

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

on. And that is the reason why I am here.

□ 2200

I returned back to the Capitol tonight to talk a little bit about what is in this supplemental and what has happened in the past. Now, we had a number of Members on both sides of the aisle that talked a lot about what is not in this supplemental and what should be in this supplemental in the future. And I can tell you right now, it is far beyond what the President has called for as it relates to emergency dollars.

And when I see my friends on the other side, and I do say friends, I can tell you every Member that is in leadership now on the Republican side voted for a timeline for Bosnia. I mean, I just want to make sure that Members understand that, because there may be some Members who weren't here at that time, including myself, and it is important.

When we start to close out on this bill tomorrow, you are going to have Members of the Republican leadership that are going to come to this floor and call the Speaker of the House "General" what have you, call the majority leader "General" whatever they want to call him, call the whip "General" this, that, and the other. Meanwhile, here is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where they voted for the very same thing when President Clinton was in office.

Bosnia didn't have half of the conflict that Iraq has now. Not even a quarter of the money that has been spent in Iraq was spent in Bosnia. I am a member of the Armed Services Committee. There is a difference when you come to the floor and speak a cappella and when you come to the floor with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Let us talk about what the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD says because I want to make sure that Members understand. And if that was all about politics, I would be home right now doing whatever, reading a book or spending some time with the family right now, because if it was about politics, I would say I want the Republican minority to vote "no." I want them to vote "no" so that they have to go home and tell their constituents that they voted against increasing veterans' health care funding, they voted against making sure that out of the 100 Stryker Brigades that we have in the Army, that they voted to make sure that some bureaucrat from the Department of Defense can waive their own rules and not make sure that those men and women have what they need to go to battle. And in every Stryker Brigade and every Stryker unit, you have to have a driver, a gunner. You have to have three individuals in that vehicle. And it is very, very important that everyone understands that we have to give our men and women what they deserve when they go into harm's way.

Let me just talk about the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD here. June 24, 1997,

House Republicans brought to the floor an amendment that would set a timeline, a date certain, to withdraw from the U.S. peacekeeping mission in Bosnia, a mission that was only 18 months old. Mr. Speaker, I said this mission now in Iraq is in its 5th year. That was 18 months old.

Now, if my colleagues on the other side want to call someone General, Colonel, four-star, Secretary of Defense, whatever they want to call them, we are, as Members of Congress, to make sure that we carry out the oversight of any action of the U.S. taxpayer dollar. They don't want to talk about the investment that U.S. taxpayers have made in this war. They don't want to talk about the sacrifice of the over 3,222-plus members of the Armed Forces that are not coming home again, Mr. Speaker. They don't want to talk about the 10,000-plus members who were injured in Iraq that cannot return back to battle because of their injury. The Republicans do not want to talk about the casualties of this war as it relates to families that will no longer have their loved one back home, and they don't want to talk about the accountability that they did not put forth when they were in charge of this U.S. House of Representatives to say, Department of Defense, if you have regulations saying that military personnel that are going into harm's way, that they have to have armor, that they have to have the support staff, that they have to have everything they need to go to battle; if you aren't willing to stand by that, then don't criticize what we are doing.

I hope that my Republican colleagues follow and come along and join us because this is national security. This is not an issue of partisanship, or I am a Republican and you are a Democrat. That should not be the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have said personally I voted for the supplemental that the Republican majority put forth two times in a row, not saying, I am a Democrat and, because they are Republican, I am going to vote against it.

Yes, I want to see redeployment in this war, but I do not want to leave our men and women without what they need to be able to fight the battle. There won't be a lack of ammunition or a lack of food or a lack of support or a lack of backup when there is a patrol out on the streets of Baghdad.

Do I support the President's surge? No, I do not. And I voted in the affirmative for the nonbinding resolution that came before this House that said that we do not support the surge that the President has put forth. Just because I disagree with the President doesn't mean that I need to disagree with the men and women in harm's way.

