

and the rule of law, a voice for the voiceless, victims of human rights abuses, and he was a lion of the right to life. In every sense, life has lost its lion, and this movement will miss his roar.

Henry once quoted me on this floor from his favorite poet Tennyson from the poem "Ulysses." He said, by memory, "Though we are not now that strength which in old days moved heaven and earth, that which we are, we are, one equal temper of heroic hearts made weak by time and fate, but strong in will to strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

On all the great issues of the day, Henry Hyde strove, he sought, he found, he did not yield. May he rest in peace, and those of us who share his values and his principles not rest until the work he began is done.

□ 1030

THE PRESIDENT AND COMPASSIONATE CONSERVATISM

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, on Monday evening, the President hosted a holiday party for Members of Congress and others. A good time was had by all. It was a wonderful time and the President was a marvelous host, but I had to think in that moment about the holiday spirit and the idea of giving and caring for people who need something and providing for them.

I asked the President at that time to use some of his compassionate conservatism to help us get through this budget. There are people that need help with their heating bills this winter. There are people that need policemen and protection for their neighborhoods. There are people who have problems with illnesses in their families, whether it be cancer, Alzheimer's, diabetes or heart disease, which research dollars could help them with. There are people that need help with Head Start and education in this country and children that need health care.

Madam Speaker, I think in this Christmas season we ought to think about why we're here, who we should be helping and what we ought to be doing. Part of it is helping others and people who need a little bit more. The President was elected on an idea of compassionate conservatism. It's time to be compassionate. Part of that is being compassionate to take care of people here in America.

Bring it home, Mr. President.

IRAQ

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, back in January, a number of Members

of the House voted against a surge in Iraq which the President had promoted. Well, although that vote passed the House, it failed in the Senate, and we know the surge did take place and the surge has paid off. Civilian casualties in Iraq are down 20 percent; 75 percent in Baghdad. IED attacks are down by 50 percent, and we've nearly doubled the number of weapon caches that have been discovered this year from last year. Lots of good progress has been made.

And I don't blame the folks who are against Iraq for pushing the bill back in January that they did. I believe that there's plenty of room for honest disagreement on this war. But at the same time, here we are now and we need to continue funding for that war. There is a \$50 billion bridge fund. The President actually has asked Congress for \$196 billion, but Congress has indicated \$50 billion is all that we're willing to go at this point. But then there are some stipulations, some micro-management of the war.

I hope that we can have this bill on the floor of the House and have an honest debate on it and keep the spirit of agreeing to disagree agreeably.

IRAN AND THE ENERGY BILL

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, after all the fabrications and all the incompetence associated with Iraq, not to mention the human rights abuses in Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib, you wouldn't think that America could lose any more credibility, but now we understand the President was warned well in advance that there was new information on Iran's nuclear program; yet he continued with his bellicose rhetoric, even raising the specter of World War III.

Well, now we know. There is absolutely no excuse for going to war with Iran. But the fact is that if the President is still concerned about Iran, which he very much should be, he should read the rest of the National Intelligence Estimate which makes it clear that Iran is going to acquire even more wealth and, thus, power because of our dependency on oil.

So the best thing that the President can do if he's concerned about Iran is to sign the energy bill that we are considering today. We cannot continue our dependence upon foreign oil, and the first way to start moving in a new and more secure direction, is to sign the Energy Independence bill that will go to his desk very shortly.

TIME FOR A CHANGE OF COURSE IN IRAQ

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, while our Nation and our military are

paying a huge price for the continuing war in Iraq, the Iraqi Government itself refuses to take any steps needed to bring about political reconciliation. It has now been more than 320 days since the surge began. During that time, more than 860 American troops have been killed and we continue to spend more than \$10 billion in Iraq every month; yet the Iraqi Government still refuses to live up to the promises it made to President Bush when the surge began.

The government promised that the Iraqi Parliament would pass a national oil and gas bill. It hasn't.

The Iraqi Government also promised the President that its parliament would pass a de-Baathification law. It hasn't.

The government also promised to hold provincial elections. Once again, they have failed to follow through.

Madam Speaker, how much longer is President Bush going to sacrifice both our military and our Treasury for an Iraqi Government that refuses to make the difficult decisions that could possibly produce real stability in Iraq? It's time for a change of course in Iraq.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3120

Mr. PUTNAM. I ask unanimous consent, Madam Speaker, that my name be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 3120.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1585, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1585) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Hunter moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 1585 be instructed to agree to the following provisions:

(1) The provision contained in section 1536(b) of the Senate amendment, relating to

the sense of the Senate that the Senate should commit itself to a strategy that will not leave a failed state in Iraq and the Senate should not pass legislation that will undermine our military's ability to prevent a failed state in Iraq.

(2) The provisions contained in title XV of the House bill, relating to the authorization of additional appropriations for Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I yield myself such time as I might consume.

