I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as The Washington Post says today: ``Altogether, the

House Democratic leadership has come up with more than $20 billion of

new spending, much of it wasted subsidies. And it makes us wonder how

$74 million to extend peanut storage payments or $250 million for MILC

subsidies will aid our troops.''

Perhaps my colleagues believe that these agricultural subsidies are

necessary, but I don't see how they are going to help us defeat

Islamist terrorists. Is this really what General Petraeus needs? Is

this what he asked for? No, it is not. And it is bad policy to start,

and it is worse by mixing it without backing of our forces in the

field.

It is not just the language that gives us pause here. If it is our

mission to win in Iraq, then we should not be making it more difficult

for our troops to succeed. Cutting off funding and micromanaging a war

does that, according to our commanders in the field. And as The Post

adds: ``The bill excludes the judgment of General Petraeus, excludes

the judgment of the U.S. commanders who would have to execute the

retreat that the bill mandates.''

And as The Post goes on to say: ``Democrats should not seek to use

pork to buy a majority for an unconditional retreat that the majority

does not support.''