Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for

allowing me to speak.

I rise today in support of this resolution. The President's

escalation, or surge, as he calls it, is not a strategy that will quell

the violence in Iraq.

We have heard for too long that change in Iraq is just around the

corner, and we continue to spend billions of dollars and have taken

thousands of U.S. casualties.

I supported our goals to bring democracy to Iraq, voted for the Iraq

resolution, and voted for the billions of dollars to support that

effort. And I will not vote to cut funding for our troops while they

are in the field in Iraq and Afghanistan.

They are doing their best with a very flawed plan, and that doesn't

come from just Gene Green saying it. I heard it less than a year after

we went there, from e-mails that parents forwarded me.

Our goals were great in Iraq. The plan was not. The administration's

plan has not worked since the first year. It is time we send a strong

message to the President that we no longer support the administration's

strategy.

President Bush addressed the Nation on January 10 of this year to

announce his plans to send an additional 21,500 soldiers and marines to

Iraq. This move ignores advice from the military and has been tried

before without success.

General John Abizaid, former commander of the Central Command,

testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on November 15,

2006, that he and General George Casey, the Corps Commander, and

Lieutenant General Martin Dempsey all agreed that more troops were not

needed. The White House is continuing with the same flawed strategy to

pacify the country that has not worked, and adding another 20,000

troops will not make it work.

March 19 of this year will mark 4 years since we went into Iraq. May

1 will mark 4 years since the President declared ``mission

accomplished.'' But we turn on the news today and still see headlines,

``Car Bombers Kill 60 in Baghdad,'' ``Four More American Soldiers

Killed in Gunfight With Militia.''

We have made great strides in Iraq, but we are now trying to police a

war between sectarian armies. Our troops have performed all that has

been asked of them, and according to the National Security Council's

analysis, we have achieved many of our initial objectives: removing

Saddam Hussein from power, assisting Iraq with a constitution and free

elections, and helping establish democratic institutions.

It is time for the Iraqis to take control of their own country and

that we begin bringing our troops home. This is in the best interests

of our military, the Iraqis and our national security.

Our forces cannot indefinitely sustain the demands we currently are

placing on them. Joint Chiefs Chairman Peter Pace acknowledged last

week when testifying before the House Armed Services Committee that

nondeployed U.S. forces are not sufficiently equipped, echoing similar

concerns expressed recently by Army Chief of Staff Peter Schoomaker and

Lieutenant General Steven Blum, chief of the Pentagon's National Guard

Bureau.

The Guard, nationwide, is only equipped to about 30 percent of their

needs. Units are taking equipment with them into theatre and being

forced to leave much of it for other units to use when they come home.

It will cost about $25 billion to reequip the National Guard and

Reserves to pre-Iraqi war levels.

We cannot continue to send troops to Iraq for 12-month deployments

every other year and expect to maintain a well-equipped and experienced

fighting force with high morale.

This resolution expresses the beliefs of many Members of this House

that sending an additional 21,500 troops to Iraq is not in our Nation's

interests and not a solution for the violence in Iraq. The solution is

for the Iraqi Government, the elected government, to do what they need

to do. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.