My colleagues, the Republican motion to instruct outlines the consequences of a failed state in Iraq and supports a clean war funding bill without a date certain to withdraw American troops from Iraq. And I would remind my colleagues that the motion to instruct goes to the Senate provision which passed by a nearly unanimous vote of 94-3.

Let me explain what it does. The Republican motion to instruct puts the House of Representatives on record acknowledging the consequences of a vote for a precipitous withdrawal from Iraq and not fully funding our troops and their missions. It instructs House conferees to accept Senate provision 1536 which states that it is the sense of Congress that a failed state in Iraq would become a safe haven for Islamic radicals, including al Qaeda and Hezbollah, who are determined to attack the United States and its allies.

The provision also notes that a failed state in Iraq could lead to a broader regional conflict involving Saudi Arabia, Iran, Syria and Turkey, and would lead to massive humanitarian suffering, including widespread ethnic cleansing and countless refugees and internally displaced persons, many of whom will be tortured and killed for having assisted coalition forces.

Senate provision 1536 concludes by stating that the Congress should commit itself to a strategy that will not leave a failed state in Iraq and should not pass legislation that will undermine our military's ability to prevent a failed state in Iraq.

Now, going to the aspect of the authorization of additional appropriations for Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, my colleagues, these are the funds that are essential in this ongoing war in two theaters, to keep the funds going, to keep the money going to operate our military forces so that we don't end up having to reach into the cash register and pull money out for ammunition, pull money out for training exercise, pull money out for important ongoing operations and activities here that are in fact assisting the war-fighting effort.

One example of those, of course, is the Joint Improvised Explosive Device

Defeat Organization, JIEDDO, which has a complicated name but very simply means developing capabilities against roadside bombs. That's a command that we set up to defeat IEDs in Iraq, and we are told now that it will run out of money within the next hundred days and may not have enough money to fund all urgent initiatives from Iraq and Afghanistan during that time.

□ 1045

I would remind my colleagues that the roadside bombs are being seen on a more widespread basis in Afghanistan now. There has been an understanding by the insurgents, by the Taliban, by al Qaeda in Afghanistan that those, in fact, are a deadly and effective system. And it makes no sense whatsoever for us to shortchange the accounts that are going toward the defeat of roadside bombs.

Another point that I would make is that we have been notified that the Pentagon will soon be required to lay off 100,000 civilian workers. Many of those workers are working on important projects that go to the heart of our ability to win in the war-fighting theaters. So this is a major, major mistake for this Congress, in the middle of an operation in two war-fighting theaters, to shortchange these accounts which will result in the military having to reach in the cash register, take money out of other accounts in the hope that at some point in the future next year we are going to be able to make up that money. So whatever your position on our operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, whether you think we should be there or not be there, every Member of this body says time and again, "We support the troops."

Madam Speaker, stripping this funding off, which is what we will do if we don't pass this motion to instruct, is very clearly a disservice to these 157,000 plus troops in Iraq and the 22,000 plus American troops fighting in Afghanistan right now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As my friend, Mr. HUNTER, the gentleman from California knows, both the House version of the Defense Authorization Act and the Senate version authorized supplemental funding for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. I say "authorized."

The Armed Services Committee has collectively supported authorizing this funding to ensure the continued relevance of the committee and to make sure that the specific purposes for which the President has requested funds are actually related to the wars.

In both the House and Senate versions of the bill, we have authorized this funding in a way that provides maximum flexibility for the leadership as well as for the appropriators. While we authorize funding, as my friend from California knows, nothing can

happen without further action on an appropriations bill, and it is those appropriations bills that have served as the vehicles for the Iraq debate.

The House recently passed a bridge supplemental fund that would change our policy in Iraq. We may very well have similar debates in the future, and I would hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would be forthcoming with their suggestions on how to address the strategic risk we incur by pursuing the President's failed policy. In the Defense Authorization Act, our committee, I expect, will act in conference to ensure that those debates can occur and that the House can work its will on future appropriations bills to restrain the President's Iraq war policy.

We all acknowledge that our troops have done a great job in Iraq. We owe them our thanks, our gratitude and our congratulations for their work as well as for their sacrifices. Their sweat and their blood have helped to reduce the level of violence in Iraq from the horrific levels of late 2006 and early 2007.

The original purpose of this surge was to reduce violence to provide the Iraqis with a chance for political reconciliation. Violence is down. It is time for the Iraqis to step up and take the hard steps toward reconciliation that will finish the job our wonderful troops have started. Yet they have refused to do this.

In response to this refusal, the House recently voted to begin to redeploy most of our troops out of Iraq and to change the nature of our involvement there. This policy is supported by a large majority of the American people who do not believe that we should continue to police a civil war when the Iraqis themselves refuse to take the hard steps to bring it to an end.

Well, we are not having the Iraq debate on the defense authorization bill. The supplemental authorization is intended to set the stage for that debate. That is an appropriations bill as all of us know. That is why the House and the Senate versions of the Defense Authorization Act, which is before us, included a supplemental authorization and why I suspect that the conference will do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) who is the ranking member on the Terrorism Subcommittee.

