

President, within the national interest that we have to redeploy, we have to send these troops back into the theater? Of course there is.

□ 2015

Are we hindering the President from him being Commander in Chief? No, we are not. But what we are saying is that there are rules, and you have to live by those rules. And it is going to be a majority vote here in this House, and the question, Mr. Speaker, how many Members are going to be with us when we make that majority vote here in the House to set forth the parameters of success on behalf of not only the men and women in uniform, but those that have worn the uniform and those that have been injured and cannot return back to battle, and even for those that are going to battle, that they have exactly what they need.

We know that we have the number one best military, most able military on the face of the Earth. But at the same time, we have to have respect for that military and making sure that the men and women have what they need and their families.

Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. MEEK, this is about government. I mean, you talk about leadership, it takes leadership to govern.

You are right. I am as close as anybody to what is happening and what people are feeling out there because I spent the last 2 years spending every day and every night visiting the pasta suppers and the pancake breakfasts really, I think, being as in touch as anybody in this Chamber is with where the American people were. And, yes, they have specific irreconcilable grievances with this President about the war, about his approach to energy policy, about his lack of any understanding of health care dilemmas facing the American people.

But I think they also just have this sense that this place is broken down, that Congress couldn't govern any longer, that they couldn't maintain their relationship as a coequal branch of government with the President, that they couldn't even get anything done on meaningful issues like health care reform or immigration or oversight of this war.

So is this bill perfect? Absolutely not. Are there things that you would change in it, things that I would change? Would I move a date around here, some money around there? Absolutely. But you know what? This isn't a place where you just come and vote your preferences. I mean, we are not voting for the American Idol here. We are governing. We are putting votes together to make progress for the American people. And so there are going to be a lot of folks who are going to cast green votes for this, who are going to have problems with certain parts of it. But in order to live up to what the American people want us to do here, which is to set a new direction, we

have all got to come together and find a way to govern. It is something that wasn't happening here for a very long time.

And so I am going to be proud to go back, once we get through this process, once we are able to put something through the House, through the Senate, we hope get the President's signature, I am going to be proud to go back and talk about it, talk about how we have fulfilled that commitment to redeploy our troops, to start spending our money in different places.

But I am going to be just as proud to tell them that Congress is working again; that there is leadership here that is willing to take some tough stands, that is willing to ask some people to cast some votes that might not be perfect for them; that we haven't allowed the perfect to be the enemy of the good, as a lot of people are talking about these days. I am going to be just as proud to talk about how this place is working again, Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, I can tell you, Mr. MURPHY, it has definitely been a pleasure and a joy to be here on the floor with you tonight. And I know that I have some information that you want to share with the Members that may want to get in contact with us.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. MEEK, the Speaker's 30-something Working Group, and I have been blessed for the last 2 months to be able to join you here on the floor and to have Speaker PELOSI allow us the time. Anything that you want to talk to us about, you can e-mail at 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov, a lot of the information that we talk about here, as well as information about the 30-something Working Group, at www.speaker.gov/30something.

Mr. MEEK, we hope the people will get in touch with us there.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, I know the good people of Connecticut have been well served. And we also want to thank Mr. Speaker, Mr. RYAN for coming down at the top of the hour to spend about 20 minutes with us. That is pretty good for an appropriator.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. They were quality 20 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. It was a good quality 20 minutes, I must add. And, Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor and a pleasure to address the House, and I mean the full House. I think it is important that we continue this discussion. As you know, we are going to be dealing with the emergency supplemental on Thursday, and next week we are going to get into the budget. These are real issues.

Timelines will be met. All the appropriations bills are moving through the process. They will be passed on time. We will no longer be in the business of continuing resolutions.

This is so, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say, I used to say in the 109th Congress, I mean, it is kind of rough when you go in front of your hometown and

you say, well, I am a Member of the 109th Congress. It is almost like kind of saying like you are a bad guy. But in the 110th Congress, I must say, and every Member of Congress, I am not talking about just some Members, I am talking about every Member because there were so many issues that were going on here in Washington, D.C.

But now we have the opportunity to work on behalf of the American people. We have the opportunity to do good things for veterans. We have the opportunity to do great things for children that are on military bases. We have an opportunity to make sure that our troops have what they need when they go into harm's way. And that is something we should all feel good about, on both sides of the aisle.

And I think that, come Thursday, Members will have a work product that they will be able to vote for and not think about. I mean, I feel sorry for the Members who have to walk around and say, goodness, I have to vote not to fund operations of troops that are in harm's way. They shouldn't walk around with that burden. They should be able to say that we cannot, I voted for the supplemental. I voted for it twice. They didn't have the parameters and the benchmarks that I wanted in it. But for the greater good, to make sure that our men and women have what they need, Mr. MURPHY, if they are in there doing what they were told to do, that they must have what they need.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that we will continue this debate, and we will also continue to do the good work up here in Washington, D.C.

THE OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARNEY). 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. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker so much for the opportunity to come and address the House once again.

Once again I want to thank the Republican leadership for the opportunity to bring another edition of the Official Truth Squad. The Official Truth Squad is a group of folks on the Republican side who got together and were interested in trying to bring about some correction to the disinformation and the misinformation that so often happens here in Washington.

