

Shuler	Taylor	Waters
Sires	Thompson (CA)	Watt
Skelton	Thompson (MS)	Waxman
Slaughter	Tierney	Weiner
Smith (WA)	Towns	Welch (VT)
Snyder	Udall (CO)	Wexler
Solis	Udall (NM)	Wilson (OH)
Spratt	Van Hollen	Woolsey
Stark	Velázquez	Wu
Stupak	Visclosky	Wynn
Sutton	Walz (MN)	Yarmuth
Tanner	Wasserman	Schultz

NOT VOTING—8

Brady (PA)	Herger	Watson
DeLauro	McMorris	
Engel	Rodgers	
Fattah	Souder	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1553

So the motion to resolve into secret session was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1585, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is expected to meet Tuesday, May 15, 2007, to grant a rule which may structure the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 1585, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008.

Members who wish to offer an amendment to this bill should submit 30 copies of the amendment and a brief description of the amendment to the Rules Committee in H-312 in the Capitol no later than 5 p.m. on Monday, May 14. Members are strongly advised to adhere to the amendment deadline to ensure the amendments receive consideration.

Amendments should be drafted to the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services. A copy of that bill will be posted on the Web site of the Rules Committee tomorrow, May 11.

Amendments should be drafted by Legislative Counsel and also should be reviewed by the Office of the Parliamentarian to be sure that the amendments comply with the rules of the House. Members are strongly encouraged to submit their amendments to the Congressional Budget Office for analysis regarding possible PAYGO violations.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 1419

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, there was a mistake by which some Members were inadvertently added as cosponsors

to a bill, and now I would ask unanimous consent to remove these cosponsors from H.R. 1419:

Mr. HINOJOSA
Mr. CONAWAY
Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida
Mr. BACHUS
Mr. HOLT
Ms. MATSUI
Mr. ROHRABACHER
Mr. SKELTON
Mr. PETRI
Mr. WILSON of South Carolina
Mr. REHBERG
Mr. FEENEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR REDEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AND DEFENSE CONTRACTORS FROM IRAQ

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 387, I called up the bill (H.R. 2237) to provide for the redeployment of United States Armed Forces and defense contractors from Iraq, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2237

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REDEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AND DEFENSE CONTRACTORS FROM IRAQ.

(a) COMMENCEMENT OF REDEPLOYMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall commence the redeployment of units and members of the Armed Forces deployed in Iraq as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom and contractors operating in Iraq and funded using amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense.

(b) COMPLETION OF REDEPLOYMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall complete the redeployment of the Armed Forces and defense contractors from Iraq within 180 days beginning on the date of the commencement of the redeployment required under subsection (a).

(c) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO INCREASE ARMED FORCES SERVING IN IRAQ.—Funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense under any provision of law may not be obligated or expended to increase the number of members of the Armed Forces serving in Iraq in excess of the number of members serving in Iraq as of January 1, 2007, unless the increase has been specifically authorized in advance by an Act of Congress.

(d) AUTHORITY TO DETERMINE LOCATIONS OUTSIDE OF IRAQ FOR REDEPLOYMENT.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to restrict the locations outside of Iraq to which units and members of the Armed Forces redeployed from Iraq may be transferred, including redeployment to an adjacent or near-by country at the invitation of the government of the country or redeployment to bolster military forces deployed in Afghanistan as part of Operation Enduring Freedom.

(e) AUTHORITY TO RETAIN ARMED FORCES IN IRAQ FOR LIMITED PURPOSES.—The Secretary of Defense may retain in Iraq members of the

Armed Forces for the purpose of providing security for the United States Embassy and other United States diplomatic missions in Iraq; protecting American citizens, including members of the Armed Forces; serving in roles consistent with customary diplomatic positions; engaging in targeted special actions limited in duration and scope to killing or capturing members of al-Qaeda and other terrorist organizations with global reach; and training and equipping members of the Iraqi Security Forces. At the request of the Government of Iraq, the Secretary of Defense may retain in Iraq members of the Army Corps of Engineers and defense contractors engaged in reconstruction projects in Iraq, to the extent necessary to complete such projects.

(f) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR SAFE AND ORDERLY REDEPLOYMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated or otherwise made available in any Act are immediately available for obligation and expenditure to plan and execute a safe and orderly redeployment of the Armed Forces and defense contractors from Iraq, as required by this section.

(g) TRANSFER OF UNITED STATES MILITARY FACILITIES IN IRAQ.—The President of the United States shall transfer to the Government of Iraq all right, title, and interest held by the United States in any military facility in Iraq that was constructed, repaired, or improved using amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense and occupied by a unit of the Armed Forces.

(h) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO FURTHER DEPLOY UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES TO IRAQ.—Beginning on the date of the completion of the redeployment of the Armed Forces from Iraq under subsection (b), funds appropriated or otherwise made available under any provision of law may not be obligated or expended to further deploy units or members of the Armed Forces to Iraq, including through participation in any multinational force in Iraq, except as provided under subsection (e) or unless such deployment of units or members of the Armed Forces is specifically authorized in advance by an Act of Congress.

(i) ASSISTANCE TO IRAQI SECURITY FORCES AND MULTINATIONAL FORCES IN IRAQ.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit or otherwise restrict the use of funds available to the Department of Defense for the purpose of providing financial assistance or equipment to the Iraqi Security Forces or multinational forces providing security or training in Iraq at the request of the Government of Iraq.

(j) CONTINUATION OF DIPLOMATIC, SOCIAL, AND ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES IN IRAQ.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit or otherwise restrict the use of funds available to any department or agency of the United States (other than the Department of Defense) to carry out diplomatic, social, and economic reconstruction activities in Iraq at the request of the Government of Iraq.

(k) ASYLUM OR OTHER MEANS OF PROTECTION FOR IRAQI CITIZENS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit or otherwise restrict the authority of the President to arrange asylum or other means of protection for Iraqi citizens who might be physically endangered by the redeployment of the Armed Forces from Iraq.

(l) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “Armed Forces” has the meaning given the term in section 101(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 387, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2237.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the sponsor of the bill (Mr. McGOVERN).

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this war is a terrible tragedy, and it is time to bring it to an end. This is a straightforward bill to redeploy our military forces from Iraq and to end the war in Iraq, and I want to thank the leadership for bringing it to the floor today.

This bill would allow the administration and joint chiefs 3 months to plan a safe and orderly redeployment process, and then an additional 6 months to carry it out. It provides for the orderly transfer to Iraqi authorities the military bases and facilities we have constructed and occupied on their national territory, as General Petraeus himself has always insisted would happen when we depart from Iraq.

The bill permits U.S. Armed Forces to remain deployed in Iraq in order to protect U.S. embassy and diplomatic personnel. It also allows limited special operations to pursue members of al Qaeda and other global terrorist organizations, and it continues the training and equipping of Iraqi security forces.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not walk away from Iraq or the Iraqi people. It specifically continues diplomatic, social, economic, and reconstruction aid, and it allows the President to provide asylum or other means of protection to those Iraqi citizens who might be physically endangered by our leaving Iraq because of services they provided to our military personnel.

Finally, this bill leaves all the decisions on the locations outside of Iraq to which our troops will be redeployed wholly in the hands of our military commanders. They may be deployed to neighboring countries or transferred to Afghanistan. Many, I hope, would be sent home by commanders, grateful that their service is now completed. And many of our proud Guard and Reserve units would, I hope, return to their stateside duties to protect our homeland.

Mr. Speaker, there is no nice, neat, easy way to leave Iraq. Every Member in this Chamber understands that. But it is the right thing to do. The American people have chosen us to act on this matter, and we must act.