Mr. SAXTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I happen to believe that this motion to instruct is extremely important. I think it is extremely important for two reasons. First, as Mr. HUNTER pointed out, this provision provides instruction to authorize the full \$192 billion supplemental for the war spending bill without strings or date certain to withdraw American forces from Iraq. I think that is important. And I will say why a little bit later here. But I also I think it

is important to recognize, as this provision also does, that there are consequences for not carrying out our actions in Iraq and in other places in the world, for that matter, in a responsible fashion.

This measure instructs the House conferees to accept a provision that has already been passed by the Senate. It is known as provision 1536 which states that it is the sense of Congress that a failed state in Iraq would become a safe haven for Islamic radicals, including al Qaeda and Hezbollah, and others, who are determined to attack the United States here at home and our allies.

Let me speak to the first point to say why I think it is important that we go forward to authorize the full \$192 billion supplemental war spending bill. All of us should be students of history, particularly recent history. I know that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee is a great historian himself. But recent events I think are extremely important. Perhaps some of our colleagues here have not watched this as closely as perhaps some of us on the Armed Services Committee, but as we saw progress begin to take place in Iraq, many of us asked why. And I think it was universally accepted that one of the reasons was that the Sunni tribal leaders, for a couple of reasons, I believe, began to cooperate with our forces and our personnel who are there. One reason was in their own self-interest. They recognized that the time of wishing each other, that is Sunnis and Shias ill, was drawing to a close because the Iraqi people themselves were tired of the violence. So just like any of our neighbors here would be tired of violence under those circumstances, the Iraqis grew tired of it as well.

But the second reason I believe we began to make the progress that we see today is very simply that the Iraqi people became convinced, in spite of many days of rhetoric on this floor, became convinced that we weren't going to leave them, that we were going to stay and finish the job. And so the commitment that would be expressed by the passage of this language I think is extremely important.

But I also think it is important to recognize that the provision notes that a failed state in Iraq could lead to a broader regional conflict. There was a lot of talk here this morning on this floor and yesterday in the news media about the state of Iran, and why was it that in 2003 we now believe that they discontinued their effort to create nuclear weapons. Could it have been something that happened in their neighborhood? Could it have been the determination that our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines showed next door in Iraq? And could it be that the Iranian leadership recognized that there were actions that they needed to take in their best interest which perhaps included the discontinuation of their effort to create nuclear weapons?

Senate provision 1536 concludes by stating that the Congress should com-

mit itself to a strategy that will not leave a failed state in Iraq, that will continue the progress that we have seen in recent months and should not pass legislation that will undermine our military's ability to prevent a failed state in Iraq.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, let me point out the fact that both in the House version of the defense authorization bill as well as the Senate version of the bill there is positive reference to the threat of a failed state in Iraq. That is fully recognized in both pieces of legislation, and I appreciate the gentleman's comments thereon and hopefully correct and parallel language could be adopted in that regard.

I now, Madam Speaker, yield 5 minutes to my friend, my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Seapower (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman.

Madam Speaker, one of the things we ought to do in a democracy is when the other guy has a good idea, no matter what political party he's in, is to say that's a good idea. I would remind the gentleman that it was the Bush administration that classified the number of jammers in Iraq under a failed policy by Donald Rumsfeld that basically didn't want the moms and dads of Americans to know how few we had. It was this Congress that insisted that we have a jammer on every vehicle in Iraq to keep the improvised explosive devices from being remotely detonated. So, of course, I don't want those funds cut because I, along with others, worked to put those funds in the bill.

Along that same policy of "war by wishful thinking" from the Rumsfeld crowd was that we didn't need mine-resistant vehicles over there. The Bush administration only asked for 4,000. We were going to build over 15,000 because this Congress realized the importance of them, and that there are kids in Walter Reed today who would still have their limbs if we had built them sooner. There are kids in Mississippi graveyards who would still be alive if we had built them sooner. So of course we want those funds in the bill.

I fully support the gentleman's efforts. We have a lot of very good things in this bill, and it deserves to be funded, and the troops in Iraq need to know that we are going to fund the jammers they need to save their lives both over there and here because one of the problems with having too few jammers is that our troops in the United States that are training to go to Iraq still aren't seeing a jammer until they get to theater. And this is the device that is going to save their lives. This is the device that is going to save their limbs. And they need to be training with those things here in America so that the first time they don't see this device that's going to save their life is when they are traveling from Kuwait into

Iraq. That is the situation that still exists today that we are trying to fix.

The Bush administration asked for too few of these. Congress, in an earmark, said no, we are going to build them because they are going to save lives. The Bush administration asked for too few mine-resistant, ambush-protected vehicles. Congress, in an earmark, said no, we are going to build them because it is going to keep kids from losing their legs, and it is going to keep kids from losing their lives. So of course I am going to support this bill, I am going to support the gentleman's efforts, and I thank the chairman for putting together what I think is an excellent Armed Services defense authorization bill that is going to lead to fewer deaths in Iraq, fewer deaths in Afghanistan, and a stronger, and hopefully in the future, more peaceful world.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the last speaker for his statement and for his wonderful contribution on the Armed Services Committee in terms of working the jammer issues, and lots of other Members who have worked these important force protection issues. I think that we have proven on the committee that the wisdom of the committee and lots of Members who have gotten personally involved in this force protection issue have matched and at some times exceeded the Pentagon's own projections and projects.