Listening to my friends on the other side of the aisle for the past couple of minutes, I feel like I am in Alice in Wonderland. They have gone through the looking glass and it is difficult to tell what is real and what is not.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I believe we have entered a new phase of democracy in our Nation. And I call it Orwellian democracy. What it means is that the majority party, whatever the majority party says is accomplished,

regardless of the actions that they take. And it is so true when you think about the issues that have been brought to the floor this evening. And I want to touch on a few of those before I talk about this incredibly important issue that we have as has been brought to the floor earlier in terms of discussion with the supplemental Iraq resolution to fund and make certain that our troops, our men and women who are defending our liberty, have the appropriate resources that they need.

But my friends on the other side of the aisle talked about the wonderful issues that they have brought and passed on this floor of the House so far this year. They didn't mention that virtually none of them have gotten through the Senate, which is another issue all together.

But they talk about these grand issues, and the statement was made that we "gave Republicans the vote they wanted all along," which is just terribly amusing, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, because what has come to the floor to be voted on in this House of Representatives this session so far have been bills that have had very little input, by and large, from the minority party, very little input, frankly, from the vast majority of the Members of the House.

And so the Official Truth Squad, the role of the Official Truth Squad is to bring light and truth to the issues that we are working with here in the United States Congress. And we have a number of quotes that we enjoy citing. One of my favorite comes from Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who was a United States Senator from the State of New York, and a very brilliant man. And he had a saying that he would use from time to time, and it was that everyone is entitled to their opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts. And I should say, Mr. Speaker, that that quote, the truthfulness of that quote was never more true than right here in the United States Congress because certainly everybody has their own opinion. But if they would look at the facts, if they would look at the facts on behalf of the American people, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we all would be a whole lot better off.

I want to highlight a couple of bills that my friends brought and mentioned as being the wonderful panacea of this new majority, which is taking us in a new direction. That was their slogan over the past campaign. And, Mr. Speaker, they are absolutely right. They are taking us in a new direction. The problem is the direction is backwards.

And a couple of the issues that they cite, the 9/11 Commission, they talk about bringing all of the 9/11 Commission recommendations to the floor. In fact, that is not what they did. In fact, they didn't bring the ones that were most important to truly gain control from Congress's standpoint, from an accountability standpoint, over the ability for us to protect our Nation.

They left those out. Now, they don't want to talk about those, but they left those out. Mr. Speaker, that is a fact, not an opinion. That is a fact.

They talk about the fixing of student loans that they did. And certainly student loans are important, and I have all sorts of young people in my district who are desirous of making certain that they can have the opportunity to gain student loans and have the opportunity to further their education. Extremely important issue.

And what the majority party did, at least they would have you believe, is to fix the challenge of providing student loans at a reasonable interest rate. In fact, what they did was bait and switch, for they decrease interest rates for a 6-month period of time, and then it shoots right back up to where it has been. So that is the truth. That is a fact, Mr. Speaker. That is not opinion. That is a fact. All you have got to do is read the bill.

And then my favorite bait and switch, my favorite Orwellian phrase, or example of Orwellian democracy that they have is the whole issue of prescription drugs for our seniors.

Mr. Speaker, in my previous life, before I came to Congress, I was a physician. I was an orthopedic surgeon, took care of patients for over 20 years. And I knew in my heart of hearts, as my patients knew, that when the Federal Government got involved in the delivery and the minutiae of medicine of taking care of people, it rarely, if ever worked.

And so my good friends on the other side of the aisle say that they have solved the problem of the Medicare part D. Well, the problem that they didn't see is that Medicare part D, which has offered our seniors much greater choice and covered the vast majority of seniors with an opportunity to receive the medications that they desire, the problem that they didn't see is that, or that they won't acknowledge is no problem at all, and that is that the program is working. Eighty to 90 percent of seniors in this Nation are pleased with the options and the choices that they have. But, no, that didn't fit their talking points. And so as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, what they did was pass a bill that would go a long way toward limiting the choices of American seniors to have medications that they so desperately need and deserve. And if you didn't believe me, if you didn't believe those were the facts from my standpoint, Mr. Speaker, all you have got to do is turn on your television, because now we have a number of groups who are advocacy groups and groups who

look out for seniors who are now advertising to try to get the message to the majority party that, hey, don't do that. That program is working. Leave that program alone. Don't upset my prescription medication. That is a fact, Mr. Speaker. It is on the television. They are advertising that right now because they understand and appreciate

that when government inserts itself into the practice of medicine that the people that lose are the patients.

And so I am pleased to be able to have the opportunity to come down here tonight and to work on setting the record straight, providing some facts.

I do want to utilize a couple of the quotes that my good friend said a little bit earlier, my good friend from Florida said, this is a "better emergency supplemental that is coming to the floor."

What is coming to the floor is a, I hope it is coming to the floor, is a bill that will hopefully provide for the appropriate resources, appropriate monies for our troops to defend our Nation and to continue the incredibly valiant work that they are doing in both Iraq and Afghanistan.

□ 2030

Now, the problem that some of our friends on the other side of the aisle have is that they are trying desperately, as valiantly as they can, to make their program make sense. And why, Mr. Speaker, you would ask, are they having trouble having it make sense? Well, the problem that they have is that they really don't believe that the troops and the mission of liberty ought to be supported to the degree that we believe it ought and that it must be in order to maintain our freedom. So they are left with a Nation that desires to support the men and women who are diligently and valiantly defending freedom around the world, left with a Nation that wants to support those individuals, and we are left with a majority party, many of whose Members, including many in the leadership, don't want to do so.