Redeployment of our troops will set a new dynamic into motion in Iraq and the region. It will force the Iraqis, their neighbors, and the international community to finally confront the tough issues of reconciliation. Until we leave, no one has to make the hard choices about how Iraqis are going to live together or die together.

Like all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I stand in awe of our uniformed men and women, who have performed fearlessly and tirelessly in Iraq. But we should no longer demand that their sweat, blood, and lives be sacrificed on the altar of Iraqi sectarian violence. They are needed elsewhere, in Afghanistan, in the region, and here back home. Their duties, their global mission and purpose continue, but Iraq must find its own way.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. For four long deadly years, this administration and their allies in Congress have been flat wrong about Iraq. The time has come for us to begin redeploying our troops from Iraq in a safe and orderly manner.

Now, every one of us, whether we voted for or against the war, has a responsibility for the men and women who have been put in harm's way. It is easy to say stay the course; but I would remind my colleagues, none of us will wake up tomorrow in the midst of a civil war in Iraq. None of us will have to go on patrol in Fallujah or Baghdad. We owe our troops better than rhetoric; we owe them honesty and action.

For me, this is a vote of conscience. For me, this is a way to restore the good and decent name of the United States. For me, this is a way to best serve our men and women in uniform, by bringing them home to their families.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill and vote to end the war.

□ 1600

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if today's actions by the House are any indication, it appears that the Out of Iraq Caucus within the Democratic majority is now running the legislative agenda of the Congress.

How else can one explain that the rule governing consideration of debate of funding of our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan provides only two legislative options with regard to U.S. troops in Iraq and Afghanistan?

The first, which we are now debating, is an immediate withdrawal of troops from Iraq. The second, which we will debate shortly, rations funding to our troops over a 60-day period. Both options are short-sighted, and they are also dangerous.

My colleagues, where did this bill come from?

I gather it was hastily written and introduced last night in an attempt to obtain votes for the Obey Iraq supplemental we will be considering a little later.

Indeed, the consideration of this withdrawal legislation is nothing more than an attempt by the Speaker and the majority leader to appease members of the Out of Iraq Caucus so they will support the second version offered by Chairman OBEY.

Once again, the majority has brought legislation to the House floor under a closed rule without an opportunity for amendment or meaningful debate. Not

only is this an abuse of the legislative process, it is an overt violation of the longstanding traditions of the House. The majority is making a mockery of the time-honored customs of this body. That, in and of itself, is shameful. It is the People's House and the people of our country who suffer when open debate is stifled in order to preordain a legislative outcome.

Fortunately, this legislation, which embraces surrender and defeat, will not pass today. Most Members of the House, both Republican and Democrats, have grave reservations about the manner in which this legislation undermines our troops and the authority of the President and the commander in chief.

Members on both sides of the aisle have expressed concern about the effects of an ill-conceived military withdrawal. And Members are rightfully concerned about any legislation that places military decisions in the hands of politicians rather than the military commanders in the field.

The last thing our country or our troops need is to have 535 Members of the House and Senators micromanaging the war in Iraq. Recent history reminds us that the enemy we face in Iraq, Afghanistan and other countries that harbor terrorists, will stop at nothing to attack the United States and our allies. They view the consideration of this measure and the Obey bill we will consider shortly, as a sign of weakness.

Al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations are watching us closely, hoping this lack of resolve will prevail. We must not let that happen.

My colleagues, now is not the time for the United States to back down from its commitment to the war on terror. Now is not the time for America to signal retreat and surrender. Indeed, now is not the time for the House of Representatives to throw in the towel, wave the white flag or signal retreat and surrender in Iraq.

How could this Congress walk away from our men and women in uniform? How could we walk away from them now? We must, we must support our troops. Our failure to learn the lessons of history, our failure to lead will result in devastating consequences, including an even greater loss of lives in the future.

It is absolutely essential that America, the last remaining superpower on earth, continue to be a voice for peace and a beacon for freedom in our shrinking world.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the McGovern/Out of Iraq Caucus bill.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK).

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of this bill because it would change our strategy in Iraq towards the successful outcome, while ensuring that America will be more secure. It

does so by providing, most importantly, a date certain by which we will not be in Iraq, approximately 9 months from its enactment, that serves as the sole remaining leverage we have to change the structure of incentives in that country and in the region toward stability.

Presently, the Iraqi ministries are personal fiefdoms where the leaders pursue their personal ambitions while we provide them political and military cover in what is now principally a civil war.

Political reconciliation. How? When their very top Shia and Kurdish leaders recently told Senator HAGEL and me that the re-Baathification law is only appeasement to the Sunnis. But our U.S. leaders in Iraq say it is critical to success and stabilization.

A date certain finally forces the Iraqis to make the difficult political compromises they are presently avoiding; more importantly, it changes the incentives and therefore the behavior of Iran and Syria from being involved destructively in this war because we are bleeding towards working for stability.

As our top political leader in Iraq said, Iran does not want a failed state if we depart.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Kentucky will control the time of the gentleman from California.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I hope the American public sees the irony in the votes that we are going to take this afternoon and evening. Before us now we are going to take a vote to pull out of Iraq immediately. Then, right after that, we are going to take a vote to fund the troops so they can stay a while.

So I guess the only difference between the House Democrats today and Senator KERRY a year ago, where he voted for Iraq before he voted against Iraq, is that our friends get to do it all in the same day.

Now, the other irony that I thought was interesting today is that we had a visitor, the deputy prime minister of Iraq, that was coming here with a message of what is really going on in Iraq. And he met with a group of us this morning in HC-9, separated only by a thin wall to the caucus that was occurring with our friends from the other side of the aisle where they were plotting the strategy of how to get out of Iraq.

I think it shows one of the differences between the two parties where we are meeting with the government officials on how to get them stood up, how do we strengthen the government there so they can take over their own operations without falling to the al Qaeda; at the same time, our friends are plotting on the other side to pull out and abandon them.

I think the day is just full of ironies, and I hope that the general public gets to see those today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill and of our troops. The tragedy in Iraq has gone on far too long. For 4 years, this administration and its supporters have put forth arguments based on misinformation and fear. I would urge my colleagues to remember this during today's debate.

This administration and the Republican leadership in Congress have presided over perhaps the biggest foreign policy and national security blunder in our Nation's history. They have ignored, shouted down and attempted to intimidate anyone who has dared to disagree.

And now, after 4 years, we see the thousands of brave Americans killed or seriously injured, untold numbers of Iraqis dead and the country in chaos.

Our troops have done everything, and I mean everything, that has been asked of them. But they have been let down by the administration that dishonors their tremendous service and sacrifice with its incompetence and arrogance.

Let us, please, finally make a change in Iraq. Let us end the war and bring our troops home.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and support our troops.

I rise in strong support of this bill and of our troops.

The tragedy in Iraq has gone on far too long.

This legislation would bring our involvement there to an end.

I have listened now for more than 4 years as the administration and its supporters up here have come forward with one reason after another for: why we have to invade, why we have to stay, and what will happen if we "fail."

They've never made sense to me. Their arguments have been based either on misinformation or fear.

The Bush administration has stumbled and bumbled, dissembled and distorted on Iraq so much that no one—no one—believes a word it says.

Last night, NBC News quoted a Republican Congressman telling the President that "word about the war and its progress cannot come from the White House or even you, Mr. President. There is no longer any credibility."

That is the reality.

So I would urge my colleagues, as they listen to this debate and hear from the Republican leadership and White House why the McGovern bill or the Supplemental Appropriations bill are so wrong, to remember this history.

