

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS) having assumed the chair, Mr. DREIER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5576) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 865, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 406, noes 22, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie	Bono	Cleaver
Ackerman	Boozman	Clyburn
Aderholt	Boren	Coble
Akin	Boswell	Cole (OK)
Alexander	Boucher	Conaway
Allen	Boustany	Conyers
Andrews	Boyd	Costa
Baca	Bradley (NH)	Costello
Bachus	Brady (PA)	Cramer
Baird	Brady (TX)	Crenshaw
Baker	Brown (OH)	Crowley
Baldwin	Brown (SC)	Cubin
Barrett (SC)	Brown, Corrine	Cuellar
Barrow	Brown-Waite,	Culberson
Bartlett (MD)	Ginny	Cummings
Barton (TX)	Burgess	Davis (AL)
Bass	Burton (IN)	Davis (CA)
Bean	Butterfield	Davis (FL)
Beauprez	Buyer	Davis (IL)
Becerra	Calvert	Davis (KY)
Berkley	Camp (MI)	Davis (TN)
Berman	Campbell (CA)	Davis, Jo Ann
Berry	Cannon	Davis, Tom
Biggert	Cantor	DeFazio
Bilbray	Capito	DeGette
Bilirakis	Capps	DeLahunt
Bishop (GA)	Cardin	DeLauro
Bishop (NY)	Cardoza	Dent
Bishop (UT)	Carnahan	Diaz-Balart, L.
Blackburn	Carson	Diaz-Balart, M.
Blumenauer	Carter	Dicks
Blunt	Case	Dingell
Boehlert	Castle	Doggett
Boehner	Chandler	Doolittle
Bonilla	Chocola	Doyle
Bonner	Clay	Drake

Dreier	Knollenberg	Pryce (OH)
Duncan	Kolbe	Putnam
Edwards	Kucinich	Radanovich
Ehlers	Kuhl (NY)	Rahall
Emanuel	LaHood	Ramstad
Emerson	Langevin	Rangel
Engel	Lantos	Regula
Eshoo	Larsen (WA)	Rehberg
Etheridge	Larson (CT)	Reichert
Evans	Latham	Renzi
Everett	LaTourette	Reyes
Farr	Leach	Reynolds
Fattah	Lee	Rogers (AL)
Feeney	Levin	Rogers (KY)
Ferguson	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (MI)
Filner	Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Linder	Ros-Lehtinen
Foley	Lipinski	Ross
Forbes	LoBiondo	Roybal-Allard
Ford	Lofgren, Zoe	Royce
Fortenberry	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Fossella	Lucas	Rush
Fox	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (OH)
Frank (MA)	E.	Ryun (KS)
Frelinghuysen	Lynch	Sabo
Gallely	Mack	Salazar
Garrett (NJ)	Maloney	Sanchez, Linda
Gerlach	Manzullo	T.
Gibbons	Marchant	Sanchez, Loretta
Gilchrest	Markey	Sanders
Gillmor	Marshall	Saxton
Gingrey	Matsui	Schakowsky
Gohmert	McCarthy	Schiff
Gonzalez	McCauley (TX)	Schmidt
Goode	McCollum (MN)	Schwartz (PA)
Goodlatte	McCotter	Schwarz (MI)
Gordon	McCrery	Scott (GA)
Granger	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Graves	McGovern	Serrano
Green, Al	McHenry	Shaw
Green, Gene	McHugh	Shays
Grijalva	McIntyre	Sherman
Gutierrez	McKeon	Sherwood
Gutknecht	McKinney	Shimkus
Hall	McMorris	Shuster
Harman	McNulty	Simmons
Harris	Meehan	Simpson
Hart	Meek (FL)	Skelton
Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Slaughter
Hastings (WA)	Melancon	Smith (NJ)
Hayes	Mica	Smith (TX)
Hayworth	Michaud	Smith (WA)
Heger	Millender-	Snyder
Herseeth	McDonald	Sodrel
Higgins	Miller (FL)	Solis
Hinchee	Miller (NC)	Souder
Hinojosa	Miller, Gary	Spratt
Hobson	Miller, George	Stark
Hoekstra	Mollohan	Stearns
Holden	Moore (KS)	Strickland
Holt	Moore (WI)	Stupak
Honda	Moran (KS)	Sullivan
Hooley	Moran (VA)	Sweeney
Hostettler	Murphy	Tanner
Hoyer	Murtha	Tauscher
Hulshof	Musgrave	Taylor (NC)
Hunter	Myrick	Terry
Hyde	Nadler	Thomas
Inglis (SC)	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Inslee	Neal (MA)	Thompson (MS)
Israel	Neugebauer	Tiahrt
Issa	Ney	Tiberi
Istook	Northup	Tierney
Jackson (IL)	Norwood	Towns
Jackson-Lee	Nunes	Turner
(TX)	Nussle	Udall (CO)
Jefferson	Oberstar	Udall (NM)
Jenkins	Olver	Upton
Jindal	Ortiz	Van Hollen
Johnson (CT)	Osborne	Velázquez
Johnson (IL)	Owens	Visclosky
Johnson, E. B.	Oxley	Walden (OR)
Johnson, Sam	Pallone	Walsh
Jones (NC)	Pascarella	Wamp
Jones (OH)	Pastor	Wasserman
Kanjorski	Payne	Schultz
Kaptur	Pearce	Waters
Keller	Pelosi	Watson
Kelly	Peterson (MN)	Watt
Kennedy (MN)	Peterson (PA)	Waxman
Kennedy (RI)	Petri	Weiner
Kildee	Pickering	Weldon (FL)
Kilpatrick (MI)	Platts	Weldon (PA)
Kind	Poe	Weller
King (IA)	Pombo	Westmoreland
King (NY)	Pomeroy	Wexler
Kingston	Porter	Whitfield
Kirk	Price (GA)	Wicker
Kline	Price (NC)	Wilson (NM)