□ 1100

I am reminded also that we manufactured and fielded 10,000 portable jammers, so that troops who are on foot could also have jammers, which had not been planned by the Pentagon. So I think he makes a good point. Of course, having these funds that are available in these supplementals that we can direct to force protection is a key aspect of our responsibility.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE).

Mrs. DRAKE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to instruct conferees. This motion would instruct House conferees to accept section 1536 of the Senate version of the national defense authorization, a provision which received near unanimous support on the other side of the Capitol. This section states, "A failed state in Iraq would become a safe haven for radicals, including al Qaeda and Hezbollah, who are determined to attack the United States and its allies." It goes on to state that "a failed state in Iraq would lead to a broader regional conflict, possibly involving Syria and Iran."

I would remind my colleagues that only a few short months ago, the President of Iran was quoted as saying that very soon we will be witnessing a great power vacuum in the region, and that Iran is willing to fill this void.

Madam Speaker, the other side has attempted over 40 times to wave a

white flag in Iraq. This motion would put this Chamber on record as supporting a policy of success in Iraq. Our goal must be the path that we are on; a stable, functioning Iraqi Government, who can be an ally with us in the war on terror and not the goal of our enemy, which is Iraq as the capital of their caliphate.

Madam Speaker, I visited Iraq this summer. I had the opportunity to meet with the Deputy Prime Minister, and I asked the question why Iraq had not passed the legislation that we were using as a benchmark. I told him I had heard he had the votes to pass the legislation.

His answer to me was quite surprising. He said, "Yes, I have the votes. I have 75 percent to pass the legislation." He said, "But if I do it, I will be cutting the Sunnis out of the government; they will have no voice and no power."

That is exactly the opposite of what their goal is in Iraq. I would maintain that the Iraqi Government is working very hard for stable institutions where no one group can take over power again.

We have all seen the efforts of our military and the surge are working, creating stability and security. And now we are seeing the best of all results, which is the Iraqi people themselves, who have chosen us and have chosen their government. And in the words of their own sheiks that we met, two Sunni and two Shia, they said, "We are working together for Iraq."

I urge my colleagues to support this motion in the best interests of our national security and working together for Iraq.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER), who is the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, who led a fabulous effort this year. For the first time in 13 years, Democrats are in the majority and wrote a defense bill that came to the floor and passed with almost 400 votes. I think that is a record, and I think it speaks very much for the bipartisan effort that we had on the committee.

In my subcommittee, Strategic Forces, which includes many different issues, including missile defense, the entire nuclear weapons portfolio, our part of the bill passed through on a voice vote and then came to the committee and was supported by virtually all members. So I think we have a very good bill. I think that the conference between the House and the Senate will be a productive one. It will be a time for us to mesh these issues.

But as we so often say in Washington, no good deed goes unpunished. I very much appreciate the ranking member from California bringing this motion to instruct forward, but, by the

way, it is what is going to probably be in the bill, and it is certainly what is reflected in a bipartisan way by both Democrats and Republicans in both the House and the Senate.

I think there has been a lot of rhetoric today about how dangerous a failed state in Iraq would be, and I stand to join my colleagues. I am absolutely, unambiguously convinced that a failed state in Iraq is not only now a bad thing, but would continue to be a bad thing.

I guess the real question is, what about the failed policy that got us to a place where we are all concerned about a failed state in Iraq, and why isn't the debate today about the failed policy? How could it be that we are sitting here talking about a national defense bill that is one of the most important bills that the Congress brings, our constitutional responsibility, and we are not talking about a failed policy that has caused us to borrow almost \$800 billion, caused us to have virtually no ready ground forces in the United States currently, caused us to degrade our ability to be prepared for any other contingency? Why isn't the debate today about that?

Well, because that would be a good debate. That would be really what the debate should be about. But, instead, we are going to have a motion to instruct on things that are already agreed to by the Senate and the House, by the conferees, and I would say every Member here.

So I appreciate the Member from California bringing this up. This is easy to support. We are all for it and we all know it. But the real question is: Why don't we have a debate about the failed policy? Why aren't we really concerned about the readiness of our troops, our inability to deal with other contingencies, all of the money we have borrowed, and no solution to extricate ourselves honorably and as soon as possible to bring our troops home so that we can maintain our readiness?

Our American forces in Afghanistan and in Iraq have done everything that the American people have asked for. The problem, my colleagues, is they have done it for too long. They have done it for too long without an Iraqi Government that will stand up and provide the political solution necessary for us to be able to leave an Iraq that is beginning to put itself together, knitting those tribes together, moving forward together to do the right thing.