Mr. Speaker, this administration and the Republican leadership in Congress have presided over perhaps the biggest foreign policy and national security blunder in our Nation's history. They've ignored, shouted down and attempted to intimidate anyone who has dared disagree.

After 4 years we are left with thousands of brave Americans killed or seriously injured, an untold number of Iraqis dead, and the country

in chaos. Most tragically, the cost for all these mistakes has been borne by the men and women who wear the uniform, and their families.

Our troops have done everything—everything—that has been asked of them. But they have been let down by an administration that dishonors their tremendous sacrifice with its incompetence and arrogance.

Let us please, finally, make a change in Iraq. Let us end the war and bring our troops home.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to support our troops.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished ranking member on the Armed Services Subcommittee on Appropriations, Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I didn't intend to speak on this until I read the bill, and I didn't have much chance to read the bill because it didn't go through any committee, and it was only introduced last night.

But this bill is an illusion. It is not what it is proposed to be. It is one of those situations where you giveth on one hand, and you take away with the other hand.

I am looking specifically at subsection (e). After saying that we have to remove our troops out of Iraq within so many days, subsection (e) says, "the Secretary of Defense may retain"—in other words, keep troops in Iraq—"for the purpose of providing security for the embassy, the U.S. embassy"; we do that now. And "other United States diplomatic missions in Iraq"; other diplomatic missions in Iraq; we do that now. "Protecting American citizens"; we do that now. "Including members of the Armed Services serving in roles consistent with customary diplomatic positions"; we do that now.

Listen to this one: "engaging in targeted special actions limited in duration and scope to killing or capturing members of al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations". My goodness, that is what we are doing now.

"Training and equipping members of the Iraqi Security Forces." That is what we are doing now. "And may retain in Iraq members of the Army Corps of Engineers and Defense contractors engaged in reconstruction projects in Iraq." We are doing that now.

Subsection (h) on page 4. "Prohibition on the use of funds to further deploy United States Armed Forces to Iraq." The funds may not be obligated or expended to further deploy units or members of the Armed Forces to Iraq, including through participation in any multinational force, except as provided under subsection (e), which is the subsection that I just referred to.

And then it goes to subsection (i), assistance to Iraqi security forces. "Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit or otherwise restrict the use of funds available to the Department of Defense for the purpose of

providing financial assistance or equipment to the Iraqi Security Forces or multinational forces providing security or training in Iraq." We do that now.

You have to get out of Iraq, but you are allowed to stay to do all of these things that we are already doing.

Vote yes if you want to. Vote no if you want to. That is not up to me. But I just wanted to point out the fact that, if you think this bill gets you out of Iraq, think again. Read subsection (e), because it doesn't accomplish what we are told that it does.

So I say again, this is an illusion. It gives with one hand, but it takes away with the other.

Mr. OBEY. In that case, I assume the administration is going to support the bill.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Democrats in the House voted four times to end this war in Iraq, yet the President and most of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to acknowledge the realities on the ground and continue to ignore the pleas of the American people.

Sadly, the President is dealing with an Iraq that exists only in his imagination. It is time for the President to understand that this House will not endorse a blank check for an endless war. Our resolve remains unwavering because we know the American people have our back.

Under the leadership of Speaker PELOSI, we are united in our efforts to bring an end to this war. Congressman McGOVERN's bill moves us closer to achieving that goal.

The phones in my office are ringing off the hook with constituents, as I am sure they are across the Capitol, asking me to vote, begging me to vote for this bill to put an end to the war in Iraq.

Listen to the mothers of America on this Mother's Day weekend. They are saying, support our children in uniform by bringing them home.

This bill does that. I urge strong support for it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts for offering this important piece of legislation.

□ 1615

I voted against the war in Iraq, but I have since voted to give our troops the resources to succeed in their mission. They have done exceptional work. But they are now being asked to take sides in a civil war. This is not what we sent them to do, and it is time to bring our troops home.

Let us be clear. Removing our troops from the midst of a civil war does not

mean we are abandoning Iraq. We will continue to train Iraqi security forces, support political reconciliation and economic reconstruction, and engage the international community to promote a lasting peace. Most importantly, we will continue to hunt down al Qaeda wherever they may hide. What we will not do is blindly follow the President's failed strategy, which has damaged our military without improving national security.

The situation on the ground has changed, and our plan should too. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to demand a new direction and end the conflict in Iraq and bring our troops home.

I thank the gentleman for offering this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this measure will allow us to begin redeploying our combat forces in Iraq and pursuing a new strategy for success. I voted against giving the President authority to go to war, but I have since voted to give our troops the resources to succeed in their mission. They have done exceptional work, but they are now being asked to take sides in a civil war—resolving conflicts that stretch back for centuries. That is not what we sent them to do, and it is time to bring them home.

Let us be very clear about what this bill does, because there is a lot of rhetoric clouding this debate. Removing our troops from the middle of a civil war does NOT mean we're abandoning Iraq. We will continue to train the Iraqi Security Forces. We will continue to support political reconciliation and economic reconstruction. We will continue to engage the international community to promote a lasting peace. Most importantly, we will continue to hunt down al Qaeda wherever in the world they may try to hide. What we will not do is blindly follow the President's failed strategy—a strategy that has damaged the readiness of our military without improving our national security. The situation on the ground has changed, and our plan should be adjusted accordingly. Sadly, the President has decided to trust his own judgment over that of our military commanders, millions of Iraqis, and, most importantly, the American people. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to demand a new direction that strengthens our military and ends the conflict in Iraq.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Chairman OBEY, first of all, for his strong and determined effort and his diligent effort to end this war. And, also, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN) for offering this bill.

H.R. 2237 does reflect the goals of what we call the Lee amendment, which was sponsored by Congresswomen WATERS, WOOLSEY, WATSON, and CLARKE. But let me tell you the goal of this bill, as the goal of the Lee amendment really is an effort to fully fund the safe and timely redeployment of our troops from Iraq. It is responsible. It is practical. It does not cut the

funding. But it designates what the supplemental can be used for, and that is to fully fund a safe withdrawal and redeployment and help the Iraqis stabilize their country with a diplomatic, social, and reconstruction effort.

Members of Congress now can choose between standing with the President or the American people who want an end to this occupation, or the President, as I said, who wants an open-ended commitment to this failed policy.

History will record that this war was a deadly mistake. History will document the damage that it has already done to our security and the security of the world, just as it already records the case for the war as fraudulent, something that we all would have known had the House approved my amendment in 2002 that would have allowed the United Nations inspectors to finish their job.

One day history will record that this unnecessary occupation ended. What remains to be seen is when it will end and at what cost in lives and treasure and what cost to our security and the security of the world.

For those Members who recognize that the President's policy is a failure but are concerned about voting to end this failed policy and to redeploy our troops, I have a question for you: At what point will you be comfortable with that vote? When the death toll hits 5,000 or 10,000?

Please vote for this. Please vote to end this occupation and bring our young men and women home. Please stop the deaths.

We have already paid close to half a trillion dollars pursuing this failed policy.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot "win" an occupation, just as the United States cannot "win" an Iraqi civil war.

We know that there is no military solution to the situation in Iraq. Our generals have told us that. The fact is that, the presence of our troops, who are seen as an occupying force, inflames the very insurgency that they are asked to deal with.

In listening to this desperate rhetoric about "surrender," and about "defeat" I am confident that history will look upon such remarks with the same ridicule that it reserves for the Vietnam war supporters discredited "domino theory" or the President's "mission accomplished" speech on the decks of the USS *Abraham Lincoln*, more than 4 years ago.

