of September 11 because of the outrageous, misguided policies of this administration.

This bill, which we voted on today, which sets out a very measured, responsible policy that will change course in Iraq, I think answers all the questions of the doubters and the cynics that we don't have an answer for what happens after a change of course that occurs in Iraq. This is not about Vietnam revisited where people are going to be evacuated in helicopters.

This bill lays out a responsible plan for real change in Iraq that addresses the need to approach this problem on a regional basis in the Middle East and reintroduces a diplomatic measure that has been sorely lacking in terms of this administration's policy over the last four-and-a-half years.

So, again, I think as new Members who are part of the new majority that have helped revive life in this branch of the government, which was a near rubber stamp over the last 4 years, it is important that I think we are here tonight to reemphasize what took place here in this chamber and to restate our mission to keep faith with the voters that took place last fall and make sure that we have a real change in policy in Iraq.

I'd like to yield now to Congressman ELLISON from the State of Minnesota who's again part of this new majority here in Congress.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm always happy to join my colleagues, the difference-makers, who heard the call of the American people and came to Congress to really make the case for a safer America, a stronger America; an America that is not mired down in the quagmire which is Iraq; an America that says, look, we are ready to defend American interest around the world, but that does not include being mired down in a war we never should have been in in the first place.

I'm proud to have voted for this safe redeployment act today, but I just want to point out something that's so very important; and that is, that while dollars and cents clearly are important in this debate, no one can calculate the loss of a loved one. Since this surge began, 600 families have received the most devastating news that any family can ever receive, 600 spouses, 600 sets of parents, 600 sets of children, 600 communities lost a loved one because of this surge that was wrong-headed from the very beginning.

We can't calculate the costs of this war in dollars really. It must be calculated in terms of the lives of our fellow Americans that have gone forward in this horrible conflict. We have to calculate this war in terms of the injuries and the casualties that have been faced, in terms of the young people who have lost limbs, who have lost their strong sense of mental health, their ability to discern reality, their ability to have a calm frame of mind because, for so many of these young people, the helicopter sounds don't stop even after

they come home. For so many young people, the explosions, a car backing up, any sort of sound sends them back to that war zone they used to be in. And it's a horrible tragedy, it's a human tragedy, and no amount of calculation of dollars and cents will ever truly capture what we have lost as a Nation.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we stand here, the difference-makers, today we want to state to the American people that we are here to keep the faith with the American people. We will never forget all of our fellow Americans, our brothers and sisters who have gone forward in this conflict, who have lost lives, who have lost limbs, who have lost their health and their families, who have received an injury that is so impossible to ever heal from. But we know the resilience and the strength of the American people, and we know that they expect us to put their best interests first forward always, and that means a safe, responsible redeployment out of this conflict.

So, Mr. Speaker, just as I say that the losses in this war cannot simply be calculated in dollars and cents but in terms of real human lives, it is also true that they be calculated in dollars and cents as well.

And before I yield back, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out this very important graph that I have right to my right, and this shows very clearly the costs of this war. It wasn't the \$8 billion that we thought it was.

Now, we know it's 10 billion per month, but just look here. Per year we're talking about a number with so many zeros behind it I think that my young children will be very hard pressed to be able to pronounce this number. This is a huge number. What is this, this number is about 120 T, trillion? Billion. I think I need an arithmetic lesson, and I'm a fellow that's had a little bit of schooling.

But as I look at this big number, it will be a challenge for any fifth grader, Mr. Speaker. It's a whopper of a number and it can't even begin to calculate the true losses of our country in this war.

Mr. ARCURI. Just a point that I'd like to make on something that you said earlier, if you could comment on that.

We talk about money costs, but think of the amount of money that this Congress has had to appropriate for veterans benefits as a result of the staggering injuries, the staggering effects that this war has had on our veterans and on our military personnel, and I just think that that's something that I don't think that this administration thought about when they planned out Iraq. They didn't think about the number of wounded because, while our medical teams get better and better, we save many more lives, but obviously many, many more people receive injuries that they will suffer from the rest of their lives. And it's our duty and our responsibility as a Nation to take care

of those individuals, and the emotional costs to their family and obviously financial cost to this country of taking care of them is great.

And I just wanted to add that because that's something else that I don't think anyone thought about before we went into Iraq.

Mr. ELLISON. No doubt, Mr. Speaker. That's an excellent point. What does it mean to care for a 20-year-old quadriplegic for the course of his or her life?

This chart speaks for itself, but I just want to go to the bottom line if I may, Mr. Speaker. We're looking at \$3,816 per second.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), and the points raised are worth talking about. He's absolutely right when we talk about the loss of life, the irretrievable loss of life as being the real cost, the real measure of our loss.