But what we have right now is an intransigent, stuck Iraqi Government that hasn't provided the political solution, the only solution, that will be able to create a stable Iraq. It is not our responsibility to create a stable Iraq. That is why they have a sovereign government. And what we can no longer do is enable the sovereign government to come up with excuse after excuse after excuse.

I really appreciated my colleague from Virginia explaining to me why the oil legislation written by our State

Department isn't something that the Iraqis can pass, even though they have the votes to do it. I find that fascinating.

We have been told for months that the petrochemical law is the most important thing that they can do. It is the thing that is going to give the Sunnis the effort to come into the government and feel like they are part of the government and that they are part of a solution and a one-Iraq strategy. But, of course, we don't have that, because even though they have the votes, it seems like it is just a little too hard to do.

We are spending too much money. We are spending too much time. We are risking too many American soldiers. We are risking our readiness. The failed policy is really what we should be talking about, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I said it is easy to support this motion to instruct because it is something we all agree on.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to respond to my good colleague from California.

First, I would say to my colleague, we are winning in Iraq. We are winning. We are going to leave Iraq in victory.

Maybe my friend heard a different briefing than the one that I heard when General Petraeus came back and laid out the most recent figures with respect to attacks, but that very dangerous part of Anbar province that we have both visited has seen a drop in attacks of 80 percent. In fact, we have seen a drop in attacks and a drop in American casualties and civilian casualties across Iraq. And we have also seen new capabilities in the 131 Iraqi battalions that we have built from scratch.

I would just say to my friend, I have seen all the old smooth-path books and reports and recommendations that said somehow there was a smooth path to victory in Iraq, and I have always said there is no smooth path.

To those who say we should have kept Saddam Hussein's army in place, I am reminded that Saddam Hussein's army had 11,000 Sunni generals, which would have been exactly the wrong formula for a military which is supposed to take on a role of stabilization and honest brokerage in Iraq.

The reports that we are now seeing from the battlefield are that the Iraqi forces, while some of them have had limited battlefield experience, some have had extensive battlefield experience, that military is maturing; that the military that broke and ran in the first battle of Fallujah, the Iraqi military, now stands and fights; that in fact that government is moving forward, and although it is moving forward in a stumbling, bumbling, sometimes inept fashion, that is the nature of new governments. That is also the nature of governments that solve their problems with ballots and not bullets, because it is not always easy to get the other guy to agree with you on a particular function.

With respect to oil distribution, there is an ad hoc oil distribution that is taking place right now, or de facto oil distribution. It is not a function of legislation. Right now the Kurds get, for example, 18 percent of the oil revenues. So there is an oil distribution. And I think if there wasn't an oil distribution, you would have more conflict. Instead of seeing a waning conflict between the various sectors in Iraq, you would see an increasing conflict.

So I would just say to my friends and to the gentlewoman and to everyone who cares about an American victory in Iraq, we will have victory in Iraq if we maintain our strength. And maintaining our strength includes continuing to fund this operation.

It is our committee, the Armed Services Committee, that came up initially with the so-called bridge fund appropriation, because we said it is only proper that the Armed Services Committee authorizes an appropriation that will go through the winter months of the year so that the services do not have to reach into the cash register and take money out of valuable training exercises, take money out of our military equipment accounts and take money out of our ammunition accounts.

So I think we have exactly what we need in this motion to recommit. It is a motion that says it is the commitment of the United States Congress that we don't have a failed state in Iraq, and it also emphasizes again that we have to have these supplemental funds to ensure that the war fighters in both of these theaters, in Afghanistan and in Iraq, are able to move forward.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Republican motion to instruct the conferees on the 2008 Department of Defense authorization act.

Madam Speaker, as we adjourned for the Thanksgiving recess, we witnessed something remarkable. We witnessed the Democratic majority, in working to mollify their liberal base one more time before the Thanksgiving recess, come to the floor pounding their fist declaring that we must not give our troops additional funding without congressional mandated withdrawal guidelines. They recycled the same old rhetoric, seemingly oblivious to the facts on the ground.

Thankfully, the direction of our efforts in the global war on terror is being guided by General Petraeus and others who do understand the momentum that we have garnered; that violence between Sunnis and Shiites has nearly disappeared from Baghdad, with terrorist bombings down 77 percent; that attacks against United States soldiers have fallen to levels not seen since before the February 2006 bombing of the Shiite shrine in Samarra; that United States casualties in Iraq are at

their lowest level since March of 2006; and that many military analysts, including some who are opposed to the war, have concluded that the United States and its allies are on the verge of winning in Iraq.

Indeed, Madam Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Defense Authorization Appropriations Subcommittee just returned from Iraq, and he declared that the surge is finally working. I reference Mr. MURTHA from Pennsylvania.

Madam Speaker, this is something the other side doesn't like to discuss, victory in the global war on terror. That is tough to squeeze in with the defeatist rhetoric recited to appease MoveOn.org and Code Pink.

