

to see what whipping a bill is. The Members on the Democrats are being threatened and coerced into voting for this. Their votes are being bought with millions and millions of dollars of pork barrel spending that has been put in the supplemental. It is really a slam against our troops.

The proper role of the Federal Government is the defense of this Nation. We may not be completely happy with every way the dollar is being spent on defense, but if that is the case, then what we need to do is have true accountability. Using the word "accountability" doesn't make it so. We heard our colleagues here talking about that. If we wanted true accountability, we would be holding the kinds of hearings that would give us accountability. Instead, we have "gotcha" kinds of hearing. Every hearing here now is a gotcha kind of hearing.

Don't take my word for the fact that this is a terrible bill that they are bringing up, what they are calling the emergency supplemental. The Los Angeles Times called for the bill to be vetoed. It said: "It is absurd for House Speaker NANCY PELOSI to try to micromanage the conflict and the evolution of Iraqi society with arbitrary time-tables and benchmarks."

So in addition to the wasteful spending that is going into the emergency supplemental, we are hearing from even the liberal press that this bill does not deserve to pass.

They are using our troops as bargaining chips. The Politico said: "Democrat leaders see this emerging strategy as a way to encourage their liberal members to vote for the supplemental budget bill."

They have willfully abandoned their pledge of fiscal responsibility, and we should not be allowing our troops to be used as a pawn in the hands of the Democrats to get funded programs they want to fund that they take off the budget because it is in the emergency supplemental. It is not a part of pay-as-you-go.

Even the Democrat leaders concede that their own bill is flawed. Democrat whip JAMES CLYBURN has described his party's proposal as a "bitter pill to swallow," again in the Politico.

We should reject this bill. I believe we will reject this bill. We need to support our troops. We need to give them the reinforcements they deserve. We need to win this war on terror. The Democrats never talk about winning; they only talk about losing. That is not the American way. The American way is to take the challenges presented to us, face them squarely, and win and do the things that are right.

#### REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as always, it is a privilege and an honor to be recognized to speak on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. I bit my tongue over the last hour and listened attentively to some of the dialogue that was taking place. It is important, I believe, to correct the record at least on the portion I was paying attention.

The issue that was being discussed by the six or seven on the other side of the aisle was about the eight U.S. Attorneys who were fired by the President. There are great, huge, yawning gaps in the description that came out. For the benefit of the people listening to that portion of it, I will attempt to fill in the gaps.

One is the President dismissed eight U.S. Attorneys. That runs about 85 short that were fired summarily by President Clinton. Talk about a chilling effect on your ability to prosecute if you happened to have been looking into Whitewater or if you happened to have been the prosecutor of Dan Rostenkowski and you found yourself immediately fired, and then subsequent to that, your successor achieving a conviction in the case of Rostenkowski, and then watching President Clinton pardon the very subject of your investigation, I would think that would be a chilling effect on a prosecutor.

But the allegation was made that "the independence of our U.S. Attorneys is the hallmark of justice." Well, yes, I think that is true, but they serve at the pleasure of the President, and the President has the authority and he has the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that those U.S. Attorneys are conducting their job, that they are actually prosecuting cases, locking people up in prison and not only taking them out of the crime job market, but also providing an example that keeps other people from committing crimes. When those prosecutions are not taking place at the pace they need to, if they are failing to distinguish themselves, then it is the responsibility and the duty of the President and subsequently the Attorney General to direct that they be removed.

The allegation that the firing of U.S. Attorneys for political purposes was a statement made by the gentleman from New Hampshire. Political purposes. There is no evidence that has been submitted on either side of the aisle that says they were fired for political purposes. There has been speculation, but that is an allegation that I think is a heavy allegation and it is an unjust allegation, and the people who make those kinds of allegations have a responsibility to come forward with some shred of evidence that they base their opinion on rather than wishful thinking.

□ 2100

This is no scandal, Mr. Speaker. It is not a scandal because it is eight U.S. attorneys. Eight U.S. attorneys, and there is not a partisan divide here that

can be seen. It is not like there were eight Democrat U.S. attorneys that were investigating Republicans in office. There is no evidence of that. It is more like there were Republicans and Democrats who have been admonished in the past and challenged by Members of this Congress, at least in one particular case, for not being aggressive enough, for not providing the kind of prosecutions necessary to enforce our borders.

Now, that is something that is essential to our national security, and if the allegations that are made here on the floor of this Congress and the statements that are made in committee and the witch hunt that is going on by submitting and requesting, subpoenaing the White House's closest advisers whom the President relies upon to be able to give him unfettered counsel, and they cannot be intimidated. Talk about intimidation, a subpoena to come before Congress and be questioned on the record about your most private advice to the Commander in Chief of the United States of America is what is going on here.

This is an unjust, unbalanced overreach, and it is my advice to the new majority to start acting like the majority because you are going to have to take responsibility for governing. You have not shifted gears from demagoguery of the past into the responsibility to provide policy that is going to direct this country into the future. It is high time that that happened. Break the mold. Let us go forward with good policy, and remember, if you have the gavels, you have the responsibility to make statements that are precisely correct, accurate all the way, truthful in every way possible, and move this country forward in the right direction and provide solutions, not just criticism.

I expect that subject will come up a little bit more, Mr. Speaker, within the next 53 minutes or so. Hopefully that will dispatch that subject for tonight.

