Mr. Speaker, as we approach the final day of the

debate on this resolution, I have enjoyed the debate thoroughly. I have

found it humorous at times. Our friends on the other side have tried

every argument they could possibly muster. They have talked about

President Clinton, they have talked about Vietnam, they are trying to

bring up Israel, and my friend from Indiana also mentioned the issue of

consistency. And I find it funny that the pro-life, self-proclaimed

pro-life party is the party that wants to keep extending the war. I

find it ironic that all of the great budget hawks in the Republican

Party want to throw $8 billion a month to keep going and going and

going as we borrow the money from China.

But I have also found the debate, at times, disappointing, where

Members of the other side have questioned our side and they have said,

whose side are we on? And how can we say that we support the troops,

and that we are, somehow, unpatriotic.

And I would just like to say that when the Republican Party and this

President didn't send enough troops, we didn't call you unpatriotic.

And when you sent our young soldiers over there without the body armor,

we never called you unpatriotic.

Mr. Speaker, we never called the other side

unpatriotic when they sent our soldiers over without enough body armor.

And when they didn't send enough up-armored Humvees, we never called

anybody unpatriotic. And now, when the next batch goes over without the

proper jammers or up-armored kits, we don't call you unpatriotic.

Now we have called you incompetent. We said you are incapable, and we

said you are derelict of your oversight responsibility. But never, Mr.

Speaker, have we called anyone in this House unpatriotic.

Now let me speak to the resolution. This is very simple. It says two

things: We support our troops and we do not support the escalation. It

is very simple and here is why. We have already done this, Mr. Speaker.

We have already done this. We have already tried the escalation and it

has not worked. From November to January of 2005, we escalated by

18,000 troops, boots on the ground, and the number of daily attacks

increased by 17 percent. From June to October of 2005, we increased by

21,000 boots on the ground, and the number of daily attacks increased

by 29 percent. And from May to November of 2006, 17,000 more boots on

the ground, and the number of daily attacks increased by 80 percent.

This escalation has not worked and it will not work. The number of

insurgents have increased from 5,000 in 2003 to between 20,000 and

30,000 to October of 2006. So this is very simple.

And I want to make just a few more points, Mr. Speaker. One is this.

With the last vote for the war, regardless of what party you were in or

how you voted, we assumed that the President and the Secretary of

Defense would send our troops over there with the proper equipment. But

with this escalation, Mr. Speaker, we know that the 21,500 troops that

are going to go over there will not have the proper Humvee kits, the

up-armor for their HUMVEES. They won't have the proper jamming devices

or enough of them, and they won't have the number of trucks that they

need.

You now know it. So if you vote against this resolution, you are

voting to send our troops over there without the proper equipment

before it could be excused because we trusted the President, assumed,

but now we know.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot over the last couple

of days about the American Revolution and the Civil War and World War

II. Well, Mr. Speaker, our President today is not Washington, he is not

Lincoln, and he is not Roosevelt. So I think our Republican colleagues

should take the advice of the Secretary of Defense, and that is you go

to war with the President you have. You don't go to war with the

President you wish you had.

Would the gentleman yield?

As I was watching the debate prior to my speech, I

wrote down a quote that was stated by the gentleman from Indiana

looking at the Democrats saying, How can we say we support the troops?

Question mark.

Now, if that is not questioning the patriotism of our side, I don't

know what is.

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely possible and welcomed

under the Constitution of the United States to have disagreements about

how we need to handle troops deployments, how we need to handle our

situation in different wars. And it is not to be said that because one

party or one group of people have a different philosophy and a

different strategy, that somehow they are not supporting the troops.

Now, your party and your President, the Republican Party, Mr.

Speaker, and the Republican President are the ones who sent our kids to

battle without armor, without body armor. And it took Jack Murtha

months to uncover it, and then to finally get it paid for and

distributed. It was the Republican Party, Mr. Speaker, who sent kids

into battle without up-armored Humvees.

Now, nobody questioned the Republican Party's patriotism, and nobody

asked them if they supported the troops. Again, we called you

incompetent, we said you were incapable, we said you were derelict in

your duty, we said you should have provided oversight and you didn't.

But we never called you unpatriotic.