

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NO MILITARY SOLUTION TO IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, one of the truest statements about the occupation of Iraq was uttered by one of our own generals.

The commander of U.S. troops in Iraq, General David Petraeus, said that there is no military solution in Iraq. In his own words, and I quote him, "There is no military solution to a problem like that in Iraq, to the insurgency of Iraq."

I ask all of us, Is this another case of the President not listening to his top brass? When is he going to learn that, despite the brave and courageous efforts of our men and women in uniform, we cannot bomb, we cannot shoot our way to peace in Iraq?

General Petraeus even said that we should be refocusing our diplomatic efforts in and around Iraq, saying that talks should include, and I quote him again, "some of those who have felt the new Iraq did not have a place for them."

I applaud him for his candor. He sees what is going on on the ground. He knows that the current approach is just not working.

The men and women under his command have given so much for this misguided occupation. They went in without armor they needed for their Humvees and even for their own bodily protection. They went in looking for weapons of mass destruction that did not work out too well. They went in to accomplish a mission that was not clearly defined, and there was no exit plan. How can we ask our troops to continue down this road?

The Bush administration, as we have seen in the reports about Walter Reed, has even failed our troops when they come home. Shame on the President. Shame on Veterans Affairs Secretary Nicholson. This is not the way to care for those who have given so very much.

The American people know what to do, even if lawmakers are slow to act. Overwhelming numbers in poll after poll say that we need to bring our troops home and end this disastrous foray into foreign policy. And we just don't need the polls to tell us that. Look at the calls, look at the letters, look at the e-mails that come into our offices. People are demanding that the White House wake up to reality and put an end to this mission, a mission that was not accomplished.

The best way to honor the legacy of those who have given their lives in this

occupation is to bring our troops home and work with the international community to strengthen and promote security in Iraq. It is the mandate from the American people, and it is the Congress's moral obligation.

□ 1515

THE OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I want to thank you for the opportunity, and I am pleased to have yielded to my good friend earlier and think that she brings into perspective some of the differences that we have in this Chamber that I would like to chat about for a little bit this afternoon.

It is a great privilege to come to the floor of the House and to present another edition of the Official Truth Squad. One of the goals that we have on our side of the aisle is to bring some light, bring some truth to the discussions that we have here on the floor of the House, so important if we are going to be making decisions, when we make decisions, on behalf of the American people.

I represent the Sixth District of Georgia, which is a wonderful district, all northern portion of suburban Atlanta. And from the very youngest to the very oldest, they give me great enthusiasm, and I am heartened by the opportunity to represent that district. It is one of the districts that has one of the greatest amounts of interest in and numbers of individuals who desire appointment to our Nation's military academies.

One of the privileges of being a Member of Congress is the opportunity to nominate individuals who avail themselves of the opportunity and have certain accomplishments at their young age to be able to be considered for appointments to military academies. Most of us get somewhere between four and eight individuals appointed to military academies each year; I was privileged last year to get over 25 people from my district appointed to the United States military academies.

When I was given the opportunity to call those folks who had been appointed, I asked my staff to put together the list, and I thought I would kind of be able to knock that out in about 1 to 1½ hours, calling those 25 or so folks who had reached an incredible accomplishment in their life. And I started down that list, and the first call was an extremely emotional call, very moving, because this individual had worked his entire life to be able to have the opportunity to serve his Nation.

And so by the end of that phone call, which lasted about 10 minutes, he was crying and I was crying; and we were

all celebrating his wonderful accomplishment. And I moved on to the next call, and it was basically a repeat of that first one, and I realized that it was going to take a long time to be able to make those wonderfully exciting and accomplishment calls. And I recognized that there are young men and women across this Nation who recognize and appreciate the value of service and the importance of making certain that there are members all across our society who stand up to serve, who stand up and appreciate the beauty and the wonder and the awe that is the United States of America. And they are proud to serve; they are proud to be able to attend one of our military academies and make that kind of commitment.

At another end of the spectrum, I have also some advisory councils in my district, different members of our community who get together and assist me in making sure that I am formulating the kinds of proposals and policies that are consistent with that wonderful Sixth District of Georgia; and recently we met.

One of the groups I have is a military and veterans group that gets together and provides information to make certain that we are addressing the kinds of issues that are of concern to military and veterans, members in the Sixth District and across the Nation. These are true heroes. They are folks kind of at the other end of the spectrum from those young men and women who have volunteered to attend military academies. But these are men and women who have served and who recognize the commitment that it takes and recognize the importance of this Congress, of this Nation stating clearly, through both word and deed, that they respect and appreciate the kind of service of our military men and women.

And those folks told me recently, they said, Congressman PRICE, we are a little perplexed, we are a little concerned by what we hear coming out of Washington. Again, these are heroes of a past time for our United States, continued heroes, but they are concerned because they believe that the information that is being put forward and the policies that are being promoted by the new majority party here in Washington as it relates to our Nation's security are troubling to them and threaten truly our very existence as a Nation.

I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that the most recent proposal as it relates to our war on terror as a Nation, is a proposal that has been coined and termed "slow bleed," slow bleed in terms of our efforts in Iraq. It kind of gives you just chills thinking about that term, doesn't it, Madam Speaker? The slow bleed policy that has been put forward by Members on the other side of the aisle, they are very troubled by this at home; and I am very troubled by it. And that is what the Official Truth Squad, part of our purpose is trying to bring light and truth to the debate as it goes on here in Washington.