Another thing the Democratic majority never discusses are the consequences of failure, and they have been discussed this morning on our side.

□ 1115

That is why this motion to instruct is so important, Madam Speaker. It is critical that the House accept Senate provision 1536 and recognize that failure in Iraq would mean a collapse of a democratic Iraqi Government, likely leading to mass killings and genocide in that nation; certainly emboldening al Qaeda; regional instability; Iran and Syria determining the course of Iraq's future; and Israel being pushed into the Mediterranean Sea, just as Ahmadinejad called for.

These are the consequences of defeat and these are the reasons why Congress must commit to a strategy that will not leave a failed state in Iraq and why Congress must not pass, indeed, not pass legislation that risks demoralizing and undermining our military, as they are indeed on the verge of victory in Iraq.

So, Madam Speaker, the Democrats are zero for 40 in trying to compel this precipitous withdrawal from Iraq. With this motion to instruct, I ask them for once to get on the right side. Join not just the Republicans, but, more importantly, our brave men and women in the military, and give victory a chance.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues, let's vote "yes" on the motion to instruct.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), a very distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee.

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, this resolution affirms the obvious and avoids the necessary. It is obvious that the common goal of the United States, the House, the Senate, Republicans and Democrats, is to avoid a failed state in Iraq. The Senate bill affirms this, the House bill affirms this, and I am supremely confident that the final conference report will confirm it as well.

The issue, as my friend the gentlewoman from California said, is how do we avoid a failed state in Iraq. Sadly, the record gives us many examples of what not to do.

When General Shinseki told the administration that his recommendation was to put 300,000 troops on the ground after Saddam fell, and the administration ignored that request, that is what not to do; when leaders who had studied Iraq in our State Department, our intelligence agencies and our Defense Department said abolishing the Iraqi Army and the Baathist Party in its entirety is the wrong thing to do, abolishing the Iraqi Army, abolishing the Baathist Party in its entirety was the wrong thing to do, it increased the risk of a failed state.

Now I heard my friend, the ranking member, talk about 11,000 Sunni generals, and he is right. The top of the Iraqi Army, the erstwhile Iraqi Army, the top of the Baathist Party should have either been put on trial, put in prison, or, at the very least, removed from those institutions. But the 85 to 90 percent who ran the sewer system and the train system and the bureaucracy of Iraq should not have been fired all at once. It was not the recommendation of the Secretary of State, it was not the recommendation of the intelligence community, but it's what we did, and it's how to create a failed state.

When voices within our government and around the world said that the right way to transition from Saddam's corrupt and evil regime to a new day was an internationally supervised political process, not listening to those voices was the wrong thing to do, and it increased the risk of a failed state.

So, yes, we know all sorts of things. We have learned all kinds of lessons about what not to do.

What should we do? Well, I think what we should do is insist that the Iraqi politicians do what American troops have done with such excellence, to execute the job they have been given. We are thankful that the level of violence has been reduced. We are very grateful for this, and we understand that the credit for that largely goes to the Americans in uniform and to their Iraqi partners fighting with them. We are very thankful for that result.

But we are also very mindful that the Iraqi politicians who have been given a golden opportunity to bring peace and stability to their country have utterly failed to do so. They have not passed a law dividing up the proceeds of their oil industry; they have not guaranteed minority rights in their government; they have not set up and established provincial elections and provincial governments. They have utterly failed to establish a stable government, because we have stood there and continued to hold their coats and let them suffer the delusion that America's sons and daughters will stay there forever.

If you want to avoid a failed state in Iraq, change that delusory perception. Say to the Iraqi politicians, the

clock is running. The time is drawing nigh when our sons and our daughters will no longer referee your civil war. Negotiate an end to it, stop it, build a stable government. That is how to avoid a failed state. That is the policy underlying the policy of this majority. Frankly, it's a policy reflected in this excellent Armed Services authorization bill, which I hope will promptly be on the floor, promptly be on the President's desk, and promptly get about the business of serving the people who serve us so well.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to a gentleman, in fact, the next two gentlemen have sons who have served in the Iraqi theater. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) has a son who is a Blackhawk helicopter pilot who has served, I believe, in both theaters and has quite a bit of experience in some very difficult operations. The gentleman always has an excellent insight on this important operation. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), I would like to give him 3 minutes.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and for his kind words.

I, like the gentleman from California, have a son serving in uniform and I am very proud of his service, proud of Mr. HUNTER's son's service in the Marine Corps and my son's service in the Army in Iraq. I understand that on January 1 my son is heading to Afghanistan. So I do feel a certain personal importance to what we are discussing today and to the funding for our troops. But collectively we have all sent our sons and daughters into combat, into dangerous theaters in the world, and we need to make sure that we are giving them every chance for victory.

My good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, said that we have learned some things not to do and some things to do. I would argue that the thing not to do is to take a strategy which is clearly working, which is bringing increased security to a dangerous spot in the world, to a strategy that is producing more electricity, more oil, opening schools, shops. You don't take that strategy and pull the rug out from under it.

