

to Israelis, but to their own people, the Palestinians in Gaza, where Hamas continues to use innocent civilians as human shields while firing rocket after rocket after rocket at Israel.

Prime Minister Netanyahu summed up his country's struggle earlier this week in the following way:

We (meaning the Israelis, and I am quoting Prime Minister Netanyahu) we are using missile defense to protect our civilians, and they are using civilians to protect their missiles.

We are using (the prime minister said) missile defense to protect our citizens, while Hamas is using its own citizens to protect its missiles.

How sad. Just today, while Israel was observing a 5-hour cease-fire to allow humanitarian supplies to reach Gaza, we have seen news reports that Hamas continued firing mortar shells into Israel, in violation of that truce.

This week has seen bitter tragedy for both Israelis and Palestinians. You have to listen carefully to the words of Rachel Fraenkel, the mother of one of the three murdered Israeli teenagers. When she learned of the brutal killing of a Palestinian teenager, Mohammed Abu Khedair, she said this:

There is no difference between blood and blood.

Of course, what she meant by that was the loss of her son and the loss of the Palestinian young man was an equal tragedy. He was gunned down by angry people motivated by the acts of terrorists to seek revenge on innocent noncombatants, in this case on children.

Mr. Speaker, Hamas has the power to end this violence. I call on them to do so before more innocent blood on both sides is shed. The United States, of course, will continue to stand by its ally, Israel, and we will continue to hold in our hearts all of the families, including Rachel Fraenkel, and the family of Mohammed Abu Khabir, who are grieving the loss of loved ones as a result of Hamas' reprehensible and criminal actions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IRAQ PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for the balance of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying the obvious. We are living in a chaotic and dangerous world. But contrary to what some in this Chamber suggest, the solution to every problem is not expanding the U.S. military footprint. There are many of us who are deeply concerned about our renewed military involvement in Iraq. We believe we need a debate. We believe we need a vote. We believe the Congress ought to live up to its constitutional responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined by a couple of my colleagues here today who share those concerns and who want to express their beliefs about how we should proceed on this issue. I would like to first yield to my colleague from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, who has been a leader on these issues. I yield her as much time as she may consume.

Ms. LEE of California. First, let me thank Congressman MCGOVERN for your tireless leadership and for hosting this Special Order today. For many years, you have been raising the level of awareness with regard to the responsibilities of Congress, our duties as it relates to war making, as well as the impact of these tragic wars on our brave men and women. So thank you for once again coming forward with now a privileged resolution that directs the President to remove all United States military forces stationed in Iraq within 30 days or by the end of the year.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very reasonable resolution. It is very consistent with what I believe the American people—we know, based on what the American people have said over and over and over again, they are war weary. And Mr. MCGOVERN has really given us an opportunity to vote the views of the American people.

This resolution exempts, of course, troops necessary for the security of the United States diplomatic post and personnel.

We are all familiar with the reports coming out of Iraq about the horrific sectarian violence taking place. We hear many of the same voices who championed the unnecessary war in Iraq once again beating the drum for a renewed war in Iraq today. So we must not let history repeat itself. We must remember history. We must not be dragged back into a war in Iraq. This must be rejected.

Many of my colleagues agree. And I want to remind us that over 100 Members of Congress now from both parties have signed a letter, Congressman MCGOVERN, myself—many—SCOTT RIGELL from Virginia, we are calling for the President to come to Congress for debate on an authorization before any military escalation on Iraq.

Last month, during the consideration of the 2015 Defense Appropriations bill, over 150 bipartisan Members supported our amendment that would prohibit funds from being used to conduct combat operations in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, there is no military solution in Iraq. This is a sectarian war with longstanding roots that were inflamed when we invaded Iraq in 2003. Any lasting solution must be political and take into account all sides. The change that Iraq needs must come from Iraqis. They must reject violence in favor of a peaceful democracy that represents everyone and respects the rights of all citizens.

The future of Iraq is in the hands of the Iraqi people. Our job is to continue

to promote regional and international engagement, recognition of human rights, women's rights, and political reforms. Only through these actions can Iraq and, of course, the United States, and the rest of the world, begin supporting a process of reconciliation and help the Iraqis secure long-term national stability.

Mr. Speaker, after more than a decade of war, thousands of American lives, and billions of dollars, the American people are rightfully war weary. The American people are looking for Congress to act. We must heed their call and bring this privileged resolution to the House floor for an immediate up-or-down vote.

As our President told the American people in May:

United States military action cannot be the only, or even primary, component of our leadership in every instance.

This is one of those instances.

Before we put our brave servicemen and -women in harm's way again, Congress should carry out its constitutional responsibilities and vote on whether or not to get militarily involved in Iraq. But we must vote on this resolution immediately because I think this would give the American people a clear understanding of what this administration and Congress intends to do, and that is remove all military forces stationed in Iraq.

So I want to thank, again, Congressman MCGOVERN for his leadership for bringing this forward. It is time that we have a clear up-or-down vote on this. I want to thank Congressman JONES for cosponsoring this.

Also, I will finally conclude by saying sooner or later—sooner or later—we have got to go back and repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force which has become a blank check for this war this past decade. It sets the stage for perpetual war. We need to repeal it. The American people deserve a vote on this resolution, and they deserve a vote for repealing this authorization.

So thank you again for your leadership, and let's move forward and vote the will of the American people.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlewoman for her eloquent words and for her leadership on this issue in particular.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be here with my colleagues, Congresswoman LEE and Congressman JONES, to talk about I think an issue that deserves a lot more discussion than it is getting. We need to take a look at the recent return of the U.S. military to Iraq.

Iraq is a complicated country with a long history of ethnic and religious divisions. It is now facing a crisis of governance and a crisis of invasion by extremist militant forces. Sadly for Iraq, the two are closely intertwined.

In large measure, Iraq is falling apart because of its sectarian government currently led by Prime Minister Maliki that excludes and represses most Sunnis, Kurds, and other ethnic and religious minorities; and an army that

thinks more about saving its own skin than protecting the Iraqi people. This is what has laid the foundation for extremist forces, namely ISIL, to enter Iraq and take control of disaffected communities and territory.

I do not believe we can fix this. Only the Iraqi people can fix this. And I certainly don't believe our brave and stalwart military men and women can fix this.

