Mr. Speaker, the President has isolated himself from

all the evidence, military advice, members of his own party, and the

American people. He is not staying the course in Iraq. The President is

making matters even worse by escalating the war.

He has ordered at least 21,500 more U.S. soldiers into the middle of

a bloody and violent civil war. This President has stepped backward in

history. He is making the same tragic mistakes of Vietnam all over

again.

The President's speeches won't stop a bullet, and they won't protect

soldiers from the tsunami of violence inundating Iraq. Our soldiers

don't have enough equipment or support. Soldiers know it, but the White

House ignores it.

Some of the best newspapers and magazines in the Nation are reporting

the facts, and they are not just repeating the President's spin.

From the McClatchy newspapers, here is a recent headline: ``Soldiers

in Iraq view troop surge as a lost cause.''

From the San Francisco Chronicle:

And the latest issue of Business Week said:

I will enter these stories into the Record.

forces and handling detainees, according to a summary of a

new audit obtained by BusinessWeek.

The findings come as the Pentagon prepares to send another

21,500 troops to Iraq and as Democratic leaders levy threats

to restrict funding for a war that's already cost about $500

billion. The Army alone expects to spend an extra $70 billion

on an additional 65,000 permanent troops from fiscal year

2009 through 2013. According to Army officials, $18 billion

of that will be spent on equipment.

The Inspector General found that the Pentagon hasn't been

able to properly equip the soldiers it already has. Many have

gone without enough guns, ammunition, and other necessary

supplies to and have

had to cancel or postpone some assignments while waiting for

the proper gear, according to the report from auditors with

the Defense Dept. Inspector General's office. Soldiers have

also found themselves short on body armor, armored vehicles,

and communications equipment, among other things, auditors

found.

reads the

executive summary dated Jan. 25. Service members often

borrowed or traded with each other to get the needed

supplies, according to the summary.

Pentagon officials did not immediately return phone calls

seeking comment.

The audit supports news reports and other evidence that

U.S. troops have been stretched too thin or have performed

tasks for which they were ill-prepared. It is likely to add

fuel to the opposition to President George W. Bush's decision

to send more troops to Iraq in an effort to quell the

violence there.

Already, support for the troop increase is tepid in the

Senate, where Democrats are preparing to vote on a nonbinding

statement against the President's plan. While lawmakers have

threatened to reduce funding for the war, few have publicly

committed to using the ``power of the purse'' to block

funding for the troop surge.

says Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.).

In the summary of the Inspector General's audit, the

equipment shortages were attributed to basic management

failures among military commanders in Iraq and Afghanistan.

U.S. Central Command lacked standard policies for requesting

and tracking equipment requirements or for equipping units to

perform nontraditional duties. Auditors surveyed 1,100

service members stationed in Iraq and Afghanistan from all

four military branches, the National Guard, and Reserves.

The Inspector General recommended that the Pentagon

establish new internal controls and policies to address the

funding, equipping, and sustaining forces performing

nontraditional duties.

Baghdad, Iraq.--Army 1st Lt. Antonio Hardy took a slow look

around the east Baghdad neighborhood that he and his men were

patrolling. He grimaced at the sound of gunshots in the

distance. A machine gunner on top of a Humvee scanned the

rooftops for snipers. Some of Hardy's men wondered aloud if

they'd get hit by a roadside bomb on the way back to their

base.

said Hardy, 25, of

Atlanta.

While senior military officials and the Bush administration

say the president's decision to send more American troops to

pacify Baghdad will succeed, many of the soldiers who're

already there say it's a lost cause.

said Sgt. 1st Class Herbert Gill, 29, of Pulaski,

Tenn., as his Humvee rumbled down a dark Baghdad highway one

evening last week.

Soldiers interviewed across east Baghdad, home to more than

half the city's 8 million people, said the violence is so out

of control that while a surge of 21,500 more American troops

may momentarily suppress it, the notion that U.S. forces can

bring lasting security to Iraq is misguided.

Lt. Hardy and his men of the 2nd Brigade of the Army's 2nd

Infantry Division, from Fort Carson, Colo., patrol an area

southeast of Sadr City, the stronghold of radical Shiite

cleric Muqtada al-Sadr.

