Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished

ranking member for yielding time.

The supplemental before us today is a case study of what happens when

one branch of the government tries to do the job assigned to another.

It is hard to say what this will be known for, unconstitutional

legislation that would allow Congress to micromanage a war, or a crude

political compromise designed to win votes.

One thing though is perfectly clear: The bill is a sham. Don't be

fooled by the rhetoric you will hear today. The managers on the other

side of the aisle will try to convince you that we are addressing

pressing needs, providing critical resources for our troops in the

field and other so-called disasters here at home. But make no mistake,

the bill will only hamstring our troops, provide fodder for our enemies

abroad, cause a disastrous and precipitous cut and run, and

indescribable damage to America's reputation in the vital Mideast and

worldwide.

It also breaks the bank here at home by providing funds for pork-

laden Democrat wish-lists. What does dollars for a spinach producer

have to do with providing help for our troops in Iraq? What does money

to a salmon farmer have to do with providing support for our troops in

Iraq? What about aquaculture money? What has that got to do with troops

in Iraq?

And for those Members who have surrendered their better judgment for

pork for their districts, the majority adds $2.5 billion in so-called

emergency

homeland security items to sweeten the pot.

Don't get me wrong, many of the majority's homeland security adds are

worthy and important items, such as nuclear and explosive detection

systems and additional aircraft for the northern border, things I have

supported in the past and continue to support, but they are in no way a

2007 emergency. They can be handled regularly in the 2008 bills. In

every instance these bills could and should be addressed through the

2008 process.

By including them as 2007 emergencies, the majority is simply trying

to look strong on security and buy down requirements to free up funds

in fiscal 2008 for additional spending. While I support homeland

security spending, I support it in a fiscally responsible way.

Let me turn to the real issue under debate today now. To the defense

provisions that will cause the precipitous withdrawal of our forces

from Iraq and take from a President his constitutional powers of

Commander in Chief, there is a very good reason why our Founding

Fathers gave the executive branch the responsibility to conduct war.

The House of Representatives is made up of 435 individuals; lawyers,

doctors, teachers, farmers, some with military experience, some

without. It is not made up of 435 military commanders who possess the

ability to manage a war. We have military professionals to do that. Why

are we attempting to insert our military judgment, which can cause the

death or injury of our troops, when we are neither trained nor skilled

to do so? Leave the management of the war to the trained professionals

who know what they are doing.

If your aim is to end the war, and it is, this is the absolute wrong

way to do it. The right way, bring forth a resolution or a bill to

reverse the original authorization for the war. But as long as you have

authorized the war, please don't tie the hands of our great soldiers

and their commanders behind their backs in carrying out your

authorization, still on the books, to fight this war against terror.

Mr. Speaker, this committee has lost its way on this one. It is a

shameful turn of events. Handcuffing the authorities of the President,

undermining our troops in harm's way and exploiting worthy government

programs for political gain is beyond the pale. Our troops and our

Nation deserve better. They deserve our undying support.

I urge a ``no'' vote.