But I would raise also there are two more issues before us tonight, Mr. Speaker, and one of them is hanging in the balance here in an unprecedented move, and that is the effort to provide a voting Delegate for the District of Columbia here in the United States Congress. It is an astonishing thing for me. It is an astonishing thing for me to be one of 435 Members of this House of Representatives who comes down to this floor every 2 years, and I bring my own Bible down here to make sure I am not short a Bible because I want my oath to go before God and country, for God and country, and take an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, so help me God. I add those words to my oath, and I have done so every time that I have been here to take that oath.

I believe that if there is a bill before this Congress, and as we analyze it constitutionally, if any of us come to the

conclusion that it is an unconstitutional piece of legislation, it is our responsibility or our duty, our obligation, our oath to uphold such unconstitutional legislation. We have taken an oath to do so. Vote "no" and clearly articulate the reasons why that bill is unconstitutional.

So Mr. Speaker, I have clearly articulated that before the Rules Committee, before the Rules debate here on the floor, and with the case of the bill on the floor, and I will seek to do that again for the edification of those that were not paying attention and still think that they can come around here tomorrow or next week or whenever it is that the majority gets the votes lined up and vote for an unconstitutional bill because they think it fits their politics. That is not what this oath is about, and so this D.C. district sets this way.

The first unconstitutional provision is this. Article I, section 2 of the Constitution says that the Representatives shall be Representatives of the States chosen by the people of the States. So if D.C., the District of Columbia, is not a State, it is a clear constitutional provision that prohibits this Congress from bestowing a Member, a voting Member representing the District of Columbia into this Congress because the District of Columbia simply is not a State.

Now, there are a couple of ways to resolve this issue. One would be to adopt the District of Columbia as a State, in which case they would get a Representative for the House of Representatives and two Senators. If that could be done and this Congress could pass it and we adopt District of Columbia as a State, that would be a constitutional solution.

Another constitutional solution would be to simply to take the populated areas outside our Federal buildings, just a little bit outside the Mall, from the Potomac River all the way up here around to the east side of the Capitol, set that aside as the District, and the balance of the District then could be ceded back to Maryland. That then could be incorporated into the redistricting process, and the people that lived in the District would be able to vote for a Representative in Congress.

But the arguments made on the other side go something like this, Mr. Speaker, and that is, well, we think that it is a violation of the 14th amendment, a violation of the equal protection clause, for people to live in the District of Columbia and not have a vote, be able to elect a Member of Congress.

I would submit, if that is so compelling that one can ignore the Constitution's clear language, then, Mr. Speaker, it is equally compelling to demand two Senators for the same region, and some will acknowledge that that is the goal, and some will deny it.

But this Constitution has always been kind of an inconvenient thing, Mr. Speaker. What is inconvenient about it is it provides constraints, constraints

for both sides, Democrats and Republicans, constraints for all of us who have a political reason or a policy need that does not consider the long-term best interests of the people of the United States.

This Constitution is the law of the land, Mr. Speaker, and I will submit that our Founding Fathers considered this when they established this constitutional Republic that we are in, and as they considered this, they looked at the democracies, the relatively pure democracies that they had in the Greek city-states 2,000 and 3,000 years ago, and they concluded that in the case of the pure democracy, the result was the same effect as if you had two wolves and a sheep taking a vote on what is for dinner. The majority rules, and the sheep is dinner.

So are we going to get let those kind of whims wave back and forth across the floor of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, or are we going to adhere to a Constitution that we have sworn an oath to uphold? I will submit that what I am seeing is the two wolves are taking a vote on what is for dinner, and the sheep is the Constitution here, and the minority in the United States House of Representatives, and I have pledged to uphold this Constitution, I will stand in the way to the last breath of an unconstitutional provision, no matter what it is.

But the arguments that were made here on the other side of the aisle primarily, Mr. Speaker, came down to this: That there are two very well-respected attorneys that have written opinions that will take the position that it is not unconstitutional for this Congress to ignore the Constitution and confer a voting right on a Member from the District of Columbia. Yet, as I look at those two names, they are high and stellar names, Mr. Ken Starr and Mr. Viet Dinh. I have worked to some degree with both of them and read their opinions, and I recognize that when one goes off to law school, one of the first things they teach you, Mr. Speaker, is argue this side of the case, now argue this side of the case, take the position on the right side, take the position on the left side.

There are two reasons for being able to argue both sides of every issue, Mr. Speaker, and one of them is so if you are hired to argue one side, you are prepared to do so; you are not stuck in an individual ideology. The other one is, if you want to survive in the attorney business, you can provide for billable hours because you are a lot more flexible to be able to go on either side of an issue.

Well, I do not allege that these legal opinions that have been produced by Mr. Starr and Mr. Viet Dinh do not have a basis. They do. I just submit that it is a weak basis, Mr. Speaker, and as I read through that, there is the foundation of the Tidewater case. Their argument there is that because a court found in favor of allowing the people in the District to have the Federal court

protection and conferred that kind of utilization of the court on the residents here in the District of Columbia, that that implies that they are citizens of a State. Well, that is an utterly weak analysis, Mr. Speaker.

Then the second argument, and that seemed to be even an argument that they hung their hat on even more, was the argument that, and believe me, the Framers understood there was going to be a District of Columbia. When this Constitution was ratified, they knew that. They defined it within the Constitution itself in Article I, but what they provided for was for the 10-mile-by-10-mile section that was laid out to become the District of Columbia for a period of time, that was from 1791 until 1801, that roughly 10-year period of time, until the Federal jurisdiction was applied here in this District, they allowed the people that before that time had been residents of Virginia to vote as residents of Virginia, and they allowed the people that had been residents of Maryland to continue voting as residents of Maryland.