I believe that we should never have invaded Iraq. I also believe it is foolish to once again commit U.S. troops to try and save an Iraqi Government and army that cannot stand on their own.

As Joseph Cirincione wrote last month in "Defense One" magazine:

This debacle was predictable. In fact, it was predicted by dozens of analysts who knew a great deal more about Iraq than those who cheerleaded the invasion in Iraq in 2002 and 2003.

This is not to say "we told you so" but to warn that the desperate, quick fixes now being offered are false hopes. The hard truth is that there is little we can do to save the corrupt, incompetent government we installed in Iraq. If 10 years, millions of hours of work, and hundreds of billions of dollars could not build a regime that can survive, it is difficult to imagine any fix that can. Those seeking to blame the Obama administration for the collapse are engaged in a cynical game.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the entire Defense One article.

[From Defense One, June 12, 2014]

DON'T BE SUCKED INTO WAR WITH IRAQ,
AGAIN

(By Joseph Cirincione)

We never should have invaded Iraq. It would be folly to recommit United States forces to save an artificial Iraqi government and army that cannot stand on its own.

Ten years ago, U.S. forces battled Sunni insurgents in the very same cities that are falling to anti-government fighters today. Hundreds of American lives were lost in the 2004 battles for Mosul, Fallujah, Karbala, Ramadi, Tikrit, Najaf and Samarra. The U.S. spent tens of billions of dollars to train and equip an Iraqi army that was supposed to protect the government we formed to replace the deposed dictator, Saddam Hussein.

This week, that army collapsed. In Mosul, The Guardian reports, "two divisions of Iraqi soldiers—roughly 30,000 men—simply turned and ran in the face of the assault by an insurgent force of just 800 fighters." In other cities, Iraqi troops simply handed over their American-supplied uniforms, guns and armored fighting vehicles to the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, or ISIS, fighters, then scattered. ISIS has seized more than \$450 million from the banks in these cities, making it perhaps the richest and best equipped insurgent group in the world.

This debacle was predictable. In fact, it was predicted by dozens of analysts who knew a great deal more about Iraq than those who cheerleaded the invasion of Iraq in 2002 and 2003. The very first sentence of Tom Ricks' 2006 masterpiece, *Fiasco*, warns, "President George W. Bush's decision to invade Iraq in 2003 ultimately may come to be seen as one of the most profligate actions in the history of American foreign policy. The consequences won't be clear for decades."

Well, they are becoming much clearer now. Ricks' concludes his book—which should be read by anyone searching for a solution to the current debacle—with this:

"So while there is a small chance that the Bush administration's inflexible optimism

will be rewarded, that the political process will undercut the insurgency and that democracy will take hold in Iraq, there is a far greater chance of other, more troublesome outcomes: That Iraq will fall into civil war, or spark regional war, or eventually become home to an anti-American regime, or break up altogether. In any of these forms it would offer a new haven for terrorists."

He was not alone. I wrote, with my colleagues at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in WMD in Iraq: Evidence and Implications, an anatomy of the false intelligence supplied to justify the war:

"It was almost inevitable that a U.S. victory would add to the sense of cultural, ethnic, and religious humiliation that is known to be a prime motivator of al Qaeda-type terrorists. It was widely predicted by experts beforehand that the war would boost recruitment to this network and deepen anti-Americanism in a region already deeply antagonistic to the United States and suspicious of its motives. Although this may not be the ultimate outcome, the latter has so far been a clear cost of the war. And while a successful war would definitely eliminate a "rogue" state, it might—and may—also create a new "failed" state: one that cannot control its borders, provide internal security, or deliver basic services to its people. Arguably, such failed states—like Afghanistan, Sudan, and others—pose the greatest risk in the long struggle against terror."

This is not to say, "We told you so," but to warn that the desperate, quick fixes now being offered are false hopes. The hard truth is that there is little we can do to save the corrupt, incompetent government we installed in Iraq. If 10 years, millions of hours of work and hundreds of billions of dollars could not build a regime that can survive, it is difficult to imagine any fix that can. Those seeking to blame the Obama administration for the collapse are engaged in a cynical game.

Rep. Paul Ryan, R-Wisc., played the game well in his speech at the Center for New American Security conference, in Washington on Wednesday. He blamed the chaos in Iraq on the failure of the Obama administration to negotiate a status of forces agreement, pulling the troops out too soon and for not intervening in Syria. In other words, for failing to double down on the military policy that created the mess in the first place.

Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., goes even further, calling on the entire Obama administration national security team to resign. McCain went "roaring onto the Senate floor" on Thursday, claiming "Could all this have been avoided? . . . The answer is absolutely yes."

Part of this is the normal partisan attack on Obama. His political opponents squeeze everything he does into their preferred frame: he is weak, naive, dangerous, doesn't really care about American security, may not even be an American.

Part of it, however, is the way Washington looks at national security issues: focused on the immediate, ignoring or twisting history. So, the Iraq debacle is something that has happened only now, with perhaps one or two years of prelude. The policy fix should address what can be done today, looking forward a year or two. There must be an immediate solution: bomb, invade, supply, sanction. The so-called "defense Democrats" jump in, too, wanting to prove their toughness by advocating one or another military solution.

The Washington Post, which played a key role in convincing policy makers to go to war with Iraq, picks up the pro-war line of attack in its editorial: "For years, President Obama has been claiming credit for 'ending wars,' when, in fact, he was pulling the

United States out of wars that were far from over. Now the pretense is becoming increasingly difficult to sustain."

In other words, the problem is not that we started the war, it is that we never should have ended it.

None of these critics have the slightest self-awareness. None take responsibility for their previous policy pronouncements. It's like the driver of a car that has plowed into a crowd of pedestrians blaming the emergency medical technicians for not saving the lives of those injured.

Nor do the defense Democrats want to go back to this debate, preferring to be seen as positive and forward-looking. They want to talk about robotics or new paradigms. They want to get away from any hint that they once were against the war, or hide their own shame that they were once for it.

I understand. But we have to go over this again. The American public long ago decided that the Iraq War was a mistake, that Iraq is not worth fighting for. It is the Washington elite that doesn't seem to have made up their minds. It is the Obama administration that, after being blasted by Republicans for always "blaming Bush" whenever they talked about the multiple crises they inherited, stopped drawing the lines from the failed policies of the past to the current dilemmas.

