

McNulty	Rahall	Space
Meehan	Ramstad	Spratt
Meek (FL)	Rangel	Stark
Meeks (NY)	Regula	Stearns
Melancon	Rehberg	Stupak
Mica	Reichert	Sullivan
Michaud	Renzi	Sutton
Miller (FL)	Reyes	Tancred
Miller (MI)	Reynolds	Tanner
Miller (NC)	Rodriguez	Tauscher
Miller, Gary	Rogers (AL)	Taylor
Mitchell	Rogers (KY)	Terry
Mollohan	Rogers (MI)	Thompson (CA)
Moore (KS)	Rohrabacher	Thompson (MS)
Moore (WI)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry
Moran (KS)	Roskam	Tiahrt
Moran (VA)	Ross	Tiberi
Murphy (CT)	Rothman	Tierney
Murphy, Patrick	Roybal-Allard	Towns
Murphy, Tim	Ruppersberger	Turner
Murtha	Rush	Udall (CO)
Musgrave	Ryan (OH)	Udall (NM)
Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Upton
Nadler	Salazar	Van Hollen
Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Velázquez
Neal (MA)	T.	Visclosky
Neugebauer	Sanchez, Loretta	Walberg
Nunes	Sarbanes	Walden (OR)
Oberstar	Saxton	Walsh (NY)
Obey	Schakowsky	Walz (MN)
Olver	Schiff	Wamp
Ortiz	Schmidt	Wasserman
Pallone	Schwartz	Schultz
Pascarell	Scott (GA)	Waters
Pastor	Scott (VA)	Watt
Paul	Serrano	Waxman
Payne	Sessions	Weiner
Pearce	Sestak	Welch (VT)
Pence	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Perlmutter	Shea-Porter	Weller
Peterson (MN)	Sherman	Westmoreland
Peterson (PA)	Shimkus	Wexler
Petri	Shuler	Wicker
Pickering	Shuster	Wilson (NM)
Pitts	Simpson	Wilson (OH)
Platts	Sires	Wilson (SC)
Poe	Skelton	Wolf
Pomeroy	Slaughter	Woolsey
Porter	Smith (NE)	Wu
Price (GA)	Smith (NJ)	Wynn
Price (NC)	Smith (TX)	Yarmuth
Pryce (OH)	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)
Putnam	Snyder	Young (FL)
Radanovich	Solis	

NOES—13

Campbell (CA)	Lungren, Daniel	Royce
Flake	E.	Sali
Hensarling	McCollum (MN)	Sensenbrenner
McHenry	Shadegg	
Lamborn	Miller, George	Whitfield

NOT VOTING—10

Bachus	Engel	McMorris
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Rodgers
Brown, Corrine	Larson (CT)	Souder
Cardoza		Watson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1215

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 323, I inserted by vote card but was not recorded. My intention was to vote “yes.” Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2237, PROVIDING FOR RE-DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AND DEFENSE CONTRACTORS FROM IRAQ; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2206, U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' CARE, KATRINA RECOVERY, AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2207, AGRICULTURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND WESTERN STATES EMERGENCY UNFINISHED BUSINESS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 387 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 387

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2237) to provide for the redeployment of United States Armed Forces and defense contractors from Iraq. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2206) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2207) making supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 4. (a) In the engrossment of H.R. 2206, the Clerk shall—

(1) await the disposition of H.R. 2237 and H.R. 2207;

(2) add the respective texts of H.R. 2237 and H.R. 2207, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 2206;

(3) conform the title of H.R. 2206 to reflect the addition of H.R. 2237 and H.R. 2207, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(4) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(5) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

(b) Upon the addition of H.R. 2237 and H.R. 2207, as passed by the House, to the engrossment of H.R. 2206, H.R. 2237 and H.R. 2207 shall be laid on the table.

SEC. 5. During consideration of H.R. 2237, H.R. 2206, or H.R. 2207 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of any such bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

I yield myself such time as I may consume and ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 387.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 387 provides for consideration of three bills, including the supplemental appropriations for the Iraq war.

It is striking to realize that for 4 years the war in Iraq has been funded by supplemental appropriations measures. From the beginning the White House has refused to plan ahead. Instead it has counted on Congress to accept its demands and pass one supplemental bill and then another time and time again, with no end in sight and no accountability required in return.

The American people have rejected a House that blindly accepts the administration's predictions about Iraq, all the while ceding its role in deciding matters of war and peace, the most solemn responsibility given to the Congress.

My fellow Democrats and I promised a new way forward. And so the first funding bill that we delivered to the President reconciled our party's conscience with the brutal realities the war presented to us, realities that we, unlike some in the administration, are willing to acknowledge.

We sought then, as we do now, to end this war but to do so responsibly, without adding to the suffering the Iraqi people and our soldiers have already experienced.

Our first bill provided the President with all of the funding he requested but attached conditions to it. We asked for the President to stand before the Nation and justify the war. We asked him to show how it was meeting the objectives that he himself had set out: the

promotion of political progress in the country and the increase of internal security in Iraq, all of which is his responsibility. And we said the war would not go on forever, that it must have an end, not an irresponsible end but an end.

The President rejected our offer out of hand. He told us that while he would never compromise, we had to.

Mr. Speaker, stubbornness is not the same as strength. Being obstinate is not equivalent to having conviction. This President famously told the world that he would refuse to alter his policy in Iraq even if, as he put it, nobody stood by him except his wife and his dog.

