Madam Speaker, before I begin, I would first like to thank

you for reminding the body of the need for decorum in our remarks

Madam Speaker, several points. First is, it is stunning to me that

this body will consume over 36 hours of floor debate on a nonbinding

resolution. This should be on the consent calendar. Irrespective of

one's position on the war in Iraq, all taxpayers are right to be

incensed at such waste in this Congress.

This legislation will not have the effect of law, will neither

inspire nor impede military action in Iraq or elsewhere, will not

encourage our troops on the ground nor foster victory over America's

enemies that practice terror. It will have one effect: poking the

President of the United States in the eye, diminishing his credibility

among the international community and eroding his ability to lead here

at home. It will also have the very genuine result of undermining and

demoralizing our soldiers that are now in harm's way.

Second, equally stunning is the apparent preoccupation with demeaning

President Bush while ignoring those who are our real enemies. Our

enemies are not in the White House or the Defense Department. They are

not people like David Petraeus or his staff. They are not the vast

majority of Muslims throughout the world, who, like us, want simply to

live peaceful and secure lives.

America's enemies are radical Islamists, less than 1 percent of all

Muslims, whose faith requires that a pure Islamic state be established

and that violence is the instrument by which to establish it. Their

faith requires terrorist acts against the West and all Muslims who

stand in the way of that agenda. That is why Osama bin Laden can say

that he and his followers are ``in love with death.'' Indiscriminate

slaughter is, for these sick people, merely a tool in their arsenal of

moral barbarity.

That is why his second-in-command has declared that Iraq and

Afghanistan are ``the two most crucial fields'' in their war. That is

why al Qaeda in Iraq has declared an Islamic state in Iraq's Anbar

Province.

Third, how do America's enemies view us? For one thing, they fear

George W. Bush and our military. That is why Libya's Mu'ammar Qadhafi 3

years ago surrendered his nuclear materials to the U.S. That is why

Moqtada al-Sadr, Iraq's most powerful militia leader, just made a

beeline for Iran; not for a sunny vacation from long, tiresome days of

planning suicide bombings, but because he feared for his life.

But America's enemies view Congress quite differently. They see us as

divided, irresolute, unwilling to face honestly their concerted plan

for our destruction. Hence, this nonbinding resolution.

In light of this reality, I would ask my friends across the aisle,

what is your binding plan for defeating America's enemies? America, our

allies and our enemies are still waiting for your binding plan.

More than 3,000 Americans have died upholding the hope of defeating

America's real enemies and bringing freedom to Iraq. We must not allow

their deaths to become a pretext for the abandonment of that hope of

victory or abandoning the Iraqi people. But rather, they must serve as

the inspiration of a renewed commitment to hope of victory and security

for Iraq. We owe to their heroism and sacrifice nothing less than one

thing, victory over America's enemies in Iraq.

America is the last best hope of man on Earth. A victory in Iraq is

our last best hope of defeat of America's most dangerous enemies and

also the freedom and security in the Middle East. We must not fail.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5\1/2\ minutes.

Madam Speaker, I am going to come here and speak from the heart. I do

not want to read a speech because I think it is important to speak from

the heart. I am not here to point fingers. I am not here to chastise

anyone. I am not here to talk about what might have been.

I support our soldiers. I support the war against terror, but I rise

in support of this resolution which is Congress' responsibility. We

have to look, Madam Speaker, at the current situation in Iraq as it is,

not as we might wish it to be, but as it is.

Several years ago, I voted to give the President the authority to go

to war in Iraq based on what we were told then. I must say that I

regret that vote.

I regret it not only because no weapons of mass destruction were

found or that there was no connection between al Qaeda and Iraq at that

time, even though we were told there was. There was obviously faulty

intelligence. We will never quite know if we were misled or if our

intelligence was bad. But one thing is very, very clear to me, that

this war has been mishandled from the beginning.

The President is now talking about a surge of sending 21,500 more

troops to Iraq. When we first went into Iraq, I am a big believer if

you are going to do something, you do it right or you do not do it at

all. We were told by General Shinseki that there were not enough troops

in Iraq, not enough troops at that time several years ago to be able to

protect the borders, to protect insurgents from coming in, to protect

people that would do us ill from coming in.

And his statements were dismissed. Not only were his statements

dismissed, but then he was dismissed; and now here it is 3 or 4 years

later, we are being told that the solution is to send more troops

again. It is obvious to me that this is too little too late.

The war in Iraq has morphed into a civil war. It is obvious to

anybody who looks at the situation that the Shia and the Sunni are

fighting each other, and our brave men and women are caught right in

the middle of it. Eighty percent of the people of Iraq on both sides do

not want us there, and more and more our people are becoming sitting

ducks.

I grieve for the more than 3,200 brave Americans who have died and

the countless thousands more who have been injured; but it is one

thing, Madam Speaker, to die in fighting for the freedom of your

country, defending your country. It is quite another to die in a

senseless civil war that more and more we see we cannot control nor

probably should we attempt to anymore.

From the minute we came into Iraq, unfortunately, not only did we

have no troops, there was mistake after mistake. We fired the Ba'ath

Party people. So we had people who were angry at us to begin with. We

have not been able to give the Iraqis what we said we would give them.

They find that their way of life is worse now than ever before. We were

not greeted as liberators, but we were greeted as occupiers.

And when we look at what we supposedly are there to protect, we look

at the leader of Iraq, Mr. Maliki. He is propped up by the al-Sadr

brigade, viciously anti-American, viciously killing Iraqis. He cannot

go after them. They are the base of his support, and we are to believe

that somehow he is a great patriot and is fighting for democracy in

Iraq.

We talk about al Qaeda. Al Qaeda is certainly a threat. I am a New

Yorker.

I will never ever forget September 11, 2001. And we have to go after al

Qaeda and we have to fight terrorism, but I believe that the war in

Iraq has now become a distraction against the war on terror.

So by staying in Iraq, are we fighting the war on terror, or are we

making it more difficult? A troop surge will not work. There are other

priorities that we have. Our young people are sitting ducks. This is

more and more like Vietnam. You cannot leave and you cannot stay.

We support our troops. This surge will not work. Congress needs to

send this message to the President and to Iraq and to the world.