Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I

may consume.

In doing so, I rise to offer a very simple, straightforward motion to

instruct conferees on the fiscal year 2007 emergency supplemental

appropriations bill.

The motion to instruct simply insists that House conferees support

the previously adopted House position with regard to a timetable for

the withdrawal of troops from Iraq. This motion, which I will oppose,

puts Members on record as either fully supporting our troops or

agreeing to a surrender date in Iraq. It is that simple.

It is no secret that many Members of the House, both Republicans and

Democrats, have strong reservations about the manner in which this

legislation undermines the authority of the President, our commander in

chief. Members are also rightly concerned about how this legislation

places military decisions in the hands of politicians rather than the

military commanders in the field.

This legislation ought to focus on our troops. It ought to focus on

providing those in harm's way with the resources they need to complete

their mission successfully. It ought to respect, not micromanage, our

combatant commanders in whom we place the ultimate responsibility for

prosecuting military actions.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are many things. We are elected to

represent the interests of our constituents from our congressional

districts. However, as presently written, this legislation makes the

dangerous assumption that Congress also has an on-the-ground role in

prosecuting the war in Iraq.

In closing, let me remind my colleagues of this: We are not generals.

We are not the Secretary of State. And we are most certainly not the

commander in chief.

The vote on this motion to instruct will signal whether Members of

The House are willing to provide our men and women in uniform with our

unqualified support or whether Members will fully embrace a timetable

for withdrawal and surrender.

I urge a ``no'' vote on this motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of my

colleague dealing with this time and circumstance. I do not intend to

take a lot of time.

But it is important for all those listening, and who were concerned

about this issue, to know that we take this matter very, very

seriously, and our motion is a serious one. It is my view that a

``yes'' vote for this bill is a bill that will undermine the potential

effectiveness of our troops for the remainder of the time that they

remain in Iraq, and that a ``no'' vote is the only way, the only way to

express support for our troops' efforts and guarantee, in many ways,

the opportunity for success. This legislation ought to focus on those

troops.

As I said earlier, it ought to focus on providing those in harm's way

with the resources they need to complete their mission successfully.

Further, it ought to respect, not micromanage, our combatant commanders

who have the responsibility for carrying forward this war successfully.

It's no secret that many Members of the House, both Republicans and

Democrats, have strong reservations about the manner in which this

legislation undermines the authority of the President and the Commander

in Chief. It is not acceptable that we find ourselves suddenly

presuming that we can afford to have 435 Commanders in Chief by way of

this House.

It breaks, in my judgment, some of the fundamental traditions of the

Appropriations Committee, which calls for an open process whereby we

can deal with each other in as close as a nonpartisan way as possible.

Indeed, a ``no'' vote on this legislation expresses strongly our

concern for allowing our troops to do their work, to do it effectively,

and to get home as soon as possible as we continue to be the voice, the

significant voice for freedom remaining in this world.

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