Wilson (SC)	Wu	Young (FL)
Wolf	Wynn	
Woolsey	Young (AK)	

NAYS—22

Capuano	Hefley	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Hensarling	Sensenbrenner
Cooper	Matheson	Shadegg
Deal (GA)	Obey	Tancred
English (PA)	Otter	Taylor (MS)
Flake	Paul	Thornberry
Franks (AZ)	Pence	
Green (WI)	Pitts	

NOT VOTING—4

Lewis (CA)	Rothman
Miller (MI)	Sessions

□ 1745

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5576, TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 5576, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2048

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2048.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IRAQ DEBATE

Mr. DEFAZIO. I ask unanimous consent to take the time of Mr. EMANUEL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has shirked its constitutional duties when it comes to the issue of Iraq.

The most solemn of duties that this body can undertake is the declaration of war, reserved to the United States Congress. Now, in the case of Afghanistan, the known perpetrators of the 9/11 attacks, Osama bin Laden and his collaborators in the Taliban, this Congress did act, with near unanimity. One person dissented. And we passed a resolution that was compliant with the War Powers Act and the Constitution of the United States to authorize an attack on Iraq and others who aided and abetted in the 9/11 attacks.

Now, if George Bush had had proof or had really thought that Saddam Hussein and Iraq were involved in 9/11, he would have needed no further authority. But, clearly, he had no proof, and he couldn't make the case. But he, nonetheless, wanted to attack Iraq. And Congress, reaching a new low point here, in my opinion unconstitutionally, vaguely delegated its solemn duties in the case of the making of war to the President.

Now, I don't believe that Congress can do that, but we did, and the President then, some 5 months later, used that very broad grant of authority to preemptively attack Iraq, ostensibly to remove weapons of mass destruction and the threat of Saddam Hussein, which later morphed into connections to 9/11, which later morphed into any number of other things, and which finally became we went into Iraq to bring freedom and democracy.

Now, since that time, this Congress, this Republican-led Congress, has refused to conduct any meaningful oversight of what happened about the distortion or the misuse of intelligence, about the huge scandals surrounding the more than \$10 billion which has disappeared in the so-called reconstruction effort or the actual conduct of the war itself, the unbelievable incompetence of Donald Rumsfeld and his cronies, and the impact on our troops in the military. Not one meaningful hearing. No debates here on the floor of the House.

