I thank the chairman, and I rise today in strong

opposition to 1591.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my friend from Wisconsin, I have a

great deal of respect for the fights that he has fought on this floor

for over 30 years, but we do disagree.

Supplemental spendings are intended to provide additional funding for

programs and activities that are too urgent and pressing to wait for

the regular appropriations process. To be clear, only emergency funds

should be included in this supplemental. Period. So if Democrats are

looking for an avenue to send money back to their districts, they

should look to regular order.

Last year when the Senate tried to include over $14 billion in

nonemergency funds in the supplemental, House Republicans demanded a

clean bill. And when the House sat down with the other body to

negotiate a final bill, we accepted nothing less than a supplemental

free of unrelated and nonemergency funding.

Why did we do that? Because we wanted to pledge the faithful support

of this Congress to the members of the armed services serving in harm's

way. This legislation should remain focused on the needs of the troops

and not become a vehicle for extraneous spending and policy proposals.

In yet another show of a different way, the same Members who screamed

for a straight up or down vote on minimum wage legislation just 1 year

ago are today trying to attach that legislation to a wartime

supplemental. And the very Members who voted to reinstitute PAYGO rules

just 2 months ago are here today casting fiscal responsibility to the

wind.

This bill should be limited to necessary funding for our troops

serving bravely in Iraq and around the world in the war on terror. I

ask my honorable Democratic friends how the Democrats can on the one

hand say they support our troops by providing them with money, but on

the other undermine them by telegraphing a date for their withdrawal

from Iraq.

Congress should under no circumstances micromanage the war and have

politicians making decisions that should be left to our Commander in

Chief and generals on the ground. Even The Washington Post and the Los

Angeles Times, hardly supporters of this administration, have

editorialized that this legislation oversteps the bounds of Congress

and both support a Presidential veto of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation and

think long and hard about its consequences. This bill is fiscally

irresponsible; it holds our troops hostage to nonemergency

spending and policy proposals, and it signals to the insurgents and

terrorists around the world a lack of American will to do what is

necessary to win the war on terror.

Vote ``no'' on H.R. 1591.