Now, some Members may have problems with this. They may not like a word over here or something that is said over there. But the bottom line is when you start looking at the morale of the men and women in uniform, the

worst message that we can send to them is that because of partisanship, because someone is a Republican or someone is a Democrat, that I am voting against it because my party leader said that I need to vote against it. I am here as an American, not as a Democrat here tonight, because I think it is important that we think about those families that cringe to hear about another casualty in Iraq of a U.S. military personnel or a nonforeign personnel that is in Iraq. And by Members saying, I don't want to vote for that because there is certain language in there that I disagree with, I think it is not a good enough reason for Members to say that I am not going to vote for it.

We talked about a commander. We talked about a gunner. We talked about a driver in a Stryker force vehicle. We talked about 100 brigades that are out there now. I have been to Iraq twice. I don't need to come to the floor and say, I am a member of the Armed Services Committee and I have been to Afghanistan, and I have been to many of the other "stans" in the Middle East to understand what our men and women are facing in harm's way. I have been to military bases. I have met with military families before. I don't need to come to the floor and talk about that. We have some Members saying, well, I love the troops.

Well, I love the troops more than you.

No, I have a tattoo saying that I love the troops more than you.

I believe we can come to the floor and talk tough and talk about what we believe in. But when it comes down to it, Mr. Speaker, Members are going to have to take out their voting card come tomorrow, and they are going to have to vote if they support the troops or not, period, dot. They can say, well, I support them, or what have you, go home, talk to the VFW and march in the Veterans Day parade and write letters back to their constituents that I support them 110 percent. The bottom line is that there is nothing in this bill that the Democratic majority has put forth that has not already been recommended.

Think about the policy. Okay. Readiness. It comes from the Department of Defense regulations. Who can argue with that? Who can complain about that? Who can argue, saying we are micromanaging?

No, not micromanaging. We are just saying if you have rules and regulations that have been set forth for the men and women in uniform, follow them, period, dot.

Being a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have watched individuals sit at a table testifying before Congress in committee, saying that the troops have what they need, and, yes, they all have body armor, and, yes, they all have up-armed vehicles, and, yes, they have the jammers to stop the improvised explosive devices; and better yet, you go to Iraq and you talk to the men and women in uniform, and they say they don't have it.

So what should we do? Should we just say we trust the bureaucrats over at the Department of Defense because they say they have what they need? Or do we come to this Congress and put in a language of legislation that not may or if you get around to it, or if you think about it, that you make sure that you live by your own standards. No. We say "shall" in this bill. We say, yes, readiness is important. Yes, we say that what General Schoomaker has asked for as it relates to additional soldiers, we said yes to it in this supplemental. You will be voting against readiness if you vote against the emergency supplemental.

The Commandant of the Marines asked for three new brigades. That is in this supplemental bill. If you vote against this supplemental, you are voting against the readiness of the U.S. Marines.

There are a number of issues that are in this bill that I think are important. But I think when you look at House amendment 302 by Representative BUYER, Republican from Indiana, and the timeline of December 15 of 1997, President Clinton was required to report to Congress on the political and military conditions in Bosnia and by a date certain, by June 30 of 1998, all troops to be withdrawn. Mr. Speaker, that actually came to the floor. And the Republican leadership that was here at that time voted in the affirmative for the amendment. And so for Members to come here and start talking about it as though this is some new idea like "never before."

I heard that today. I was sitting in my office. I could not believe that Members on the Republican side of the aisle were saying never before, that this never happened, that we have micromanaged generals and commanders and all the men and women that are in uniform and from this Congress we have 135 generals. Here is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD right here.

One guy once said, "I am not talking about anybody. I am just talking about what I am talking about." And the bottom line is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, just as clear as I am speaking now, 20 years, 200 years from now, someone can unearth what I have said here tonight. And we have unearthed, to my colleagues on the Republican side, what took place, and guess what? Only four Republicans voted "no." Here is the voting record right here. I have it. Of all the Republican Members that voted at that time, only four Republicans voted "no" when it came down to a timeline for Bosnia.