And I don't say that lightly, Mr. Speaker. I say that in all seriousness, and I say that because I know, and you know, that the policy that has been proposed by this majority party now as it relates to the incredibly difficult and brave work that is being done in the Middle East on behalf of all Americans by our troops, the program that the majority party is proposing is a program called "slow bleed." Slow bleed. It kind of gives you chills when you think about it, Mr. Speaker, when it is being used in reference to our Nation and our troops. Slow bleed.

What does it mean? Well, Mr. Speaker, it means that high-ranking members of the majority party, the Democrat Party, have decided that they are not interested in funding the troops. They are not interested in the mission of victory, of liberty over tyranny. They are not interested in that. What they are interested in is removing the funding.

So I quote, Mr. Speaker, a fact. I quote Representative JOHN MURTHA in an interview that he gave just 1 month ago when asked about this slow bleed program that they are trying to put in place. He said, "They won't be able to continue. They won't be able to do the deployment. They won't have the equipment."

Mr. Speaker, that is a little concerning. We have men and women who are putting their lives on the line, who are standing in front of enemies the likes of which we have never seen. And here in the United States House of Representatives, this majority party has a Member who is determining funding for the troops who says, "They won't be able to do the deployment. They won't have the equipment."

Well, Mr. Speaker, what equipment is he referring to? Well, he is referring to protective armor. He is referring to vehicles that have the appropriate protection from IEDs. He is referring to the kind of air superiority, the air power, that is necessary to protect our troops on the ground. As far as I can tell, he is referring to everything that would be used in the normal course and operation of a military activity.

And why do I say that? I say that because what they are trying to do, what they are attempting to do, is to truly remove from generals on the ground the ability to defend not only their troops, but to defend liberty and defend freedom.

It is a remarkable thing, Mr. Speaker. We are at an incredible crossroads in our country's history, and we have a leadership in place that has a difficult time matching their message with their action, because what they want to do doesn't match what the American people want done, and it is extremely difficult for them.

I quote again, Mr. Speaker, from Mr. MURTHA when asked, but why don't you just cut off the funding for the war? This was back on March 4. He was asked on a news program, why don't you just cut off funding for the war? That is the honest thing to do, Mr. Speaker. If they want to have the vote about whether or not we ought to continue our involvement, our protection of liberty, and our engagement in this war on terror, you ought to have that vote. Let us have that vote. Let us have that debate. But, Mr. Speaker, they won't do that. They won't do that.

Why won't they do that? That is what Mr. Russert asked on NBC's Meet the Press on March 4, 2007. He asked Mr. MURTHA, "But why not cut off funding for the war?"

And what did Mr. MURTHA say? "Well, you don't have the votes to do that. We don't have the votes to do that. You just can't go forth, and the public doesn't want—they don't want that to happen."

So, Mr. Speaker, the contortions that you see on behalf of the majority party on this issue are because their desire, their zeal to end support for our men and women who are defending liberty and fighting tyranny and fighting terror around the world don't mesh. They don't mesh.

There are some who get it right, though, throughout Congress, some members of the majority party who understand and appreciate what their leadership is trying to do. One of those is Senator JOSEPH LIEBERMAN from

Connecticut. Speaker PELOSI was quoted as saying, "Democrats have proposed a different course of action. Over and over again we have suggested a different plan." And Senator LIEBERMAN was very sage when he 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."

Slow bleed, Mr. Speaker. Slow bleed. That is a sad and dangerous time when we find our majority party here in the United States House of Representatives supporting a policy that would remove the ability for our troops to do what they must do to defend our liberty.

What is our principle on our side of the aisle? What is the Republican principle? Well, the principle is that our troops in combat deserve to be sent the resources and the reinforcements that they need to succeed in their mission in Iraq without strings and without delay. Without strings and without delay.

We have, as a matter of fact, a piece of legislation that would do just that. Representative SAM JOHNSON from Texas, a war hero, truly a war hero, an individual who spent years in a prisoner of war camp in Vietnam, an individual who knows of the challenges that troops face when involved with an enemy that is ferocious, but an individual who understands and appreciates that from this Chamber, from that Congress, you cannot micro-manage a war. And when you attempt to do that as a Congress, when you attempt to have 435 Members of Congress who want to all be generals or 100 Members of the United States Senate who want to all be generals or Commanders in Chief, when you have that, it doesn't work. It can't work. It is impossible.

So if you want to have the vote, I tell my friends, I ask my friends, I challenge my friends in the majority party, if you want to have the vote on whether or not we ought to simply cut off the funding to support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, let us have that vote. Let us have that vote. I would be interested in the outcome of that. I doubt we would get 100 votes in support of that. And it wouldn't, because that is not what the American people want. The American people don't want failure, and that is the prescription that the Democrats, the majority party, are giving us.

We have a bill, House Resolution 511, introduced by Representative SAM JOHNSON, as I mentioned, and it is very simple. It states what the principle ought to be when American military forces are in harm's way. And that principle says, as this resolution says, "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." That is it. That is it.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with that is that that doesn't fit the bumper-sticker politics of the majority party. That doesn't fit the Orwellian democracy of the majority party. That doesn't fit the hypocritical actions that are being taken by the majority party. And consequently this bill is languishing in committee.

