I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of victory in Iraq and in

support of our troops. But I also rise to oppose this Democratic

defeatist resolution and I hope to provide some historical perspective

to help the American people understand what the Democrats plan to do

this year.

Make no mistake about it, this resolution is about polls. National

polling before November's elections showed a majority of Americans were

opposed to cutting off funds for the war but were generally unhappy

with events on the ground. Now, this polling data led the Democratic

message machine to create a ``we support the troops, don't support the

war but won't cut off funding'' position. Much like Majority Leader

Hoyer's empty promises to allow a Republican alternative to this

defeatist resolution, the Democrats are now following polls and slowly,

piece by piece, bit by bit, revising their stance on defunding the war.

Due to their majority status, this resolution will pass, and soon

after the

passage, I suspect that Congressman Murtha and others will move to

defund the war the same way the Democratic-controlled Congress defunded

the Vietnam War over a several-year period. They will do so in a

piecemeal fashion with various amendments to appropriation bills,

always avoiding the term ``defunding'' at all costs.

Before we have even concluded this debate, our Speaker has already

said a vote of disapproval will set the stage for additional Iraq

legislation, which will be coming to the House floor. I ask our

Speaker, what is your additional Iraq legislation?

The only difference between what the Democrats will soon attempt to

do and what they did in the late 1960s and early 1970s is that they

will continue to say publicly that they support the troops, instead of

speaking, as Senator Kerry did, in front of a congressional committee

of the atrocities of the so-called baby killers. The poisonous

atmosphere of those times resulted in the military prohibiting all

military personnel in the metropolitan Washington area from wearing

their uniforms in public out of safety concerns.

Now, two of the most crippling amendments of the Vietnam War were

passed in 1969 and 1973. In 1969, Senator John Sherman Cooper of

Kentucky cosponsored an amendment prohibiting the use of ground troops

in Laos and Thailand. In August of 1973, the Congress passed the

Fulbright-Aiken amendment, which cut off all funding for U.S. military

forces in or over or from the shore of North Vietnam, South Vietnam,

Laos or Cambodia.

President Nixon's approval ratings in 1973 were dismally low, and he

was close to resigning as a result of the Watergate scandal, and his

weakened position emboldened the Democrats to take extreme actions. I

would say that some of their actions may have bordered on treasonous,

but they have never been judicially challenged.

Our current President has an approval rating nearly as low now as

they did then. Democrats are feeling emboldened to challenge our

Commander in Chief during a time of war specifically for political

gain.

It has also been said that this nonbinding resolution will not affect

troop morale. If so, why not amend this nonbinding resolution to send a

copy to every man and woman fighting in Iraq, along with a record of

each vote. That is right, we don't get a chance to have any amendments.

What is important here are the President's words and his actions. He

has ordered more combat forces to Iraq. He has extended the tours of

some forces already in country. Let us be perfectly clear, 14 of the 18

provinces in Iraq are secure. These additional forces will help restore

overall order and provide a stable environment for the political

process from within which to work. Now, I cannot assure all of my

constituents that the recent developments in Iraq will result in a

quick or certain victory in Iraq. But I can assure my constituents and

my colleagues that Democrats cannot say with absolute certainty that

there is no military solution to the war in Iraq.

I must also point out several other recent Democratic statements that

I take issue with, like the one from over this weekend, where a Senator

with Presidential ambitions said that more than 3,000 lives were

wasted. Of course, he clarified his remarks, because he forgot about

the secret Democratic memo that this isn't the 1970s anymore, and

trashing the military is no longer acceptable.

It reminds me of a former Presidential candidate who said that those

who joined our Army were only stupid people. Of course, after the polls

came in, he clarified his remarks because he saw they were not being

taken very well.

Back to the polls, only 15 percent of the public expressed initial

support for the first President Bush to invade Iraq in 1991. Many in my

own Republican Party vehemently opposed FDR in World War II. During the

Civil War, there was a congressional committee that met officially and

unofficially on a regular basis to critique President Lincoln's

performance in nearly every battle the Union waged. Does history now

reflect these?

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the rest of my comments be inserted in the

Record.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of victory in Iraq and in support of

our troops.

I rise to oppose this Democratic defeatist resolution and I hope to

provide some historical perspective to help the American people

understand what the Democrats plan to do this year.

Make no mistake about it--this resolution is about polls. National

polling before November's elections showed a majority of Americans were

opposed to cutting off funds for the war, but were generally unhappy

with events on the ground.

This polling data led the Democratic message machine to create a ``we

support the troops, don't support the war, but won't cut off funding''

position. Much like Majority Leader Hoyer's empty promises to allow a

Republican alternative to this defeatist resolution, the Democrats are

now following polls and slowly, piece by piece, bit by bit, revising

their stance on defunding the war.

Due to their majority status, this resolution will pass and soon

after the passage, I suspect Congressman Murtha and others will move to

defund the war in the same way the Democratic controlled congress

defunded the Vietnam war over a several year period. They will do so in

a piecemeal fashion with various amendments to appropriations bills and

avoid the term ``defunding'' at all costs. Before we have even

concluded this debate, our Speaker has already said, ``A vote of

disapproval will set the stage for additional Iraq legislation, which

will be coming to the House floor.'' I say to Speaker Pelosi what is

your additional Iraq legislation?