But he is not making decisions that impact only himself. The weight of his decisions are being borne by the American people and the people of Iraq. His decisions are costing American lives and they are costing Iraqi lives. They are overstressing our military. They are undermining the national security of this Nation. And they are not improving the wretched conditions of the Iraqis the war is theoretically helping.

The President must not be allowed to ignore everyone: the majority of the generals, the majority of the House, the majority of the Senate, the majority of the Nation, and the overwhelming majority of the world. He must not be allowed to ignore everyone when it is they who are bearing the burden of his war and suffering the consequences of his administration's mistakes. He must understand that his opinion, as sincere as it may be, is not the only one that matters. He must yield.

The bill we are considering today will, once again, give him the chance to acknowledge the demands of the citizens of this country. They are demanding a change of direction in Iraq, and this bill delivers it.

This legislation will fund military operations in Iraq between now and July. By then the President's surge plan will be in full effect, and its impact, either positive or negative, will be obvious. The President will report to Congress on the state of political and military progress in Iraq, and then we will vote on whether or not to provide the remaining funds that have been requested. Our degree of financial support at that point will be based not on endless promises or rosy scenarios, but on concrete reality on the ground in Iraq. Accountability is being introduced into the conduct of this war.

Mr. Speaker, let me also add that during the last debate on this supplemental, the President and his supporters told us the measure was "unclean," that it contained spending unrelated to the war effort.

That spending, Mr. Speaker, was for critical projects the last Congress failed to fund by not passing any budget at all for the year 2007, which included funding for veterans care, recovery from Hurricane Katrina, health insurance for children, home heating oil

for low-income families, and much more. In other words, there is nothing dirty about it. My fellow Democrats and I refuse to abandon it. We are going to fund these vital and important projects because people are counting on them. What is more, we campaigned on increasing the minimum wage, and this supplemental spending legislation will do that as well. And I hope we don't hear anything more about so-called "unrelated spending."

Mr. Speaker, it is long past time for this body to abandon the destructive rhetoric that has labeled this plan a form of "surrender." It is time to stop branding the Democrats, and a growing number of Republicans, who seek to end this brutal conflict as "defeatists."

We want our country to be secure. We want our military to be sound. We want the Iraqi people to be able to live with dignity. But we see that this war fought in this way is undermining all of those goals. And we are not alone. We speak for a clear and vocal majority of the American people, and we represent their wishes. For the sake of our citizens, for our soldiers, and the people of Iraq, we will be heard.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise to express my appreciation to my very good friend from Rochester, the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules (Ms. SLAUGHTER), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I have to say that this is somewhat unusual for me. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule, but I rise in even stronger opposition to the underlying legislation.

Here we go again, Mr. Speaker. These bills bring us to round three, round three of the Democratic leadership's Iraq charade.

First they brought up a bill that they knew the President would veto. Then they called for a veto override that they knew would fail. And today we are once again considering the same defeatist policy that failed in the first two rounds plus, plus, Mr. Speaker, a call for redeployment, basically withdrawal, within 90 days, to begin withdrawal within 90 days.

Mr. Speaker, they may think that they made progress, but in truth we have, in fact, gone backwards. Kicking the pullout vote a few months down the road is not a solution.

Mr. Speaker, the closing remarks that were just offered by the distinguished Chair of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, I think were right on target in describing the exact goal that we have here. We want to make sure that the American people are secure. We want to make sure that our troops can be successful. We want to make sure that our troops come home. And we want to make sure that the Iraqi people can live with dignity. The one thing that I will add with that statement that Ms. SLAUGHTER just made, Mr. Speaker, is that not only simply

live with dignity but with the kind of self-determination that led to a 70 percent voter turnout in Iraq. So obviously we share the exact same goal that Ms. SLAUGHTER just outlined.

But I am very, very troubled with the plans that we have before us. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, withdrawal that would begin in 90 days would undermine every single one of those goals to which Ms. SLAUGHTER just referred. And this time, Mr. Speaker, it is not just the President's opposition that stands in their way of what it is that they are trying to do. Their own colleagues in the Senate have said that the House Democratic leadership's approach won't work on their side of the Capitol.

□ 1230

Senate Majority Leader REID has criticized their punting strategy and acknowledged he has serious doubts that the House plan could actually get through the Senate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this policy of defeat couldn't prevail in April. It won't prevail in May. So it would appear the idea is to wait and hope for the best in July.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq is not a game. Funding our troops who are in harm's way is not a game. These votes may make my friends on the other side of the aisle feel good, but they aren't doing anything to get our troops what they need to protect themselves and to fight effectively against terrorists around the world. Mr. Speaker, that's what matters here.

Again, going back to the words of the very distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules, Ms. SLAUGHTER, we want to make sure that we are secure at home. The way to do that is to ensure that the troops have what they need.

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to have a serious, substantive debate to supply our troops with the funds they need to do their job and to demonstrate to the American people that we are doing what is necessary to win in Iraq and to bring our troops home. But rather than fulfilling our duties as responsible legislators, Democratic leadership has simply scheduled one more empty political vote under yet another totally closed process. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats go so far as to have three closed rules, two of them on appropriations bills. Now, we will consider four appropriations bills this year, and all of them, Mr. Speaker, will have been under a completely closed process. And we all know, under both Democrats and Republicans, the tradition is that when it comes to wartime supplementals, they be considered under an open amendment process, but that's been thrown out the door.