Well, it is time to draw the lines again. It is vital that we not be bullied into squandering more resources into a futile effort. We cannot let politics and ideology and short-term thinking again trick the nation into making a bad situation worse.

There is not a quick fix to this problem. The hard truth is that, like the collapse of the Diem government in South Vietnam a generation ago, there is little we can do to prop up this government. As military expert Micha Zenko tweeted, "Unless the US has bombs that can install wisdom and leadership into PM Maliki, airstrikes in Iraq would be pointless." We may have to revisit then-Senator Joe Biden's strategy from 2006 that the only way to stop the killing and salvage the situation was to scrap Iraq's artificially-imposed boundaries and partition the country into three ethnic regions.

Gen. Colin Powell famously invoked the "Pottery Barn rule" about Iraq, but he got it slightly wrong. It is not, "You broke it; you own it," but "You broke it; you pay for it." We broke Iraq. We paid a huge price in lives, treasure and legitimacy. It is time to stop paying.

□ 1345

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I believe President Obama has done the right thing to send U.S. forces to Iraq to increase the security and help protect our diplomatic facilities and personnel.

So far, he has sent two contingents—the first of 275 military troops on June 15 and a second deployment of 200 additional troops on June 30. With respect to the second deployment, he noted that they would also be used to reinforce the security of the Baghdad International Airport.

They would consist of additional security forces; rotary wing aircraft; and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support. The President specifically noted that they are equipped for combat.

In between these two deployments, the President announced on June 19 and notified Congress on June 26 that he was sending 300 military troops to

train, advise, and support Iraqi security forces and to establish joint operations centers with Iraqi security forces, so we could share intelligence and coordinate plans on how to confront the threat of ISIL. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, this deployment concerns me deeply.

In each of these three deployments, the President has rightly formally informed Congress consistent with the War Powers Resolution. The only reason a President has to inform Congress about such overseas deployments—the only time it applies is when the President—and I am quoting now from the War Powers Resolution—has introduced “United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances.”

Mr. Speaker, I ask to include for the RECORD the three notifications the President has sent to Congress on deployments of troops to Iraq.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

[For Immediate Release—June 16, 2014]

TEXT OF A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:) Starting on June 15, 2014, up to approximately 275 U.S. Armed Forces personnel are deploying to Iraq to provide support and security for U.S. personnel and the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad. This force is deploying for the purpose of protecting U.S. citizens and property, if necessary, and is equipped for combat. This force will remain in Iraq until the security situation becomes such that it is no longer needed.

This action has been directed consistent with my responsibility to protect U.S. citizens both at home and abroad, and in furtherance of U.S. national security and foreign policy interests, pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93-148). I appreciate the support of the Congress in these actions.

Sincerely,

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

[For Immediate Release—June 26, 2014]

TEXT OF A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:) As I reported on June 16, 2014, U.S. Armed Forces personnel have deployed to Iraq to provide support and security for U.S. personnel and the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad.

I have since ordered further measures in response to the situation in Iraq. Specifically, as I announced publicly on June 19, I have ordered increased intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance that is focused on the threat posed by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). I also ordered up to approximately 300 additional U.S. Armed Forces personnel in Iraq to assess how we can best train, advise, and support Iraqi se-

curity forces and to establish joint operations centers with Iraqi security forces to share intelligence and coordinate planning to confront the threat posed by ISIL. Some of these personnel were already in Iraq as part of the U.S. Embassy's Office of Security Cooperation, and others began deploying into Iraq on June 24. These forces will remain in Iraq until the security situation becomes such that they are no longer needed.

This action is being undertaken in coordination with the Government of Iraq and has been directed consistent with my responsibility to protect U.S. citizens both at home and abroad, and in furtherance of U.S. national security and foreign policy interests, pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93-148). I appreciate the support of the Congress in these actions.

Sincerely,

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

[For Immediate Release—June 30, 2014]

TEXT OF A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:) As I previously reported on June 16, 2014, U.S. Armed Forces personnel have deployed to Iraq to provide support and security for U.S. personnel and the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad.

In light of the security situation in Baghdad, I have ordered up to approximately 200 additional U.S. Armed Forces personnel to Iraq to reinforce security at the U.S. Embassy, its support facilities, and the Baghdad International Airport. This force consists of additional security forces, rotary-wing aircraft, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support.

This force is deploying for the purpose of protecting U.S. citizens and property, if necessary, and is equipped for combat. This force will remain in Iraq until the security situation becomes such that it is no longer needed.

This action has been directed consistent with my responsibility to protect U.S. citizens both at home and abroad, and in furtherance of U.S. national security and foreign policy interests, pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93-148). I appreciate the support of the Congress in these actions.

Sincerely,

BARACK OBAMA.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I think the President did the right thing to inform Congress because I believe that our troops have been introduced into a situation in Iraq where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances. In fact, more simply put, if Iraq wasn't engaged in hostilities in a moment of crisis, we wouldn't have sent troops over there.

This is why last Friday, on June 11, my good friends and colleagues, Representatives WALTER JONES of North Carolina and BARBARA LEE of California, introduced a privileged resolu-

tion, House Concurrent Resolution 105, to direct the President to remove U.S. troops from Iraq within 30 days, or no later than the end of this year, except for those troops needed to protect U.S. diplomatic facilities and personnel.

We did this for a simple reason. Congress has the responsibility to authorize the introduction of American troops where hostilities are imminent. In less than 3 weeks, in three separate deployments, the U.S. has sent at least 775 additional troops to Iraq.

We don't know what might happen next to those troops or to yet another deployment of additional troops, but we do know that Congress should debate it. We do know that Congress should vote on whether to authorize it or not.

That is what the Constitution of the United States demands of Congress. That is what the Constitution demands of us. Now is the time for Congress to debate the merits of our military involvement in this latest Iraq conflict—openly, transparently.

Do we approve of these deployments and any future escalation? If so, we should vote to authorize it. If we do not support it, then we should bring our troops back home. It is that simple, Mr. Speaker. Congress has the responsibility to act on Iraq now.

Mr. Speaker, we did not introduce this privileged resolution lightly. By doing so, we started a process to hold a debate on our engagement in Iraq in the coming days, using the special procedures outlined under the War Powers Resolution. While this is an imperfect tool, it requires the House to take up this bill after 15 calendar days.