There is a discharge petition, which, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is a petition that Members of the House of Representatives can sign to be able to bring legislation out of the committee when it is against the will of the leadership. That discharge petition was begun today. What it allows is Members of the House of Representatives, when there are a majority of them, and that takes 218 Members, when there is a majority of them who sign that, then that bill then comes to the floor of the House for a vote.

So I challenge my friends on both sides of the aisle, House Resolution 511, sign the discharge petition. This is principle. This is principle. This is truth. This is the kind of support that our men and women deserve. It is not feigned support. It is not Orwellian support. It doesn't say, yes, I support you, and then pull the rug out from under you. It is not hypocritical support. It doesn't say we want to support you so very, very much, but we are not going to do what it takes. This says it all. It says that we will not cut off or restrict funding for units or members that are deployed in harm's way. Why can't we have a vote on that, Mr. Speaker? What are they afraid of, Mr. Speaker? What are they afraid of?

I would suggest they are afraid of the fact that this would pass on the floor of the House of Representatives. This bill would pass. And because it doesn't fit their political agenda, their political agenda, then I doubt that we will see it unless we can get 218 Members of the House of Representatives to sign the discharge petition.

So what about this bill that they are going to bring to the floor? What about this supplemental bill that the majority party is planning to bring to the floor this week? Of course, we have been told it would be earlier than this; so they seem to be having some difficulty within their own ranks in garnering support. But what the bill does, as we understand it, is to put in place an inflexible timeline, an inflexible timeline that says that the troops must come home regardless of what is happening on the ground unless the mission is completely accomplished, in essence. Well, Mr. Speaker, as you know, in battle and in war, it is just not possible to have 535 Commanders in Chief. That is not the way our system works, not the way it ought to work, not the way our Founders envisioned it.

In fact, it is curious, Mr. Speaker, when the Articles of Confederation were written and our Nation was formed, some of the aspects of those articles didn't work very well; so the

Founders of our great Nation got together in a Constitutional Convention, and they worked on issues to try to make certain that this Federalist system, this United States, could come together and work together. And one of the first things that they did was recognize that in the Articles of Confederation there were no provisions for a Commander in Chief. So one of the easiest things that they were able to do was to get consensus on the fact that the Commander in Chief ought to be one individual, and that that individual ought to be the President of the United States and the executive branch, and that that was the only way to work it because obviously you couldn't have countless Members of the House of Representatives or countless Members of the United States Senate who were functioning as Commanders in Chief. It doesn't work, and they recognized that.

So putting in place an inflexible timeline that culminates with a date certain for the withdrawal micromanages our commanders in the field, and it undermines the efforts of our troops on the ground. I believe that. I believe that putting in place the kind of artificial timelines and artificial constraints on our commanders, on our generals, on our troops would be a disaster. It doesn't make any sense. All it does is make political points. And that, Mr. Speaker, isn't fact. Isn't fact. It is just not Republicans who believe that that would be the wrong course. There is a remarkable orchestra of individuals and groups all around the Nation that are standing up now and speaking out against the foolishness of that kind of proposal.

□ 2045

I cite for you, Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post. Now, the Washington Post is a wonderful newspaper. It has been around for a long time. But nobody would contend that the Washington Post was a very conservative newspaper or a great friend of conservative thought. Nobody would contend that.

But what does the Washington Post say about this plan of the majority, about the Democrat plan? They say, "It is an attempt to impose detailed management on a war without regard for the war itself." That, Mr. Speaker, was written on March 13, just 1 week ago. "An attempt to impose detailed management on the war without regard for the war itself."

What volumes that speaks, when you think about where it is coming from. It is not coming from individuals who would have any political chip, no political reason to embarrass the majority party or to call them out on a policy that may not necessarily be very sound. What that does is demonstrate that they understand and appreciate the consequence of adopting what is supposed to come to this floor this week as the Iraq war supplemental would be devastating for the nation of Iraq, for the Middle East, for the United States, and, yes, for the world.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about the Iraq Study Group. The Iraq Study Group was the bipartisan group that got together, actually a group that began because Representative FRANK WOLF, a Republican in this House, added it to a piece of legislation that was passed almost a year ago. What it said is that we ought to have a bipartisan group get together and work in a non political way to make recommendations to the executive branch and to Congress about how to move forward in Iraq.

They came up with a number of recommendations. We hear it all the time from the other side that the Iraq Study Group didn't endorse this or didn't propose this or didn't support that; that they supported a withdrawal of the troops from Iraq; that they didn't support any escalation in the number.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you look on page 73 of the Iraq Study Group, Mr. Speaker, that is another fact, if you look on page 73 of the Iraq Study Group report, it, in fact, supports an escalation, a small escalation, of the number of troops in Iraq. What they also did was oppose a date certain for withdrawal.

Mr. Speaker, again a fact. I quote from one of the cochairman, former Secretary of State James Baker, who said in testifying before the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, "The Study Group set no timetables and we set no deadlines. We believe that military commanders must have the flexibility to respond to events on the ground."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues here in the House heard that. I hope that they are listening, because what they are saying, what the Iraq Study Group said is exactly what we are saying now, and that is that this supplemental bill that has artificial timetables and artificial deadlines that are capricious and politically motivated, clearly that that kind of action is not appropriate, it wasn't called for by the Iraq Study Group, and would not allow the military commanders to have the flexibility that they need to succeed.

