I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, since taking a seat in this body over 2 years ago, I

have supported our President's efforts in the war on terror at every

turn. I have been to Iraq. I have visited those wounded there, and I

have spoken with family members who have sacrificed more for their

country than most people could stand.

I have carefully considered the President's plan. I have listened to

his reasons, and I have tried to understand them. But the inescapable

conclusion

is this. While there are differences between the President's new

strategy and his prior conduct of the war, the similarities still

outweigh the differences. The President's new plan is not a new

strategy. Instead, it represents more of the same strategy that has

gotten us to where we are today. If we are going to defeat terrorism in

Iraq, we simply cannot afford to keep doing more of the same.

Congress cannot manage a war, and it should not try. Instead,

Congress' job is to demand accountability from those charged with the

conduct of the war effort, and so far Congress has failed to do that

job.

This resolution, however imperfect, is intended to bring about some

accountability on the part of those charged with the conduct of the war

effort, and it says of the President's plan, thou art weighed in the

balance and found wanting.

The President's plan is found wanting because he doesn't explain how

this escalation in the number of American troops can make any

difference in a war plan that depends on redeploying so many more Iraqi

troops. We have been given no credible explanation as to why 21,000

more American troops can accomplish what the 130,000 already on the

ground cannot accomplish.

The President's plan is found wanting because it calls for completely

new rules of engagement.

The President's plan is found wanting because it calls for new rules

of engagement, with no explanation as to why such rules of engagement

were not allowed in the past when they would have done the most good.

The question before us is not whether the President's new plan

represents a better chance of success in Iraq. The real question is

whether the chances for success it represents is a good enough chance

to be worth the sacrifices that our soldiers will have to make to

implement it.

A 1 percent increase in the chances of success may be better than no

increase, but our troops deserve a better plan that that. Mr. Speaker,

I do not believe that this plan represents the change in strategy that

we need in Iraq, nor does it offer a good enough chance for success to

be worth the sacrifices that it will cost. And that is why I will

support the resolution.