This is a far cry, Mr. Speaker, from the open and fair Congress that was promised to the American people. Worse yet, buried in the appropriations bill is yet another totally closed rule, completely and prospectively shutting out Republicans 2 months from now.

And they even go so far as to totally deny us a motion to recommit, something that we never did in the 12 years that we were in the majority. And those were tame restrictions when compared to what they tried to do to the Senate.

It has been said by my very good friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for whom I have the highest regard. I served with him for many years on the Rules Committee. I had the privilege for the past 8 years of chairing the Rules Committee, and during that period of time, Mr. McGovern would regularly say that the Rules Committee is the place where democracy goes to die. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is only fitting that it is the rule which provides for this bill, for his bill, that we will use to pronounce the time of death. And while this tactic fails to achieve a legislative success here at home, it is already producing disastrous results in Iraq.

Ryan Crocker, the very highly regarded new ambassador to Iraq, I've heard a number of leading Democrats, a number of leading outspoken foes of what it is that we are doing in Iraq speak very highly of Ryan Crocker. Ambassador Crocker said last week in an interview with Morton Kondracke of *The Roll Call*, that the Iraqis are watching the Democratic leadership's political games play out in Congress. They hear the calls to abandon our mission, and it is taking away any will to negotiate among political factions and achieve an effective government capable of bringing about a political solution to the crisis.

Mr. Speaker, as Kondracke puts it in his piece, and I quote, "What is going on in Congress is hurting Crocker's ability to get the sides in Iraq to make agreements with one another." He goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "It hardens the sectarian divisions. They think we are going to leave, and instead of reaching across lines and making agreements with the adversary, they are getting ready to go to the mat."

Now, that is what Mr. Kondracke writes following his discussion with Ambassador Crocker, and it's very troubling.

What we do here and say here, Mr. Speaker, has consequences. And the report back from the new Ambassador to Iraq is that those consequences are not good. Those who would declare this war lost before the new strategy of, again, the very highly regarded General David Petraeus, who enjoyed unanimous support of the United States Senate, that means Democrats and Republicans on a recorded vote provided unanimous support confirming General David Petraeus. We are now basically, with what we are trying to do here with this effort, not even giving his new strategy a chance to succeed, and I believe that it is a huge mistake.

Now, Mr. Speaker, like everyone in this institution and people around this country, I read the newspapers, and I watch the news. I watch the pictures

on television. And I know that the terrible images of violence that are broadcast every day permeate. And as we see those horrible pictures, I don't blame the American people for becoming extremely discouraged by what is being reported out of Iraq. And I will say that I am horrified by the pictures and the things that we see coming out of Iraq. But there is real and significant progress that is being achieved by our military.

Mr. Speaker, the *Chicago Tribune* editorialized just yesterday on one of the great success stories, that success story being the al Anbar province, which is the large province just to the west of Baghdad. Its capital city, Ramadi, was once described by the *New York Times* as the most dangerous city in Iraq and potentially the most dangerous city on the face of the earth. Today, Mr. Speaker, this former outpost for the insurgency is not only a secure city, it is a model for Sunni, Shia and American cooperation in the fight against the organization that was responsible for what happened on September 11, 2001, that being al Qaeda.

Mr. Speaker, the *Chicago Tribune* editorial said, "al Qaeda's terrorists in Iraq now face a new enemy, Sunni tribesmen in the al Anbar province." Their editorial goes on, and I quote, "These tribal leaders in the heart of the insurgency are now backing coalition and Iraqi forces against the terrorists." "You want good news from Iraq," the *Chicago Tribune* editorial goes on to say, "there it is, flashing in neon."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this editorial goes on to quote the *New York Times* report saying, "The progress has inspired an optimism in the American command that among some officials borders on giddiness." "There are some people who would say we have won the war out here," one Marine officer said. I am simply quoting, I would say to my friend, the chair of the Rules Committee, not something that a Republican said, but the editorial that appeared just yesterday. I would encourage all of our Members to look at that editorial in the *Chicago Tribune*.

Now, Mr. Speaker, through the Joint Services stations that have been established, local Sunni police, Shia Army officers and U.S. military have worked hand in hand to take back the city and the province and drive al Qaeda out. With the full support and cooperation of the local Sunni leaders, the Shia Army has earned the confidence of the local population. Through their alliance, they are achieving our objective for the entire country, peace sustained by the Iraqis themselves through national unity.

Mr. Speaker, General Petraeus came here, as we all know, just 2 weeks ago to provide Members of the House of Representatives with a classified briefing on Iraq. Unfortunately, the Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI, was unable to attend that briefing, but for those of us who were there, we were given a realistic picture from General Petraeus

of what was taking place. He did not, and I don't know all of the Members who were there, Mr. Speaker, but I will say, General Petraeus did not sugarcoat the tremendous challenges that lie ahead in this war in Iraq. But, Mr. Speaker, he also described tremendous successes, such as this great success that I just reported on in Ramadi, what was one of the most dangerous cities on the face of the Earth and has now been stabilized in the al Anbar province.