We have some favorite sayings on the Official Truth Squad. This is one of them. It comes from Senator Patrick Moynihan, who was the United States Senator from the State of New York. He said, "Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but not their own facts." And, Madam Speaker, we would go a long way here in Washington if we heeded this statement and belief by Senator Moynihan: everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but not their own facts. We hear a lot of opinions here, and it would be wonderful if the majority of them were more supported by facts.

One of the facts, though, is that the majority party here has the power of the purse; and if they so desire to bleed our troops dry in their mission, which is the mission of all Americans, which is to preserve and protect and defend our Nation; if they desire to slow bleed our troops, then they have the power to do that. They have the power to do that. And that is why it is called the slow bleed policy, because it would bleed dry our troops in terms of the ability for them to defend our Nation.

I quote, Madam Speaker, from Representative JOHN MURTHA on February 15 of this year when he was asked about this strategy. And he said: "They won't be able to continue," they, referring to the United States troops, our military. He said, Madam Speaker: "They won't be able to continue. They won't be able to do the deployment. They won't have the equipment."

What a sad commentary it is, Madam Speaker, when you have the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that has jurisdiction over our military talking about a mission that our military is on to defend freedom and to defend you and to defend me, and say proudly, "They won't be able to continue. They won't be able to do the deployment. They won't have the equipment." Madam Speaker, that is a sad commentary on the level of discourse and the level of involvement and the level of support that this new majority party has for our military.

And then when asked just 2 weeks later, this same individual, same Member of Congress, was asked by a member of the press, Why not cut off the funding for the war? And at this point he said, "Well, you can't. You can't go forth. The public doesn't want that. They don't want that to happen." They don't want that to happen. But then the Speaker of the House reaffirmed her support for Mr. MURTHA's policies.

The greatest amount of truth and light on this issue comes from an individual who stands tall and proud when he talks about the truth and talks about defending our Nation, Senator JOE LIEBERMAN from Connecticut. When the Speaker said, "Democrats have proposed a different course of action; over and over again we have suggested a different plan," then Senator LIEBERMAN said, "Any alternatives that I have heard ultimately don't work. They are all about failing, they

are all about withdrawing. And I think allowing Iraq to collapse would be a disaster for the Iraqis, for the Middle East, and for us." That is a little truth, Madam Speaker, on an issue that is so incredibly important to us as a Nation and to us as it relates to the stability in the Middle East, and, yes, to the world, to world stability and world peace.

I am so proud to be joined today by many of my colleagues to talk about the policies of the other side, to talk about the war on terror, to talk about defending our Nation and freedom and liberty. And the first individual to join us here on the Official Truth Squad is my good friend JOHN KLINE from Minnesota who knows of what he speaks. Colonel KLINE, we are so proud to have you join us today, and I look forward to your comments.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank Dr. PRICE for yielding and for really exerting the leadership to take the floor week after week and shine the light of truth on a lot of the obfuscation which, unfortunately, takes place on this floor and in this House.

We had the opportunity to chat a little bit today about the Democrat Party's plan here in the upcoming weeks with the supplemental funding and, in general, their plans for the war against Islamist extremists, the war, if you will, which is being certainly heavily fought in Iraq. And they do kind of have a plan. Their plan is not a plan for victory, however, and that is what I think we need to keep in mind. Their plan simply says: get out; get out of Iraq. And that is not a plan for victory.

There is a very interesting headline; perhaps you had a chance to talk about it before I made it down to the floor. In the Los Angeles Times editorial, it starts with a little headline that says: "Do we really need a General Pelosi?" I will quote: "Imagine if Dwight Eisenhower had been forced to adhere to a congressional war plan in scheduling the Normandy landing, or if, in 1863, President Lincoln had been forced by Congress to conclude the Civil War the following year. This is the worst kind of congressional meddling in military strategy." The Los Angeles Times, not the place I would normally go to find criticism of the Democrat majority.

Well, I think that you and I would certainly concur that we don't need a General PELOSI. But we do have a general. We have a new general on the ground in Iraq, General David Petraeus, named by the Commander in Chief to execute this new strategy in Iraq, and confirmed, by the way, with no dissenting votes in the United States Senate.

Let me just go through a few quotes that the new commander has shared with us in the last couple of months. This is General David Petraeus, the commander of multi-national forces in Iraq, senior commander on the ground. In looking at what would happen if we precipitously withdrew from Iraq, he said, a number of other potential out-

comes, none of which are positive, could occur: "Sectarian groups would obviously begin to stake out their turf, try to expand their turf. They would do that by greatly increased ethnic cleansing."

On another occasion he said: "The very real possibility of involvement of countries from elsewhere in the region around Iraq entering Iraq to take sides with one or the other groups."

A new quote: "The possibility of an international terrorist organization truly getting a grip on some substantial piece of Iraq."

New quote: "There is the possibility of problems in the global economy, should in fact this cause a disruption to the flow of oil," and so forth.