Today, members of Congress will decide what side of history they will be on. I urge them to stand with the American people and all those who recognize that there is no military solution to the situation in Iraq, and to vote for H.R. 2237, legislation to fully fund the safe and timely withdrawal of our troops from Iraq.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that I have come down to this well to demand that our troops come home and that we end the occupation of Iraq. In fact, I have come to the floor over 200 times. And as the first Member of Congress to call on the

President to bring our troops home and the author of the first amendment on the floor requiring the President to bring a plan to the House on how he will end this debacle that he started, you can know that I am very pleased that this vote is before us today. Finally, after 4 years here we are.

Many of the provisions in the bill were included in H.R. 508, the Bring the Troops Home and Iraq Sovereignty Restoration Act, a bill that I introduced with Representative LEE and Representative WATERS. These provisions will fully fund bringing the troops home, prohibit permanent bases, give the Iraqi people sovereignty and a sense of hope for their future.

My colleagues, I urge you to support H.R. 2237. The American people are asking that we stand up for our troops, and we do that by fully funding them to bring them home. Bring them home to their families. Bring them home so that we can end this misguided occupation. By passing H.R. 2237, we will bring our troops and our military contractors out of Iraq safely.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am thinking about a teddy bear that is in my office, and I think about it because I remember going to a funeral when a mother placed a teddy bear and a red fire truck in the coffin of her young fallen hero, a member of the United States military that lost his life in Iraq.

No, it is not the Iraq Caucus that is running this very poor and devastating agenda of this White House. Rather, I would like to say that I am proudly a member of the Iraq Caucus. And I thank Mr. McGOVERN, the Speaker of the House, Mr. OBEY, and Mr. MURTHA for understanding that our children are dying and that we must do something that faces the fact that our troops have won the victory. So I hope that we will debate H.R. 930 that says there has been a military success but this is a devastatingly wrong political mission that we are on.

The President has to listen. This is 90 days plus 180 days, 9 months to redeploy. That's fair. We will fund our troops. That's fair. It is time now to bring our troops home because we love our children and we love America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2237, the "Iraq Redeployment Act." I rise in strong support of this legislation because I am listening, and responding to the will of the American people. Last November, Americans went to polls by the millions united in their resolve to vote for change. They voted for a new direction and a change in the Bush administration's disastrous policy in Iraq. The new Democratic majority heard them and responded by passing H.R. 1591, the Iraq Ac-

countability Act. The President vetoed the bill, demanding instead a continuation of the ancient regime under which the Republican-led Congress gave him a blank check to mismanage the occupation and reconstruction of Iraq.

Those days are over. No matter how many veto threats the President issues, this Congress is not going to give him a blank check to escalate and continue the war ad infinitum. It is long past time for change in Iraq. It is time for the people and government of Iraq to take primary responsibility for their own country. It is time for the President to recognize the reality on the ground in Iraq. The time when a surge in troops is useful and necessary is past. It is now time to redeploy our troops and launch a diplomatic surge for national and political reconciliation in Iraq. H.R. 2237 will help achieve this goal and that is why I support the measure.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more important issue facing the Congress, the President, and the American people than the war in Iraq. It is a subject upon which no one is indifferent, least of all members of Congress. The Framers understood that while the military does the fighting, a nation goes to war. That is why the Framers lodged the power to declare war in the Congress, the branch of government closest to the people. They knew that the decision to go to war was too important to be left to the whim of a single person, no matter how wise and well-informed he or she might be.

Four years ago, President Bush stood under a banner that proclaimed "Mission Accomplished." If the mission was to further place our troops in harm's way at the hands of insurgents and sectarian violence, then it is mission accomplished. After spending more than \$400 billion dollars sacrificing the lives of 3,381 of America's finest citizen-soldiers, what have we accomplished and where are we headed?

I cannot support the President's waging of a war that has no clear direction, does not meet the benchmarks that the President set, and has no visible target.

Four years after launching the invasion, conquest, and occupation of Iraq, the evidence is clear and irrefutable: the preemptive invasion of Iraq, while a spectacularly executed military operation, was a strategic blunder without parallel in the history of American foreign policy. This is what can happen when the Congress allows itself to be stampeded into authorizing a president to launch a preemptive war of choice.

It is time to change our strategy in Iraq. It is time to engage the key stakeholders in the Middle East and make real strides towards securing a just and lasting peace in Iraq and for the Iraqi people. And most important, bring our troops home so they can be reunited with their families, friends, and neighbors.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, in February of this year I introduced H.R. 930, the "Military Success in Iraq and Diplomatic Surge for National and Political Reconciliation in Iraq Act of 2007." Title I of my legislation, the "Military Success in Iraq Act of 2007" (M-S-I-A) or "Messiah," offers an honorable deliverance from Iraq. Let me explain.

In October 2002, the Congress authorized the President to use military force against Iraq to achieve the following objectives:

1. To disarm Iraq of any weapons of mass destruction that could threaten the security of

the United States and international peace in the Persian Gulf region;

2. To change the Iraqi regime so that Saddam Hussein and his Baathist party no longer posed a threat to the people of Iraq or its neighbors;

3. To bring to justice any members of al Qaeda known or found to be in Iraq bearing responsibility for the attacks on the United States, its citizens, and interests, including the attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001;

4. To ensure that the regime of Saddam Hussein would not provide weapons of mass destruction to international terrorists, including al Qaeda; and

5. To enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.

Every one of these objectives has long been accomplished. Iraq does not possess weapons of mass destruction. Saddam Hussein has been deposed, captured, and dealt with by the Iraqi people. The American military has caught or killed virtually every member of al Qaeda in Iraq that was even remotely responsible for the 9/11 attack on our country. Last, all relevant U.N. resolutions relating to Iraq have been enforced. In other words, every objective for which the use of force in Iraq was authorized by the 2002 resolution has been achieved.

Mr. Speaker, since the objectives which led Congress to pass the 2002 Authorization to Use Military Force (AUMF) have been achieved, I believe the authorization to use that military force expires automatically. My legislation affirms this proposition. Additionally, I believe, and my legislation provides, that it is the Congress that is the ultimate arbiter as to whether the objectives set forth in a congressional AUMF have been achieved.

Mr. Speaker, where a Congressional authorization to use military force has expired, the President must obtain a new authorization to continue the use force. My legislation requires the President to do that as well. Finally, my bill requires that if the Congress does not vote to reauthorize the use of force in Iraq within 90 days after determining that the objectives set forth in the 2002 AUMF have been achieved, all American armed forces in Iraq must be redeployed out of Iraq. Thus, under my legislation, an up-or-down vote must be held by the House and Senate to continue waging war in Iraq.

I am not talking about "cutting and running," or surrendering to terrorists. And I certainly am not talking about staying in Iraq forever or the foreseeable future. The Armed Forces won the war they were sent to fight. Their civilian leadership has not succeeded in winning the peace. That is why the United States should surge diplomatically and politically.

Title II of H.R. 930, the "Diplomatic Surge for Political and National Reconciliation in Iraq Act," implements 12 of the most important recommendations of the Iraq Study Group. Significantly, it creates a high-level Special Envoy for National and Political Reconciliation in Iraq (SENPRI). This Special Envoy would consist of individuals like former Secretary of State Colin Powell, Madeleine Albright, or James Baker who would undertake the peaceful reconciliation of the major stakeholders in a free and democratic Iraq, particularly the Sunnis, Shiites, and Kurds.