Now, this is not something that came from the Democratic National Committee or from the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee or from my office because it sounded good. This came out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

So I want to make sure that the Members know and their constituents know that when Members come to the floor and give inaccurate information

to the American people and to Members of the House, it is a disservice. And I am not calling any names. I am just saying that here is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. For those Members who said never before in the history of the House of Representatives, you have got to know what you are saying before you say it, and if you said it, you should come to the floor and correct yourself so that individuals are not misled.

This is 18 months in Bosnia, let alone going into a 5th year in Iraq. No matter how you feel about the war, whether you voted against it or voted for it, I am not going to editorialize or have an opinion on how you voted when you voted. We are talking about right now. We are talking about tomorrow, less than 12 hours from now, you are going to have an opportunity to say if you are with the troops or you are not with the troops. And it is not going to be a floor speech, and it is not going to be a press release. It has to be if you vote "yes" or "no" tomorrow.

And I am speaking to every Member of the House. This is something that you have to live with. You cannot go to Iraq or Afghanistan or even write a letter or answer an e-mail from a troop if you found yourself in a situation where you said, no, I don't agree with what you are doing; that is fine, but to defund the mission while it is ongoing, our men and women that are in harm's way right now, is something that you are going to have to answer to your constituents. You don't have to answer to me, you just have to answer to your constituents. And I think that it is something you should take into consideration. And one of the great reasons why we come to the floor is to make sure that the Members know exactly what they're voting for.

And, Mr. Speaker, if I can, and Members, if they will indulge me, I would just like to talk a little bit about what is in this bill, what is in the emergency supplemental, because I want to make sure that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflects it when you have some voters that may go into the archives of what took place at this time right now. Mr. Speaker, I used to see all the time in 109th Congress where we had some rough, rocky water, in the 109th Congress.

□ 2215

We had Members that are no longer Members of this House, not by vote but by the fact they had to leave the Congress because of unethical behavior, not unethical, criminal behavior, and we never once called the names of those individuals. But we said we have to do away with the K Street Project and other projects like it, because once upon a time this House, when the other side was in control, you had to pay to play. Either you were on a list or you didn't get access to this House.

Now we have returned this House to the people of the United States of America. We are going to continue to

move in that direction, and I think it is important that we make sure that every Member of the House has the opportunity to vote on good legislation.

We are going to consider H.R. 1591, which is the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act of 2007.

I am sorry, I was just corrected, not only four Republicans will vote against it, only two Republicans will vote against it. We are checking while we are on the floor. I want to make sure the RECORD reflects the accurate information.

I think it is important that Members understand the defense healthcare is \$1.7 billion more than what the President has requested. I want to just outline that. The President put forth his recommendations which should be in this emergency supplemental. We have on top of that, as it relates to the Appropriations Committee, which I commend not only the chairman but the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the Appropriations Committee giving us an opportunity to vote on \$1.7 billion more for healthcare, defense healthcare, above what the President has called for.

\$450 million for posttraumatic stress, which is going to happen. This vote is going to come up tomorrow. That is very, very important. And counseling. We talk about families, you have to remember that there are men and women that have seen a lot, an awful lot, some things that we would never see. Members of this House, a few Members serve in the Reserves, some have served in the Guard, some have seen some of this. But the majority of Members of the Congress has not seen what these men and women have seen or gone through what they have gone through, seeing someone in the mess hall one day and not seeing them the next day, and hearing about what took place with them, that happened to them.

Sniper fire, improvised explosive devices, we could never understand that. But they come home with those real issues, and we have a number of members of our armed services that have admitted that they have issues mentally that they need help with. Now, let's think about it. We are talking about men and women of the armed services that admitted they have issues. How many of those have not?

We talk about preparation for when our troops come home. It is not just when you are in harm's way that some Members may say well, you know, it is important we take care of them. No, when they get home, we need to be there for them. \$450 million in traumatic brain injury care and research.

\$730 million for prevention healthcare.

\$20 million to address the problems at Walter Reed Hospital. I think it is important, and I think we have that chart here dealing with Walter Reed, that is so very, very important. The Washington Post broke the story saying that Walter Reed wasn't up to par.