We have a general on the ground, I would say to my colleagues, and it is General David Petraeus, and it should not be either General PELOSI or, for that matter, anybody else in this body. We cannot, we cannot prosecute foreign policy at all and certainly a military operation with 535, or maybe it is 540 with the delegates voting, different Commanders in Chief. You cannot run an operation like this by committee. And I think it would behoove us, certainly as Members of this body, but as American people, to go with the Constitution, recognize that the Commander in Chief is in fact elected by the Nation to be that, and to abide by one of the fundamental principles of military operations, and that is unity of command. That is now being exercised by the Commander in Chief overall, and by General David Petraeus in Iraq.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. And I appreciate, Congressman KLINE, your perspective in bringing light to one of the important fundamental principles of our Nation.

□ 1530

And that is that the responsibility for controlling our military, waging war, rests with the Commander in Chief, with the executive branch. And as you know, our good friend Congressman BLUNT from Missouri, our minority whip, Republican whip, he is fond of saying, look, when the Nation began under the Articles of Confederation, there was no Commander in Chief. And the first thing that was easy to do once the Constitutional Convention organized to try to put together a Nation that would survive, one of the first things they were able to do, almost without dissent, was to provide that the executive branch would be the Commander in Chief because you can't fight a war with 535 generals.

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Yes. And I am smiling a little bit, but of course we learned a very tough and bitter lesson when we tried to use the Continental Congress to, in fact, command the Army of the soon-to-be the United States and it did not work well. We would be foolish to try to duplicate that now. And, in fact, the proposed

supplemental, which we can talk about in a little more detail perhaps a little later in this hour, is an attempt to dictate the tactics that are being involved. It is micromanaging the war. It is taking away the resources that our troops need.

I wonder if I could take just a minute of our time here. I know that I have been a big supporter and I am sure you have of a bill sponsored by our colleague, a real American hero, Congressman SAM JOHNSON from Texas, who, as my colleagues know, spent 7 years as a prisoner of war in Hanoi and understands the stakes here as well as I am sure anybody in America. He has a bill that this entire body ought to get behind. It cuts to the heart of the matter and reassures our troops, our allies, and our enemies that we are not going to undercut our troops. So if I could just read a little bit of that bill because I think that that is what we should be about. I will skip a couple of paragraphs, all of which are important, talking about previous acts and resolutions of Congress, but picking up on subparagraph (4), it says: "Members of the United States Armed Forces have served honorably in their mission to fight terrorism and protect the greater security of the United States.

"These members of the Armed Forces and their families have made many sacrifices, in many cases the ultimate sacrifice, to protect the security of the United States and the freedom Americans hold dear.

"Congress and the American people are forever grateful to the members of the Armed Forces for the service they have provided to the United States."

In that light it says: "Faithful support of Congress—Congress will not cut off or restrict funding for units and members of the Armed Forces that the Commander in Chief has deployed in harm's way in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom."

And that is the road that we ought to be going forward on. I would hope that more and more of our colleagues would sign onto this bill and that this really awful effort to take central funding away from our men and women who are, as we stand here now on this floor, engaged in protecting our freedoms and advancing the cause of liberty around the world, to keep that funding from being taken away from them.

I have talked to Sam many times. He and I are a part of an ever-dwindling group of Vietnam veterans in this body, and he and I and others have watched what happens when our young men and women go fight and give it their all and have the rug pulled out from under them by politicians in Washington, D.C.

We watched what happens when combat operations are run from Washington, D.C., and it doesn't matter whether it is being run from the White House situation room, as bombing targets were selected sort of famously by President Johnson, or whether it is dic-

tating from the floor of this House. We should not let that happen. And since this is the Official Truth Squad, I think that our colleagues need to understand that that is at the core of what this very dangerous supplemental bill has added. It is a terrible micromanaging of the war, and it will be forcing, forcing, our defeat in Iraq. And, unfortunately, with that defeat the war doesn't just end. We are still in a war that is going to last a long time against radical Islam, against jihadists. Were we to suffer defeat in Iraq, the war becomes tougher for us, not easier.

And I see we are joined by some of our colleagues.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Maybe you could stick around and we can talk a little more about that supplemental and the slow-bleed policy.

I recall the comment that was made just a little earlier, Madam Speaker, by a friend on the other side of the aisle where she was quoting a general saying there was "no military solution" in Iraq. And, in fact, that is true. There is no isolated military solution. But that doesn't mean that the military doesn't have a role because it is a three-pronged strategy, which is military, economic, and political. And we are striving in all those areas to make certain that that area of the world is much more stable and much more secure so that we are much more stable and much more secure.

With that I am pleased to welcome my good friend VIRGINIA FOXX from North Carolina. I thank you for joining us today, and I look forward to your perspective and your conversation on this issue.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank you, Congressman PRICE, for continuing to make sure that the Official Truth Squad is represented here in Special Orders and that we continue to hold the majority accountable for telling the truth. They forget that a good part of the time; so I am very pleased to continue to be a member of the Official Truth Squad.

My colleague has shared some of the concerns that I have already with this legislation that we are talking about that nobody has actually seen, the supplemental war funding bill that we think that the Democrats are going to unveil this week. We believe that it is laden with a great deal of unnecessary pork which is being used to buy votes on behalf of the Democrats to try to get the legislation passed. It is also, I think, out there to try to make us look bad if we vote against it.

But the worst part about this bill is that it is a reckless attempt to curtail the President's power to wage a congressionally approved war.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle simply need to understand that this misguided proposal will serve only to hamstring our generals as they work to bring peace and democracy to this tumultuous region. And again my

colleague that has spoken before me, Congressman KLINE, I think has done a great job of talking about what the generals have said and what they need, and we know that the Democrats very selectively take quotes out of what General Petraeus has said.