A map in Hardy's company headquarters charts at least 50

roadside bombs since late October, and the lieutenant

recently watched in horror as the blast from one killed his

Humvee's driver and wounded two other soldiers in a spray of

blood and shrapnel.

Soldiers such as Hardy must contend not only with an

escalating civil war between Iraq's Sunni and Shiite Muslims,

but also with insurgents on both sides who target U.S.

forces.

said Pvt. 1st Class Zach Clouser,

19, of York, Pa.

Almost every foot soldier interviewed during a week of

patrols on the streets and alleys of east Baghdad said that

Bush's plan would halt the bloodshed only temporarily. The

soldiers cited a variety of reasons, including incompetence

or corruption among Iraqi troops, the complexities of Iraq's

sectarian violence and the lack of Iraqi public support, a

cornerstone of counterinsurgency warfare.

said Sgt. Chance Oswalt, 22, of Tulsa, Okla.

Bush's initiative calls for American soldiers in Baghdad to

take positions in outposts throughout the capital, paired up

with Iraqi police and soldiers. Few of the U.S. soldiers

interviewed, however, said they think Iraqi forces can

operate effectively without American help.

Their officers were more optimistic.

If there's enough progress during the next four to six

months,

said Lt.

Col. Dean Dunham, the deputy commander of the 2nd Infantry

Division's 2nd Brigade, which oversees most of east Baghdad.

Maj. Christopher Wendland, a senior staff officer for

Dunham's brigade, said he thinks there's a good chance that

by late 2007 American troops will have handed over most of

Baghdad to Iraqi troops.

said Wendland, 35, of

Chicago.

If the Iraqi army can control the violence, his thinking

goes, economic and political progress will follow in the

safest areas, accompanied by infrastructure improvement, then

spread outward.

In counterinsurgency circles, that notion is commonly

called the ``inkblot'' approach. It's been relatively

successful in some isolated parts of Iraq, such as Tal Afar

on the Syrian border, but in most areas it's failed to halt

the bloodshed for any length of time.

Across America, the newspapers are filled with stories and editorials

about the tragic consequences of this war and the dread over the

President's escalation. From the Seattle Post Intelligencer, their

editorial published yesterday is titled: ``Iraq War: Advice and

dissent.''

While the President is acting like he can go it alone, the PI

correctly places responsibility on the co-equal legislative branch of

government: Congress. The PI wrote:

It is time for Congress to act responsibly by exercising its

constitutional responsibility and deny funding for the President's

escalation of the Iraq War. The history of the Vietnam War shows us how

to deal with the Iraq War, and I am prepared to apply the lessons of

history in this Congress.

In 1970, the McGovern-Hatfield amendment was introduced to stop the

President from continuing to escalate the Vietnam War. It capped

funding for troops for a short period of time, after which money could

be used to bring the troops home and for bringing the prisoners home.

It didn't pass, but it began a 5-year process that ended the war.

I intend to offer a similar amendment to the first appropriation bill

related to Iraq that is introduced in this House. There should be no

new funding for any escalation of this war, not one dime, because it

only leads to more U.S. casualties. Resolution in Iraq will never come

on the bloody streets of Baghdad. It is time for us to act on behalf of

the American people and on behalf of our soldiers. They deserve our

strong and unwavering support.

We can provide that by passing my amendment to channel our funds to

the immediate redeployment of U.S. forces out of Iraq, out of

occupation, and out of harm's way. We have waited far too long to act,

and our soldiers have paid for our delay with their lives and their

limbs.

I believe it is time for Congress to reassure the American people

that the President cannot go it alone. It is time for Congress to put

an end to the President's reckless disregard of the truth about Iraq.

Those who fail to learn the lessons of history are doomed to repeat

them. The President is doing today exactly what happened in Vietnam. On

September 1, 1970, George McGovern spoke eloquently on the floor of the

other body where he introduced the McGovern-Hatfield amendment.

He said,

and now young women

I believe we must apply the lessons of history, and I urge my

colleagues to approve that amendment when it comes up so that we can

begin to end a damnable war that never should have been brought in the

first place.