A March 2007 Los Angeles Times editorial posed the

question: ``Do we really need a General Pelosi? Too many lives are at

stake to allow Members of Congress to play the role of Eisenhower or

Lincoln.''

How unfortunate that less than a month after the fifth and final

brigade of this surge effort has arrived in Iraq we sit here once again

prepared to put bad politics in front of sound policy and undercut that

mission, putting the lives of our troops, our coalition partners, and

millions of Iraqis at risk.

Once again, the leadership of this institution wants to play general,

so it chooses to circumvent the committee process to rush a hastily

written piece of legislation to the House floor, one that has no chance

of becoming law.

And so the question that I and many Americans have is: Why?

You can find the answer in today's Washington Times. According to

this body's majority leader, we are here because ``if we don't do

anything, these groups,'' meaning MoveOn and affiliates, ``will feel

like we haven't done anything.''

So that's it. We are here to appease MoveOn.org. Where is the policy?

Where is the plan? Are we to believe that this bill will bring an end

to violence in Iraq? Are we to believe that our withdrawal will make

our Nation or the world any safer? Thus, politics replaces policy. We

are a Nation at war against Islamic terrorists who have no intention of

giving up the fight. We must defend this Nation. We cannot afford to

play politics. This legislation carries no plan for securing Iraq or

the Middle East, only politics.

Mr. Speaker, we have authorized our military to execute this surge

and to report to us in September on its status. Why should we cut the

rug out from under them now? Our troops will not give up on us; let's

not give up on them. I urge rejection of this resolution.