And I agree with you, Congressman PRICE, we have both a military and a political war to win in the Middle East, and we are going to do that. I have every conviction that we are going to do that. But I think it is very interesting, as Congressman KLINE pointed out, that even the very liberal mainstream media understands that this slow-bleed strategy on the part of the Democrats is absolutely wrong. It is such a cynical thing that they are proposing to do. And I think that the L.A. Times editorial, "Do we Really Need a General Pelosi?" is so appropriate. These people promised so much to get elected last fall, and the kinds of things they are doing are so far away from what they promised to do. And getting involved in micromanaging the war is absolutely the opposite of what they should do.

I am going to quote some of what nobody else has quoted from the editorial. It went on to call the bill "an unruly mess, bad public policy, bad precedent, and bad politics . . . It was one thing for the House to pass a non-binding vote of disapproval. It's quite another for it to set out a detailed timetable with specific benchmarks and conditions for the continuation of the conflict."

And we saw this morning a replay of a press conference where even the Democrats couldn't agree on what the timetables are that they are setting up. They talk about 2007, they talk about August, they talk about April. Even they are very, very confused about it. But the L.A. Times article goes on to say: "This is the worst kind of congressional meddling in military strategy. If Congress accepts Bush's argument that there is still hope, then lawmakers have a duty to let the President try this 'surge and leverage' strategy."

"By interfering with the discretion of the Commander in Chief and military leaders in order to fulfill domestic political needs, Congress undermines whatever prospects remain of a successful outcome. It's absurd for House Speaker Nancy Pelosi to try to micromanage the conflict, and the evolution of Iraqi society, with arbitrary timetables and benchmarks."

I mean even when the liberal press comes out against you, you have got to know that something is wrong with what you are planning to do.

The Washington Post has described the Democrats' slow-bleed strategy as leading "not toward a responsible withdrawal from Iraq but to a constitutional power struggle with Mr. Bush, who has already said he will veto the legislation. Such a struggle would serve the interests of neither the Democrats nor the country."

I think these people are so detached, they are so focused on what they see as their power, one they think through an overwhelming majority, which was not an overwhelming majority in the fall, but they think that they now have all power. They don't want to just be Members of Congress. They want to be the President. And I think that it is ridiculous that they want to do that.

Like my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I want to see America's troops come home as soon as possible. But the best way to do that is to achieve victory in Iraq.

Somebody pointed out in the last few days that we never hear the word "victory" out of the mouths of any Democrat, and I started listening for that and I think the American people need to listen for that. The Democrats want us to lose in Iraq. They want to be able to prove that this was not a good war. I think for their own political purposes they would like to see us lose. They never mention victory.

If we don't secure Iraq before we leave, we will be encouraging the terrorists and insurgents by convincing them that their war of attrition has been successful.

I want to emphasize again what has been said before. There are very good reasons why our founders set up congressional oversight and accountability for presidential war powers, but micromanaging legitimate wars on the basis of political considerations was never one of them. This Congress needs to focus on our constitutional duty to provide long-term oversight. Not enough of that has been done. We need to do more of that. But to set a precedent of micromanaging a war is shortsighted and extremely dangerous. We need to get back to doing what Congress should be doing and leaving the execution of this war to the President and the generals who are there to do it, and let us do our job. We don't do well enough as it is.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her perspective and especially bringing to light the interesting articles that we are now seeing come out in the national press.

And the editorial that you and that Colonel KLINE brought to us today from the L.A. Times saying, "Do we Really Need a General Pelosi?" And the underheading of that was "Congress can cut funding for Iraq, but it shouldn't micromanage the war." And, in fact, that is what we would suggest, that if the majority party believes so strongly that we ought to end our involvement in Iraq, then let us have that vote. Let us have that debate, and let us have that vote. And if that is what they believe we ought to do, then we should have that vote. I would be interested to see what the outcome would be. I suspect that we are not having that vote because the majority leadership is afraid of the outcome of that vote because it doesn't fit with what they have been telling people and

with what they would like to see. So I think it is important that we do concentrate on what they are doing, and that is proposing to micromanage the war.

And if I am able to bring a few quotes from some other folks to talk about this slow-bleed micromanagement of the war plan, about a week ago it was quoted in one of the local newspapers that "House Democratic leaders said the measure, expected to put conditions on the President's use of funds . . ." And then quoting the Speaker on March 8, she said: "The House Democratic plan for the Iraq funding bill could force a pullout of U.S. combat troops starting on July 1, with all American units out of the country by the end of 2007."

And then another quote from the Associated Press on March 8: "Speaker Nancy Pelosi . . . told reporters the measure would mark the first time the new Democratic-controlled Congress has established a 'date uncertain' . . ."

□ 1545

That is micromanagement by anybody's definition. In fact, Representative Dan BOREN, a Democrat from Oklahoma, said, "It is still micromanaging the war." Goodness knows that is the last place this Congress needs to be is micromanaging the war. Again, that is why we have the principles of the system in place that we have, that it is the executive branch's responsibility to conduct a war, to conduct the defense of our Nation.