How about the Los Angeles Times, Mr. Speaker, again, not a paper in our Nation that has tended to be terribly friendly to conservatives or Republicans. The Los Angeles Times, in an editorial on March 12, when it had reviewed what the majority party was proposing in this supplemental Iraq war resolution to fund the hard, incredibly diligently working men and women who are defending liberty, what did the Los Angeles Times say? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times called for the bill to be vetoed. Vetoed, Mr. Speaker. Why would they do that?

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate our receiving a message from the Senate. The message from the Senate is that a Senate bill was passed, and we are pleased to see that. We look forward to the time when the Senate will take up some of the legislation that the House

majority has passed, that they have been so terribly proud of, and look forward to working in concert on that legislation.

But I was talking, Mr. Speaker, about the supplemental war resolution that will come forward, the bill that will provide for appropriate funding of our troops in harm's way, defending liberty and defending us, and the proposal that is coming from the majority party is a proposal that would micromanage the operations of our troops. It is a proposal that has been described as "slow bleed," which is a proposal that means that you will defund, you will remove the funding from the men and women who are working so valiantly to defend us.

That is not just an opinion from our side of the aisle. That is an opinion from all over. Many people are recognizing that. The Washington Post, as I mentioned, had an editorial that criticized the majority party for coming forward with it. The Iraq Study Group supports, in fact, a minor, small escalation in the number of troops, and never said, Mr. Speaker, never said that they agreed with artificial timelines. The Los Angeles Times, again, Mr. Speaker, a paper that has not been noted for its friendliness to our side of the aisle, called for the bill to be vetoed. They called for the bill to be vetoed. Why did they do so? They said, "It is absurd for House Speaker NANCY PELOSI to try to micromanage the conflict and the evolution of Iraqi society with arbitrary timetables and benchmarks."

Mr. Speaker, that is a fact. March 12 of this year, the Los Angeles Times calls the war supplemental "absurd."

And what about the National Intelligence Estimate? The National Intelligence Estimate, which was released in January, warned of the dangers of early troop withdrawal. They said that if coalition forces were withdrawn rapidly during the term of this estimate, we judge that this almost certainly would lead to a significant increase in the scale and scope of sectarian conflict in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to give credibility to the National Intelligence Estimate. Those are the folks that determine in an objective way, in a non political way, what are the consequences or prospective consequences of actions that this Nation takes.

This poster here talks about the consequences of failure. It is important that we talk about the consequences of failure, because many people, not just on our side of the aisle, but many people around this Nation, including the Washington Post, including the Los Angeles Times, have concluded for themselves that the proposal that the majority party has put forward is a bill that will result in defeat or failure in Iraq. So it is important that we look, Mr. Speaker, at the consequences of failure for our Nation. What are the consequences of failure?

This is from the National Intelligence Estimate. What they say is that Iraqi security forces would be subject to sectarian control; that interference by neighboring countries would occur in an open conflict, that means Iran, Syria, other neighboring countries; that massive civilian casualties and population displacement would occur. Massive civilian casualties.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the majority party, the leadership in the majority party, has considered the consequences of that? What would happen? 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.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, clearly, failure, failure will result in a much worse situation for the people in Iraq, the people in the Middle East; I would suggest much more danger in the Middle East and for our friends in Israel; and, Mr. Speaker, it would result in a much more dangerous situation, I believe, for the United States of America.

So, what are they doing? What is the other side doing to try to pass this piece of legislation, this hypocritical piece of legislation, this piece of legislation that they are having such difficulty doing, because, again, what the American people want and what they in their rhetoric, what the majority party in their rhetoric, say are two completely different things. So what are they having to do?

Well, they are having to use a lot of what has come to be known in this town, Mr. Speaker, as pork. The original estimate for the bill was about \$100 billion. About \$100 billion, Mr. Speaker. The other side has now added over \$20 billion to the bill. And what are they doing, Mr. Speaker? They are buying votes. They are buying votes.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that an emergency bill, this is an emergency bill to fund our troops, is not the appropriate vehicle for unrelated spending, either foreign or domestic. Our troops ought not be bargaining chips. Our troops ought not be bargaining chips. That is what the majority party is doing.

Quoted here in a publication here in Washington earlier this month, it says, "Democratic leaders see this emerging strategy as a way to encourage their liberal members to vote for the supplemental budget bill." This emerging strategy is buying votes, adding all sorts of items to the bill.

Curiously, this party, the majority party, ran in their campaign on this wonderful issue of fiscal responsibility, financial responsibility, making certain that everything that came through Congress was paid for. They call it PAYGO, pay-as-you-go; make certain that you have got the resources in place in order to pay for whatever proposal you are moving forward.

Well, they have virtually thrown that out the window. We have had a number of amendments on bills that

would hold their feet to the fire and make certain that they were accountable on this PAYGO issue, and they have defeated everything that would make them accountable.

They are doing the same thing here. They willfully abandoned their pledge of fiscal responsibility. Not long ago they pledged to follow pay-as-you-go budget rules and spending restraints to curb the deficit, and this bill would not be subject to PAYGO.