Not too long ago during this surge, the escalation of this war, within this past 6 months, I had the very sad experience of I'm sure that many of you have had of going back to my district to go to visitation, to calling hours, for a fallen soldier. And on this occasion, I walked in and I was taken aback because family members, they thank you. They thank you for coming to pay your respects to this one who was willing to give it all for his country.

And as I walked in and I walked over to the casket where this brave soldier lay and there he was, this young man, and I knelt down and I looked and I looked long and I looked hard because I wanted to remember and I wanted to feel all that I could so that when I came back here to cast the votes that we must cast and to make the decisions that we must make about the lives that are in our hands, to answer the questions about what we're willing to ask them to do and what we're willing to protect them from, I wanted that to be a part of who I am and the decisions I make.

So I carried that with me, and I carried it with me for the vote today, but I can't help but also share a very disappointing moment that happened later that day when I returned home, to hear the news and our President talking about how much he enjoyed riding his bike and how we should all ride our bikes because it's a healthy thing to do. Well, maybe so, but it struck me that this President, to my knowledge, doesn't go to many of those calling hours, and perhaps it would be different and perhaps the decision-making would be different because you're right, my colleague from Minnesota, the lives lost are irretrievable.

With that, I'd like to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES), who has joined us again.

Mr. HODES. Thank you. It's very moving, as we stand here, to think about the real impact, the effects of this misbegotten war on the people of this country. The war is a cancer on the body politic that it is our job to deal with. It's unfortunate.

We were sent to Congress, those of us who are here, largely to serve as catalysts for change. The legislation we passed today is that beginning, and I recall standing here where I'm now standing in the well of the House of Representatives a few weeks ago to welcome to this chamber men and women who had recently served their country, who were coming from Walter Reed, who had come from other military hospitals where, as my friend from New York Mr. ARCURI points out, the costs of dealing with the traumatic injuries that have been inflicted on more than 25,000 people in this war have not even begun to be calculated on the chart next to me. They run into so much money that the mind cannot grapple with it.

These brave men and women came to the floor. They came on crutches. They came in wheelchairs. And each one is a story of bravery and of sadness for me because I saw people whose lives were shattered, people without one leg, people without two legs, people without two legs and an arm, people without two legs and an arm, with traumatic brain injuries, and veterans in addition to the active duty wounded warriors who came here to meet Members of Congress and talk to us about the difficulties they were having in their lives, veterans for whom the Veterans Administration was not responsive, and we have dealt as a new Democratic majority with those issues as well.

I tried to think of what I could say. There was one soldier who sat in the front row with a young lady, it was his wife or his fiancée, who wanted to talk to us about what was really happening in Iraq. And he started by saying, I have three things to tell you. He said, number one, they're not telling you the real story about what's going on there. Number two, and he stopped because he'd forgotten number two. He couldn't get to it.

□ 2245

He had traumatic brain injury. I ask myself, what will it take for the President of this great country of ours, for those predominantly on the other side of the aisle who support a surge which has weakened our security, strengthened al Qaeda, weakened our military, continued the destruction of our reputation in the world; what will it take for this President to face the reality of what his policies have created, to come before the American people with courage and dignity and say, "We have made some terrible mistakes, and it's time to correct them. We will change course, because I know it's the right thing to do. I know we must do it. We honor the service of all those who have served in this conflict. But now we will go and we will fight al Qaeda where we need to in Afghanistan and Pakistan. We will deal and set our strategy in the Middle East so that we can effectively deal with the threat of Iran, the threat posed by Syria, the threat posed by Hezbollah in Lebanon, the threats

posed by Hamas and Fattah in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. We will, once again, reassert our leadership in the world with the moral courage, with the principles and the values and the dignity that the American people expect. We will face up to our past mistakes, but we will lead into the future with a comprehensive strategy to protect American security"?

I am waiting. The American people are waiting. Congress is waiting.

Enough name calling. We are all in this together. This is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. The comprehensive strategy that we have adopted today is an American issue that will move us forward. The real honor that this President and those who oppose a new direction can do to those brave men and women who came to this floor shattered is to acknowledge the past mistakes and move forward to strengthen America and protect us all.

Ms. SUTTON. It reminds me of a committee hearing yesterday, and we heard some discussion from one of the witnesses about courage. It was used in the context, you have to have the courage to go forward. Sometimes it takes courage to go forward.

I know that Mr. ARCURI and I together looked at each other, and thought sometimes it takes the courage that you spoke of, Mr. HODES, to admit when things aren't going right and changing direction. That is the kind of direction that we need in this country from our President, that we need for our troops from our President.