This immoral approach will slowly squeeze off funding and support and

become a self fulfilling prophecy for the Democratic party--a party

fixated on the 2008 election and ``intoxicated'' by their new majority

status.

The only difference between what the Democrats will soon attempt to

do and what they did in the late 60's and early 70's is they will

continue to say publicly they support the troops, as Senator Kerry did

in front of a congressional committee, of the atrocities of the so-

called ``baby-killers.'' The poisonous atmosphere of those times

resulted in the military prohibiting all military personnel in the

Metropolitan Washington area from wearing their uniforms in public, out

of safety concerns.

Two of the most crippling amendments of the Vietnam war were passed

in 1969 and 1973. In 1969, Senator John Sherman Cooper (R-KY)

cosponsored an amendment prohibiting the use of ground troops in Laos

and Thailand. In August 1973 the Congress passed the Fulbright-Aiken

amendment which cut off all funding for U.S. military forces in, or

over, or from the shore of North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos or

Cambodia.

President Nixon's approval ratings in 1973 were dismally low and he

was close to resigning as a result of the Watergate scandal. His

weakened position emboldened Democrats to take extreme actions. Some of

their actions may have bordered on treasonous, but have never been

judicially challenged. Our current President has an approval rating

nearly as low; and now, as they did then, Democrats are feeling

emboldened to challenge our Commander-in-Chief during a time of war,

for political gain.

Last week the Democratic-controlled United States Senate attempted to

debate various non-binding resolutions about the Iraq war. I must admit

I found it interesting to hear Majority Leader Reid say that voting on

a non-binding resolution would show the American people where they

stood on the war. Senator Reid and the Democratic leadership of both

the House and Senate have made it very clear where they stand on the

war--they are opposed to winning the war, claim they were tricked into

supporting it and will do anything in their power to cut off all

funding to the war.

I encourage Democrats to put forth a bill that eliminates all funding

for the Iraq war along with an accompanying statement of non-support

for the deployed troops. This would show their true colors and allow

the Democrats to be intellectually honest.

It has been said this non-binding resolution will not affect troop

morale. If so, why not amend this nonbinding resolution to send every

man and woman fighting in Iraq a copy of it, along with the recorded

vote.

Oh--that's right, no amendments.

This would also stand in stark contrast to their most recent act of

hypocrisy--voting to confirm General David Patraeus, wishing him luck

and then moving to undercut his efforts soon after he left the Capitol

to begin his journey to Iraq.

More importantly, we need to achieve real progress in Iraq. We have

come to a critical juncture and must make sure the price that has been

paid--the blood of our young men and women--results in victory. To

ensure a real and enduring victory, our Commander-in-Chief is moving

forward with a new plan. Some in Congress and the media are debating

whether it is a new strategy, a new set of

tactics or no change at all. This political posturing is unimportant to

the Specialist or Corporal walking point in Baghdad or Al-Anbar

province.

What is important are the President's words and his actions. He has

ordered more combat forces to Iraq and has extended the tours of some

forces already in the country. Their mission is to restore order to the

4 provinces in Iraq that remain volatile. Let us be perfectly clear, 14

of the 18 provinces are secure. These additional forces will help

restore overall order and provide a stable environment for the

political process within to work.

Today we have received reports from various sources that the radical

cleric Al-Sadr may have fled to Iran as a result of the American and

Iraqi forces cracking down on his militias and top aides. Iraqi forces

are showing up to their appointed duty locations in excess of 70

percent of the time. The Iraqi government is taking the politically

difficult step of forcing some Baghdad residents to vacate homes they

unlawfully moved into during the war. There is also talk of stricter

curfews and closing the borders with Syria and Iran for 30 days--all of

this talk coming from the Iraqis.

I cannot assure my constituents these recent developments will result

in a quick or certain victory in Iraq. I can assure my constituents and

my colleagues that Democrats cannot say with absolute certainty that

there is no military solution to Iraq. I also must point out several

other recent Democratic statements that I take issue with.

One Senator with Presidential ambitions claimed that the more than

3,000 lives lost in the war had been wasted--he then immediately

clarified his remarks because he had forgotten the secret Democrat memo

stating that this isn't the 70's and trashing the military is no longer

acceptable. This reminds me of a former presidential candidate's

comments alleging that only stupid people end up in the Army and in

Iraq. Of course, another ``clarification'' was issued soon after these

comments since 2-3 days of polling indicated that the remarks were not

well received.

Back to polls--only 15 percent of the public expressed initial

support for the first President Bush to invade Iraq in 1991. Many in my

own Republican party vehemently opposed FDR in World War II and during

the Civil War there was a congressional committee that met officially,

and unofficially, on a regular basis to critique President Lincoln's

performance in nearly every battle the Union waged.

Does history now reflect that these three conflicts were wrong for

America to engage in? I think not. Resolute leaders bucked short term

public opinion for the good of the country in the long term. That is

why we elect Presidents and that is what we should demand of them.

To date, mistakes have been made and the President has acknowledged

them. We must, however, win this war. I believe immediate withdrawal

will destabilize the region and cause us to return there in the future,

as we have had to do in many regions throughout our history. We cannot

fight a war based on polls and emotions. We must take actions that will

preserve and enhance our national security now and beyond the next

election, the next news cycle or the next opinion poll.