Then you had U.S. News and World Report. We have a specialist here. We have troops, men and women in need, and I think it is important that you look at this Newsweek cover. If you have this at home, take a look at it. It just came out March 5, 2007. I think it is important that everyone pays attention and focuses on this.

We have to make sure we are here for them. \$14.8 million for burn care. For veterans care, \$1.7 billion more than what the President requested.

I want to stop there to say we put I believe \$3.7 billion in the continuing resolution. What do we mean when we say continuing resolution? We mean that the Republican Congress did not finish their work in passing all of their appropriations bills on time. The fact that they weren't able to do so, we were able to meet that shortfall.

Let me correct myself. \$2.7 billion that was a shortfall for that. We were able to put \$3.6 billion in January 31. The Democrats increased the veterans healthcare budget by \$3.6 billion. And that was prior to the story coming out about Walter Reed. We had several amendments on the floor where we tried to increase veterans healthcare because we knew already there were issues in VA hospitals, VA clinics, our veterans getting what they need, leave alone the number of troops and soldiers and also their families that we are going to put into the system of active and those that have left the military, the strain on it. That is when it comes down to planning, and that is already there.

But when you look at the \$1.7 billion more than the President asked for, we are talking about \$550 million to address the backlog of maintaining VA health care facilities that were intended to prevent veterans from experiencing a situation similar that they found at Walter Reed.

\$250 million for medical administration to be able to bring on sufficient personnel to support the growing number of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans and to maintain the level of service at all VA facilities and for veterans.

\$229 million for treatment for a growing number of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans.

\$100 million for contracting mental healthcare, with the funding to allow the VA to contract with private mental healthcare providers to ensure that Iraq and Afghanistan veterans are seen in a timely manner. I think this is an important point.

We have veterans now, Members, that are waiting, not hours, not weeks, but months, and it is real really unfortunate they have to do so. I told the story about a friend of mine that was in a VA hospital that had my cellular number in his cell phone, and he called me and said, "Kendrick, things are not going the way they are supposed to go. I am waiting to see a specialist, and I have been here for some time and I haven't seen one and I don't think I am going to see one." He was admitted.

Of course, my office called. We were in a truck moving around. My office called the administrator of the hospital, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure not only did he have the specialist, he had the head of the department of the area that he needed assistance in, and he got what he needed.

But, guess what? Every American, every American, every family member of a veteran, doesn't have the cell number of a Member of Congress. That shouldn't be the requirement for service, and that is why we are trying to respond to it.

It is also important, as I talk about readiness and support for our troops, \$2.5 billion more to address the current readiness crisis that is the situation on stateside for our troops, including those that are better equipped and trained.

It is important that we make sure that our National Guard units are equipped. Mr. MURTHA, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, has said there is not a National Guard unit that is at a point of readiness right now, Mr. Speaker. They are not ready? Why? Because half of their equipment is in Iraq. Why? Because the training has not been taking place because of the lack of funding to be able to allow them to be battle ready. I think it is a disservice for those who have volunteered to serve our country.

You have \$1.4 billion more for military housing allowance, \$311 million more to make sure that you have the mine resistant ambush protection, which we call MRAP, for the vehicles in Iraq at this time. Everything that the military has asked for to make sure that our men and women don't come back in a way that this specialist had to come back.

She didn't have a choice, Mr. Speaker. Members, by voting for this supplemental, you are going to give her and many other people like her an opportunity to know that we have done everything possible that we can do here in the Congress to avoid what has happened to so many of our men and women that are going in for treatment, physical therapy, to make sure that we can avoid misfortune from happening to them, even though they keep the spirit that we ask them to keep, and these are the most resilient men and women in our society that are citizens.

I think it is important also to look, when I talked about the size of the military, \$2.3 billion for the full cost of fielding an additional 36,000 Army troops and 9,000 Marines, and also \$720 million as it relates to military construction costs. I think it is important that we look at this.

This is exactly what I was stating earlier. Members want to talk about readiness for voting against this bill? You are saying you are fine with the status quo. We don't know when the next conflict is going to take place. We don't know when. We asked the Army, why do you have soldiers rotating in

120 days when they just served several months, almost a year, and beyond a year in Iraq?