General Petraeus described the Sunni Arabs who have turned against al Qaeda and have joined the Iraqi Security Forces. Our American and Iraqi forces have succeeded in detaining a number of key network leaders, getting critical intelligence on how various elements of al Qaeda operate in Iraq, taking apart a car bomb network that killed 650 citizens in Baghdad and destroying several significant car bomb factories. These are the kinds of joint efforts that are taking place at this very moment in Iraq, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, General Petraeus has spoken publically about these successes, about the reduction in sectarian murders in Baghdad by two-thirds so far this year, about the tripling of seizures of weapons caches this year, about the revival of markets and the return of displaced families to neighborhoods and cities that were previously totally uninhabitable because of violence. Mr. Speaker, these success stories are not meant to paint a rosy picture of Iraq. And I will say that again, Mr. Speaker. I'm not attempting to sugarcoat the situation in Iraq. I'm not attempting to paint a rosy picture of what is taking place in Iraq. I know how horrendous and what a difficult situation this is.

We all know the enormous challenges that our military still faces there and will continue to face for some time to come, not just to be solved by September; it will extend longer than that, we all know that. The other night I was with Ambassador John Negroponte who reminded me of the public statement that he made just as he left his ambassadorial post in Baghdad; he said it would be at least 5 years. So we all know that this battle and this struggle is going to continue.

But what these successes do demonstrate very, very clearly is that we have not lost this war. They demonstrate that our men and women, when they have the necessary resources, can achieve victory. We must give General Petraeus adequate time and adequate resources to build upon these successes and make his new strategy work. Setting a day for defeat, whether it is today, next week or at the end of July or September is simply not an acceptable policy. Rationing funding for our troops is not an acceptable policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I offered two amendments yesterday in the Rules Committee that would have stricken two of the most egregious elements of

this legislation. First, I proposed to remove the July cutoff date for the troops' funding. Our generals in the field have said that this limitation ties their hands and keeps them from doing even their near-term planning, which is absolutely essential if the successes that we have seen are going to continue. Wars aren't won in 2-month increments, and military victories aren't achieved by congressional decree.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my second amendment would eliminate the requirement that the President make his reports to Congress on the Internet. Even in its unclassified form, this highly sensitive information would provide information to our enemies and the enemies of the Iraqi people. It would provide them with their blueprint for victory. The notion of providing this report from the President to the Congress, not in any kind of confidential way but on the Internet, is absolutely outrageous. There is no justifiable reason for us to give the people who are wanting to kill us and are responsible for the violence in Iraq this kind of information.

Now, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, neither of the amendments that I offered was made in order. They would have provided an opportunity to consider a troop funding bill that would actually be enacted and would actually fund the troops rather than simply staging one more meaningless vote allowing Members to posture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand very well, having been in the majority for a while, I understand that the Democratic leadership is in a very tough spot. They want to be able to say that they are funding the troops. At the same time, they have to accommodate their Members who want to get out yesterday. They want to get out immediately, regardless of the consequences. So their political situation is to schedule vote after meaningless vote. They get their weekly opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to say, "I support the troops," out of one side of their mouth, and "Let's retreat" and get out immediately out of the other side of their mouth.

□ 1245

But, Mr. Speaker, our troops and the American people deserve more than political gimmicks. We must stop playing dangerous games with the lives of the American people, our men and women in uniform, and the Iraqi people who have been struggling for freedom. We must get our troops the funding that they need and give our military commanders the means to win and to do what we all want, Mr. Speaker, to bring our troops home.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just respond to my colleague from California saying that we can't

win the war on 2-month funding intervals. I would submit we have now been at this Iraq war longer than it took us to win World War II when we were fighting both Japan and Germany, and still we are no closer, and, I would submit, further from what they define as "victory."

I, like so many Americans, have tried to be patient with this administration in extricating us from the difficulties we find ourselves in in Iraq. They first told us there were weapons of mass destruction. None were found, yet we were still patient. Then they told us we were there to remove a tyrant. We removed Saddam Hussein, yet we are still there, and we continue to be patient. They told us we were there to fight terrorism, and we have been fighting terrorism, and we still remain patient.

Now they tell us that we are there to make our families safer. Well, I don't feel that my family is any safer as a result of our being in Iraq. And like the American people, I am losing patience with the hollow promises that this administration has made about getting us out of Iraq.

I rise today in support of this rule because I think that it is time that we change the course, we change the direction. How many strategies is this administration going to adopt before they arrive at success?

Last night in the Rules Committee I got to thinking as we were discussing this rule about my own children, about my family, and I thought about how would my children look at me later in life, how would my grandchildren look at me later on, in terms of how we tried to stop this conflict in Iraq. Then I thought about a situation that I talked about a lot during my campaign.

During my campaign, when I was trying to decide whether or not I would run, my son and my daughter, who are both teenagers, were not supportive of that. One day my son said to me, Dad, what is it that a Congressman does? I started telling my son what a Congressman does.

He said, Dad, are you saying that if you get to Congress, you will be able to stop the war in Iraq?

I said, Not alone, but certainly with the other Members of Congress.

He said then, I really think that you should run for Congress, because the war in Iraq is a bad thing and too many people are dying.

My son, then 15 years old, got it. He understood what it was about. He understood that we are in Iraq for the wrong reason. He understood that it was time to change the course and change the direction.

That is why I rise today. I rise because I support the rule that will get us out of Iraq, but, more importantly, because my children know that it is the right thing to do.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gen-

tlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the honorable chairwoman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, our troops are brave and capable. They have fought heroically. But, Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to tell our President that he can no longer ignore the American people, this Congress or the reality of the situation we face in Iraq.

We have the responsibility to provide oversight, to ensure that our brave and honorable troops are provided a mission based on a realistic assessment and an achievable goal before we ask them to risk life and limb to implement it. We must end the strain that we have put on our brave military men and women and their families, and we must act today.