So nothing changed for the people that were residents of the District for 10 years until the Federal jurisdiction was established, at which time then they did not have a Representative here in this Congress, and have not had all this time for this 200-plus years.

Well, the argument that was made by the two stellar legal scholars was because Congress allowed the people that lived here in this District to vote as residents of Maryland or Virginia, as the case may be, for 10 years, somehow that established a precedent or a constitutional right to have a Representative in the United States Congress, an utterly weak argument, and a precedent it was not.

Mr. Dinh admitted what the analysis comes down to, because there was an agreement between the House and the Senate, and the President signed the bill and let them vote conditionally for a 10-year period of time, that it was no precedent like you would get if the Supreme Court had made a decision. The only decision was no one disagreed with, so there was no constitutional argument to be resolved. In fact, no constitutional precedent was established either.

We go forward, and now equal protection under the law, Utah, to give a resident or a Member at-large so that if you are a resident of Utah, you can go and vote for your Representative in your district and the Representative that would be the Representative at-large in Utah. In fact, if you are a Member or a candidate, you could vote for yourself and somebody else to come here and do the same job. That is not equal protection under the law.

There was a case in 1961 called *Baker v. Carr* that tied this down to as close to an individual population balance as you could possibly get. That was the beginning of one man, one vote. There was a subsequent case in 1964 that speaks to it as well, but Utah also blows this Constitution sideways.

There are many reasons to vote "no" on this, and the difficulty that the majority has, and now unprecedentedly pulling a bill down as it was to go up for final passage and refused to allow a vote after days of building up to this with no explanation is unprecedented in this Congress, and that violates, I believe, the right of the people to be heard and the right of their judgment to be recorded here in a recorded vote on whether the District of Columbia will have an unconstitutional Member in this Congress or whether they will not, Mr. Speaker.

So that kind of cleans up the air here and gets us to this point where we are at the subject matter we came here to talk about, and what I would like to do to kick that subject matter off would be to yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee, the tenacious Marsha Blackburn.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa so much, and I thank him for hosting our Republican Study Committee hour this evening so that we can come here and talk a little bit about what those of us in the Republican Study Committee are doing, and certainly how we feel about the supplemental budget that is before us, a vote that we will take tomorrow. I appreciate the context that Mr. KING has brought to our debate tonight.

It is so very interesting to listen to our colleagues across the aisle. They talk about how they are going to change things, and when we talk, Mr. Speaker, about the change the American people wanted to see in November, they were not talking about subpoenas and hearings and vilifying people. The Democrats said that was not what they were going to do, and we know there are many who would like to make the President responsible for every single thing that has gone wrong.

We understand that, and we accept that, but it is unfortunate that when they come down here and they talk about honesty and accountability and trustworthiness and oversight and responsibility, their actions do not match their words. Their actions do not match their words at all.

What we continue to see in the supplemental budget, in the D.C. voting bill that they pulled from the floor today, and the budget that they will bring before us next week are a lot of accounting gimmicks, trying to move spending off line, hiding dollars, budget manipulation and deception. My goodness, this does not match up to what we hear from their rhetoric at all.

We know that there was all this talk about trying to be certain that we kept the spending low, and, Mr. Speaker, it took our colleagues across the aisle, as they took the majority, it took them 2 days to increase spending and 2 weeks to increase taxes on the American taxpayer, on the middle-class families working so hard to make ends meet, 2 days to increase spending.

□ 2115

They have spent well over an additional \$50 billion so far. Two weeks to increase taxes, and as this budget that the Democrats are working on comes to the floor next week, they are going to invoke the largest tax increase in U.S. history, \$400 billion over 5 years. That does bring us to the point of talking about the supplemental, and that is before us. Because as we hear all of this rhetoric, what we see is a budget, a supplemental bill that is to be there for our troops.

We all know that there is a lot that our troops need. When it comes to meeting their needs, when it comes to meeting their readiness, there is a lot they need. One of the reasons for that, when you go in and you look at the decade of the 1990s, budget after budget after budget, the military was cut. Funding to the military was cut. Funding to veterans, funding to veterans health care, funding to programs for the military retirees, funding for the active duty, funding for equipment, funding for artillery, funding for research and development, cut, cut, cut, cut, cut, year after year after year. The Democrats chose to cut that.

Bill Clinton chose to cut that because they had other priorities. They were in the dot-com boom. They were into issues that were other domestic issues, but the Nation's security was not a priority. Certainly, even the current Speaker of the House was quoted in last year's campaign as saying national security shouldn't be a campaign issue.

There is nothing more important than the security of our families in this Nation. There is not one thing more important.

I have so many places I could go to talk about what has happened to this budget, to this supplemental bill that is before us tomorrow. It is to be the emergency spending bill for the war on terror, for our issues in Iraq. USA Today even had an editorial calling this a bad bill, because they don't see, and I agree with them, I agree with USA Today on this, they don't see an additional \$500 million for the Forest Service as an emergency spending. They don't see \$283 million for the Milk Income Loss Contract Program as an emergency, or \$120 million to compensate for the effects of Hurricane Katrina on the shrimp and fish industry, or \$100 million for citrus assistance, or \$74 million for peanut storage costs or \$64.4 million for salmon fisheries or \$54 million for asbestos mitigation, or \$48 million in salaries and expenses for the Farm Service Agency, or \$35 million for NASA risk mitigation or \$25 million for spinach growers or \$25 million for live stock.

Even USA Today doesn't see that as emergency spending. I agree with them, because it's not.