Like most of my colleagues, I would prefer for this House to bring up a bill authorizing our engagement in Iraq, and nothing in this resolution inhibits such important legislation from being drafted and brought before the House for a clean up-or-down vote. Frankly, I wish that were happening, but I have not heard that such an authorization is even under discussion, let alone being prepared for debate.

I regret to say that I only hear how we can avoid having such a debate. So my colleagues—Mr. JONES and Ms. LEE and myself—we introduced this concurrent resolution because we strongly believe that Congress has to step up to the plate and carry out its responsibilities when our servicemen and -women are once again being sent into harm's way.

The time for debate is now, not when the first body bag comes home from Iraq, not when the first U.S. airstrikes or bombs fall on Iraq, not when we are embedded with Iraqi troops trying to back an ISIL-held town, and worst-case scenario, not when our troops are shooting their way out of an overtaken Baghdad.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is the time to debate our new engagement in Iraq—before the heat of the moment—when we can weigh the pros and cons of supporting the Maliki government or

whatever government is cobbled together should Maliki be forced to step down—now, before we are forced to take sides in a religious and sectarian war; now, before the next addition of more troops takes place—make no mistake, I firmly believe we will continue to send more troops and more military assets into this crisis—now, Mr. Speaker, before we are forced to fire our first shots, launch our first missiles, or drop our first bombs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is when the House should debate and vote on this very serious matter. For those who say it is too early, too premature for this debate, I respectfully disagree. The administration has tacitly signaled when it notified Congress that our troops have been sent to a place where the threat of hostilities is imminent.

The longer we put off carrying out our constitutional responsibilities, the easier it becomes to just drift along, and this is what Congress has done over and over. We just kind of drift along, and it has to end. It has to end, Mr. Speaker. Congress must speak. Congress must act.

This resolution, should it pass, would direct the President to bring our troops home from Iraq within 30 days—or should the President determine that such a rapid withdrawal would pose a security question, then no later than by the end of the year, nearly 6 months from now.

It would not require those troops that have been deployed to safeguard the security of our diplomatic facilities and personnel from withdrawing. They could remain and carry out their crucial roles of protecting our civilian personnel on the ground in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we need to take up this resolution. We need to debate our military engagement in this latest war in Iraq. We need to have a clean up-or-down vote, whether we stay in Iraq or whether we bring our troops home.

We owe that much to our troops and their families. We owe that much to the American people, and we owe at least that much to our own democracy and democratic institutions that require Congress to be the final arbiter on whether our troops are sent into hostilities abroad.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my privilege to yield to the conscience of this Congress on issues of war, a man I have great admiration for, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I want to thank him for being a leader on bringing to the floor of the House not only this resolution asking for a vote about bringing our troops home from Iraq, but also the way that he speaks about the fact that 17 million American children go home at night hungry. That is another issue, I understand that, but it all ties in.

When we continue to not debate whether we should be sending our young men and women to die, we are

shirking our constitutional responsibility that we, in this Congress, have raised our hand to swear that we will uphold the Constitution of the United States, but we don't do that, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to war, and I blame myself.

In 2003, I bought the lie that was told by the previous administration about the weapons of mass destruction that Saddam Hussein had and how he was going to use that against the American people.

That misinformation that was given by the previous administration caused us to go into Iraq, and I voted to give the President at the time—President Bush—the authority to bypass the Constitution.

It is called the AUMF, the Authorization for Use of Military Force, and I regret that and will until the day I die because I gave up my constitutional responsibility to debate and to vote on whether we should go to war or not, and that was the constitutional responsibility of this Congress and of me being a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have beside me a poster of a funeral. It is a military funeral where a soldier has given his life for this country. His wife is there with her sunglasses on, holding the hand of her little girl who can't quite understand why her daddy is dead, why her daddy is in a flag-draped coffin.

That is why we need to be on this floor, as Mr. McGOVERN and Ms. LEE have said, to debate whether we continue to allow the President—in this case, President Obama—to use the War Powers Act to send our troops into Iraq, and yet, we sit here idle.

We don't even hardly debate the issue of war when we are going to pass millions and billions of dollars to be spent by our military overseas. It does not make any sense.

I want to say about my own side, I regret that my side, the Republican Party, we have become the war party now. It is not so much the Democrats who were the war party during the Vietnam war. Now, it is the Republican Party.

I am a great supporter of Pat Buchanan. I love his position on foreign policy and his many articles. This is from a recent article that he wrote. Pat Buchanan says:

It is astonishing that Republicans who threaten to impeach Obama for usurping authority at home remain silent as he prepares to usurp their war powers to march into Syria and back into Iraq. Are Republicans now prepared to sit mute as Obama takes us into two new Middle East wars on his own authority?

This is what Mr. McGOVERN and Ms. LEE and I are trying to say. It is time that this Congress start speaking out. We listen to the American people when it comes to war, and the American people are tired. They are worn out.

A recent survey actually said that 71 percent of American people said that the first intervention in Iraq was wrong. It was a mistake. It should

never have happened, and yet that is why I admire you, Mr. McGOVERN, and Ms. LEE and the others who are willing to speak out on this.

Just a couple of other points I want to make—people always say those who wrote the Constitution, they maybe really better understood more than we do, and yet they didn't have the sophistication that we have today in the wars that we fight, but that brings me to a letter from George Washington to James Monroe:

I have always given it as my decided opinion that no nation has a right to meddle into the concerns of another, that everyone has the right to form and adopt whatever government they like best to live under themselves.

That is George Washington in 1796, in a letter to James Monroe. Again, I think about the fact that I, along with other Members of Congress, gave away my constitutional right to declare war when we gave to President Bush the authority to use military force.

That in itself is something, again, being repetitive for just a moment, I will always, always regret.

Another quote, this one by James Madison, and this is Mr. McGOVERN's point:

The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature.

We are the legislature. It is our responsibility to meet our constitutional duties. Mr. McGOVERN, I have signed over 11,000 letters to families and extended families in this country since we went into Iraq because I have asked God to forgive me for listening to the misinformation and the distortions by the previous administration to go into Iraq.

That is my pain, and I will live with that pain.