We don't have the troops. That is what the Army is saying. The Marines are saying we are stretched thin. They are asking for help, and we are saying we are there to help them, and it is in this bill, and I think it is important that Members understand that.

I could not go to Iraq, which I am going to be going again for the third time, and look a marine, soldier, sailor, airman, Coast Guard person, in the face and say that I am there for you if I voted against the supplemental.

Mr. Speaker, I go back to say that I voted for the Republican version of the supplemental. I believe we should have redeployment, but the last thing that I want to do as a Member of Congress, the last thing that I want to do is vote against our men and women having what they need when they are in harm's way. That is the last thing I want to do. There has to be a really rough day for me not to vote to support these troops.

I know that there are some Members that are going to do what they need to do, but I just want to make sure, especially for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, those conversations that I have had with many of my friends, they say, "Our leadership tells us that we need to vote against it." In the Appropriations Committee, some of my good friends on the other side of the aisle, the leadership said that.

Well, what about what our troops are saying? What about what their families are saying? What about our responsibility as men and women of the U.S. Congress?

Of course, I am not a general. I am not even a sergeant. I am not even a specialist in the Army. But I have been elected and federalized by my constituents to come here and represent them and the United States of America and make sure that we carry out our responsibility as Members of Congress to have oversight.

It is not making decisions here in the Chamber. It is oversight. What is wrong with the Iraqi government having to meet benchmarks? Let's just put it this way, Members. How long have we been talking about, and I do mean talking, about the training of Iraqi troops to secure their own country? How long? I just want to know how long. We have been talking about it I know for at least 3 years, which this is a war in its fifth year.

For at least 3 years there has been a strong conversation about training Iraqi troops, taking over patrols. They have a brigade now taking over a city. We look the next couple of months, U.S. troops are riding side-by-side with Iraqi troops, and in some cases it is a U.S. patrol, because that is what we are down to. A coalition of the few. Great Britain has already said, you know, guess what, folks? We are out of here. We have done our mission. Saddam Hussein is gone, has gone on to

another place. His two sons are gone. And they know it is a civil war going on right now in Iraq and they know full well that the key to Iraq, using the Iraq Study Group, I must add, and also every other expert as it relates to Iraq, will not be solved militarily.

□ 2230

It will not be solved militarily. Diplomacy is going to play a big role. Unless we start to endorse diplomacy, and Members are coming to the floor and saying, by passing this bill, we are saying we are surrendering.

Let me go back to what President Bush said. He was asked during the last campaign when would there be a victory. Well, there won't be a victory.

What he meant by that by saying there will not be a time when someone will go and hand a flag over to the United States and say "you won." That is not going to happen. That is not going to happen. So for Members thinking there is going to be some big conversation at Little Big Horn or whatever the case may be for those historians that are around, that is not going to happen.

If you are waiting for an insurgent to come up and say let's sign an agreement and say, let me borrow this pen. This pen is fine. I will sign right here to say we surrender to the great U.S. military. That is not going to happen, ladies and gentlemen, and every Member of Congress has to know that. So to say we are going to hang around officiating a U.S. war, and losing two to three troops on average to sniper fire and IEDs, just to say we are tough and we are going to keep riding until we can't ride any more, we are moving into \$525 billion-plus, with a B, in spending in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Afghanistan is a worthy cause because they had everything to do with 9/11. Because of Iraq, the Taliban and al Qaeda still live in Afghanistan, and they are getting stronger because of the lack of oversight by this Congress and the White House saying we need to send more troops because we have the coalition of the few who are leaving Iraq. So we have to continue to send brigades and troops into Iraq. This supplemental is moving in a new direction. It is moving in the direction of oversight saying that the President of the United States put benchmarks on the Iraqi Government, and in this bill it addresses that. If they don't meet those benchmarks, we start reversing our troops out. If we have an unwilling government in Iraq saying we can continue to do what we are doing because the Americans are going to be here, that is not so. The American people are far beyond several Members of Congress on this issue. Democrats and Republicans and Independents know full well that the reaction in Iraq of saying we are going to continue to send military in and some bureaucrat over at the Department of Defense saying, well, regardless of the fact that they had enough downtime, we are going to