Mr. COURTNEY. One day last week, this past week, in Hartford, Connecticut, General Eric Shinseki came and spoke to the World Affairs Council in Hartford. He, speaking of courage, was the chief of the Army at the outset of the Iraq war, was asked the question by the Armed Services Committee, how many forces it would take to secure Iraq after the invasion. He said, hundreds of thousands of troops.

As we all know, what happened to him was that because the neoconservatives to dominated the administration at the time didn't want to hear that type of reality; instead, they were wedded to this view, that you could win the war on the cheap.

He was bounced out of the Army, after an incredibly distinguished career, decorated combat veteran in Vietnam, one of the people who did an incredible amount of work to bring our Armed Forces back after the debacle of Vietnam.

He spoke to the World Affairs Council on Monday and talked about what happened in the wake of Vietnam in terms of our Armed Forces, that the disillusionment and, you know, just the negative fallout that occurred in terms of people enlisting in the Army, departing well before their planned careers were going to actually come to fruition, caused great damage to the Armed Forces that took decades to recover, and that we as a Nation had finally gotten to a point where we had

not just people at the top level but also at the middle levels of the Army who had really gotten a strong, competent force back into place. His concern is that this war in Iraq is going to result in the same damage as an institution to the Army and the Marine Corps.

We are seeing it in terms of people departing the service, the mid-level officer corps. We again saw another example where the Army failed to hit its recruiting goals last month.

This bill today that we voted on was all about trying to repair the damage that has been done to the military readiness of this country, and General Shinseki, who I think will go down in history as a prophet in this country, as hopefully somebody who still has service to give to this Nation, maybe in a new administration some time or in some other role, is reminding us that we are at grave risk.

Again, the quality people, I know we saw it in Iraq when we went and visited, just wonderful, wonderful people serving in uniform in Iraq, helpful, smart, independent minded. But right now they are trapped in a policy by the administration that is basically telling them that their service is just being used in a way that shows no respect for their own wonderful qualities.

It is one of the main, most important reasons that this bill today that we voted on has got to get passed and signed into law. We have got to keep chipping away with vote after vote over the next few weeks or so to make sure that the gathering numbers we are picking up on these measures are going to get us to the point where real change is going to happen.

Ms. SUTTON. I would just ask the gentlewoman from New Hampshire to add to that, because I know that you hear a great deal in your role as a member of the Armed Services Committee. That is a point that is important for people to know about one of the consequences of this continuing path that we are going down in Iraq.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. It's very important. I sit on the Armed Services Committee and the Subcommittees on Personnel and Readiness. So I hear every day what the President's impact has had on personnel and on readiness. I would like to address both of them.

Supporting the troops is a lot more than putting a yellow ribbon on a car. The "Support the Troops" sound coming out of the White House rings hollow to my ears after 6 months on the Armed Services Committee. I will give you an example. Here we have the most wonderful troops in the world, committed volunteers who signed up out of love and patriotism for their country. It came time for a pay raise, and the President only wanted 3 percent.

The House of Representatives, bipartisan, said they wanted 3.5 percent pay raise. So, how much is 3.5 percent versus the President's percent? Well for an E-4, it would be \$200 a year. I know, from sitting on the Personnel Subcommittee, what a strain this is on

their families and the cost of having a loved one gone and having to get day care and having to get extra help and not having the same support system that they have when they have their spouse or family member with them.

Yet the President said 3 percent was sufficient. He was angry enough, when the House voted for a 3.5 percent pay raise, that he listed it as one of the reasons that he would consider vetoing the bill. If you can't give an E-4, who is serving his or her country, \$200 a year, then all the talk you want about supporting the troops is hollow, and it really ranks sour for the rest of us.

You look at readiness, and you realize the Army has been so impacted by this, that I actually voted to grow the size of the Army. I also voted for the largest, we all did, the largest military budget in history.

As a direct result of the President's misguided policy, he has left us in such a weakened state around the world, that we have to grow the size of the Army. We have to put more incentives in there, and we have to put the largest budget in there.

You know, we do have enemies in this world. We know that. We have a lot of enemies. They weren't in Iraq, but we do have enemies.

Peter Pace, a general, was asked if he were comfortable with the ability of the United States to respond to an emerging threat around the world. He paused for a moment, and he said, no, I'm not comfortable. That should frighten all of us.

If the general doesn't feel that we could respond to an emerging threat because all of our resources and all of our treasure and all of our people are planted inside of Iraq, we have a real problem. This is why we had to have that vote today, and this is why we need to get out of this war.

You know, I have been very disturbed by the way it has been treated like a political issue. It's not.

The freshman class that came here to make the change have been going to Iraq at great personal risk to themselves to have a look and to be sure that they are right about their position against this war. One by one we have come back, as you know, and said, no, we were right about this. What we saw was horrific. We saw a very sad, destroyed country. We saw a country at war with itself in Iraq, and we saw our troops stuck in the middle of the civil war.