□ 1400

I am on the floor with you today—and Ms. LEE who has already spoken—to say thank you for taking the lead in trying to force this Congress to have a debate.

I am not going to restate what Pat Buchanan has said, but I will say to my own side many times: Why do you sit idly by when you complain about Mr. Obama and spending, spending, and we have already spent \$1.5 trillion in Afghanistan and Iraq, and we are still spending money in Afghanistan?

We will for 10 more years because of a bilateral strategic agreement, but what we are trying to do today is to say that we are not going to make another mistake in Iraq.

That is why I am pleased to join with you today in this effort to make the American people aware that we do care. We want the American people to contact the Members of Congress and say join in this concurrent resolution, this privileged resolution, to bring a debate to the floor of the House.

Mr. McGOVERN. I look forward to a continued exchange on this issue with my colleague. I want to thank him for

his passion on this issue and for reminding not only our colleagues, but the American people that there are really consequences to war.

One of the things that has frustrated me is that, for too long, we have avoided talking about the wars in this Congress, not just Iraq, but also Afghanistan.

My colleague, Mr. JONES, and I had an amendment to the defense authorization bill a few weeks back, which said that President Obama had mentioned a couple of years ago that we would be out of Afghanistan by 2014. Clearly, that is not going to be the case.

The amendment said that the President had to notify Congress of what our military plans were going to be in Afghanistan and that Congress should consider that and vote up or down on whether we should continue our military involvement in Afghanistan.

That is hardly a radical bill. It is simply a bill that says: Congress do your job, you have an obligation—a constitutional obligation when it comes to war.

This amendment, which was germane, it was in order—on the defense bill, no less—at the last minute, we were told we could not offer it, it would not be made in order because the leadership of this House didn't want that debate, they were afraid it might pass.

Well, that is the way democracy is supposed to work. If a majority in this place does not want to continue an endless war in Afghanistan or does not want to start another war in Iraq, then that ought to mean something.

My criticism right now is not with the White House. I may have some disagreements with the President in terms of what his policy on Iraq might be, but he has done his job, he has notified us, he has sent letters up to Congress that have announced the deployments that he is making, and it says—consistent with the War Powers Resolution, so this is not a complaint about the White House. We may disagree with their policy, but they did what they were supposed to do.

Our complaint is with this institution, that we are not doing what we are supposed to do. The Foreign Affairs Committee, in consultation with other relevant committees, ought to bring a resolution to the floor if they want to authorize the use of additional force in Iraq.

I would vote “no.” There are some in this Chamber that would vote “yes,” but there ought to be a debate. We ought to go into any new deployment—any new military intervention with our eyes wide open. We have lived through enough deception. We have been lied to over the years too many times. It is time for us to demand some truth when it comes to war. People ought to know what we are getting into.

By the way, one other thing that has troubled me greatly about these wars that we have been involved with is that we don't pay for them. We all complain

about the deficit and the debt, and we have to dig ourselves out of this hole of debt. Trillions of dollars of that debt are directly related to these wars. We don't pay for these wars. We put them on a credit card.

I offered a bill a few years ago calling for a war tax, saying that if we are going to go to war, then we ought to pay for it—the American people ought to pay for it, and if the American people don't want to pay for it, maybe we ought not go to war.

This notion of going to war and putting it on a credit card and making believe like it is not a big deal has to stop, has to stop. The first George Bush, when he went to war in Iraq when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait—I wasn't for that war, I wasn't in Congress then—but nonetheless, when he went to war, he got the cooperation of all the Arab states in the region to pitch in to pay for it.

What wasn't paid for, Congress paid for, but it wasn't added to our debt. Now, it has become commonplace, and we don't even question it.

There are huge costs to these wars, not only in terms of blood, but also in terms of treasure. We nitpick on this House floor over whether or not we are going to feed hungry children or make sure people have adequate housing.

We say we don't have enough money, but when it comes to these wars, the sky is the limit—whatever you want, you can get.

Here is the deal: I would argue with you that that money has not been spent wisely. Notwithstanding the incredible service of our men and women, we are in Afghanistan right now propping up one of the most corrupt governments in the world, in the world.

In Iraq, we are now reentering a situation where even our own administration is saying the Maliki government is lousy, and we obviously hate this extremist group called ISIL, so we are going right in the middle, and I worry that we are going to be target practice for both sides.

One other thing—the Iraqi Army, as I mentioned earlier, has been trained by the very best of American military personnel. They have the best equipment, they have the best weaponry you can imagine.

They outnumber, overwhelmingly, these extremist groups that are now attacking Iraq. We read in The Washington Post last week that commanders of the Iraqi Army in areas that come under fire decide to leave—they basically desert—and so do the troops.

If they are not willing to fight after all that we have sacrificed, why the hell are we going back in there and thinking of fighting this? Now, this is the beginning—this is the very beginning of our reentry.

As Mr. JONES and I have said, we hope that it doesn't go any further than this, but this is the time when we ought to have a debate about what might happen and what we are prepared to do.

I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. JONES. Mr. MCGOVERN, thank you very much.

I want to pick up on a few things you said just a few minutes ago.

Iraq is in total chaos. It is kind of ironic. In 1983—I found a photograph of Donald Rumsfeld who was a special envoy sent by President Reagan to thank Hussein for what he had done to try to defend Iraq against the Iranians.

That brings me to where we are today and why this resolution that you have sponsored is so important. I have the former Commandant of the Marine Corps who, for the last 6 years, has been my adviser on Afghanistan, simply because I don't have the military background, and he is a very dear friend of mine.

I emailed him a week ago and asked him:

What do you think about all of these advisers going to Iraq, something you were just talking about?

He emailed me back and he said:

We should not put boots on the ground.

He further stated:

It is a Middle East issue that needs a Middle East solution, not more troops.

That is why, again, your resolution, and our resolution needs to be debated.

A couple of other points, very quickly—after I found out that I had been misled with the first war in Iraq, I contacted Lieutenant General Greg Newbold because he wrote an article for Time magazine. I want to read just a little bit of it very quickly.

General Greg Newbold was director of operations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff from 2000 to 2002 and describes himself as “a witness and therefore a party to the actions that led us to the invasion of Iraq, an unnecessary war”—Mr. MCGOVERN, unnecessary war.