Again, if we in Congress believe that it is appropriate to cut off funding for that, then let's have that vote. Let's have that vote, Madam Speaker. I would welcome the opportunity to defend the action of our military currently and would welcome the opportunity to oppose that kind of vote. But I suspect the majority leadership in this House is not interested in having that vote. That would be a truthful and honest debate about what this Nation ought to do; and, frankly, we haven't seen that to date on this issue. But I encourage them to bring that forward.

I am pleased to be joined by my good friend and fellow Georgian, Congressman Lynn WESTMORELAND. Georgia has a strong history of relationship with our military and with our Defense Department, and Congressman WESTMORELAND represents a number of those areas. We welcome you and appreciate you joining us today and look forward to your perspective.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Thank you, Congressman PRICE. Thank you for doing the Official Truth Squad. It is an honor to be here with Colonel Kline. Like he said, the number of our Vietnam veterans is declining every year, and we are fortunate enough to serve with some great heroes from that war in this body.

It is interesting that we have talked about micromanaging, we have talked

about different people taking on the role of general. Today in the Committee on Government Reform when we were passing out a bill that I feel is unconstitutional to give the D.C. Delegate the ability to vote and also creating another seat in Utah, I was reading the Constitution and I came across the part where it called the President the Commander in Chief. This is something that our Founding Fathers I think had experienced through the Revolutionary War and through the different militias and the different bands of people, that they understood that we needed one Commander in Chief. So they gave that responsibility to the man who is ultimately responsible for what goes on in this country, the guy that, as Harry Truman put it, the buck stops here. They gave the President the responsibility to be the Commander in Chief.

Now, we have several people in this body who I think want to be the Commander in Chief. In fact, I think we have got probably over 200 people that think they need to be the Commander in Chief. But the truth of it is our Constitution only gives that to one person.

What the Constitution also does is give Congress the ability to put forth funds for this war. If that is what the President decides to do, it gives Congress the ability to do that. It also gives them the ability to declare war.

This House voted and the Senate voted to authorize President Bush to use the military force that he has used, and if they don't like that, then they need to do something to call that authority back or to reauthorize or not to reauthorize. But we need to quit micromanaging and interfering with the affairs of our military leaders. General David Petraeus was approved unanimously in the Senate. Then the very next week they are trying to tell him how to run the war.

The other interesting thing is, and I think Ms. FOXX spoke about all the pork that is in this supplemental bill to fund the war, which, by the way, I think the President asked for about 3 or 4 weeks ago, so we want to make sure we do have these funds for our troops and not just keep prolonging it. But it would be good to hurry and bring this bill to the floor, since they have called it an emergency spending bill. But as Ms. FOXX pointed out, there are several things in there that really aren't what I would consider emergency spending.

One of the other things that has been taken out of that is the Iran language. I don't know if you had seen that or Colonel Kline or any of you had seen that, but they have taken the Iran language out of it.

I wanted to quote something, Congressman, because I think this is kind of what we are seeing out of the majority party, is they will say one thing about one situation and something counter to that on something else.

Here is what was said about the Iran situation: "I don't think it was a very

wise idea to take things off the table if you are trying to get people to modify their behavior and normalize it in a civilized way."

That was a quote from Representative Gary ACKERMAN, talking about that if we tied the hands of the President, that it would take away any threat off the table that he might have to use against Iran to make them follow the U.N. resolution or some of the things that we have asked them to do. I think that is very unusual, or at least concerning to me, that on the one hand they are tying the President's hands on what he is doing in Iraq, but they don't want to tie his hands on what he is doing in Iran.

Hopefully one day we will see some decisive leadership come out of this Congress. I think that the Republicans gave 12 good years of leadership, and I hope that the American people will miss that one day, as bad as we were at times. I hope that they will miss that and want to put us back in that position where we can earn our way back into the leadership of this country.

But I certainly hope that in the next year and a half that we don't do things that will ruin our reputation with freedom-loving people all over this world, that the American people don't keep their word.

Colonel Kline, I can't help but just think about that picture of that last helicopter leaving South Vietnam and those people standing on the top of that government building with their hands reached out, knowing that after our troops pulled out because of political pressure that some of those people were probably murdered and massacred the next day, or at least within the next 30 days.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. If the gentleman will yield, we forget and time slips by that following that disastrous day, not some people were killed, but millions died. Again, we have forgotten the boats, the ships, with hundreds and thousands of Vietnamese scrambling to stay on board, leaky boats, rafts, as they tried to escape the horror that followed that day. A movie was made called "The Killing Fields" that depicted quite graphically the humanitarian disaster that followed that withdrawal.

I think that that scenario of a humanitarian disaster has been painted for us by a number of true experts in the field, even those who have been harshly critical of the administration's conduct of this war. The recognition that you could have that kind of bloodbath is widely seen, except perhaps by the House leadership, who has, as we said earlier, a plan for defeat in Iraq, which I am afraid would in fact lead to that kind of disaster.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, when we use the term "slow bleed," let's think about what that means. If you are going to torture your enemy or want somebody to have the most painful death possible, you give them a slow bleed. You let them bleed

out very slowly. You are a doctor and you know that can be the most painful death in the world.

That is what they are doing, is a slow bleed. It is going to be a painful death, not only for our military and for the victory we want to have in Iraq and Afghanistan, but for those people that the colonel is talking about. And those people have been our allies in this. Those are the people that believe with all their heart and mind and soul and every breath that they want to breathe freedom and liberty. Those are the people that believe in what we believe in, and they have pulled alongside of us to make this work. Those are the first ones that are going to be slaughtered.