I bet that many Members of this House had a wonderful mother like my mom has always been. My mother was always very good at saying, when I was

doing something that maybe wasn't appropriate, she would say not here, not now, this is not the place.

Well, as good as some of these programs may be, not here, not now, this is not the place. The men and women in the US military are worth more. They are worth more than the actions, the actions and the conduct that is being carried forward in this budget. It is the wrong place, and this is the wrong time to spend \$21 billion on discretionary spending that the Democrat majority does not want to carry to the floor and debate. They want to hide it. They want to keep it out of sight. They don't want anybody to know this. They just want to get the spending in there. Because, why? They want to circumvent their own PAYGO rules and their own budget rules. It is not the time; it is not the place.

Now, if the leadership of the Democrat Party is so into instant gratification that they cannot wait to take it to committee and go through the proper channels, then I think they need to have a reevaluation about what is important. I can tell you what is important to my constituents. It is knowing that when they put their head on the pillow at night, they are safe. It is knowing when they drop their children off at school, they are safe. It is knowing that when those children graduate from high school and from college, they are going to have a brighter future. It is knowing that as they work hard to build a business, that they are going to have the opportunity to grow that business. It is knowing that when they retire, that they are going to be able to enjoy every single day of that retirement.

It is knowing that, yes, indeed, they are going to be accountable, they are going to support their government, and it is knowing that their government is going to be there to support the fundamental values, the underpinning of this Nation, and to support the men and women who put their lives on the line every single day to go and defend this country and defend their freedom.

You know what, if it were not for those men and women in uniform, if it were not for them doing their job, if it were not for the fact that they have done their job time and again during the course of this Nation's history, you and I would not be standing here tonight having this debate.

There is a price that is paid for freedom. Every penny we appropriate in an emergency bill deserves to be spent on the men and women wearing the uniform defending that freedom.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee. Certainly I wish to associate myself with all of her remarks, and I appreciate the consistency and the persistence with which Mrs. BLACKBURN comes here to the floor and participates in committee in every way possible to move the right agenda here in America.

I reflect upon a thought that crossed my mind a week or so ago or maybe 2

weeks ago in committee, as I was listening to the kind of argument and debate that was coming from the other side of the aisle, and the discussion was about people who have food anxiety. We established food stamps for people who were suffering from malnutrition, and then we extended those benefits to those that were hungry, and now the effort is to extend those benefits, not to just those that, we can't make the argument that people don't know where their next meal is coming from any longer, so now the argument is made that people wonder where their second, third, fourth and fifth meal is coming from, and that is called food anxiety. Food insecurity is the more appropriate term they likely use, food insecurity.

It occurred to me, this Constitution, I waved it around a little earlier, provides some constitutional rights: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But as I read back through my history and recognize that FDR back in the 1930s made another speech, and it's called the Four Freedoms speech. Those four freedoms, as he defined them, are etched into stone down in FDR's monument. First is freedom of speech, the second is freedom of religion. Those are constitutional rights. Speech and religion are one and two, third and fourth are freedom from want and freedom from fear.

Now, those aren't constitutional rights. They are extra-constitutional rights, as articulated by FDR. But they were used to advance an agenda that grew government more dramatically than ever before, and it eclipsed the vision of most Americans. But they are really not rights. They are not constitutional rights. It's a vision or an image to have freedom from want and freedom from fear. Now, I don't know how you ever get to that point where you are free from fear. I don't think that can be guaranteed.

But we have gone another step now with the food anxiety or the food insecurity part. Now we have gone from our real freedoms, freedom of speech and religion, all of our Bill of Rights, to freedom from want and freedom from fear as articulated by FDR. Now, because of food insecurity language, now the argument is we need to make sure that people are free from the fear of want, freedom from fear of want.

So you should never have to wonder about whether you could pay your rent. You should never have to wonder about where your next meal is coming from. You should never have to wonder if you are going to have a job or if you are going to get fired, because government can be all things to all people. Government can take this safety net and turn it into a hammock, and no one has any anxiety. Perhaps we could cure ulcers if we could just have enough Federal money to do that.

If we are free from fear of want, we will also be free of the ambition to provide for our future wants and needs. If that's the case, the productivity in

America will go down dramatically, and we will watch this work ethic in our culture collapse. One of the things that drove me to work my entire life was fear of want and not knowing, necessarily, even where my next meal was coming from, not knowing if I was going to be in business the next week or next month, but knowing I was the one in charge, I was the one in control. I had to not only work hard; I had to work smart.

That has given millions of Americans to succeed, freedom from fear of want, a new right in this new Pelosi administration. I offer that thought for edification and consideration.

But I also recognize that the gentleman who represents the vast majority of the State of Nebraska and some of those spaces out there are, indeed, vast, Mr. SMITH. I appreciate your arrival in this Congress, the values that you bring here, and the principled stand that you take. Often there are many things that tie western Iowa to all of Nebraska, and particularly western Nebraska. I appreciate you being here on the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Thank you to the gentleman from Iowa. It's great to be here. I take this responsibility, not only this evening, very seriously, but being elected as a Member of the United States House of Representatives very seriously.

My primary responsibility, I believe, is to protect the freedoms that so many Americans enjoy and, perhaps, have taken for granted for a time. I think back to the terrorist acts leveled on our country, and that is a constant reminder that we cannot sit idly by, that we cannot let division sway us from our goal. I believe that one of the fundamental sources of our freedom is through economic freedom, and that is why I requested a spot on the Budget Committee.