He wrote an insightful editorial for Time in April 2006 titled, “Why Iraq was a mistake.” I want to share a paragraph from his article because it is so appropriate of what we are trying to do today and what we are trying to do with this resolution to force Congress to meet its constitutional responsibility about sending our young men and women to die.

In 1971, the rock group The Who released the antiwar anthem “Won't Get Fooled Again.” To us, its lyrics invoked a feeling that we must never again stand by quietly while those ignorant of and casual about war lead us into another one and then mismanage the conduct of it.

He further stated:

Never again, we thought, would our military's senior leaders remain silent as American troops were marched off to an ill-considered engagement. It's 35 years later, and the judgment is in: The Who had it wrong. We have been fooled again.

We were fooled to go into Iraq.

I am with you. I know Mr. Obama came out against the Iraq war—and I want to thank him for doing that—when he was a Senator, but you are right, it is not the administration we are talking about today. It is the role of Congress and our lack of fulfilling our constitutional duty.

One last point, very quickly—four weeks ago, I went to Walter Reed hospital. I was told that two marines from Camp Lejeune in my district had been severely wounded, so I went to Walter Reed hospital.

As I go into the area where they teach them how to walk without legs, on prosthesis—they teach them how to use the artificial limbs to pick up a spoon—I met three Army guys from Fort Bragg, which is not in my district, but in North Carolina. All three had lost one leg each, each one of them.

Then, Mr. MCGOVERN, when I went over to meet the young marine from Camp Lejeune, 23 years of age, and he is on what they call an exercise mat about 3 feet off the floor—he has lost both legs and an arm. I never will forget his father's eyes.

They were the saddest eyes I have ever seen on a man in my life. I saw pain. I saw worry. Here is his son, both legs gone and one arm gone, 23 years of age.

The second marine that I saw from Camp Lejeune had lost both legs by stepping on a 40-pound IED in Afghanistan.

The more that we have troops in Iraq, the longer they stay, there will be someone killed or wounded before it is over.

That is why your resolution—that is why it is necessary for my party, the Republican Party, to stop being the war party and being the party that wants to defend the Constitution. My party needs to allow us to have this debate that you have introduced.

As I leave, I want to thank you for giving me a little bit of this time today. I want to thank you for your friendship. I want to thank you for what you do for America. I want to thank you for what you do for our military. I want to thank you for what you are trying to do for the House of Representatives to say we have an obligation.

No kid should ever die again if the Congress is not willing to follow the Constitution and demand a declaration of war and have that debate and that vote, so I thank you so much for giving me this time, and may God continue to bless our men and women in uniform.

□ 1415

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for his eloquent remarks. I want to associate myself with every single word that he has said.

I believe deep down that the President of the United States does not want to get involved in another endless war in the Middle East, but sometimes things have a way of happening and sometimes things have a way of spinning out of control, and that is why this debate is so important and so timely now.

Mr. Speaker, the Iraq war has already claimed 4,500 American lives. 4,500 Americans have already been killed in the Iraq war. According to one

study, over 500,000 Iraqis have also perished over the past decade of war. The UNHCR states that over 1 million additional people have been displaced in Iraq this year alone.

Linda Blimes, an expert in public finance at Harvard University, estimates that the total cost of the Iraq war for the United States will be \$4 trillion when we take into account the long-term costs of health care and benefits for the veterans of that war.

The human and financial costs for us and for the Iraqis have been severe.

Let me just quote a few experts on military and foreign policy about this possibility of reentering the Iraq civil conflict.

Gordon Adams, a former senior White House budget official, said in mid-June:

What is happening in Iraq right now is both a cautionary tale and an unfolding tragedy. The caution is about the blithe American assumption that the United States is omnipotent, and that with enough money, goodwill, expertise, equipment and training, Americans can build foreign forces and bring security to troubled areas around the world. The tragedy is that what the U.S. does, and has done, leads down the road to failure.

Retired U.S. Army Lieutenant General Robert Gard, Jr., stated, on July 6:

The collapse of the Iraqi Army was not due to a shortage of trained Iraqi troops or the inferiority in firepower or equipment. The case was their lack of confidence in, and commitment to, Iraqi national institutions and leadership, both military commanders and political authorities. This intangible but essential element in combat effectiveness depends upon legitimate governance, not admonitions from foreign military advisers.

Retired General Barry McCaffrey, on June 12, said:

At the end of the day, if your army won't fight, it's because they don't trust their incompetence, corrupt generals, they don't trust each other. This is an enduring civil war between the Shi'a, the Sunni, and the Kurds. So I don't think we've got any options, and we'd be ill-advised to start bombing where we really can't sort out the combatants or understand where the civilian population is.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the United States should be involving itself militarily in a civil war, a sectarian war, a religious war, a struggle for power that has been going on for generations. We shouldn't be taking sides in this conflict.

I do believe that a region in turmoil is not in the best interest of the United States. But as so many have said, including the President, this requires a political solution and it requires the political will of all the key actors in the region, not just outside actors like the United States and the Europeans, but those in the region. The countries and leaders in the region need to step up to the plate and actually lead on finding a political solution or watch their neighbors go up in flames and hope the fire doesn't jump to their homes and destroy them as well.

This is why we need a full debate on what is happening in Iraq, in the region, what our options are, and whether

or not we should keep sending troops to Iraq or not.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the bipartisan Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, which I cochair with my good friend Congressman FRANK WOLF, held a briefing on the human rights and humanitarian crisis in Iraq. We had witnesses from the administration, the U.N. High Commissioner on Refugees Office, and several NGOs.

The situation on the ground in Iraq that they described is horrifying, but it stretches back over a year. The human rights and humanitarian crisis in Iraq did not begin with ISIL coming back into Iraq, but that certainly has worsened and accelerated the decline in security, protection, and basic rights for the civilian population.

Yesterday, Antonio Guterres, the head of UNHCR said:

There will not be a humanitarian solution for the Iraqi crisis. It is absolutely crucial that the Iraqi political system find a way to overcome its political divisions and contradictions.

He urged Iraq's neighbors and Western countries to work together to find a political solution as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, this is where we should be putting our energy, not trying to find some sort of military path to civil war in Iraq, because there is none.

I will enter into the RECORD today's Washington Post article on UNHCR's assessment of the humanitarian crisis in Iraq.

