Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in strong opposition to H.R.

4156, the so-called Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment

Appropriations of 2008, because in fact, Mr. Speaker, the bill should

be called the Disorderly and Irresponsible Iraq Redeployment

Appropriations Act.

Let me be clear, Mr. Speaker. What we are debating tonight, disguised

as a genuine bridge fund to sustain operations in the global war on

terror, is nothing more than another defeatist measure intended to

placate the Democrats' liberal base as we approach this Thanksgiving

recess.

The Democratic leadership apparently has decided it's more to stand

with the Out of Iraq Caucus, MoveOn.org and Code Pink than with our

brave men and women in uniform. Rather than funding our soldiers' needs

and delivering a decisive blow to the terrorist campaign in Iraq, the

Democrats are again conditioning the funding on a date certain for

withdrawal.

At a time of sustained progress by our forces, Mr. Speaker, it seems

that what is great news for America and for our troops is consequently

bad political news for a Democratic majority who has literally bet the

farm on a defeatist agenda.

Just last weekend, Prime Minister Maliki stated that violence between

Sunnis and Shias has nearly disappeared from Iraq, disappeared from

Baghdad, with terrorist bombings down 77 percent.

The Washington Post reported that attacks against United States

soldiers have fallen to levels not seen since the February 2006 bombing

of the Shia shrine in Samarra. And an Investor's Business Daily article

detailed that military analysts, including many who are opposed to the

war, have concluded that the United States and its allies are on the

verge of winning in Iraq. And, thankfully, United States casualties in

Iraq are at their lowest level since March of 2006, Mr. Speaker. Now is

not the time to risk impeding the progress we are making. Now is the

time to continue building on the turnaround we have made, and to state

unequivocally that we are on the verge of victory in Iraq and that we

will finish the job.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot give in to the terrorists' extremist views and

sinister plans for the Middle East and the world. And we certainly

should not send a message to the terrorists that such a capitulation

will begin in 30 days and will wrap up by December of 2008.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ``no'' on tying funds for

our troops to a date certain withdrawal from Iraq. I urge all my

colleagues to vote ``no'' on this dangerous bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2156, the so-

called ``Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations of

2008.'' Because, in fact, this bill is a ``disorderly and irresponsible

Iraq Redeployment Appropriations Act.''

Let me be very clear, Mr. Speaker. What we are debating today--

disguised as a genuine bridge fund to sustain operations in the Global

War on Terror--is nothing more than another defeatist measure intended

to placate the Democrat's liberal base as we approach the Thanksgiving

recess.

The Democratic leadership has decided it is more important to stand

with the ``Out of Iraq Caucus,'' MoveOn.org and Code Pink than with our

brave men and women in uniform. Rather than funding our soldiers' needs

and delivering a decisive blow to the terrorist campaign in Iraq, the

Democrats are again conditioning the funding on a date-certain

withdrawal.

At a time of sustained progress by our forces, Mr. Speaker, it seems

that what is great news for America and for our troops is consequently

bad political news for the Democrat majority and their defeatist

agenda.

Mr. Speaker, a July New York Times editorial authored by Michael

O'Hanlon and Kenneth Pollack stated ``We are finally getting somewhere

in Iraq, at least in military terms. . . . The soldiers and marines

told us they feel that they now have a superb commander in General

David Petraeus; they are confident in his strategy, they see real

results, and they feel now they have the numbers needed to make a real

difference.''

In September, General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker spoke

optimistically about the future of Iraq citing concrete progress.

Acknowledging we still had a long way to go, they recognized we had

achieved tactical momentum and were building momentum toward local

reconciliation. Indeed, local Iraqis were turning against extremists.

Last weekend Prime Minister al-Maliki stated that violence between

Sunnis and Shi'ites has nearly disappeared from Baghdad, with terrorist

bombings down 77 percent. The Washington Post reported that attacks

against U.S. soldiers have fallen to levels not seen since before the

February 2006 bombing of a Shi'ite shrine in Samarra. An Investor's

Business Daily article detailed that military analysts--including many

who are opposed to the war--have concluded that the U.S. and its allies

are on the verge of winning in Iraq.

And thankfully, U.S. casualties in Iraq are at their lowest level

since March 2006. Now is not the time to risk impeding the progress we

are making. Now is the time to continue building on the turn-around we

have made and to state unequivocally that we are on the verge of

victory in Iraq, and that we will finish the job.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues of the consequences of

giving up on Iraq: the collapse of a democratic Iraqi government,

likely leading to mass killings and genocide in the nation; an

emboldened al-Qaeda; regional instability; Iran and Syria setting the

course of Iraq's future; and Israel being pushed into the Mediterranean

sea.

The stakes are too high for political posturing. Ayman al-Zawahiri

has said ``the Jihad in Iraq requires several incremental goals. The

first stage: expel the Americans from Iraq.''

Mr. Speaker, we cannot give in to their extremist views and sinister

plans for the Middle East and the world. And we certainly should not

send a message to the terrorists that such a capitulation will begin in

30 days and will wrap up by December of 2008.

Mr. Speaker, never have I been so glad that we've got General

Petraeus leading our troops in Iraq and not the Democratic leadership

of this house. I urge my colleagues to vote ``no'' on tying funds for

our troops to a date-certain withdrawal from Iraq. I urge all of my

colleagues to vote ``no'' on this bill.