So thanks for giving me the opportunity to come down and speak, and thanks for doing the Truth Squad. I just look forward to continuing this debate one day.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman's comments and your perspective on it. It is chilling. Slow bleed is chilling, because it is not just slow bleed for our allies. It is slow bleed for our troops and our military. You talk about the consequences of failure. This is a list of the consequences of failure. This doesn't come from the national Republican Party or the House Republican Caucus. This comes from the National Intelligence Estimate.

What it says clearly crystallizes what would happen if the majority party here enacts the slow bleed policy that is promoted by their leadership. It says: "Coalition capabilities, including force levels, resources and operations, remain an essential stabilizing element in Iraq. If we fail in Iraq, the Iraqi security forces would be subject to sectarian control, interference by neighboring countries in open conflict," which means Iran and others would pour into Iraq, "massive civilian casualties and population displacement."

That is what the colonel was talking about earlier happened after the conflict in Vietnam.

"Al Qaeda in Iraq would plan increased attacks inside and outside of Iraq and spiraling violence and political disarray, including Kurdish attempts at autonomy in Kirkuk."

But the spiraling violence is again the important thing to concentrate on, because that is not our conference, that is not our caucus saying that. That is the National Intelligence.

Colonel, if you would like to comment and make a few words, then I know we have Congressman DAVIS here.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman for yielding. That is exactly the point.

You had a chart up earlier that said something about you are entitled to your own opinion, but not your own facts. We seem to be very selective. We have heard a lot of very selective fact-choosing recently.

I remember in the debate we had on the floor of this body a couple of weeks

ago, there were people who said consistently that the President's troop surge was in violation of the recommendation of the Iraq Study Group. We know for a fact that is not true, that on page 73 the Iraq Study Group agreed that a surge would be appropriate if it was requested by the commander on the ground, and we have covered in this Special Order the fact that the commander on the ground, General David Petraeus, has in fact said that he needs those troops, and it will be for a temporary basis.

If I can take one more minute, because I know our colleagues have joined us and others want to speak on this critical issue, we do have some details of the Democrat supplemental so far that I have been looking at and trying to figure out. It is just a barrage of demands on the administration for reports and certifications which will make this unworkable for the Commander in Chief. It is in fact micromanagement.

There is by July 1, 2007, the President has to report on a whole series of things. By October 1, 2007, he has to have another report verifying the report from July 1. In either case, if that doesn't satisfy the majority in the Congress, we have to start withdrawing troops within 180 days. If none of that applies and nothing else pertains by March 1, that is less than a year away, we have to begin deployment and redeployment. We have to leave; we have to retreat from Iraq within 180 days. This indeed details a plan for defeat.

I don't know yet exactly all it is going to say, but one of the things that is in this bill would require that no Federal funds could be used to send any military unit to Iraq "unless the chief of the military department concerned has certified in writing at least 15 days in advance as to the readiness of this unit." I don't know, but if you are in the 82nd Airborne, within 15 days you are already long since on the ground and in combat.

It is horrible micromanaging. As I said in my opening remarks joining you here on the floor, I agree with the L.A. Times, and I don't get to say that very often, so perhaps I should say it again: I agree with the L.A. Times that we don't need a General PELOSI or a General MURTHA, or for that matter a General PRICE or a General KLINE. We have a general on the ground, and we ought to be doing everything in our power to make sure that he and our young men and women have everything they need to succeed.

I know that all of us worry about our sons and daughters that we send over there, we as a body. I certainly worry. My son has been over and back and is planning to deploy again to Afghanistan. I worry about my son and about all sons and daughters. But I absolutely do not want to be part of sending our sons and daughters into conflict knowing that all we have is a plan for them to fail. That, in my mind, and I think in many of their minds, is a betrayal.

I had some of the \$21 billion of extra spending here, but I know that we have other colleagues that are joining us, and for that I thank you again for your leadership and yield back.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota again for his participation here and great perspective and for outlining truly what the majority party has done, and that is outlined their plan for failure. This is not a plan for victory. It is not even a plan for the defense of the United States. It is a plan for failure.

□ 1600

I think it is important that as we bring truth and light to this discussion and this debate that the American people appreciate that.

It is not by any grand fabrication that we come up with this Commander in Chief notion, it comes out of the Constitution of the United States. Article II, Section 2, for those who are interested in looking it up for themselves, says the President shall be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of several States when called into actual service of the United States.

It doesn't say as long as the Speaker of the House says it is okay. It says that the President shall be the Commander in Chief. So if the majority leadership in this House wants to have a debate about whether or not we ought to fund the military challenges that we have around the world, including in Iraq, let us have that debate and let's have that vote. But let's not go through a micromanagement and a slow-bleed process which would be the death knell of our military accomplishments in the Middle East and in Iraq.

With that, I am pleased to have join us the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID DAVIS). I welcome you and look forward to your comments.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Thank you, Congressman PRICE, for giving me an opportunity to join you today. And, Mr. KLINE, thank you for your leadership in the Congress and in the military. I appreciate it so very much.