[From the Washington Post, July 17, 2014]
REFUGEE CHIEF URGES POLITICAL DEAL IN IRAQ

(By Abigail Hauslohner)

BAGHDAD—The head of the U.N. refugee agency said Wednesday that he was increasingly frustrated with Iraq's skyrocketing number of displaced people—and with governments worldwide that expect humanitarian aid organizations to “come clean up the mess.”

“There will not be a humanitarian solution for the Iraqi crisis. There is no humanitarian solution for the Syrian crisis,” Antonio Guterres, the U.N. high commissioner for refugees, said in a closed briefing with reporters here in the Iraqi capital.

“It is absolutely crucial that the Iraqi political system find a way to overcome its political divisions and contradictions,” he said.

Iraq's Political factions are negotiating the key positions in a new government that they hope will guide this fractured nation out of its worst crisis since U.S. troops pulled out in late 2011.

In recent weeks, Iraq has come dangerously close to breaking apart as Sunni militants calling themselves the Islamic State have seized control of a vast swath of territory stretching from Syria to central Iraq.

The Shiite-led government has fought back with the help of militias, raising the specter of sectarian war as violence—including airstrikes, bombings, and executions of Shiites by Sunnis and vice versa—racks many parts of the country.

Iraqi Kurds, meanwhile, are pressing for a referendum on independence in their largely autonomous—and relatively stable—region in the north.

On Wednesday, Guterres urged Iraq's neighbors and Western countries to work together to find a political solution as quickly as possible.

He said about 1.1 million Iraqis have been displaced since the start of the year, when serious violence first broke out between government forces and Sunni insurgents in the western province of Anbar.

At least half a million have fled their homes in the past five weeks alone, Guterres added.

During his weekly televised address Wednesday, embattled Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki congratulated the Iraqi parliament on electing a new speaker. The vote Tuesday was a crucial step toward forming the desperately needed new government.

"I hope that they will work in harmony and to agree on running the parliament . . . away from all differences and calculations," Maliki said, according to the Associated Press.

But the parliament still needs to vote on a president and a prime minister. Maliki is facing growing pressure to step down, and his reluctance to do so has been the main cause of Iraq's political deadlock.

In his address Wednesday, however, he did not comment on whether he would seek a third term.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Mr. JONES, Ms. LEE, and I have come to this floor because we are worried. We are worried because we have lived through the last many years of war and we have seen how things have gotten out of control.

I remember when the war in Iraq began. Then-Vice President Cheney was on all the news shows saying that it will be over in a few weeks or few months. No big deal. Don't worry. That was in addition to being told that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, which we all know now was a lie.

But the fact of the matter is all those rosy predictions did not come true. We were involved in Iraq for many, many years, and there was a high cost in terms of blood and treasure. Afghanistan, we were told that it would not be an endless conflict, and here we are today still involved in Afghanistan—the longest war in American history.

I hope that history doesn't repeat itself, and I know President Obama does not want history to repeat itself. I know he deeply wants to find a political solution. I know he does not want to see more troops be involved in the Iraqi civil war, but the fact of the matter is none of us know what is going to happen.

In a couple of weeks, this Congress will adjourn for several weeks of our summer break, and then we come back for only a couple more weeks and we adjourn again for many more weeks for the campaigns. I don't want to come back to a situation and have to react to a situation that is engulfed in an all-out mess, quite frankly.

I think we ought to be debating these issues now. We ought to be debating these issues with open eyes. We ought to have a transparent system, and we ought to live up to our constitutional responsibilities.

What happens when there are the first American casualties in Iraq? What happens? What is the reaction?

Some say maybe we don't have to send military troops; maybe we will

just bomb them. We will send drones. We will send missiles.

As military expert Micah Zenko tweeted:

Unless the U.S. has bombs that can install wisdom and leadership into Prime Minister Maliki, air strikes in Iraq would be pointless.

And imagine the civilian casualties that would be associated with that.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Earlier, you made a statement about there being no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. I would respectfully ask the gentleman to maybe rephrase that. There are mass graves in Iraq. As somebody who—

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

The Vice President of the United States, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of State came to Congress and told us there were weapons of mass destruction, implied there were nuclear weapons of mass destruction. And the deal was, it was a lie.

4,500 Americans died; 5,000 Iraqis died. We need to pay for the war. We didn't pay for the war. The brave men and women who served our country paid, their families paid, and the rest of us were asked to do nothing.

What I am suggesting to everybody in this Chamber now, whether you want to go back into Iraq or not, that is almost beside the point for the purpose of this debate. The issue is we ought to do our job in Congress. We have a constitutional responsibility that we seem to waive, that we seem to ignore.

We are bombing in Pakistan. We are bombing in Yemen. We had a military incursion in Libya. None of that was authorized by Congress. We are relying on these vague AUMFs that were negotiated over a decade ago to justify more military involvements in different parts of the world. What is wrong with debating these issues?

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. You have tens of thousands of people in mass graves as a result of chemical weapons in Iraq, killed directly by the regime of Saddam Hussein. When you continue to perpetuate this idea that there were no weapons of mass destruction, WMD includes chemical weapons, biological weapons.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, as the gentleman knows, that is not what the Vice President or the Secretary of State or the head of the National Security Council or the President of the United States were talking about. He knows that.

What was presented to us was not truthful. It was not truthful. We were

deceived. The Vice President of the United States said the war was only going to last a couple of months. He said that on TV, on news shows. That was a lie. It was a lie, and I am sick and tired of being lied to.

One of the lessons that I think we should have learned from our involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan is that we need to ask the tough questions before we get involved—not in the midst of a conflict, not later on in the conflict.

We have a responsibility. Read the Constitution of the United States. The notion that the President of the United States—and, again, I don't believe he wants to get involved in a lengthy, unlimited, endless war in Iraq. But there is the notion that we are ramping up the number of troops, and those in Congress here are saying nothing. The leadership in this Congress says nothing. There is no authorization.

I guess it is easy to sit back as an elected official and not have to vote years from now. It is a lot easier. You don't have to take responsibility. If things go well, you can say, "Hey, that was a good idea." If things don't go well, "Gee, I would have been opposed to that." But we are not doing our job here. We are not even paying for these wars.