Incidentally, last night, we had a long markup of the budget. It was very enlightening to me as a new Member, and it was very enlightening to me, I think, some of the rhetoric and the objectives of a budget. We know that so often we want to tell people, yes, in terms of the of new programs, of new spending. There comes a time, though, when we are going to have to pay for that.

There was a lot of rhetoric exchanged in terms of what tax relief has done for our economy, some would say what it hasn't done for the budget. But I don't know if it's just coincidence that the economy turned around with tax relief. I don't think it's coincidence, to be quite honest with you. But it is interesting how the allegations are leveled that the Bush administration tax relief or the Reagan tax relief or, quite honestly, the President John F. Kennedy tax relief had nothing to do with a rebounding economy subsequently.

It was very enlightening to me, in fact, when I was visiting the JFK Library in Boston, or outside of Boston. This is not the Ronald Reagan Library;

this is not the Bush 41 or the Bush 43 library. This is the John F. Kennedy Library that has an entire exhibit devoted to the economic policies of tax relief leading to economic prosperity.

I believe that it has to do with the very basics of economic freedom that individuals, families, you name it, when they have those dollars in their hands, they can spend it more wisely on the economy, rather than paying it into the government, and then the government doling it out as a redistribution of wealth or whatever the case might be.

□ 2130

But it does amaze me that we are here listening to the need for so much more spending. In fact, a high level of spending wasn't enough to get enough support, so they made it even higher to bring on more support. That concerns me, and I know that it concerns many Americans as well.

But as we were marking up the budget last night in committee well into the night, it was interesting how we heard that the majority wants to maintain the tax relief relating to the marriage penalty, tax relief relating to the child tax credit, but yet the budget doesn't show that. The budget does not show that. And it just spoke volumes, I guess, in terms of sound budgeting according to the principles I think of economic freedoms that should be instilled there.

But when we talk about something, we politicians kind of get a bad name now and then, or maybe more often than that, for saying one thing and doing another. That is unfortunate, because this budget says one thing and does another, and that is my concern.

It is interesting that there were amendments proposed for the budget resolution last night that would have solidified the tax relief one measure at a time. So there was the option of cherry-picking, if you will, good parts, bad parts, whatever the case might have been for others wanting to support these amendments. If they like the child tax credit, but didn't like the dividends reduction in taxes, they have the option to choose one without the other. Every single amendment was rejected. Every single amendment. That concerns me a great deal because, like I said, it eats away at what I believe is a fundamental freedom that we should enjoy in America, that being economic freedom.

Mr. KING of Iowa. If the gentleman would yield, and just inquire as you were working through that budget last night, what kind of message did you get from the majority party on how much support there was for the Department of Defense budget and how much support for military spending? We are having this debate here on the floor today and starting again tomorrow morning. Did you sense that there was a commitment to support our military financially, our troops, and their mission?

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I did not sense that commitment. It would be hard for me to speak or to speculate. And I am not here to beat up on those with whom I disagree. That is not my job.

I do believe, though, that this supplemental spending bill, and I don't want to take up all of your time, but I do want to touch briefly on the fact that this supplemental spending bill with the caveats that many would call micromanaging the war is the wrong thing to do. I don't think we want to give our enemy any hint of what our plans are. A date certain withdrawal is the wrong thing to do. Certainly that was not discussed, especially in the spending context that we have heard so much here today about and well into the future.

There is a lot we can worry about in the past, but if we don't focus on the future, we are not doing our jobs. And as we look at protecting the freedom, I can't help but think how productive we could be with a more unified approach. And I believe that military generals are trained highly, and that we should entrust in their abilities the objective of doing what they need to do so that we can see success overseas. And I cannot say that enough, but I truly believe that turning a spending bill into a bill to micromanage the war is the wrong thing to do.

Constitutionally the President is the Commander in Chief. No one else is the Commander in Chief. And the Commander in Chief makes the tough decisions. And we can again look at the past and perhaps learn from the past and apply those lessons to the future, which we must do and can do. And if we pay attention to really look at the information and the facts and the data, we can do the right thing, and that is availing the resources to our military, to those most highly trained, those closest to the situation, and allow those folks to make the right decision.

I yield back, but I certainly appreciate this opportunity and would certainly encourage my friend from Iowa to continue his pursuits here, because I think it is helpful, and I hope to join again. Thank you.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska, a Mr. SMITH who has come to Washington to stand up for middle-American values, and to hold the line on the spending in the Budget Committee, hold the line on the constitutional issues with the micromanagement that is coming out of here with this supplemental spending bill, this emergency supplemental spending bill.

And I will make no such pledge that it isn't my job to challenge the people with whom I disagree with. In fact, I believe it is my job to do that, and I intend to step up every time and draw those bright lines when I think it is imperative that those bright lines be drawn.

So here we are with this bill on the floor being debated several hours

today, with 1 or 2 hours left in the debate for tomorrow. And maybe it will go to final passage, maybe the votes won't be there, maybe the vote will get pulled down just like D.C. voting was pulled down today. They take it all the way through the process, and, at the time it is supposed to go up on the board, realize, we lost the debate, so now we can't allow a vote. That is exactly what happened here in the House of Representatives today. The people's voice wasn't heard.

We have got a little debate to go tomorrow. People are going to sleep on this tonight, and they are going to think about the President asking for \$99 billion to provide for Afghanistan and Iraq, the surge in Iraq, the strategy that was part of the Iraq Study Group's recommendation, the bipartisan Iraq Study Group's recommendation, and the effort to succeed in Iraq.