Last year, it is important to appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that House Republicans rejected a \$14 billion increase in nonemergency spending that the Senate tried to attach to an emergency troop funding bill; \$14 billion was saved for the American taxpayer in a bill that came to the floor of the House from the Senate just last year. Under a different majority we saved \$14 billion. The majority party now is going to spend, if they have their way with this bill, at least \$21 billion more than has been requested.

That is important, Mr. Speaker, because this is an emergency bill, and as such it doesn't come under the normal budgetary rules. So if they are able to spend \$21 billion in this piece of legislation, then what happens is that they don't need to spend that \$21 billion in the normal course of activity, in the normal budgetary process, so it frees up another \$21 billion, and, in fact, Mr. Speaker, what you get is \$42 billion of more spending, extra spending.

But, Mr. Speaker, our troops deserve the resources that should be in this bill, the finite resources, the resources that the President and the generals and the commanders in the field have requested. They should be able to receive those resources now, not after, not after our friends on the other side of the aisle in the majority party carry out this incredible political charade of voting on a bill that will never become law in its current form because the Senate, the Senate, won't go along. They have, in essence, said so.

Mr. Speaker, there are some incredible quotes that I have regarding this issue of micromanaging the war and this issue of loading the bill up with pork. There is a Democratic claim earlier this year, just last week, as a matter of fact, from Majority Leader STENY HOYER, who said, "There is no micromanaging of the war, period."

Mr. Speaker, as you know, I already have outlined that individuals outside of the Republican Party and the Republican cause have reached the conclusion that, yes, in fact this is micromanagement. Again, the Los Angeles Times editorial where they said it is "absurd" that they try to micro-manage the war. The Washington Post editorial said, in short, the Democratic proposal to be taken up this week is an attempt to impose detailed management on a war without regard for the war itself. Aggressive oversight is quite different from mandating military steps according to an inflexible timetable.

Even some of their own Members have reached the conclusion that this, indeed, is micromanaging the war. Representative DAN BOREN of Oklahoma said just 2 weeks ago, "It is still micromanaging of the war."

□ 2100

Mr. Speaker, this plan that our friends on the other side of the aisle have truly does a disservice to the discussion, does a disservice to the debate, makes it seem that all votes are for sale here in Washington to Members of the House. Really, it is a cynical ploy. Spending the kind of money they are proposing to spend is not helpful at all.

Where are they planning to put some of that money? It is important to look at that. We talk about the Iraq emergency war supplemental, an extra \$21 billion. Where would some of that money go? Well, \$1.8 billion in crop disaster assistance. It may be appropriate money to be spent, Mr. Speaker, but in an emergency war supplemental, it is absolutely the wrong place. If you will recall, if this House, if this majority party has its way and puts that money there, what it will allow them to do is increase somewhere else spending by \$1.8 billion and follow their shadow PAYGO rules.

\$60 million for salmon fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, it truly is a cynical ploy on the part of this majority party if they continue to march down this road of packing this legislation with all sorts of extraneous spending that nobody in their logical, correct, factual, truthful mind could conclude was related to the emergency war supplemental. \$60 million for salmon fisheries; \$25 million for spinach growers. Spinach growers may indeed need some emergency assistance, but in an emergency war supplemental? I think not.

Mr. Speaker, \$50 million for asbestos abatement in the Capitol, and it goes on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, there are very specific guidelines in this bill for our troops, very specific dates about when they must be at a certain place in the accomplishment, in the engagement, in the execution of the challenges that they have before them, very specific. In this bill there is very specific language about the amount of money that is available for the troops and when it would be cut off if in fact those arbitrary timelines and benchmarks were not met.

But, Mr. Speaker, I learned this afternoon something very, very interesting, and that is there is a significant amount of money for livestock, American livestock, in this bill. That is real pork, if you will. It may be upwards of billions of dollars, but I can't tell you exactly what it is because in the language of the bill it says that the amount of money that will be available for this livestock provision will be "such sums as may be necessary." Mr. Speaker, that is unlimited. And it struck me as truly ironic and sad that this majority party, this Democrat

leadership, believes we ought to have an unlimited amount of funds for livestock in this Nation and a finite and limited amount of money for our troops in the field.

Mr. Speaker, that contrast just speaks volumes. It speaks volumes about the cynicism with which this House is being led, about the hypocrisy by which this bill is being brought to the floor. An unlimited amount of money for livestock in America and finite, limited amounts of money and arbitrary guidelines, arbitrary timelines for our troops in the field.

Mr. Speaker, it saddens me. It saddens me to serve in a body where the majority party has a leadership that is that cynical and brings the debate and the items that we discussed here on the floor of the House to a point that is so very, very trite really. So very, very trite.

Mr. Speaker, I have only a few minutes left, and I wanted to spend a few moments discussing the larger issue, the larger war on terror. I think it is important we do that because when the American people think about the issue in Iraq and whether or not we ought to be there, and the debate can be had about whether or not we ought to be there, and that is an appropriate debate to have. And I wish we could have an honest and open debate and an honest and open vote on whether or not we ought to be there, a single vote on that; but the majority party has seen not to bring that kind of open and honest debate to the floor of the House of Representatives.