send them anyway because we have to keep over 140,000 troops in harm's way, just in Iraq. In this bill it goes against that theory.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me just clarify. Does it tie the hands of the administration? No, it doesn't. It says if it is within the national interest of national security, you have to come before Congress and justify stepping out of what we want to pass here in this House. It doesn't do anything to the President. It doesn't tie the hands of the military. It says if you are going to do something outside of the rules that you have already set, you have to come before Congress and let us know what you are doing. What's wrong with that?

Newsweek, Time, and other periodicals that are weekly, and some daily, have asked, Is the President listening? What is the President thinking?

The American people are saying they want to do certain things as it relates to Iraq, but they don't want to be in the middle of a civil war.

The Department of Defense 2 weeks ago admitted there is a civil war in Iraq. They said that 2 weeks ago, and it has been going on for over a year. The media 6 months ago said we are now calling it a civil war. And the Department of Defense just came to grips with that.

I am going to tell you, there are four star generals that are friends of mine that know full well and have told me, Just between you and I, Congressman, we are in a civil war.

But the administration had to give the okay. So, you know, things are getting tough now, and you go ahead. You can say it, yeah.

That is the kind of DOD that we have right now. When I say DOD, the Department of Defense. This bill unearthed that kind of philosophy. We want the Department of Defense to be professionals. We want our three and four star generals and our people in harm's way to make the decisions and come before Congress and tell us the truth, not because someone in the White House or someone in the Department of Defense said if you tell it, there is going to be a price to pay.

Mr. Speaker, I have a list of generals that have paid that price that have said otherwise than what the Department of Defense wanted them to share.

One thing that is good, Secretary Rumsfeld is gone, and that is good. I am glad he is gone from the Department of Defense. I asked him politely, Maybe you want to consider retiring after Abu Ghraib. When you have the kind of power over DOD, it smothers other ideas. This is not something in DOD. This was printed in newspapers. If you disagreed with the Secretary of Defense, you had a problem. We want to fight against that.

I want to talk about my colleagues on the other side. My good friend who used to be the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he said he never felt stronger against what was going on as relates to the surge. They are going

to have an opportunity to vote on the supplemental.

You had Senator HAGEL who is also a Republican and I consider a good person. He said: "I think the speech that was given last night," and this was after the President presented his plan for the surge, "by the President represents the most dangerous foreign policy blunder in this country since Vietnam. If it is carried out, it will be resisted." That is Senate Foreign Relations Committee testimony of 1-11-07. It goes on and on. Senator SNOWE, Senator COLLINS, Senator COLEMAN, Senator SMITH, Senator BROWNBACK, Senator SPECTER, Senator BUNNING, and on and on and on. Senator SUNUNU.

So we can go on and on talking about the justification of third-party validators that are here. And then we have generals, Mr. Speaker, that have said otherwise against what this administration is proposing. The President has threatened to veto this supplemental. I wonder why. It is his words that he said here at that podium that the Iraqi Government has to be held accountable because we will not be there.

We used his words and put it on paper, put it into law. Here is the bill. It is on the Internet. Folks can read it. Every Member has a copy. There is no secret. It is not in some back room, it is not like, I have not seen the bill yet. H.R. 1591. You can read about all of the good things that are in here that are already Department of Defense regulations. That is what the President said when he made his surge speech and the accountability that is being placed on the Iraqi Government.

The Iraq Study Group, it is in here. Their recommendations are in here. It is nothing new. They were bipartisan, appointed by the President of the United States.

All we are saying is we are going to hold you to your word. What is wrong with that? Whatever happened to those good old days, if you say it, you are going to do it? What is wrong with that?

I don't know what the problem is, Members, but the only problem I can find with holding you to your word is probably politics, partisan politics. When we look at national security, there is no room for that.

Let's talk about some of these military leaders that have raised a concern about the escalation.