Congressman PRICE, as you well know, none of us want to be in war; I certainly don't want to be in a war. But the fact is, we are in a war on terror. As a matter of fact, I think back right after September 11, 2001, the first casualty in Afghanistan was Sergeant Davis from my district. A distant family member, the first casualty in the war on terror after we decided that we were going to join the battle. As you well know, that battle didn't start on September 11. This is not a war just limited to Iraq. This war has been going on a long time. It is a global war on terror. This war has been going on for a long time, and it was started by radical Islamic extremists.

This war didn't start on September 11. It has been going on for a long time. Many of you can remember the Iranian

hostage crisis. In 1979, 52 Americans were held for 444 days until we had a President that finally came to office and said we are going to have a backbone and we are going to take on the terrorists, and those 52 Americans were set free.

Then we had the bombing of the Beirut barracks in 1983 where 241 Americans were killed.

Then we had the first bombing of the World Trade Center in 1993. So you are starting to see a trend here. This war really didn't start on September 11, and it is really not a war that is limited to Iraq.

Then we step forward in time to the year 2000, the bombing of the USS Cole. Seventeen sailors were killed.

Finally, September 11, 2001, almost 3,000 Americans were killed. How soon we forget.

I certainly haven't forgotten. I am sure that the family members of those 3,000 haven't forgotten, and I hope the American people and the Congress and the majority in the Congress never forget those 3,000 people that were killed.

We are going to be fighting this battle somewhere. We are in a war with a people that hate us; terrorists that hate us. They hate our freedoms; and, quite frankly, I think they hate our religion.

The extremists engaged us in battle. We owe it to our fellow citizens to see that we have nothing less than total victory. We can and we must win this war on terror. We simply cannot allow this Congress to move forward with a slow-bleed strategy. We must not cut off funding for our troops.

I spent several hours last week at Walter Reed Medical Center, and I had the opportunity to see men and women in uniform. Many of them had lost limbs. Many of them had internal injuries. We owe them nothing less than total victory. We asked them to go protect us. I can't imagine a Congress and a government of the United States not standing behind them to make sure that they also have victory.

America cannot afford to repeat the mistakes of the past by withdrawing from a direct confrontation of the radical Islamic extremists. They will stop at nothing to destroy America. They have proved that.

You know, I can remember when people said they have fought over there, they have been fighting over there for thousands of years, why are we over there? The reason we are over there is because they came over here. They brought the war to us, and they have been bringing the war to us for well over 30 years. This is not something we can turn our backs on.

I have spoken to the men and women in uniform as they have returned, and I can tell you to a person, every one of them said we are doing the right things. We need to stay there. We need to finish this job.

Can you imagine being a soldier over there and knowing that the Congress has the potential to pass a law that we

could pull out in 18 months. Can you imagine being a soldier over there at 17 months, 3 weeks, 4 days, and you are on patrol and knowing you can lose your life or your limb, but in 3 days you are going to be pulled out and we are going to lose the war anyway. I can't imagine being a soldier that is being asked to do that. We need to have soldiers that understand that we are going to be there for them because they are there for us.

The consequences of failure in Iraq would be tragic for America and for the entire world. If we retreat, the enemy will follow. Our decisions now regarding how we handle this global war on terror will affect future generations. We have the duty to pursue nothing less than victory.

The good news is the surge is working. It is already taking place. For instance, Brian Williams, anchor of NBC News, hardly a news group that typically sides with Republicans, recently reported a dramatic change in Ramadi. The city is now safer, according to Mr. Williams.

It is already working. How can we be talking about cutting and running and failing on this critical issue?

We need to stop campaigning on the floor of the House, and we need to get about allowing the generals to be the military leaders.

As you pointed out just moments ago, there is one Commander in Chief, not 535. Congress should not micromanage this war, and we need to let our military leaders do just that, lead. That is what they are called to do.

General Petraeus just weeks ago received unanimous approval in the Senate, and a week later you have Senators and Congressmen and Congresswomen saying we don't want to listen to what he says. Actually what he is telling us to do is send in the troops.

It is almost like the cavalry. If you can remember growing up, the trumpet would sound, the bugle would alert, and you would bring in the troops to win the battle. We need to do that same thing.

What we have been doing over the last few years has actually worked again. The United States has been able to prevent further terrorist attacks on our homeland since 2001. We did it by taking the fight to them. They have proven they are going to fight us somewhere, it is either over there or over here. I would much rather keep them busy over there if they want to continue the fight.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle may have the votes to defund the war, bring the troops home, and not use the word "retreat." But if we leave before the job is finished, we have retreated. It is simple. We either win this war or we lose this war.

The good people of the First District of Tennessee and I support the efforts of our troops and we support winning this global war on terror. We can do no less.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate so much your comments and your perspective on this because you bring light to some important information.

One is visiting the men and women at Walter Reed, and how moving is that experience every time we take part in that, and thank those young men and women for the work they have done in defense of our liberty and of our freedom.

If anyone wants moving accounts, all they have to do is read or listen to conversations or e-mails sent back from our men and women who are in harm's way right now. I get chills every time somebody forwards to me an account by one of our brave military men and women as they describe what is going on on the ground, and the enthusiasm and the passion that they have for the wonderful work that they are doing to bring freedom and liberty to that land.

You bring light to who our enemy is. I think it is important that we appreciate exactly the magnitude of this. This is a battle, a war against an enemy who is more ferocious than any we have ever faced.

