Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for

yielding.

You are right. A big problem, big issues, and this resolution doesn't

address them.

What does it do? It basically says that the military leaders have a

suggestion that we have reinforcements that they believe may improve

the situation, help us get a victory in Iraq. Now, they can't guarantee

that. The President can't guarantee it. Nobody can guarantee it. But

what does this say? It says we are not going to do that. Okay, fine.

But what are you going to do instead?

This resolution, by rejecting the only plan on the table, basically

is saying stay the course, keep the status quo.

I don't think the status quo has been working. I think we know we

have to make some changes in strategy and whatever. We have to make

something work. But this basically says we will take the only plan that

is out there and reject it. We won't do it.

So my question would be what do you do instead? What do you do to

ensure that we don't have a genocide in Iraq on the scale of what is

going on in Darfur? If you don't want to do this plan, what do you do

to ensure that terrorism does not grow and flourish in Iraq and that

then they come to attack us on our soil again, which they haven't done

for 5 years? What do you do to protect our troops?

I think these are a lot of questions that we have, Mr. Hoekstra,

which is why just saying no to the only plan that is on the table won't

do it. It is kind of like a football game: the coach and quarterback

call a play, and they are in there, and then someone runs into huddle

and says, No, we are not going to run this play.

What play are we going to call?

We don't have a play.

So the quarterback gets under the center. The center snaps the ball,

and nobody goes anywhere. Nobody knows what to do because there is no

play, there is no plan. That will fail.

This simple status quo resolution is not the solution.