To my friends on the Republican side who complain about debt, where is the outrage on the fact that we don't even pay for these wars? I can't quite understand why people approach war in this Chamber with such indifference.

My colleague Mr. JONES and I tried to bring an amendment to the floor, as I said earlier, to debate whether we should stay in Afghanistan longer. We were not even allowed a vote. The amendment we offered was germane, was relevant, and the leadership of this House said you can't even debate or vote this.

The defense bill. We are at war. What can be more important than debating whether we should be involved in this war?

So this is the time. What Mr. JONES and Ms. LEE and I are saying is that this is the time to debate this, before the first soldier comes home in a body bag.

The major proponents of a new war in Iraq are those who disastrously got us involved in the first place; people like Dick Cheney and John Bolton, Senator MCCAIN and Senator GRAHAM.

We were deceived, and we should never let that happen again. We should never let that happen again. We should demand the truth. Congress should carry out its constitutional responsibilities and vote on whether or not to get militarily involved in Iraq again.

That is what this privileged resolution that Mr. JONES, Ms. LEE, and I have suggested that we vote on. I don't know why that is such a controversial issue, but for some reason in this Congress big issues like that don't ever seem to make their way for debate on the House floor.

This should not be a Democratic or Republican issue. In fact, there are Democrats who disagree with my position. There are some Democrats who believe we ought to continue to send more military aid and potentially more troops to Iraq, and there are Republicans who agree with me that we ought not to. So this is a bipartisan concern.

□ 1430

I will close by simply saying to the Speaker of the House: Give us a vote. Let us debate this issue.

To my fellow Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle: Live up to your constitutional responsibility. Demand a vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

PROVIDING FOR THE CORRECTION OF THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 5021

Mr. CHAFFETZ (during the Special Order of Mr. MCGOVERN). Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRIDENSTINE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 108

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 5021) an Act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following correction: At the end, add the following and conform the table of contents accordingly:

“TITLE III—TREATMENT FOR PAYGO PURPOSES

“SEC. 3001. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

“(a) PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(d)).

“(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).”.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING LOUIS THEODORE GETTERMAN, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, our Nation lost Louis Theodore

Getterman, Jr., a veteran, a successful businessman, a dedicated philanthropist, and a legend at Baylor University.

Lovingly known by all as Ted Getterman, he was born on October 1, 1924, in Baltimore, Maryland, and later moved to Waco, Texas, to attend Baylor University and to eventually become an active community leader.

Ted Getterman lived his entire life with excellence. At the age of 18, he volunteered for the Army, and served our Nation for 3½ years during World War II. He was on the beach with his fellow soldiers, preparing to invade Japan, when the atomic bomb was dropped, thus ending the war. Upon his return, he attended Baylor University, where he received both his BBA and J.D. degrees.

Ted Getterman was very dedicated to his alma mater, Baylor University. He upheld the university's mission well—to educate men and women for worldwide leadership and service by integrating academic excellence and Christian commitment within a caring community. He was active in various Baylor organizations, and was an honorary member of the Baylor “B” Association. Ted was also awarded with the Baylor Athletic Director's Hall of Honor Achievement Award, the Victory with Integrity Award, and the Baylor Founder's Medal. He was also a fellow in the Golden Bear Circle. He was even recognized as a Distinguished Alumnus by the Baylor Hankamer School of Business. The Baylor softball field was even named in his family's honor—Getterman Stadium.

In addition to his love for his university, Ted Getterman was also successful and active as a businessman. He was a partner of the Seven-Up Bottling Company, which owned franchises in 29 Texas counties and bottling plants in the Texas cities of Waco, Bryan, and Austin. Ted also served in the leadership of various business organizations, including having been the chairman of his chapter of the Texas Manufacturers Association and the president of the State Bottlers Association.

As an active community leader, Ted Getterman served on the Waco City Council, and was the mayor of Waco for two terms. He also served tirelessly on various boards and organizations, including the Waco Chamber of Commerce, the Rotary Club of Waco, the Hillcrest Baptist Medical Center, the Salvation Army, the Family Counseling and Children's Services, the Baylor Stadium Corporation, the Bear Club, the Baylor Development Council, the Ridgewood Country Club, and the McDonald Observatory of Texas. In fact, Ted was named the Philanthropist of the Year by the Central Texas Chapter of Fund-Raising Executives.

Ted Getterman was a hardworking man who also enjoyed his leisure time with family, friends, and his rescue dog, Noodle. He enjoyed traveling, golfing, and working out at the Ted and Sue Getterman Wellness Center. He

was a faithful husband to his loving wife, Sue; a mentoring father to his sons, “T” and Holt; and an inspiration to his numerous grandchildren and great grandchildren.

When I was growing up, my dad used to always tell me the same thing each day. Those words were: “Go make a hand.” In other words, he was telling me to add value, to make the world a better place. I think all of us in the 17th Congressional District of Texas can unanimously say without reservation that Ted Getterman made a hand.

Before I close, I ask that all Americans continue to pray for our country, for our military men and women, and for our first responders, who serve selflessly to keep us safe and free.

My thoughts and prayers are with the family and friends of Ted Getterman's. He will be forever remembered as selfless, hardworking, and devoted man of God. He left a legacy of love, dignity, grace, and philanthropy. God bless his family and our community as we mourn his passing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SEPARATION OF POWERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 55 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I have a festival of charts with me, not because they are pretty, not because they are attractive, but because I have something very important I want to talk about today, and I just can't do it without the direct quotes. I want to talk about the separation of powers.

If you will remember the conversation that the gentleman from Massachusetts had—he was down here on the floor with the gentleman from North Carolina—they were talking about constitutional powers. They were talking about what we need to do in this body to fulfill our constitutional powers. It is hard. I don't envy them at all, Mr. Speaker. I come down here, and folks at home always ask about this time at the end of the day.

They say, What goes on in that time?

I say, Well, they yield time for long periods, about an hour at a time. They will yield Members time to come down here and debate the issues of their choice, but your job of sitting there as the impartial observer while anybody says “goodness knows what” down here on the House floor is a hard, hard job—a hard job.

I didn't want to come down here today and try to come up with something that was divisive, that would try to get you out of your chair, that would try to bring your gavel down on me. I wanted to come up with something today that would be something that we could agree on as a people.

Now think about that.

I don't know what your understanding is, Mr. Speaker, of who we are