Fortunately, there are some Republicans who are now breaking away from the President's grip and speaking the truth about this war. I just wanted to read a couple of them. I will leave their names out, because who they are is not important, except to say that they are Senators.

Here's one, "We need to be fighting terrorists, not civil wars . . . Iraq's peace is one they must win on their own. We cannot win it for them. Our might should be focused on stopping terrorists who are plotting to bring harm to the United States."

Here is another Republican Senator, "A policy of responsible military disengagement with a corresponding increase [in] nonmilitary support is the best way to advance our Nation's interests."

Another one, "There's nothing to wait for. Almost everybody that has any knowledge of the reports . . . would indicate they are not going to show any degree of a big change that we needed. So we are just wasting time."

If we are going to fight terrorism, first of all, we need to protect our own homeland.

You know, if you know there is a burglar in the neighborhood, first thing you do is lock your own door. We didn't do that. If you look at the little money we have invested in Homeland Security, you will know that we are no safer than we were before 9/11, that we took the money and we went to Iraq.

Now why did we go to Iraq? I guess that's the question that hangs in everybody's mind. There were no Iraqis on the plane that day. There was no evidence that Iraq was ready to attack us. We were misled, misguided, got into this war. What's happened to us? Are we safer here? No, of course not.

Are we in more danger there? Yes. Have we destabilized the region? Yes. Do we have to worry about growth of al Qaeda? Yes.

However, the good news is, yesterday at a hearing on global security, there was a Member of the CIA and a couple of others who spoke, and they said that we do not have to fear Iran's sway over Iraq.

Let's remember, Iran and Iraq were bitter enemies who fought an 8-year war. They are not natural allies. They are only allies right now because of us. Once we leave, it's my fervent hope and belief that it will calm down.

Ms. SUTTON. I would like to turn to the gentleman from New York, because I know he has something important to add.

Mr. ARCURI. Let me say thank you, again, to my friend from Ohio for organizing this.

Let me just say, I hear throughout this debate, victory, victory, victory. The other side constantly talks about victory. But to my way of thinking, victory is long past.

What victory means at this time would be bringing as many of our troops home alive and safe as we possibly can. That's what victory means. That's what we should be trying to achieve, and that's what today was all about. I think that really is the most important thing that I think we achieved today.

Ms. SUTTON. It really is. Today was the day we passed the Responsible Re-deployment From Iraq Act. It is about achieving that victory. We ask that the President join us in trying to take this into a different direction, a better direction for the country, for our troops.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 3:00 p.m.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JEFFERSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALL of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROHRBACHER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, July 19.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 13, 2007, at 4 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2435. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Asian Longhorned Beetle; Removal of Quarantined Area in Illinois [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0105] received July 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2436. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cold Treatment Regulations [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0050] received July 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2437. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Indoxacarb; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0149; FRL-8137-8] received July 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2438. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cymoxanil; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0331; FRL-8130-5] received July 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2439. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Chlorpropham, Linuron, Pebulate, Asulam, and Thiophanate-methyl; Tolerance Actions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0483; FRL-8131-6] received July 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2440. A letter from the Acting Deputy Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the Agency for International Development, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2441. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Case Number 04-02, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2442. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-B-7703] received July 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2443. A letter from the Deputy Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received July 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2444. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Human Cells, Tissues, and Cellular and Tissue-Based Products; Donor Screening and Testing, and Related Labeling [Docket No. 1997N-0484T] received July 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2445. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, CMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicaid Program; Citizenship Documentation Requirements [CMS-2557-F] (RIN: 0938-AO51) received July 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2446. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Arizona State Implementation Plan, Pinal County Air Quality Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2006-0729; FRL-8439-2] received July 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2447. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Criteria for the Safe and Environmentally Protective Use of Granular Mine Tailings known as "Chat" [EPA-HQ-RCRA-2006-0097; FRL-8326-1] (RIN: 2050-AG-

27) received July 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2448. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Delaware, and West Virginia; Control of Emissions from Existing Other Solid Waste Incinerator Units [EPA-R03-OAR-2007-0354; [FRL-8338-7]] received July 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2449. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [VA201-5201; FRL-8336-1] received July 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2450. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 06-07 informing of an intent to sign Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E) Projects Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and the Republic of Korea, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2451. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2452. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to section 36(b)(5)(A) of the Arms Export Control Act, relating to enhancements and upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 06-70 of 27 September 2006 (Transmittal No. 0A-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2453. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to the Government of France (Transmittal No. 01-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2454. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-27, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Brazil for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2455. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of defense services, including technical data, and defense services to the Republic of Korea (Transmittal No. DDTC 044-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2456. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad with the Government of Germany (Transmittal No. DDTC 018-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.