All 6 of Iraq's neighbors—Iran, Turkey, Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait—have an interest in a stabilized Iraq because

as the Iraq Study Group report makes clear, none of these countries wants to live with an Iraq that, after our redeployment, becomes a failed state or a humanitarian catastrophe that could become a haven for terrorists or hemorrhages millions more refugees who will stream into neighboring countries.

Mr. Speaker, every day when I walk into my office I am reminded of the courageous young men and women who have given their lives in service to our Nation. Outside my office I have displayed a poster-board that displays the names and faces of those who made the ultimate sacrifice. The poster-board is nearly full. I do not want to start another board.

That is why I rise in strong support of H.R. 2237. This legislation significantly reduces the U.S. military presence in Iraq over a 9 month period. The legislation does not abandon the Iraqi people. On the contrary, it recognizes the need to complete our mission by training Iraqi military forces and providing Special Forces to continue to pursue al-Qaeda, Osama bin Laden, and destroy terrorist networks working out of Iraq. The bill also provides the full array of non-military assistance for Iraq's economic and political reconstruction.

This legislation recognizes and respects Iraqi sovereignty. This bill also respects the decision-making judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and U.S. military commanders in the field in determining where forces leaving Iraq might next be deployed. Finally, this legislation provides balance between the security priorities of the United States and Iraq to complete key military missions, and the political imperative to reduce the presence of U.S. military forces inside Iraq.

For all of these reasons, I strongly support H.R. 2237 and urge all members to do likewise.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, a member of the committee (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's just say that the critics of the war, and I don't mean the Members of the House, but the critics in the general public who often say "Bush lied" and put up posters to that effect and they bring in Halliburton and Blackwater and bumper stickers that say "No War for Oil," let's say all that is true, absolutely true, that everything was a trick to get us there, and just say we can agree with that, and HILLARY CLINTON and JOHN KERRY never made the statements that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, which, of course, they did make those statements.

But if all that was the case, regardless, we are there and we are there now.

I met with the Deputy Prime Minister of Iraq today, and he said, in fact, the surge is working. And maybe he has a view that might be suspect by some. But I have also spent a lot of time this week looking at a report of indexes in Iraq put out by the Brookings Institute, which, as you know, is left of center. But they track the number of civilian deaths, the number of IED attacks. They track the number of

newspapers and radios, economic and political progress. They track the benchmarks, revenue sharing, oil sharing, and elections and so forth. And in that there is a glimmer of hope that is important to know that there is some progress that is being made.

But I think between the Brookings Institute and the Prime Minister's report, there is a very bleak picture; but it is a picture nonetheless that progress is being made.

If you pass this legislation today, you wouldn't just erode that progress. You would sign a death sentence to people like this Prime Minister and his family. Now, I agree that the Republican Party probably lost the majority in the House because of the war as much as anything else, but for us that is just politics. It is a political death. For the people over there that we are helping, this is real death. What would happen to this Deputy Prime Minister if we pulled out, and what would happen to all the other Iraqis who have been there trying to take a step forward as Sunnis, as Shiites, as Kurds, trying to work together in a cooperative agreement? Do the proponents of this bill believe that Iraq would suddenly say to them, Okay, you all can go home; we are going to switch governments? If this passed, there would be more chaos and a civil war that we have never seen before in the Middle East, and it would spill over to other countries in the Middle East.

One of the things the Prime Minister said that Americans have failed to understand is there is a cultural shift going on in the Middle East right now, and it is not unique to Iraq, and that is that al Qaeda is becoming a mainstream group. Al Qaeda and an Islamic radical fundamentalist movement with sights on the West is growing.

If we withdraw from Iraq, it is victory to them. A defeat means it is not just going to stay in Iraq, but the momentum probably would go to Israel next. It would probably encourage the Iranians to get nuclear. Saudi Arabia would follow suit. They would need to have nuclear weapons, and Jordan. The good, the bad, and the ugly in the Middle East would happen.

The previous speaker said the troops did win the war. I agree. But we have not finished the war. We should vote this down and give Petraeus time, which is very much needed.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a course correction in foreign policy. The bills before us today reflect the will of the American people and the reality on the ground.

We have invested 4 years in a war that was predicated upon the fantasy that Iraq would, Iraq could, become a bastion of democracy without a massive investment of time, talent, and treasure. This President had no plan to win the war he wanted to fight. He had no strategy to finish the job he started.

We must bind the wounds of a Nation that has lost over 3,300 men and women in a war precipitated by the arrogance of an administration that made decisions based upon the world they wanted instead of the world that is. We must extract ourselves from what has become a civil war in Iraq. We must stand up to a President that is so insulated that members of his own party cannot even persuade him to change course.

I have stood in this Chamber to mourn the passing of fallen heroes. Sadly, but most assuredly, I will stand here again to mourn more.

But today I stand here asking you to explore your own conscience and stand up for our country, our families, and our troops. Let us renew our commitment to making the difficult choices we were sent here to make, and let us begin today.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to control the balance of the time of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker and Members, I take this opportunity to thank the leadership for honoring the work and the request of the progressives of this House to place a bill before this body that we could feel good about supporting.

Some of us have been against this war. We have come to the floor. We have done interviews. We have worked the floor. We have done everything that we possibly can to communicate what we believe are the feelings of the American public about this war. The November vote indicated to us, and should have to others, that Americans are sick and tired of this war. They want to bring our soldiers home. They want to stop the loss of lives. They want to stop the money that is being spent, over \$400 billion on Iraq and Afghanistan; 3,200 or more lives that have been lost; over 25,000 soldiers who have been seriously injured.

□ 1630

Some of us are not willing to spend other another dime on this war. And this bill that is before us, thanks to BARBARA LEE and Mr. MCGOVERN and to LYNN WOOLSEY and I, we have this bill that represents the thinking of the progressives of this House that simply says, we will give no more money to continue fighting this war, but rather, any money that is expended would simply be funds to help wind down this war and to bring our soldiers out; no permanent bases left in Iraq; and basically that no money would be spent on a surge. This surge that the President has initiated is placing our soldiers at

great risk. As a matter of fact, there is no safety in the Green Zone. As a matter of fact, we do not have friends in Iraq. The Sunnis are against us. The Shias are against us. The Kurds are against us. And those Iraqi soldiers that are embedded are undermining our soldiers. I would ask for an “aye” vote on this very progressive piece of legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read excerpts from a letter about Iraq. It reads as follows:

“I am deeply concerned about Iraq. The task you have given me is becoming really impossible . . . incompetent Arab officials are disturbing some of the provinces in failing to collect revenue. We have overpaid almost half a million [dollars] on last year’s account, which it is almost certain Iraq will not be able to pay this year, thus entailing a Supplementary Estimate in regard to a matter never sanctioned by [the legislative body]; a further deficit, in spite of large economies, is nearly certain this year on the civil expenses owing to the drop in revenue. I have had to maintain . . . troops at Mosul all through the year in consequence of the Angora quarrel: This has upset the programme of reliefs and will certainly lead to further expenditures . . . In my own heart, I do not see what we are getting out of it.

“I think we should now put definitely . . . to the Constituent Assembly the position that, unless they beg us to stay and stay on our own terms in regard to efficient control, we shall actually evacuate before the close of the financial year. I would put this issue in the most brutal way, and if they are not prepared to urge us to stay and to cooperate in every manner, I would actually clear out.

“Surveying all the above, I think I must ask you for definite guidance at this stage as to what you wish and what you are prepared to do. The victories of the [opposition] will increase our difficulties throughout the [region]. At present, we are paying . . . millions a year for the privilege of living on an ungrateful volcano out of which we are in no circumstances to get anything worth having.”

That is a letter written by Winston Churchill in 1922 to David Lloyd George. I would suggest not very much has changed since then.