When I try to put that in perspective, I am reminded of the airline debacle that was stopped last August or so in Britain by good intelligence on the part of our British allies and Pakistanis and our own intelligence agents. What they did is identify a group of individuals whose whole goal was to bring down or destroy as many jumbo jet airlines flying from England or Europe to the United States at one time so they could kill more innocent civilians than were killed on 9/11. That is chilling enough. That is enough to get your attention.

But when you appreciate that two of the people who were involved in the planning of that and involved in what would have been the execution of that tragedy were two parents who were using their 8-month-old child and the baby food for that child as the vessel for the explosive that would bring down a plane, and they were going to be on that plane with their 8-month-old child, they were going to kill themselves and their 8-month-old child in order to kill innocent civilians, Madam Speaker, that is an enemy that carries with them the ferocity that we cannot even comprehend. It is an enemy that Musab al-Zarqawi crystallizes in his quote of January 2005 when he says, "We have declared a fierce war on this evil principle of democracy and those who follow this wrong ideology."

Madam Speaker, it is extremely important for us as a nation to appreciate the fundamental objection and the fundamental fight that we have is against people who oppose our own freedom and our own liberty and our own democracy.

Madam Speaker, it is imperative that this Congress appreciate the magnitude of the challenge that we face as a nation. It is imperative that in so appreciating that magnitude, that we recognize that facts and truth are im-

portant when we talk about this and we make certain that we as a Congress do not institute a policy that would result in tying the hands of the men, the brave men and women in our military who are defending our liberty and our freedom and our democracy.

It is a privilege for each and every one of us to be able to represent our districts in the United States House of Representatives. We should do nothing to thwart the activity of those who are defending our liberty and our freedom and our democracy.

BLUE DOG COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TAUSCHER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Again, it is a great privilege to address this House in the Special Order for the Blue Dog Democratic Coalition, and we are delighted to do so.

This is a very critical time in the juncture of our Nation. We are faced with a ballooning debt. We have an overextended military. We are in the midst of a very controversial war. It is paramount that Congress not just weigh in, but weigh in heavily as due our constitutional obligations.

As we all know, the Constitution speaks very clearly on this matter. In Article I, Section 8, it speaks very clearly that it is exclusively Congress' responsibility when it comes to military action and foreign policy.

□ 1615

And that is this: it says that only Congress has the exclusive right to determine the purse strings. In other words, the exact verbiage in the Constitution is "to raise and support the military." And then, secondly, to legislate. And quite naturally, it gave the executive branch comparative duties in a time of war.

You know, Madam Speaker, in preparation for this time on the floor, I went back into the Constitution because I wanted to examine how this came about. And if you go back in the Constitution around 1787, if I am not mistaken, there was a great debate on how to handle the question of war and foreign policy facing our Nation. And it was handled by two of our greatest Founding Fathers, one was Alexander Hamilton and the other was James Madison.

But you know, Madam Speaker, it was a peculiar circumstance that neither Hamilton nor Madison used their names. That struck me as very strange. Hamilton wrote under the name of Pacificus, and Madison wrote under the name of Helvidius. And I wondered about that. Why? But it was only on this profound question. Because it was so heavily debated, it was so heavily controversial that neither

party wanted the public to know exactly who was saying what. But it was very important that they agree on the substance to leave this issue very flexible.

But the one important point that they made was it would be the Congress, and expressly the House of Representatives of the Congress, that would have the final say so on the money end and on the legislative end, and that is what we are here to do today. For the American people are looking to this Congress to indeed weigh in. And Hamilton and Madison will smile kindly on us today.

Leading off our discussion, Madam Speaker, is one of our distinguished Members, one of our cochairs for communications, one of my dear friends from the great State of Arkansas, Representative MIKE ROSS.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for leading this hour-long Special Order, this discussion on the debt, the deficit, but more importantly on accountability, in restoring common sense, accountability, fiscal discipline to our Nation's government.

Madam Speaker, I don't have to tell you that we have got the largest debt ever in our Nation's history; \$8,835,629,777,913 and increasing some \$40 million every hour. Our Nation is spending a half a billion dollars a day simply paying interest on a debt we've already got, and that is before we increase it by \$1 billion a day. Half a billion dollars a day going to pay interest on the national debt. That is a half a billion dollars a day we do not have to properly equip our troops, to support our troops, to support our veterans, those returning from Iraq and Afghanistan, to educate our children, to build roads. The list of what should be America's priorities is endless, and yet our Nation is spending half a billion dollars a day simply paying interest on a debt we've already got.

It is time to restore fiscal discipline and common sense to our government, and one of the ways we do that is by requiring accountability in Iraq. That is why the Blue Dogs have written what has become known as H.R. 47, providing for Operation Iraqi Freedom Cost Accountability.

Let me just say this, that 9/11, September 11, 2001, is a day that I will never forget. From my office window in the Cannon House Office Building I could see the smoke rise from the Pentagon. A few hours later, after being evacuated, I would learn that a young Navy petty officer, Nehamon Lyons, IV, from Pine Bluff, Arkansas, was among those killed at the Pentagon on that dreadful day.

In the months that followed, I voted to give the President the authority to go to Afghanistan to hunt down Osama bin Laden. Remember him? To bring him to justice and to put an end to the Taliban, to put an end to terrorism. And then on September 26, 2002, I was called to the White House. I sat in the Cabinet Room, took notes, I still have