Mr. Speaker, we know we must get our troops out of the crossfire and the violence of the raging civil war in Iraq. We know what must be done for our soldiers in Iraq to ensure the protection of them and our families here at home. Our military and our National Guard are stretched thin. We must rebuild and re-equip both. Our National Guard in Ohio is training and working on gear that is obsolete. So not only are our military men and women at risk in Iraq; we have our homeland exposed to national emergencies and other threats that we may face. But our President has refused to acknowledge the reality of the situation that we face as a Nation, and I and many other Members of this Congress will not allow the status quo to continue.

For this reason, I cosponsored and will cast a powerful "yes" vote in support of H.R. 2237. This bill, authored by Mr. MCGOVERN, whom I respect tremendously for his courage and leadership, is responsible and will ensure the safe redeployment of our troops from Iraq. Our bill calls for the redeployment of our troops and allows Congress to take back from the President the reckless decisionmaking that we have seen.

Our bill also very importantly ensures a number of things: it protects the ability of our military to go after al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations in Iraq; it provides for the protection of diplomatic and other related U.S. personnel in Iraq; and, finally, it will truly shift our role in Iraq to training and equipping the Iraqi security forces.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to end this war; and, unfortunately, the failed policies of this administration and lack of oversight from past Congresses have left us with few options. 3,372 of our troops, including 157 brave military men and women from Ohio, have died in this war. It is time we did the responsible thing for our heroic soldiers, for their families and for our Nation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, we must end this war. On November 7, when the American people spoke in the last election, from Washington State to Florida, from Vermont to California, they made a very clear decision that they want to bring our troops home. Their challenge to us is to implement that policy.

Americans want a new direction in Iraq. The citizens of America know that the time has come to change direction, to bring our troops home with their heads held high in honor of a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, many of our finest, most highly decorated members of the military, now retired, can say publicly what in the past they could only say privately. It is this: Iraq is engaged in a civil war. It is not the proper job of our men and women in uniform to referee an Iraqi civil war.

The citizens of our country also recognize the obvious: if the Iraqi leadership is unwilling to help itself, how can we expect the American people and the American military to do that job for them? Iraqi leaders will not spend \$10 billion in funds available to improve electricity and water, yet expect Americans to spend our taxpayer dollars to do that.

Commonsense citizens in our country are asking an obvious question: If the Iraqi Parliament has work to do, why is it taking a 2-month vacation this summer, a vacation, when they haven't reached agreement on oil sharing, when they haven't allowed former Baathists, low level with no blood on their hands, to resume a place in that society, when they won't crack down on sectarian violence, and, Mr. Speaker, when they interfere with the efforts of the American military when they attempt to do so?

Mr. Speaker, there is a very clear recognition on the part of the American people, and it is this: our men and women in uniform have done their job. They toppled Saddam, they reported back that there were no weapons of mass destruction, and they did provide stability in Iraq so that they could have three elections.

What we face now is a White House that has dug its heels in and a President who refuses to change and adjust and provide leadership to the facts as they exist. Those facts: Iraq is engaged in a civil war, something the White House denies. Those facts: it is the job of the Iraqi political leadership and the people of Iraq to create a civil society. It is not the job of the military to do nation-building.

The legislation we have is going to allow us to change the direction of our policy from escalating militarily, as the President stubbornly pursues that policy, to a strategy of Iraqi self-control and stability in the region. I support the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I listened to my very good friend from Vermont, my Rules

Committee colleague, Mr. WELCH, for whom I have the highest regard, he talked about the fact that the President was sticking his heels into the ground and was not willing to make any modifications whatsoever.

Well, I will acknowledge that the President has in fact, I would say to my friend from Vermont, Mr. WELCH, stuck his heels in the ground when it has come to his quest for victory, to ensure that we keep the battle against al Qaeda and those forces that would want to do us in in Iraq. What he has done in recognizing that mistakes have been made, in recognizing that there have been challenges, as has historically been the case in war, we have seen a dramatic change.

I don't know if my friends have noticed, but there is a new Secretary of Defense, his name is Robert Gates; and there have in fact been a number of changes made. I don't know if people have noticed, there is in fact a new commanding general on the ground in Iraq. His name is David Petraeus. As I said in my opening remarks, he has enjoyed strong bipartisan support.

Obviously, these military leaders, the Secretary of Defense and other military leaders, are insistent upon giving a very sober assessment of what is taking place and not providing an unrealistic, rosy picture of what is happening in Iraq. And they have reported, they have reported that we have in fact seen success, especially, as I said in my remarks, in Ramadi, what was determined to be one of the most dangerous cities on the face of the Earth; and we have now seen stability there, and this alliance which exists, Sunni, Shia and American forces working together to bring about this kind of peace and stability.

So while I am not saying there aren't difficult days, weeks, months, and, Mr. Speaker, I hope not, but possibly difficult years ahead in Iraq, the fact of the matter is this President has made it very clear that he is willing to make modifications so that we can in fact ensure victory over those who want to do us in.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

□ 1300

Mr. INSLEE. Who are the real experts on the question of whether the lack of a timeline actually fuels the insurgency, the lack of a timeline actually making the violence worse?

One of them is named Muhammad al-Dini. He is an elected member of the Iraqi parliament. He was here yesterday, and I met with him. He told me that a majority, 144 members, of the elected Iraqi parliament 2 days ago signed a petition that basically said that the lack of a timeline is fueling

attacks against our troops. The lack of a timeline is fueling this insurgency. The lack of a timeline is playing into the hands of al Qaeda. And the reason he told us this is that it allows them to go out and recruit and say, Look, America is going to be here forever. And they recruit people that go out and attack us.