I do not know if the timetable in this bill is exactly the correct timetable or not. What I do know is that I intend to vote for every responsible action that I can take that will increase pressure on this administration and on the government of Iraq and the politicians of Iraq so that they both finally understand there must be a change in policy; there must be a recognition that our troops do not have the capacity to produce the political compromises that are necessary to end this carnage. That power is only in the hands of American politicians and Iraqi politicians. It is about

time we get about the business of using it and insisting that the Iraqis use it.

I would urge support for this proposition.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I ask unanimous consent to control the balance of the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, for months Democratic leaders have tried to dictate military strategy by press release with little regard for the service men and women putting their lives on the line every day.

Perhaps my colleagues on the other side of the aisle did not realize that the privileges of the majority come with an actual responsibility to govern. Let me say to them, the time for tantrums is over. At long last, we are presented with an opportunity to vote yes or no on abandoning our mission in Iraq. But let’s not mistake this newfound direction for some kind of profile in courage.

After months of factual disarray, the Democratic Party has not suddenly found its spine; it has simply realized that the liberal agents who drive this majority, MoveOn.org, the labor unions, they have run out of patience. And it is them that demand a vote on abandoning our mission and abandoning it ASAP. Sadly, the Democrats have little concern for the demands of our military or for its waning patience for the funding that they so desperately need.

More than 3 months, Mr. Speaker, have passed since the President requested emergency funding for our troops. Over the past 94 days, the Democrats have succeeded only in putting politics over policy and trying to substitute their judgment for that of the combatant commanders. For the past 94 days, they have chosen to beat their chest at press conferences, and yes, on this floor, rather than finding ways to actually get our troops the funding that they need to achieve victory.

But, astoundingly, over the past 94 days, Democrats have never once grasped the consequences of resigning ourselves to defeat in Iraq. The void created by our departure would be filled by religious extremists and terrorists. Iran’s path to develop nuclear weapons would be cleared. Violence in Iraq would grow exponentially. Shiite death squads and al Qaeda terrorists would further destabilize the democratically elected government. Another rogue regime could take root, leading to genocide. The terrorists, freshly emboldened by our surrender, would then be able to export terrorism around the world.

Today, each of us has a critical decision to make: Do we stand by the side of victory or on the side of defeat? Do we stand with our troops or with those who would want to abandon them? Do we rise to the challenge of fostering freedom, or do we capitulate to the political pressure of special interests? The choice, Mr. Speaker, is ours. For the sake of our soldiers and our Nation, I implore my colleagues to choose wisely.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of those debates that you just have to take a deep breath and say, is this our finest hour or one of our worst, or somewhere in between? With this new Democratic majority, I thought there would be a reaching out to both sides of the aisle. I thought, on something so important, they would say, we went into Iraq on a bipartisan basis, two-thirds of the House, including Mr. MURTHA and others, and three-quarters of the Senate voted to go into Iraq.

We did not find weapons of mass destruction. And this administration made some terrible mistakes early on in disbanding the army, the police and the border patrol and allowing the looting. I understand the tremendous discontent. And this war has not turned out the way many had hoped. And certainly when we look back we can say a lot of it was predictable. But we attacked them; they did not attack us. I want to say it again: We attacked them; they did not attack us. We abolished their entire security force. I think of New York State. New York State had 19 million people. Imagine if a hundred thousand prisoners had been let out from Rikers Island and Attica, and then we said, no police in New York City, no police in Albany, no police in Syracuse, no police in Buffalo, no police in any of the towns in between. But do not worry, we are going to have 150,000 Arabic speakers spread out across all of New York, and they will keep the peace. Well, we did that to Iraq, but it is much larger than New York, and it has 26 million people instead of 19 million. So a lot of what has happened is predictable.

But now, when you talk with the Iraqis and you talk with the neighbors of Iraq, they say, we did not want you to go in, but we sure as heck do not want you to leave until you leave this a better place.

We could, on a bipartisan basis, work this out. And there will be a point where bills like this will not be considered because we will come up with a bill that says, well, there are some of you on this side of the aisle that do believe in timelines, but timelines that actually work, not timelines that guarantee defeat of any chance of success.

We expect that maybe you would say to us, well, we call you an occupying Nation, that is what you say we are.

Well, fine. Then let's negotiate with the Iraqis like we negotiated with the South Koreans. That is a possibility. Why aren't we negotiating with them?

The Iraqis, if they want, could ask us to leave. They have their own government. They have their own leadership. Why not have a plebiscite in that Nation? Why not have the Iraqi Council of Representatives vote? Why aren't we talking about those things? Why aren't we talking about the Iraqi Study Group, which Republicans and Democrats have both agreed have merits to it? We could potentially have a resolution that many of us could support. Why aren't we having an approach on the other side of the aisle that says, we need to find common ground and work it out together? I believe this: I believe two-thirds of the Iraqis want us to leave, and I believe two-thirds want us to stay. That is what the polls say. They do not want us to leave until we leave it a better place.

I believe the Iraqis are a proud people, and they want to be treated with dignity. What this resolution does is simply pull the rug out from under our new Secretary of Defense, which all of you said you wanted, pulls the rug out from General Petraeus, who received 100 percent support in the Senate. Our general has said, give me a chance to show that we can win back Baghdad. That is what he has asked.

What this resolution does is say that one part of the equation, the military, disappears. And we all have agreed you cannot win it militarily, but you cannot win it without the military. You cannot win it just with a change in politics, but you cannot win it without it. You cannot win it just with economics, but you cannot win it without it. It takes all three. And it is almost like, in a way, you want us to lose. It is almost like we are going to tie one hand behind our back and then say there is a failure because we have not given them all three parts.

I cannot tell you how objectionable I find this. I find it objectionable that we would not allow the Iraqis to stand up on their own. They need us to train their military, their police and their border patrol. They need our troops embedded in there because they do not have any sergeants and corporals. We are embedded in there to help identify who among all those privates that we are training can be leaders among those troops.

This is an unwise resolution. It is a partisan resolution. It is a bad message for us to send the Iraqi people. They do not know what to think about this Congress, but they do know this: We are more divided than they are, and we do not even have bombs blowing up.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know why we should be surprised that we are divided as a Nation when in fact we have an administration whose governing principle has been to govern by dividing.

I would simply observe that there are some Members of this body evidently

and some members of the administration who are willing to fight to the last drop of somebody else's blood. We are not, and that is why we are here with this proposal today.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, I would not have voted for this resolution. Two years ago, I would not have voted for this resolution. One year ago, I would have voted for this resolution. But after seeing no progress in Iraq, none, zero, having misrepresentation coming from even the Pentagon, I am beginning to believe it is time that we have to send a very strong message to this administration.

□ 1645

The total number of U.S. troops killed in Iraq is 3,382. Killed since President Bush announced his surge is 366. We have lost more people in the last 4 months than we lost in any other period of the war, and that doesn't count the number that have been wounded, and all of us have been out there and seen the ones that have been wounded.

The foreign minister of Saudi Arabia in The New York Times last week said, "We don't see anything happening in Iraq in implementation. Our American friends say there is improvement; improvement in violence, improvement in the level of understanding, improvement in disarming the militia. We don't see it."

Admiral Fallon, he is the new commander in Iraq, the central commander. Admiral Fallon said last week in the Senate Armed Services Committee, "Prime Minister Maliki's progress thus far has been disappointing. They are not moving, in my opinion, fast enough to support what we are trying to do. The number one question in my mind is the ability as well as the willingness to do this."