Last July, Madam Speaker, I and other Members stood on this floor to ask our colleagues not to snatch the possibility of victory away from our soldiers and marines. In an atmosphere filled with overblown rhetoric predicting the failure of surge operations before they had begun in earnest, General Petraeus and those under his command pushed forward into the streets of Baghdad and into the tribal-dominated areas of al Anbar province. They engaged and destroyed al Qaeda cells while working closely with tribal leaders to establish a lasting stability in once hostile Sunni areas.

Just a few short months ago, critics in this body and the Senate declared defeat, declared defeat before giving

success a chance. They did not believe our fighting men and women, implementing General Petraeus' new counterinsurgency strategy, could rout al Qaeda and insurgent forces and win over the Iraqi population. I am proud to say that they were wrong, and that is what has happened.

As we proceed with conference negotiations on this National Defense Authorization Act, I would urge my colleagues not to repeat the mistake we have sadly made many times before. We must not declare defeat while our military forces fight for victory. This motion to instruct conferees is just a small step to ensure that the position of this body is not to accept a strategy which will produce a failed state in Iraq.

In a letter to his troops before commencing the surge operations, General Petraeus noted that, "Success will require discipline, fortitude and initiative, qualities that you have in abundance."

The question before us today, Madam Speaker, is the same one I asked in July: Do we in Congress have those same qualities?

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The motion to instruct by my friend Mr. HUNTER from California is in two parts. Both of these sections make reference to issues that are spelled out in both the House and Senate versions and consequently should be acceptable. I would hope that the conferees would be in line with accepting both of those issues.

I would like to take just a moment, Madam Speaker, however, to say a word about those wonderful troops who we, through this authorization, support. They are the best in the world. They and their families have been tasked to do monumental work in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere, and to say we are proud of them is an understatement. General Petraeus is the right man for the job in his great efforts in Iraq.

That is why in this bill we authorize a 3½ percent pay raise for our troops; that is why we made significant changes to address the problems unearthed by the Walter Reed situation regarding our wounded warriors; that is why we put \$1 billion in strategic readiness funds to deal with the critical readiness shortfall. And this is a major challenge for us. The reforms for Iraq and Afghanistan contracting are spelled out in this bill. There is additional money for the MRAP vehicles; there is \$980 million for our National Guard equipment; prohibition on TRICARE fee increases; taking steps to minimize the inequities for survivors and to step forward on the survivor benefit plan offset.

So all of these are major issues within the realm of the two bills, and hopefully the conferees would be able to make significant progress on each of those.

I am proud of the work we have done. I am proud of the Armed Services Committee. I think it is the most bipartisan committee in Congress. Special thanks to the gentleman from California who has worked with us these many years to the end of positive help for the American in uniform.

So with that, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes now to another gentleman whose son has served in the Iraq theater, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I want to thank my Republican colleagues for bringing this motion to instruct to the floor. It is important to me as a member of the Armed Services Committee, as a 31-year veteran of the Army National Guard, and as the parent of a soldier who has served in Iraq, with another son soon to deploy to Iraq. Additionally, our family is grateful to have two additional sons serving in the military.

This motion to instruct is straightforward. It simply confirms that the representatives of the American people understand the consequences of our actions in Iraq and that we are not going to pull the rug out from underneath our brave soldiers. Congress should never act to undermine our troops and jeopardize the success they are achieving in Iraq today. Unfortunately, the strategy of precipitous withdrawal and defeat some continue to advocate has brought us to this point.

The Democrat leadership has continued to propose legislation that aims to micromanage our military leaders and tie their hands as they stop the terrorists. This undermines the extraordinary gains by our troops that I have seen on my eight visits to Iraq, which has been possible by the surge led by General David Petraeus. We must not forget al Qaeda spokesman Zawahiri has declared Iraq and Afghanistan the central front in the global war on terrorism, and we must succeed in stopping terrorists overseas and protecting American families at home.

□ 1130

This motion to instruct is a right opportunity for this body, for the leadership here in Washington to say with one voice that we are invested in success, that our aim is not to leave behind a failed Iraqi state where safe havens for terrorists will threaten American families. Our military should be able to count on our unwavering support for the fight in which they are engaged.

Our colleagues in the Senate have already acted with near unanimous support, 94-3, to include the language of this motion in their authorization. Only three Senators voted against this, showing a unified United States Senate. They have gone on record recognizing that a failed state in Iraq would have dire consequences for the safety and security of the region, for American families, and for our allies around

the world. It is imperative that we follow their lead.

Again, I want to thank the ranking member, DUNCAN HUNTER, for his leadership. He is a dedicated veteran and father of an Iraq veteran. And additionally, I want to thank my Republican colleagues for bringing this motion to the floor. I encourage all of my colleagues to support it and send a bipartisan message to our enemies and allies that we are committed to victory in Iraq and ensuring that Iraq does not become a failed state and a safe haven for terrorists.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Madam Speaker, we have no further speakers on our side and are prepared to close.