And it is interesting that the President has retooled our approach here. We have a new Secretary of Defense, Secretary Gates; we have a new Secretary, at least an Acting Secretary of the Army, Mr. Geren; and we have a new Commander at Walter Reed Hospital, we have a new Commander of CENTCOM. And this is a new plan, a new plan put together by the individual who wrote the book on counterterrorism and the most successful general that I believe that we have seen come out of the Iraq theater, and that is General David Petraeus, I believe the most impressive military individual I have met in my time here, in fact in my life. And his strategy is part of the same strategy that the Iraq Study Group put out. And having written the book on counterterrorism and being endorsed without opposition for his confirmation for a fourth star by the United States Senate, and within a week the United States Senate is back trying to jerk the rug out from underneath his plan, trying to oppose the surge in Iraq and trying to oppose the 21,500 extra troops that go in there. And now we are seeing a little wavering, a little quavering, and some people going a little wobbly because they are starting to see the positive signs in the effort in Baghdad.

Now, the situation there is kind of interesting, Mr. Speaker. Baghdad and 30 miles around outside of Baghdad is where 80 percent of the violence in Iraq is taking place. And it occurred to me, it was actually back in December, I was reflecting back upon the 101st Airborne 62 years earlier had been surrounded at Bastogne during the Battle of the Bulge in World War II. Bastogne, a city that had seven roads leading to it and through it, was the centerpiece of the transportation link. It was the key to success or failure in the Battle of the Bulge, and maybe it was the key to victory or defeat for either side in World War II, at least in the European theater.

And so, as the 101st Airborne was surrounded at Bastogne, mercilessly being shelled by the Germans, and the Ger-

mans demanded the surrender of the 101st, General McCollum's response is famous, and it should echo throughout all of American history when he said in his response to the Germans, "Nuts." We understood what that meant, being Americans. The Germans didn't. They had to go get their linguists to try to understand what it meant, and they still, I don't think, have figured out to this day. Well, that was in one word, four letters, the American spirit of defiance, the American spirit of perseverance.

And there they were surrounded at Bastogne, hopelessly surrounded, and their response was, "Nuts." We are hanging on and we are going to defend Bastogne. And shortly thereafter we had General Patton and the 3rd Army that came and relieved the 101st Airborne. They argue to this day that they didn't need the help of the 3rd Army, that they had the Germans right where they wanted them.

That was the American spirit 62 years ago, Mr. Speaker, and today 80 percent of the violence is within Baghdad or 30 miles from Baghdad. Baghdad is essentially surrounded; it is not a stronghold. We have always gone wherever we wanted to go in Baghdad, or any other city in Iraq for that matter, even though the press calls it a stronghold. We went wherever we wanted to go, and we go more now than we did before. Baghdad is significantly pacified, but Baghdad was surrounded by peace, a relative peace at least, and the violence was in there.

Now, if we had pulled out, or if sometime in the future this side of the aisle is successful in shutting off the resources so that our military can't succeed in their mission, and we pull out of there, I believe history will judge us nuts if we do such a thing, Mr. Speaker.

There is too much at stake. There is no discussion on this side of the aisle here about the consequences for pulling out. No one has a plan for victory. No one over there will utter the "V" word, the victory word. No one will define it. They are just a group of "defeatocrats" that can't get it out of their head that America's destiny is worth more than marking political points against your opposition.

So we sit here with more than 3,000 lives sacrificed for the freedom of the Iraqi people and the destiny of the world, because if we don't defeat this enemy here in Iraq, as Prime Minister Maliki said right here behind where I am standing right now, he said, "If the terrorists can't be defeated in Iraq, they can't be defeated anywhere."

Now, if Mr. MURTHA gets his way and troops are deployed out of Iraq, the bill doesn't say where, but he has said where: Okinawa. Okinawa. Over the horizon is Okinawa, and we can put our troops over there, and then we can fly them wherever we need them whenever we need them. I would say we might as well take them right to Afghanistan. And I am going to explain the reason for that, Mr. Speaker.

First, this is a poster of Muqtada al-Sadr. He is quite an interesting character. He started out in this conflict as a militia general, and he wasn't doing very well down south of Baghdad a couple of years ago when he suffered huge, huge casualties in the Madhi militia. In fact, the casualties were so heavy that he decided to become a politician instead of a general, and so he entered into and built a little coalition and picked up 30 seats in the Iraqi Parliament. He also took over the security on the civilian side of Baghdad International Airport, along with one portion of the Shia region of Baghdad and some of the area to the south. Muqtada al-Sadr, not a friend of the United States, an individual who has empowered himself by attacking the United States and denigrating the United States and inspiring his followers the same way, and this is how he did it.

And I was sitting in Kuwait City, the date is right here, June 11, 2004, waiting to go into Iraq the next day, and I was watching al-Jazeera TV, Mr. Speaker. Now, Muqtada al-Sadr came on, this burly face, and he was speaking in Arabic, so I was looking at the crawler underneath in English, and it read just like this: "If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu." That was Muqtada al-Sadr, June 11, 2004. Al-Jazeera TV. I attest to that; I was there, I wrote it down; I saw it; I heard it. And that is the statement that he made.

Now, I went back and picked up the book written by General Vo Nguyen Giap, and it is, "How We Won the War." And he is writing about the Vietnam war, how they won the war. And very early in the book he takes the position that because the United States did not win a clear victory in Korea, they understood that we would maybe not have the will to win a clear victory in Vietnam. So their strategy from the beginning was to fight the war in such a way that it would break down and defeat American public opinion and encourage the antiwar activists all across this country and around the world. That was a part of their calculated strategy that is in the book, "How We Won the War" by General Giap.