But when Americans think about what is going on in the world, they understand and appreciate that however things have been executed or delivered in Iraq, the activity that has gone on on behalf of the American people in Iraq, although they may have problems with that, they understand and appreciate that the bigger picture, the larger war on terror, is a challenge that we must recognize in America and we all must face. It is a challenge and the facing of an enemy the likes of which we have never seen.

You don't have to go far to find examples of that, Mr. Speaker. In fact, the best examples I have found are those that come from the self-proclaimed enemies themselves. This is a quote, Mr. Speaker, from Abu Musab Al-Zarqawi, an individual with whom we had as far as I know no concerns before he decided that he wanted to become a mortal enemy of the free world. He acted upon that in a way that has been extremely treacherous. He said, "We have declared a fierce war on this evil principle of democracy and those who follow this wrong ideology."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a little chilling, but it is important that we recognize that is the nature of the enemy in this war on terror. The consequences of not engaging and not being certain that we prevail in this war on terror, the consequences of failure in that activity would deliver a

death knell to our society. The issue is as large as that.

I try to visit schools in my district, the Sixth District of Georgia as often as possible, and I like to talk to young people and get their perspective on their life and what they see in the future. Most of them are very, very hopeful; and I share that hope and optimism for the future of our Nation. But often-times when we are talking about government and talking about politics and talking about the issues of the day, I will ask them, especially the middle school students and the high school students, I will ask them: Do you believe the United States will continue to survive forever? And it is an interesting question because it forces one to think, well, what allows us to survive right now? What has been put in place that allows us to survive right now?

Most young people when you ask them that question, they have not really ever thought about that. They have not thought about what has brought about the preservation of our Nation, the longest surviving democracy in the history of the world. It is a remarkable question to ask. Most of them have not ever thought about it; but when they do think about it, they understand the gravity of the question. They understand that there are challenges in this world. They understand there are people like Abu Musab Al-Zarqawi out there who want to see the end of our Nation as we know it. That is not our opinion; that is his stated fact. That is what he has said that he wants to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, the gravity of the challenge that we have facing us is real, and the magnitude of it is remarkable. And the ferocity of the enemy is unlike any we have ever faced.

When I get individuals to tell me, well, if you just think about this in the way we fought World War II or previous wars in which we prevailed, then you will appreciate we need to do X, Y and Z. But I would suggest that the enemy that we are up against is not like any enemy we have faced. If you don't believe me, all you have to do is think about the terrorist plot and the attacks that were foiled because of the wonderful intelligence work on the part of Great Britain and the United States and Pakistan last August. And that plot as you will remember was a plot to bring down at least 10 or more civilian airlines carrying enough people who were flying across the Atlantic Ocean to bring them down in a terrorist act so they could kill more people than were killed on 9/11. So they had to have 10 or a dozen planes that they would work in concert to bring down. That plot was foiled. That was a real plot. That was a real plan on the part of our enemy.

And that plan itself is chilling enough, Mr. Speaker; but when you realize and appreciate that two of the individuals who were apprehended and had participated in the planning of that and were intent on carrying out

that act were a married couple, a mom and a dad with an 8-month-old child, and they were going to use that 8-month-old child's baby food in the airplane to be the vessel for carrying the bomb on board. They were going to kill themselves and their 8-month-old child and bring down a plane and kill as many innocent civilians as they could.

Mr. Speaker, that is an enemy whose ferocity we can't even comprehend. That is an enemy who says: We have declared a fierce war on this evil principle of democracy and those who follow this wrong ideology. That is an enemy the likes of which we have never seen, and that is an enemy that requires that we in the United States House of Representatives work in concert together, that understand and appreciate the gravity of our time, of this time and make certain that we do all that we can to follow the principles that have allowed us to become the longest-surviving democracy on the face of the Earth.

Part of those principles are embodied in the United States Constitution. Part of that United States Constitution that has allowed us to prevail and to have the greatest amount of success and provide the greatest amount of freedom for the greatest number of people ever in the history of mankind, part of those principles stipulate that there is one Commander in Chief, not 535.

So if the majority party wants to have a vote about whether or not we want to end the funding for the battle that our Commander in Chief believes we must be engaged in in order to make this next step in the larger war on terror, if the majority party wants to have that vote, then let's have that vote. But to do so as they are planning to do this week, in a cynical and hypocritical way, to load up the bill with so much extraneous spending, tens of billions of dollars in order to buy votes to pass this hypocritical and cynical bill that micromanages this incredibly important endeavor that we are engaged in right now is wrong. It does an injustice and a disservice to not just this body but our entire Nation.

I urge my colleagues to encourage leadership on both sides of the aisle to support that open and honest debate. I know on our side we are ready for that debate. We are ready for that debate. I would hope that the Speaker and the Democrat leadership would encourage and support that debate as well.

□ 2115

It is an incredible privilege to come to the floor of the House and share these words, Mr. Speaker. I thank my leadership for that opportunity.

It is very humbling to serve in the United States House of Representatives, a body in which 10,000 or 11,000 or so individuals have served in the history of our Nation. It is a great responsibility in serving in this body, but the primary responsibility is to make certain that we do all that we can to preserve and protect our Constitution and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest humbly that the bill that is being proposed by the majority leadership this week on the supplemental emergency war resolution is not a bill that does a service to our Nation and does credit to the work of this House of Representatives.