So, finally, the Republican leadership says, well, we are going to have a meaningful debate. Now, let's see what they mean by meaningful debate. Tomorrow, the House of Representatives will take up a bunch of time, that is good, at least we are going to discuss it on the floor, but it will be to debate a nonbinding resolution; that is, something which has no force of law and no authority. It is a sense of the United States Congress.

And if you read that sense of Congress, you will find a nonbinding resolution which will not be amendable. No Democratic alternative or substitute will be allowed. What the Republicans wrote in secret will be voted on here on the floor of the House. That is it, up or down. This resolution, if you vote for

it, is a vote for the status quo. It is a vote for staying in Iraq indefinitely, perhaps a decade or longer. It is to continue the current policies with no end in sight.

On March 21, President Bush himself even said that the question of bringing home U.S. troops from Iraq will be decided by future Presidents. Future Presidents. Remember, unfortunately, he still will be President until 2 years from last January. Now, that is a pretty extraordinary statement for the President to make.

Now, I wish that the Republican leadership really wanted to have a full and fair debate. They could at least allow us to have and debate an alternative. I am a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus. I am a cosponsor of Representative JACK MURTHA's legislation, legislation that would lead to a thoughtful and appropriate redeployment of our troops, and would also say that we would be ready should they need to reintervene in a crisis situation in Iraq. But what it would do is get us out of the business of day-to-day getting between the Shiias, the Kurds, and the Sunnis.

Now, Bush administration said, well, we never could have predicted the Shiias, the Sunnis, and the Kurds wouldn't get along. Rummy said they would welcome us like liberators, with flowers and stuff. He just ignored the last 1,400 years of history, that is all. He also ignored the State Department and the intelligence agencies, other than the little select group he had who said the same thing.

And now, I believe that the Shiias, the Kurds, and the Sunnis, and many others, will not meaningfully move to share power, get their act together and develop a national government as long as we are staying forever, which is what the President and what this resolution says. So I believe that if we go down the path of adopting this resolution that there will be Members of Congress debating this issue years and years from today about what is the U.S. future in Iraq.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IMMIGRATION

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consume the time of Mr. JONES.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, immigration has been the number one concern of many Americans in recent months. The House passed a bill last December which dealt mostly with

tough border security. It provided for more Border Control agents, a 700-mile fence, different penalties for illegally entering the U.S., and substantial penalties for employers who employ illegal immigrants.

The Senate, more recently, passed a bill with tight border security but also had language which addresses the problem of the 11 to 12 million illegal immigrants now in the United States. Some believe the Senate's three-tiered approach to dealing with undocumented workers now in the U.S. amounts to what many would refer to as amnesty. Their approach is as follows:

Those illegal immigrants that have been in the United States for 0-2 years would be deported; those who have been illegally in the United States between 2 and 5 years would have to return to the border for processing and then reenter the country receiving a work permit; those who have been in the country for 5 years or more illegally would be able to obtain a legal status by paying a fine and meeting some other requirements.

So many have been concerned about this because it does mean that you could enter the country illegally and gain a legal status while still in the United States, which again many people would refer to as amnesty. So there is obviously tension between the House and the Senate bills, and the concern right now is that there may not be a bill that will be suitable to both bodies that can be achieved in conference.

The big concern I think, in the House at least, is what has been referred to as the three-tiered approach in the Senate. And, obviously, most people who are here illegally at the present time are going to claim they have been here 5 years. It may be very difficult to ascertain how long somebody who is undocumented has been in the country because they are undocumented. It is very hard to ascertain what records are valid, which are not, and how long they have actually been here.

As a result, I have introduced legislation that could represent some common ground. This obviously will be controversial. No one agrees entirely on how we might go about bringing the two bills together, but I have introduced a bill called H.R. 4065, and the basic requirement are as follows:

It would require illegal aliens to return home to apply for a visa. In other words, they would have to return to their country of origin and apply at their home country consulate. Much of the paperwork could be done in the United States before they leave here, but it would have to be stamped in their home country. They then could reenter the country with a legal status and cross that border with papers as documented workers.

Secondly, this would provide for a 3-year visa which is conditional on continuous employment. It would be renewed every 3 years. This would be open to undocumented workers with, first, a demonstrated U.S. employment