Now, it hadn't occurred to me that because we settled for a truce at the 38th parallel in Korea at the place, the same line as the beginning of the war was the end of the war. But because we didn't push the Communists all the way out of North Korea and draw a new line, they believe that we could be defeated because we didn't demonstrate the will to succeed.

Carl Von Clausewitz wrote the treatise on war, and the name of the book is, "On War." And he states in there, "The object of war is to destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war." To destroy the enemy's will and ability, Mr. Speaker. And I believe Clause-

witz lists will ahead of ability because it is more important here. Your will to succeed, your will to prevail is more important than your ability to conduct war.

In other words, if you are fighting an enemy, and you destroy their airplanes and their navy and their tanks and their guns and their ammunition, and they still have the will to fight you, they will come at you with IEDs or rocks or fists or boots or clubs, because they still have the will to take you on.

But here in this Congress, there have been dozens, there are scores, there, in fact, may be more than 100, there may be more than 200 that don't understand that when they stand here on this floor and they speak against our military's mission, they are encouraging people like Muqtada al-Sadr when he is inspiring his people by saying, "All we have to do is keep attacking Americans, and they will pull out of Iraq the same way they did Vietnam, Lebanon and Mogadishu."

□ 2145

And if we should do that, Mr. Speaker, I can show you the next poster you will see on this floor, the next quote that will show up in the news media.

This is another notorious individual: Osama bin Laden. Where is he? We are looking diligently for him. One day we will find him.

But the lesson from Muqtada al-Sadr, the lesson that needs to be understood by the Defeatocrats is that if we pull out of Iraq, we don't win there. You have al Qaeda taking over. You have Iran coming in and taking over 70 to 80 percent of the Iraqi oil. You have Iran with their hand on the valve that could shut off at the Straits of Hormuz, 42.6 percent of the world's export oil. Doing so let's them control the world economy, including that of the United States, including that of China, empowering Russia, empowering Iran, intimidating and controlling the entire Middle Eastern oil supply by Ahmadinejad. That is what is in store for us if we don't prevail.

And so Muqtada al-Sadr has laid it out, and he has got a clear vision. His vision isn't hard to figure out. General Giap has figured it out, just from seeing that we would settle for a truce at the 38th Parallel, and we have got Muqtada al-Sadr seeing that and Vietnam and Lebanon and Mogadishu, and several others, by the way.

But if we pull out of Iraq, our troops aren't going to be deployed to over the horizon, Mr. MURTHA, or over to Okinawa, Mr. MURTHA. They may get to go home for a little while and polish their boots, but they are going to Afghanistan, because that is the next stop for these terrorists that are going to keep coming at us until we defeat them or capitulate.

And so this will be the next quote you will see if we pull out of Iraq. It will be Osama bin Laden this time, and he will be saying, if we keep attacking Americans they will leave Afghanistan

the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu, the same way they left Iraq. That is what is in front of us if we don't have the will to prevail, Mr. Speaker.

And these kinds of unconstitutional supplemental or emergency spending bills that tie so many strings on to the hands of the Commander in Chief, that if he adheres to the language that is in here, ties his hands so he can't win.

Now, why would you not be for victory? Why would you send money over there and not provide a way for the troops to win?

This bill pulls us out of Iraq. That is the goal and they have said so. Their goal is not victory. Their goal has been defeat for a long time so they can say I told you so. To put a stain on this administration perhaps. To try to gain political favor, perhaps. But whatever is their motivation, I will submit that this appropriations bill is unconstitutional because it is micromanagement of the duties of the Commander in Chief.

And so I will submit that this Constitution gives this Congress three responsibilities when it comes to war. The first one is to declare war. We haven't done that since World War II. The second one is constitutionally to raise and equip an Army and a Navy, and by implication an Air Force. The third one is to fund the war. That is it. No other constitutional responsibilities. Declare a war, raise a military, fund military. But the President is Commander in Chief because our founders lived through the mistakes of trying to run a war with a whole series of micromanagers and trying to do so by consensus or majority rule within the Continental Congress.

The Continental Congress tried to micromanage the war that was fought by the Continental Army. And they were so stung by that painful effort, and the only thing that preserved them was they had the will for victory. They carried themselves through the hardest of times, barefoot at Valley Forge, because they were determined that they were going to defeat the British and establish a new nation. And that is the legacy that the founders have passed along to us. And they drew bright lines in this Constitution because they understood you couldn't fight a war by committee. You couldn't fight a war if a Congress was going to micromanage the Commander in Chief. So they drew the line clearly, and there is no equivocation, and there is no historical record about the founders wondering about who had what responsibility when it came to fighting a war. No. It was the Commander in Chief. And they gave Congress the authority, declare a war, raise the Army and the Navy, and then, I said by implication, the Air Force, and fund it.

So if you don't want to support our military, and if you don't want to support their mission, then you ought to have enough intestinal fortitude to



come down here with a bill that unfunds our military and face the wrath of the American people and the wrath of the United States military, who, by the way, are 100 percent volunteers, not just to join the military and put on the uniform, but for the mission that they are on.

Everyone there has had an opportunity to retire from the military in such time since the beginning of this conflict. Yet, Mr. Speaker, they step forward and they re-up and they volunteer in greater numbers than one ever anticipated. These are brave souls that are on a mission. And to say to them, after they have volunteered for one or two or three or more deployments, well, thanks a lot for the effort, but we are not going to let you finish the job, we are going to drag you home.