I urge my colleagues to bring forth the bill that will show that, in fact, we do indeed support the troops in harm's way.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4. An act to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1928a–1928d, of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Assembly during the spring session, to be held in Madeira, Portugal, May 2007:

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-398, as amended by Public Law 108-7, in accordance with the qualifications specified under section 1238(b)(3)(E) of Public Law 106-398, and upon the recommendation of the Republican Leader, in consultation with the chairmen of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Finance, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the following individual to the United States-China Economic Security Review commission:

Mr. Mark Esper of Virginia, for a term expiring December 31, 2008.

HUMAN PAPILLOMA VIRUS

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, this looks like Georgia night in the great Chamber of the House of Representatives. My colleague, Representative PRICE, just talked about one of the most important debates that we have had in this body in a long time and will have in regard to the situation in Iraq and the Commander in Chief and the constitutional right for the Commander in Chief to make the decisions along with the combatant commanders.

These issues are hugely important. Things like the energy crisis that we

faced 25 years ago, and we are facing again today, are hugely important issues. In fact, former Vice President Gore will be before the Science and Energy and Commerce Committees on Thursday talking about global warming and what we think we ought to do in regard to not only solving the energy crisis, but to keep from polluting the atmosphere. Hugely important issue.

Trying to solve the crisis that is looming in regard to the entitlement spending which is, that along with the interest on the debt, is probably approaching 65 percent of what we spend each year in a \$2.7 trillion budget, hugely important issue.

Then, Mr. Speaker, every now and then along comes something that maybe does not get at first notice very much. There is not a lot of press. It is not one of the marquee issues of the day, but what I am speaking to my colleagues about tonight is also hugely important, and it, thank goodness, is beginning to get the attention that it deserves.

That is an issue that I, as a physician and OB/GYN specialist in particular, physician Member of this body, feel very, very strongly about. What I am referring to is the recent decision by one of the Governors of our 50 States to mandate that young girls in the public school system of that particular State would be required to receive a new vaccine, which I will describe in detail in just a minute.

They would be required before they could enter the sixth grade, the sixth grade, we all know sixth, seventh and eighth, and in some cases, considered the middle school years. So coming out of elementary or what I used to call grammar school, where there are many of these young girls, including my precious granddaughters, are still thinking about watching Little House on the Prairie as an example or playing with their dolls, would be required, just like they would be required to have their shots up to date in regard to measles and mumps and rubella and chickenpox, these highly contagious, infectious diseases that can be acquired just on casual contact; if you sneeze in the vicinity of a classmate, the disease is spread. This new vaccine, though, is not against one of these highly contagious communicable diseases, no, Mr. Speaker.

This vaccine, called Gardasil, is a vaccine against cervical cancer-causing viruses, referred to as human papilloma virus, or HPV. There are probably 100 strains of that virus in existence that have been identified, but four of them, virus number 6, number 11 and particularly number 16 and number 18, have been associated with the dreaded disease of cervical cancer about 70 percent of the time. About 70 percent of the cases that occur, the 9,000 new cases that occur in this country every year, are associated with that HPV virus. So there is certainly a suggestion, a strong suggestion, of cause and effect.

One of our great pharmaceutical companies in this country developed a vaccine that was approved a year ago, June of 2006, to prevent the contraction of this HPV virus, and it is a great vaccine. The studies, the phase III trials, while there, Mr. Speaker, may be some minor side effects, the safety seems to be there. The recommendation, of course, is that sexually active young women between the ages of, well, actually 9 and 16, I would hasten to add that there are not too many 9-year-olds that are sexually active, but the vaccine is approved for those in that age group.

It is thought that a series of three vaccines, given a month or two apart, at the cost of \$360 just for the vaccine, probably up to \$500 once you add the cost of going to a physician, going to a gynecologist and having these vaccines administered, the cost of an office visit, the administration of the vaccine, probably a \$500 charge, but a good investment in this humble Member, physician Member, former gynecologist, in his opinion, probably a good choice for a young woman even at the age of 14 or 15, if she is sexually active or going to be sexually active, or maybe even a little bit younger if her parents are concerned about that possibility.

Then I think the vaccination that has been developed by this pharmaceutical company and the vaccine referred to earlier, Gardasil, I would highly recommend, and if I was still practicing medicine, Mr. Speaker, and a mom brought her daughter in and asked me about that and said that she heard about it and wondered if I would recommend it, I would absolutely recommend it.

But what was done in the last month or so, and this Member just happened to notice, and that is why I say this maybe seems like a small thing, but what it does is the mandate was issued that every single girl in that State at age 11, before going from elementary school, grammar school, to middle school, would have to have that vaccine, or she would not be able to continue in that public school system.

Mr. Speaker, that is just flat wrong, and my bill that I introduced the very next day in this body, H.R. 1153, the title of that bill is the Parental Right to Decide Protection Act, because this is all about the rights of a parent to decide what is best for their child. There is no State interest in this because, as I point out, you do not contract human papilloma virus by casual contact. No, it is by sexual activity, and to force every single 11-year-old child in this country to get that vaccination or they cannot go to the public school system, even though they have paid their property taxes, they live in that school district, they have been in that school district, they have supported that school district, and their parents teach their children, maybe they believe firmly in abstinence-based sexual education, but they have that right to decide. The State does not have that right.