The other thing he told us is that the Maliki government is using our taxpayer dollars to run sectarian militias that go out and attack Americans. He urged us to adopt a timeline. An elected official in the parliament of the state of Iraq; now there is an expert.

It amazes me that people who have been wrong on Iraq for 4 years come down and lecture us, lecture us about whether a timeline is going to work or not. I think it might be handy in Congress to have a penalty box. If you have been wrong for 4 years on the right strategy in Iraq, maybe you should to go into the penalty box for a while and allow the people who were against this war from the beginning to have a say on what we do in Iraq.

What we are saying is, a lack of a timeline hurts. We need to bleed the insurgency of the fuel they use, and the fuel they use is the lack of a timeline.

One more thing, I read this headline: "Bush Told War is Harming the GOP." I don't care about the GOP or the parties. The GOP members went and told the President this is hurting the GOP. It doesn't matter who is getting hurt politically here. I will tell you what matters: Our sons and daughters are being killed in Iraq.

I hope some of my GOP colleagues, the next time they go to the White House, I hope they say, we don't care about the GOP or the DEM; we care about the Army and the Navy and the soldiers who are being killed in Iraq, and let's get a timetable and get us out of there.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me the opportunity to speak this afternoon.

I strongly support the rule. I strongly support our men and women in uniform who are courageously fighting to defend our freedoms. In my own district, we lost 14 soldiers. My recent trip to Iraq confirmed that to support our troops is to support their redeployment. Our troops told me they were overextended and underequipped. Many are on their second, third and fourth tour. They face increased risk without proper equipment and longer stays. In fact, not enough equipment was available for those new incoming soldiers that were just deployed by this President. That is what I heard from our troops when I visited there about a month ago.

Extending the tours of all active-duty personnel is unacceptable, a price our families shouldn't have to pay, nor our troops. As Members of Congress, we have the responsibility to protect and

provide for the best interests of all of our troops. That includes the redeployment out of Iraq and a safe return home.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and vote for these bills to support our troops.

One last comment. I want to thank the Speaker of this House for having the courage to allow us to vote on these very important pieces of legislation this day. It is indeed a historic day.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Dallas, the distinguished chair of the Republican Study Committee, Mr. HENSARLING.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. What happened to the most open and transparent and fair process that was supposed to occur in the history of Congress? We have a closed rule on top of a closed rule on top of a closed rule.

And now what we see is, yet again, the Democrats bringing a bill to the floor that our Secretary of Defense says is even worse than the last one they brought to the floor as far as tying the hands of our troops as they attempt to protect our freedom.

Once again we have a slow-bleed strategy for our troops in Iraq. Once again we still have a pork-laden supplemental.

Let's talk for a second about the ag bill. Now there is legitimate debate, and there may be legitimate reasons, and I agree that drought assistance may be necessary in certain parts of the country. But this is supposedly the PAYGO Congress? I have looked at this. Number one, where is the emergency? The drought took place last year. That is when the emergency was. Why isn't this going in regular order? Where is the offset?

Had there been an open rule, I would have been happy to offer an offset amendment. Once again, I don't know how anyone on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, can call this the PAYGO Congress. There are so many holes in this PAYGO it looks beyond Swiss cheese. This is one of the worse rules that I have seen brought to the floor, and every Member should rise in opposition and defeat this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, year five of blunders, that is a true slow-bleed policy in Iraq.

Defeatism? Well, that is an Administration that lacks the courage to admit its failures and which pays for those failures with the blood of the brave, the blood of someone else, and with \$10 billion of your tax money every single month.

Gimmicks? Gimmicks are what got us into Iraq in the first place. It certainly wasn't the "war on terrorism."

You can make all of the excuses that you want for continuing to embed our troops in a civil war, but a vote today

for the Iraq Redeployment Act is a vote to end endless war. It is a vote for a fully funded, safe, and orderly redeployment that allows us to refocus on the war on terrorism, which is a threat to our families, rather than the civil war in Iraq, which is not.

It is not the enemy that has us pinned down in Iraq today; it is this Administration's unwillingness to admit its mistakes and its lies.

The intervention in Iraq was this country's largest foreign policy blunder. Now it is time for Congress to intervene. With this war in its fifth year, for Congress not to act now is for Congress to become an enabler and an accomplice to the Administration's errors.

Vice President CHENEY rightly complains about the Iraqis proposing to take a two-month vacation. But what is really at fault here is Mr. CHENEY and this Administration's four-year vacation from reality.

"Victory" is improving our families' security. Pursuing policies contrary to that objective, committing the same error over and over again, that is defeatist.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 7½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who will explain why we didn't deal with agricultural disasters last year.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply say in response to the previous speaker on that side of the aisle, he claims that efforts on our part to withdraw our troops or redeploy our troops out of a combat situation represents a slow-bleed policy. I would suggest that the existing policy is a bleed-forever policy, and it needs to be changed.

The second question the gentleman asked referred to agriculture. He said, "Gee, these agriculture disasters occurred last year; why weren't they handled then?" That is a very good question. We weren't in charge last year. The other side was.