Now, I said to the Iraqi National Security Adviser when he was here visiting me, I said, Look. I said, Originally we need a diplomatic effort, an international diplomatic effort. I urged him to change the Constitution. I urged him to pass a bill to spread out the oil revenues.

He said, Well, it's a slow procedure, and he started talking about how we needed to stay, and he talked about the war, he didn't call it a civil war, the insurgency and the al Qaeda.

I said, There is 2,000 al Qaeda. You don't think you can take care of 2,000 al Qaeda when you have in your country 26 million people? I said, Let me tell you a story. My great-grandfather's Civil War hat sits on that shelf there. And I took it out and I showed him that. We fought our own civil war. And then I said, My ancestors fought in the Revolutionary War. They were ragtag. They didn't have shoes. They fought in cold weather without cold-weather gear. They fought the greatest army in the history at that time, the

greatest navy in the history at that time, the greatest empire in history at that time, and we beat them. We beat them by ourselves, with a little help from the French.

You have to do this yourself, I said to the National Security Adviser for Iraq. You have to win this yourself. We can't do it for you. I said, Your Parliament takes a 2-month vacation in the middle of a time when it is crucial to the history.

The American people, three-fourths of them, are unhappy with what is going on. The Congress more and more. Even some of our Republican friends need to help us convince this President that we need to move in the right direction, we need to change the direction of this war. I see in a news release that the President is now, after all this time, considering benchmarks. After all this time, the President of the United States is saying I'll consider benchmarks. He finally is starting to compromise. He has come off the pedestal and the President is starting to begin to realize that something has to be done to change the direction of this country.

All of us want to solve this. All of us want stability in the Middle East. All of us want to do the right thing. But it is not working. Electricity production, below pre-war level. Oil production, below pre-war level. It has been that way for the last 4½ years. Incidents are up. If you look at the way the incidents have gone, every month they have gone up. They have gone down a little bit, but they have gone up the whole time. And more Americans were killed in the last 4 months than any other period during this war.

We need to change direction. We need to send a message. We need to go to conference and have some kind of a conversation with the White House so that they understand. I am glad to see some Republicans went to the White House and spoke the truth to this President and said to him, Mr. President, we need a change. You are destroying the Republican Party.

Well, that is one of those things where I won't go there.

But let me say this: we need to have a strong vote. We need to vote for this resolution, and then we need to pass the other bill and get on with our business.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, my colleague, the gentleman from California, DUNCAN HUNTER.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from California for giving me some time.

You know, in Iraq it is tough, it is difficult, it is dusty and it is dangerous; but we are following the same pattern that we followed for the last 60 years in bringing freedom to other parts of the world. It is not a smooth road.

First, you stand up a free government. We have done that. It is an inept

government. It bumbles along, as most new governments do. But it is a free government, and it represents the people.

The second thing that you do is stand up a military capable of protecting that free government.

Thirdly, the Americans leave, because we don't covet anything that another country has.

We are right now in the second phase of standing up a military capable of protecting this government. My good friend who just spoke talked about the difficulty of standing up the Iraqi military. I know a couple of years ago in the first battle of Fallujah when we rushed green Iraqi troops to that battle and we thought they were going to help the United States Marines, the next day they were gone. They didn't show up for roll call. But this time when you go out there and you are in Fallujah and Ramadi, the Iraqi military is standing and fighting.

We sat there about a month ago with the Sunni leaders of the national police in Ramadi and Fallujah, and they sat there side-by-side with the Shiite leaders of the Iraqi Army and talked about how they are working together, this time to push back against al Qaeda, whose rough edge has made enemies in the Anbar province.

Now, we got 129 battalions in the Iraqi Army, and, personally, I think that the standup of the Iraqi Army and the reliability of the Iraqi Army is the key to America's success in Iraq and our successful turnover of the security burden.

We have got to make sure that every one of those 129 Iraqi battalions moves into an operation where they do two or three months in a military operation where they have to work out, exercise their logistic chain, their chain of command, the commander has got to co-ordinate with the guy on the right and the guy on the left. At that time they can rotate into the battlefield and displace American heavy combat forces. That is the right way to leave Iraq. Not this way.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me the time, and I thank all of those who participated in this debate today.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle apparently believe in and want to continue the status quo. That is their right. But I believe they are wrong. They have been wrong for 4 long, deadly years. So it is time for new leadership, for a new direction, for a new policy, a policy based on reality, not spin, not press release, not intimidation.

My friends say that we can't leave Iraq until the Iraqis ask us to leave. I saw a story that appeared on the Associated Press wire today which states that a majority of Iraqi lawmakers endorsed a draft bill calling for a timetable for the withdrawal of foreign troops and demanding a freeze on the number already in the country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we just heard from the gentleman from California that the Iraqi Government represents the Iraqi people, and apparently the Iraqi Government is telling us they want us to have a time certain when we leave.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. Our friends on the other side of the aisle argue that the best way to support the troops is to ask them to participate in a failed policy. Well, I disagree.

The question before us is simple: Do you want to end this war? If you do, then you will vote for the bill before us.

Mr. Speaker, let me end this debate the way I began it, by reminding everyone in this Chamber, Republican and Democrat, reminding everybody, whether you supported the war initially or whether you opposed the war, that we all have a responsibility. We have a responsibility to those men and women who we have put in harm's way, and that responsibility is to act responsibly, to make sure that we are giving every consideration before we put them in harm's way.

We are now entering the fifth year of this war. We have a President who refuses to admit one error, one misjudgment. The fact of the matter is, there are two ways to end this war: one, with the cooperation and the help of the President, which we all want. The other way is for Congress to do its job, to take its responsibility seriously and to do what is necessary to bring this war to an end.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the underlying bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2237, the legislation offered by Mr. McGOVERN that would provide for the redeployment of United States Armed Forces and defense contractors from Iraq.

H.R. 2237 would significantly reduce the U.S. military presence in Iraq over a 9-month period. It requires that the Department of Defense begin redeployment of armed forces and military contractors no later than 90 days after the date of enactment, allowing the Department the time necessary to plan, prepare and execute the process of drawing down troops. The redeployment would be completed within 6 months, at which point further funding for an increased presence in Iraq would be prohibited.

H.R. 2237 respects the decision-making powers of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and U.S. military commanders in the field. It specifically leaves decisions about where U.S. troops should be redeployed in the hands of the Pentagon. Troops drawn down from Iraq may be redeployed to neighboring countries, to Afghanistan, to other U.S. bases abroad, or back to the United States in support of homeland security and other national needs.

This legislation also recognizes and respects Iraqi sovereignty by ensuring that the present conflict will not provide for the establishment of permanent American military bases in Iraq. H.R. 2237 provides for the orderly transfer of bases and facilities constructed or occupied by the U.S. military to Iraqi control. Nothing in this bill precludes the United States from negotiating base rights or shared use in the future, as is our practice with other sovereign nations.

H.R. 2237 provides strong support for the Iraqi people by continuing assistance for social, political and diplomatic reconstruction. Additionally, aid is permitted, at the request of the Iraqi government, for assistance or equipment to the Iraqi Security Forces or multinational forces providing security or training in Iraq. U.S. military forces would be authorized to remain in Iraq to complete the training and equipping of Iraqi security forces, pursue foreign terrorist networks operating inside Iraq, and provide protection to U.S. citizens and embassy and diplomatic personnel.

Recent news reports indicate that two days ago, a majority of Iraqi parliamentarians signed a petition calling on the United States to establish a timeline for our military to withdraw from their country. Poll after poll indicates that a large majority of Iraqis believe the large-scale presence of U.S. military forces inside Iraq is fueling, rather than abating, both the Iraqi insurgency and an increasing presence of foreign jihadists. Reducing our footprint in Iraq provides that country, its neighbors, and the international community with a new opportunity and a new environment in which to pursue reconciliation and a political solution to the violence currently devastating Iraqi society.