Well, I would say to that that I could quote a colonel that I went to Iraq with not that long ago, and he said, and I don't know if I will find it so I will speak from off the cuff and this will be close. It won't be probably an exact quote. He said, don't save me. I volunteered for this mission. Don't save me. I am here because I volunteered for my children. I am here to fight this war so my children don't have to fight this war. You are not doing me any favors if you try to pull me out of this mission that I am committed to. And I have children at home that I am here to defend.

Now, I would say, also, that probably the most profound statement that I heard from a military person over there was a major from Kentucky. And he is a farmer, a father, loved his cows, worried about his bull, wanted to see the digital picture of his new bull, and loves God. And he said to me, he said, we have everything we need. So when you pray for us, meaning the military, pray for the American people. Pray they understand the threat, and pray they do not lose their resolve. We will not lose ours.

That is the kind of personnel we have that put their lives on the line for the future of freedom in the world, for the safety of the American people so that we can ultimately prevail in this long, long war against these global terrorists who believe that their path to salvation is in killing us.

It is not going to be easy. It is not going to be over quickly. And, in fact, every time we step back and show weakness, it empowers the enemy and we are more likely to hear this statement sooner.

But this is not over if we pull out of Iraq, as General Pelosi and Mr. MURTHA would like to do. It is not over. They will follow us here. And they will be more empowered. They will have a base that is protected that they can operate from out of Iraq. And you hand over that oil money to the Iranians, they will be spending it to buy missiles to deliver nuclear weapons, not just to Tel Aviv, not just to Western Europe, but within a few short years to the United States. And we will face an

enemy that is a lot tougher than the one we are facing right now.

We need to resolve this issue in the Middle East now. This is the time to do so. Put the cross hairs on Iran's nuclear and tell them cease fighting this proxy war against the United States within Iraq. Resolve and pacify Iraq, and turn our focus over to Afghanistan. Because if we don't do so, this man and his allies turn Iraq into a terrorist base camp, and they turn their effort to Afghanistan to try to drive us out of there and destroy the freedom that has been established there, where people voted for the first time on that soil in all of history.

That is what we are faced with. This is a long war. We need to step up to it. We need to understand that. We need to let our voluntary military perform their mission and stand with them, because not only do we stand with our military, but we stand with them in their mission. I do so on this side of the aisle. I challenge everyone on that side of the aisle to do the same.

It is intellectually inconsistent to take a position that you can support the troops and not their mission. And it is constitutionally inconsistent, in fact unconstitutional, to micromanage a war from the floor of Congress and tie so many strings in there that they can't be met, so that it is certain that if this language passes and the President adheres to it that there will be an end to this sort of victory.

And I ask the President, Mr. Speaker, to stand on this constitutionally. He has the authority to do intra-departmental transfers. If the money goes to DOD and it is directed to an aircraft carrier and we need armored Humvees and Strykers and bulletproof vests, he can mothball that aircraft carrier and put the money where it is needed. That is why he is Commander in Chief. That is constitutional. This bill is not. And I urge that all Members stand up and vote "no" on this when it comes to the floor tomorrow.

### 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRALEY of Iowa). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to come back before the House this evening. And I must say that tomorrow is going to be the judgment day as it relates to Members that are willing to lead on behalf of the men and women in uniform and those that have worn the uniform, and even making sure that we take care of some of the issues as it relates to homeland security.

Today there was a 3-hour, 4-hour-or-so debate on the emergency supplemental that is coming up tomorrow. And you know, part of the mission of the 30-Something Working Group is to come to the floor to make sure the Members have accurate information

and to make sure that we provide good information, not only to the Members, but also to the American people. And having Members come to the floor that may represent one view or another is a part of our democracy, and I embrace it 110 percent.

I think it is also important for the Members to be able to receive up-to-date information and also talk a little bit about the past. And I think the past is something that we should embrace from time to time to allow the Members to be able to make a good assessment on how they should vote.

A couple of days ago, Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor and I recommended to some of the Members that it is important on both sides of the aisle that maybe some of us need to go see the wizard and find some courage and also find a heart when it comes down to standing up for the men and women in uniform.

And I talked a little bit about what is in this supplemental bill, emergency supplemental, which is over \$125 billion and which will be, from what I understand, the last supplemental outside of the budget.

Now, when we talk about this emergency supplemental, this is for a war that we are going into the fifth year of. And I just want to say that again: a war that we are going into the fifth year of. It has lasted longer than any other conflict in U.S. history. And I just want to make sure the Members understand that.

We have heard statements on the floor. Members come to the floor, especially on the other side of the aisle, saying, well, we just need to give the troops what they need and then, you know, not have any oversight or any language in the bill that may bring about accountability.

Well, I voted for two past supplementals. I said that the other night. I will say it again. Some parts of that supplemental I did not like, but the last thing, the last thing that I wanted to do was to vote against the troops having what they need that are in harm's way. And I think that is important.

I don't know how I would have been able to go home to talk to my constituents and say that I voted against the supplemental because there was a part in it that I didn't agree with, while we have folks that are in a forward area, while we have men and women on the ground in Afghanistan, while we have men and women that are patrolling the streets of Baghdad now because the Commander in Chief sent them there to do so.

We want to support those men and women in harm's way and their families while they are here, and in this supplemental we are going to support them when they come back.

We are in the majority now. The Democrats are in the majority. But we have a minority spirit, to make sure that there is no Member in this House left behind because of a lack of information on what they are going to vote