I thank the gentleman from Texas, who is a real American

hero, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution we are considering does not do a single

thing to help our troops or to achieve the goals of America, our allies

or the Iraqi people.

Congress is spending an entire week on a nonbinding resolution that,

even if it passes, will not change the course of action in Iraq. Our

time could have been spent much better debating real issues, such as

how to most effectively win the war that terrorists are waging on us.

Now, personally, I am skeptical that an increase of 20,000 troops

will make the difference and that it will stabilize Baghdad and Iraq.

But, for me, the question is, to whom should we listen regarding

operational decisions in Iraq? Should we listen to the recommendations

of the U.S. military or to the politicians in Washington?

And as an Air Force veteran, I think we should accept the

recommendations of our military. And in that respect, 2 weeks ago the

General in command of ground forces in Baghdad said, and I quote, ``By

bringing more troops in, it provides us the opportunity to work with

them, to provide more time to defeat this threat, which is both an al

Qaeda threat as well as sectarian violence.''

I have visited in Germany in the medical facilities with our wounded

troops from Iraq. A member of my family served a year in a combat zone

in Baghdad, and I am incredibly proud of our men and women in the

military. They are talented. They are dedicated. They are professional

and they are the best in the world. And we owe them a tremendous debt

of gratitude.

Now, even though it is nonbinding, there is, I think, a large

omission in this resolution. While it does compliment the actions of

our military men and women, nowhere does it commit to continue

providing funding for troops in the field. And at a time when some in

this town are talking about cutting off funding for our troops, I think

we should commit to providing full funding for our Armed Forces as long

as they are in the field.

Now, there is no guarantee that this troop buildup will be

successful, or that the Iraqis will succeed in finally taking over the

security situation in a responsible way. But what we do know is, at

this point there is not a better plan proposed which has a chance of

victory. And we also know that failure in Iraq threatens the security

of the United States, the security of the Middle East, and, in fact,

the whole world.

Early last year I had the privilege of leading a delegation to Asia,

where we met with the Prime Ministers of India, of Thailand and

Singapore. And those are all countries that are now and have been under

terrorist attack. All of them agreed with the need to cooperate for

security purposes, and with the importance of winning the war against

terrorism in Iraq because of the consequences of not winning would have

on the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution has two purposes. First, it rejects the

only plan which has been suggested by military leaders with a chance of

success in Iraq. Second, it begins this Congress down a path which ends

with cutting off funding for our troops and abandoning our foreign

policy because of failed congressional fortitude. I am opposed to the

resolution and opposed to our micromanaging of the war on terror.