General Colin Powell, can't say enough about him, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, former Secretary of State. That is some resume. "I am not persuaded that another surge of troops in Baghdad for the purpose of suppressing this continued violence, this civil war will work."

That is General Colin Powell. It is not Kendrick Meek. And he is a Republican. He is just being an American when he said this. I know General Powell, and he is a friend.

General Wesley Clark, retired, former Supreme Allied Commander of

Europe of NATO. This is a man who led us in Bosnia. He said troops surge and accountability will be seen as rhetoric. The bottom line of what he is saying is that the accountability of what we say that we want to be accountable for in Iraq as it relates to security is not going to see itself through.

General McCaffrey, who is retired, he said: "It is a foolish idea. Our allies will leave us."

Mr. Speaker, that is what has happened.

"Make no mistake about that, most will be gone by the summer." This is what he said. And sure enough, they are going to be gone by the summer.

These are our decorated members of the military that are saying this. So when Members come to the floor and start calling Members names and calling the Speaker names and calling the Speaker "general" and carrying on and trying to make a point and trying to sensationalize the obvious, it is not serving our troops well and it is not serving our country well.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to close with this: we have a responsibility as Americans and also as Members of the House to make sure that we follow through on what we said and told our constituents that we would do, that we would come as thinkers to this process and that we would represent them in the best way possible.

For the men and women that allow us to salute one flag, for those who have served in the past, we thank them and honor them. Let's honor them tomorrow when we come to this floor and vote for this emergency supplemental. We had a nonbinding resolution a couple of weeks ago that said we were against the escalation of troops in Iraq. This bill and this emergency supplemental is binding, and it has meat and teeth on it on behalf of those in harm's way, and even those that have served. In this bill we are taking care of the needs of not only military but military families. We are providing homeland security with the necessary funding that they need. And so when you think about, when you pray about what you are going to do tomorrow, think about those that are counting on us to represent them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker and majority leader for allowing me to come to the floor tonight. I want to thank the Members of the House for listening. It is always a true honor to address the House.

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) for 2 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. First let me tell the gentleman from Georgia I appreciate him trying to save some money. I think his efforts, though, are a year late. If you want to look for Katrina fraud, look for Katrina fraud that was perpetrated by the Bush administration.

In south Mississippi we had 40,000 people at one point living in FEMA trailers. We are grateful for every one

of them, but those trailers were delivered by a friend of the President, Riley Bechtel, a major contributor to the Bush administration. He got \$16,000 to haul a trailer the last 70 miles from Purvis, Mississippi down to the gulf coast, hook it up to a garden hose, hook it up to a sewer tap and plug it in; \$16,000.

So the gentleman never came to the floor once last year to talk about that fraud. But now little towns like Waveland, Bay Saint Louis, Pas Christian, that have no tax base because their stores were destroyed in the storm, a county like Hancock County where 90 percent of the residents lost everything, or at least substantial damage to their home, he wants to punish Bay Saint Louis, he wants to punish Waveland, he wants to punish Pas Christian.

* * *

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire as to whether or not those words are eligible to be taken down.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot render an advisory opinion on that point.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand that his words be taken down.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today until 4:30 p.m. on account of attending a memorial service.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLEIN of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HILL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SCHWARTZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KINGSTON) to revise and

extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today and March 23.

Mr. PEARCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, for 5 minutes, March 27.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOX, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 23, 2007, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

921. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Vehicle Fleet Report on Alternative Fuel Vehicles for fiscal year 2006, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 13218; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

922. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mariner Licensing and Documentation Program Restructuring and Centralization; Correction [USCG-2006-25535] (RIN: 1625-ZA09) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

923. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Amendments [USCG-2001-10881] (RIN: 1625-AA36) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

924. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Waters Surrounding M/V TONG CHENG, HI [COTP Honolulu 07-001] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

925. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rates for Pilotage on the Great Lakes [USCG-2006-24414] (RIN: 1625-AB05) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

926. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Amendments; Marine Safety Center Address Change [USCG-2007-26953] (RIN: 1625-ZA12) received March 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.