I just want to once again remind everyone what this is really about. We have an excellent national defense authorization bill for fiscal year 2008. It has broad bipartisan support, bicameral support, both the House and the Senate. Most Members voted for this bill when it came to the floor in the spring. We are about to go to conference and make sure that the bills become congruent so we can send it to the President.

This is a bill that the President must sign. It has so many good things in it. I want to take a couple of seconds and talk about the fact that Democrats, who took majority in January, have written their first bill in 13 years, and there are many, many good things in here that we are very proud of. We have done many things for the troops. We have included a 3.5 percent pay raise. We have prohibited increases in their health care, which is called TRICARE, and pharmacy user fees.

The bill also provides \$980 million for National Guard equipment. We know how stressed and strained our National Guard has been. We know how upset many Governors have been that the National Guard has been deployed out of States so the State is without their own National Guard. And the worst part of it is when they went to Iraq or Afghanistan, and some are there for the second and third time, they left their equipment there. So the State doesn't even have equipment that the State can use in the case of a flood or fire or some other kind of an emergency.

We have a lot of equipment that we have added; \$17.4 billion for MRAPs, which is a plus-up from what the President requested. We have also added a shipbuilding request that the President didn't ask for, which is a Virginia class submarine, an LPD and a T-AKE, and eight C-17s that the Pentagon didn't ask for either, because we know that we need global power projection.

This is a very important bill that is part of our congressional responsibility to raise and support our troops, and I am proud to say this is a strong bill that supports our troops, restores military readiness and improves accountability to the American people. I ask for my colleagues' support of it when we bring it back from the conference.

I appreciate the fact that this is a motion to instruct, but what we are being instructed is, frankly, two different issues that we have general widespread support for. Both in the House and Senate version of the bill, the language included in the motion to instruct has been included. We should be very confident that they will be part of the final conference report, so this is a motion to instruct that is very supportable.

I am happy to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California for her comments, and also the distinguished chairman, who is a great friend and a wonderful patriot and has done a great job of steering our committee through the authorization process.

Let me tell you why I think it is important to pass this motion to instruct. We built the bridge fund. The Armed Services Committee realized we have the winter months when you need funding for the troops before you get to the spring supplemental. So we came up initially several years ago with the idea of a \$50 billion bridge fund to make sure that those soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines had what they needed in the war-fighting theater to be successful.

It is true we have this in our bill this time because we are the major architects of the bridge fund. We are the people who came up with it the first time, and the appropriators followed us. But this time they did not follow us. This time they conditioned the bridge fund with get-out-of-Iraq language, and that was a disservice to everyone who wears the uniform in the theater and to the mission. So it is important for the Members of this body to cast their votes in favor of that bridge fund, and perhaps that will show the right direction to the Appropriations Committee and to the Members of Congress who vote on the full appropriations, because we need to have that bridge fund not only authorized but appropriated.

Finally, we do need to have that very strong language committing ourselves to avoid a failed state in Iraq. And we are winning.

Now let me go back to my good colleague Mr. SKELTON, who said we all support the troops and we have manifested that support in pay raises. And we have. We have manifested it in good medical care and a new Wounded Warrior bill to assist those in Walter Reed and Bethesda and in our medical facilities around the world. We have done that. And we have manifested that in getting them the right equipment to carry out their mission.

But there is something else we owe the troops. We owe them the right to have victory, and they are achieving victory. And we owe them the right to have a successful mission, because nothing will be more fulfilling to them than to be victorious. And that means

we need to continue to move the resources into Iraq and Afghanistan so they can continue to be victorious, so that the 80 percent drop-off in the violence rate in Anbar province will continue, and so that the Iraqi Army will continue to stand up to the point where it can displace America's heavy combat forces, Marines and Army, and our guys can come home or go to other places in CENTCOM.

Madam Speaker, this is a very important motion to instruct because it gives a very clear message to those 157,000-plus troops in Iraq and those 22,000-plus troops in Afghanistan. It says the American Congress, we stand behind our troops and we stand behind their mission.

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Speaker, I voted in favor of the motion to instruct conferees, which included Senate language stating that "the Senate should not pass legislation that will undermine our military's ability to prevent a failed state in Iraq", because I believe the men and women of the United States military are admirably and ably performing their duties. They are already doing everything they can to prevent Iraq from becoming a failed state, and I continue to support them and the professionalism and skill they have displayed. However, it is not the role of the United States military to control the long term viability of the Iraqi government. To avoid becoming a failed state, Iraqi political leaders must come to a consensus regarding the future of Iraq and the Iraqi government. There is no role for the United States military in that task. I continue to call for strong diplomatic efforts to resolve the situation in Iraq, and believe that a firm timeline for the withdrawal of U.S. troops will force Iraq's political leaders to take responsibility for the future of their country.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 1585, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 12 of House Rule XXII, I move that meetings of the conference between the House and Senate on H.R. 1585 may be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information may be broached, provided that any sitting Member of Congress shall be entitled to attend any meeting of the conference.