In fact, we have had agriculture disaster legislation pending for 2 years. The President declared 70 percent of the counties in this country to be disaster areas, and yet the last Congress couldn't put together a two-car funeral when it came to addressing that problem. So we are simply cleaning up in a separate bill; mind you, we are cleaning up last year's agriculture disaster problem. It is just another one of the leftover items from the previous Congress that we are now charged with the responsibility to finish.

Now let me get to what the real issue is in this bill.

The Washington Post carries a story this morning describing the efforts of the administration to use Iraqi government officials to try to get the Democratic lawmakers to ease the pressure on the White House to have a timetable for the withdrawal of troops. Mr. al-Rubaie is quoted as saying the following: "Now, nobody is talking about

sliding into a civil war, as we've been able to avoid it."

He added, "Portraying the scene there as Shiite killing Sunni and Sunnis killing Shiites is totally untrue."

What are they smoking? What do we see on television every day, despite the effort of the administration to shut down as much access on the part of the public to the carnage as is possible?

I strongly support this rule today for one simple reason: The President has asked the Congress to give him \$100 billion in additional funding to fight this war, no strings attached. The Congress passed a proposal and put it on the President's desk suggesting that there ought to be certain limitations on the President's conduct in return for getting the money. He vetoed that. He believes he is "the decider."

Well, under the Constitution, we are all supposed to be deciders. So now we have before us, in response to the President's action, a proposal to do three things: First of all, it would provide an opportunity to have an up-or-down vote on the issue of whether or not troops ought to be redeployed over the next year. I think that is what a democratic institution is supposed to do, to make choices like that.

Secondly, what we are proposing under this rule today will allow the Congress to require the President to report to the Congress on three things: First of all, since the President has said that, as Iraqi military units stand up, we should stand down, we have a sense of the Congress provision in this legislation which says that, as the President certifies that battalions have achieved full combat capability, that a certain number of corresponding U.S. units ought to stand down. It is not mandatory. It is a sense of the Congress that that ought to happen.

Secondly, we ask the President to report to the Congress on the progress that Iraq is making on the benchmarks that the President himself set out last fall as being the criteria by which we should judge Iraqi progress.

And then thirdly, so that it isn't a softball report, we are also asking that the President report to the Congress spelling out which of those benchmarks have actually been achieved. Has the Iraqi parliament actually passed an adequate oil revenue-sharing law which shares that oil equitably with Sunni, Shiites and Kurds alike, because if they don't do that, the Sunnis will never stop fighting?

And then, lastly, what we do is to set up a separate bill that deals with some of the domestic emergencies that we face that the President described as "pork." Among those is the agriculture disaster bill. And so we are considering that as a separate bill to demonstrate to the White House and to demonstrate to our critics that they are wrong when they say that we are afraid to let these programs stand on their own. So we are going to vote on them alone, and I happen to think they are in a stronger position when we vote on them alone.

It is going to be very interesting to see how many of our Republican friends from agricultural districts are actually going to support us in trying to provide that assistance.

□ 1315

After all, we did not declare those counties disaster areas. A fellow by the name of Bush did, and he's the guy that lives in that big white house, and when he makes a declaration like that, there ought to be certain consequences that flow from it, and we're simply meeting those obligations. So that's basically what we are trying to do.

As the gentleman from Washington said earlier, we simply happen to believe, those of us who are going to be supporting this proposition, we simply happen to believe that it would be nice if we were fighting the right war in the right place rather than the wrong war in the wrong place, and the right place to be taking al Qaeda on is in Afghanistan.

Now, we also provide in our proposition, we say that 60 days after or 60 days from now roughly, by July 13, by the time this bill is passed, by July 13, we guarantee the administration that the Congress will have an up-or-down vote on its own request for all the money. I don't know what more we can do.

What we are simply doing is we are letting the President report, letting him give his judgments to us. We then give the Congress about 10 days to absorb what the President has said, and then we vote, up or down, on two issues: number one, whether the President should get all the remaining money; and, number two, there's another amendment that would simply have us instead use that money to re-deploy our troops out of combat.

It's a fair, square deal. The administration gets a straight shot at what it wants and war critics get a straight shot at what they want. That, to me, is eminently fair.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I had one Member who was hoping to come over, and I do not see him here. So I'm going to yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, we all know how painful the war in Iraq has been. As I said in my opening remarks and throughout this debate, no one is trying to paint a rosy picture of the situation there.

My very good friend from Wisconsin, distinguished Chair of the Appropriations Committee, has just told us that we should be fighting the war in the right place. Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we have found tragically over the past several years is that al Qaeda can be found almost anywhere on the face of the Earth.

It was just a few months ago that we saw a successful effort by the Ethiopians going into Mogadishu, Somalia, to liberate that capital from the forces of al Qaeda. We know very well that on September 11, 2001, al Qaeda attacked us here in the United States, and we regularly go through the litany of the

actions of al Qaeda, Hamas, Hezbollah: the bombing of the two embassies, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania and Nairobi, Kenya; the USS Cole; the Khobar Towers; the World Trade Center in 1993.

We can go on and on and on about al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations. And guess what, Mr. Speaker, virtually everyone has acknowledged that the front line in the battle against al Qaeda is where they are mostly, and that is in Iraq.

Now, I just reported the great statement that came from our new ambassador, Ryan Crocker, in Iraq who has talked along with General Petraeus about the success that we have seen in the al Anbar province, in Ramadi in particular, one of the most dangerous spots on the face of the Earth until we saw this alliance develop among Sunni, Shia and American forces standing up against al Qaeda because, Mr. Speaker, al Qaeda is there in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that fighting al Qaeda in Iraq plays a big role in preventing them from attacking us right here in the United States of America, which is obviously their goal. They have done it before, and they would love to do it again.

This process around which we are considering this measure is very unusual to say the least. In fact, my good friend from Rochester, distinguished Chair of the Rules Committee, described this rule as one of the most complicated that we have ever seen.

Now, my good friend again, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, just talked about the fact that we are going to give the President his chance to see this. Well, here is what we are going to give the President. We are going to give the President a bill that potentially calls for cut-and-run and immediate withdrawal within 90 days, beginning a pullout of our troops in Iraq; number two, a supplemental appropriations bill that has all of this re-deployment that creates fits and starts, beginning and reduction, just incrementally putting it out, which has been harshly criticized by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gates; General Petraeus; Ambassador Crocker and others. So that is included in this measure, and then the agricultural appropriations provision.

Now, my friend from Wisconsin just asked how many Members will stand up and be supportive of the effort that I laud in dealing with something that we were not able to deal with in the last Congress as we struggled with the appropriations process, that, among others, being this agricultural appropriations issue, with the disasters that we have faced. And of course, there will be Members on our sides of the aisle who will support that.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think we need to recognize that this is the most convoluted process because we are not allowing it to stand on its own. What we are doing with this rule is we are taking all three of these very separate items, linking them up, and sending

them to our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol in the United States Senate, where the majority leader, Senator HARRY REID, the one who's already announced that we've lost the war in Iraq, he said there's very little chance of success there.

That's why I have always considered myself, I like to have that Jeffersonian spirit of a healthy skepticism, as opposed to a corrosive cynicism, which sometimes we have seen more than a few people slip to around here. But I can't help but be skeptical. I'm not going to be cynical, Mr. Speaker, but I can't help but be a little skeptical as we look at the one, two, three punch of vote after vote after vote when we know full well it will most likely die in the Senate; and if it by chance, as this last bill did, ends up getting to the President, it's going to be vetoed by the President.

So as I said earlier, it allows our colleagues to stand up, as so many have, during this debate saying they support the troops, but at the same time they want to get out immediately and not provide the troops with the kind of consistency and support that they need for us to be victorious.

Again, one of the interesting things that we hear, as we juxtapose the debate that emanates from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and ours, is that we regularly talk about victory. We regularly talk about being victorious in this battle against Islamic extremism, the battle which we all united to fight on September 11, 2001. It is tragic that we have gotten to the point where we are not united on this.

And I will acknowledge that there were some who tried to exude the image that Iraq was involved on September 11, and I never said that and most people I know never claimed that Saddam Hussein was involved in command and control of what happened on September 11, 2001; but, Mr. Speaker, I will say this: Saddam Hussein had the exact same goal for the future of the United States as al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden, and that's why we need to be prepared to fight them at any spot whatsoever.

I am going to offer when, I say "when" because I am going to be an eternal optimist, when we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer the amendment that I was speaking about earlier.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that just before the vote on the previous question that the text of my amendment that I am going to be submitting when we defeat the previous question be made in order, and I ask unanimous consent that that be included in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LYNCH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. And let me just briefly say that that amendment says that

when the President of the United States reports to the Congress that on the success in training or lack of success in training the Iraqi security forces, that that report not be made available to the leadership of al Qaeda by way of the Internet.

The amendment that I am going to offer when we defeat the previous question, Mr. Speaker, is an amendment that will allow us to say that we will strike the provision that says that the report from the President to the Congress is provided on the Internet for the world to see. We should not be feeding our enemies, those who want to kill us, with this kind of information.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to urge defeat of the previous question, and when we defeat that, I urge support of my quest to make the amendment in order that will allow us to prevent the President's report from getting on to the Internet for our enemy to see, and if by chance I am not successful, I urge defeat of the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to contradict my colleague from California, but we do not know the pain of this war. Members of Congress know it a little better than most people because we try to comfort the bereaved and visit the ones who are maimed, but we don't really know the pain of this war. We can't know about the 35,000 or more young people with life-altering wounds, people 18 and 19 years old who will live with them for the very rest of their lives.

We don't know the loss other people have sustained because nothing much is required of us except to pay the bill of \$10 billion a month, mostly borrowed from China, so we can finance this war.

There is no compelling reason why we should go on forever with this. Nothing that we are asking the President to put on the Internet is anything but classified and who is going to believe it anyway.

If the President is running out of money for the troops, it is simply because he vetoed the money that he asked us for that we sent to him. The fault, the blame lies exclusively with him.

And with that I ask all of my colleagues to vote for this rule on both sides of the House. Obviously, numbers of them didn't want to come down and talk today. Please vote for this rule. Cleanse your conscience. Let's do a good thing today for those people who count on us in Iraq.

The material previously referred to by Mr. DREIER is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 387 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER OF CALIFORNIA

(1) Amend section 2 to read as follows:

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2206) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The

amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority the Committee member of Appropriations; (2) the amendment printed in section 6, if offered by Representative Dreier of California or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

(2) At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

Strike section 1326(f) (relating to the public availability of information regarding the combat proficiency of Iraqi security forces).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. 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 are postponed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE FRED UPTON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable FRED UPTON, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2007.

HON. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that a judicial subpoena for trial testimony, issued by the United States Court of Federal Claims, has been delivered to my District Office.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by rule VIII.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Member of Congress.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2082, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 388 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 388

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2082) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 2082 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1330

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.