I applaud Speaker PELOSI for allowing this bill to come to the floor, and join with members of the Out of Iraq and Progressive Caucuses in supporting it.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Democratic efforts to end the War in Iraq.

We are considering two bills today, both of which are significant improvements over legislation passed by Rubber Stamp Republican Congresses over the last four years. The Iraq Accountability Act provides funding for the war, but only until July. After receiving a report on the progress in Iraq—or lack thereof—Congress would then decide whether or not to extend funding through September. Unlike the legislation President Bush demanded, this bill holds him and his administration accountable for concrete economic, political and security benchmarks in Iraq.

Though I appreciate the attempt to keep President Bush on a "short leash," I cannot vote to continue funding a tragic war that has already taken the lives of thousands of American troops and tens of thousands of Iraqis. Every time I hear the President lie to the American people about the situation in Iraq and about the patriotism of those who dare criticize his many foreign policy failings, I can't help but think he needs a muzzle, not a leash.

It's past time for us to get out of this mess and for our troops to come home from Iraq.

That's why I'm excited to join my colleagues in supporting the Iraq Redeployment Act. This bill requires the withdrawal of American troops to begin in the next three months and be completed in the next nine. It also prohibits funding for the "surge" and permanent United

States military bases in Iraq. My constituents have been calling for withdrawal for years and I'm proud for vote for it on the House floor today.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, like H.R. 2237, this bill has serious flaws. However, while I could not vote for H.R. 2237, which would have required rapid withdrawal of troops from Iraq, I will vote for this emergency supplemental appropriations bill.

I could not support H.R. 2237 for two reasons:

First, I do not support the idea of rigidly insisting on a date certain for withdrawing U.S. combat troops from Iraq. I remain convinced that we should steer clear of arbitrary public deadlines for military actions and focus instead on realistic diplomatic and political goals.

Second, I am very troubled by the provision that would prohibit funding for troops described as being part of the "surge."

My concerns do not reflect support for the administration's strategy. On the contrary, I still think an open-ended escalation—and that is the reality behind the Administration talk about a "surge"—is no substitute for what is really needed, which is a strategy for containing civil war and a wider regional war.

That is why in January, I voted against President Bush's plan to increase the number of troops deployed in Iraq—a course he took against the best advice of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group, military leaders, and other policy experts who have warned against extending our military commitment in Iraq.

But now nearly 14,000 additional troops have been deployed, and I think it would be irresponsible to vote to cut funding for their weapons and equipment and for all they need to keep them alive and fighting for our country in the midst of Iraq's civil war.

In short, while I remain convinced that it was a strategic mistake to go to war in Iraq in the way that the Bush administration did, the fact is that we are still deeply engaged there—and while our troops are in the field, we must provide them what they need.

On the other hand, I will vote for H.R. 2206, the revised Supplemental Appropriations bill, primarily for the same reason that I voted for the previous supplemental appropriations bill.

I believe we must vote to provide America's men and women in uniform with the equipment and resources they need and with the best health care they may require when they come home. I think it would be grossly irresponsible not to provide these resources.

And we must hold the president accountable to the benchmarks set by his own administration and the Iraqi government—including enactment of a hydro-carbon law; conducting of provincial and local elections; reform of current laws governing the de-Baathification process; amendment of the Constitution of Iraq; and allocation of Iraqi revenues for reconstruction projects.

The bill seeks to hold the president accountable by "fencing" half the funds until the Secretary of Defense reports on meeting the benchmarks and Congress votes again to release the remaining funds.

I am not convinced that is a workable approach. But, I do not think its effectiveness will be tested, because I do not think it will become law in its present form—partly because the president has said he will veto it if it should reach his desk and partly because

every indication is that the Senate will take a different approach.

Under these circumstances, I think the most important thing is for the House to pass a supplemental appropriations bill today and then to proceed to a conference with the Senate without further delay. I hope that the result will be a bill that will both provide essential funding for our troops and also hold the president accountable—but for that hope to be realized, it is necessary for the House to act today, and so I will vote for the supplemental appropriations bill now before us.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 2237 with certain reservations. Very few bills that pass this House are written exactly as each of us would like. My own plan for the redeployment of U.S. forces would not take this exact form. However, the general thrust of this plan is in the right direction. It establishes a timetable to extricate U.S. forces from a bloody, sectarian civil war while providing the flexibility to carry out other missions both inside and outside Iraq for the purpose of going after al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations with global reach. It also provides for U.S. forces to train and equip the Iraqi Security Forces, and to protect the U.S. Embassy and diplomatic missions.

Mr. Speaker, I preferred the approach taken by the House in the Supplemental Appropriations bill we recently passed. Unfortunately, the President vetoed that measure. He wants the funds without any accountability. We cannot give the President a blank check. While I do not agree with every provision in this bill, it sends the right message—it is time to end the President's failed policies in Iraq and change direction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 387, the bill is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SAXTON

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SAXTON. In its present form I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Saxton moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2237 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REDEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AND DEFENSE CONTRACTORS FROM IRAQ.

(a) FACTORS APPLICABLE TO ANY REDEPLOYMENT DECISION.—A determination to withdraw or redeploy units and members of the Armed Forces deployed in Iraq as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom and contractors operating in Iraq and funded using amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense shall be based, among any other relevant factors, on the following factors:

(1) The protection of members of the Armed Forces deployed in Iraq.

(2) The protection of members of the Army Corps of Engineers and defense contractors engaged in reconstruction projects in Iraq.

(3) The protection of American citizens in Iraq and the security of the United States Embassy and other United States diplomatic missions in Iraq.

(4) The ability to engage in actions to kill or capture members of al-Qaeda and other terrorist organizations with global reach.

(5) The training and equipping of members of the Iraqi Security Forces to achieve stability and security in Iraq.

(6) The regional security of the Middle East, including the security of the State of Israel.

(7) The national security of the United States.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Defense, the Commander, Multi-National Forces-Iraq, and the combatant commander of the United States Central Command shall report to Congress periodically, but not later than September 30, 2007, and periodically thereafter, on the factors specified in subsection (a).

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "Armed Forces" has the meaning given the term in section 101(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues to resist the urge to begin a withdrawal of our forces from Iraq within 90 days as this bill requires. Doing so would have a devastating impact on our ability to fight terrorism here and abroad and would have severe security impacts, not only in Iraq but throughout the Middle East and the entire region. My motion to recommit will ensure that when we withdraw from Iraq, we do so based on the conditions on the ground by requiring we take into account our national security assessments and the regional security implications, as outlined by the National Intelligence Estimate for Iraq.

We are not in the position to determine when U.S. forces should redeploy from Iraq. Only the commanders on the ground have that information. Only our commanders and diplomatic representatives on the ground can determine effectively when conditions are in place to warrant a troop withdrawal. It would be irresponsible for us to assign such an arbitrary timeline and impose it upon our leadership in theater.

We have to consider the conditions that we would leave the Iraqi Government to deal with going forward if we were to precipitously withdraw our personnel.

In my view, there are two significant threats that would remain behind, and the Iraqi Government would not be prepared to effectively counter either one. The al Qaeda threat in Iraq is significant. Al Qaeda's deputy commented a few days ago that the establishment of an Islamic state of Iraq is an important milestone on the way to reviving the Islamic caliphate. He noted that the defeat of American forces in Iraq is a key to this objective.

Securing control over Iraq is the strategic objective for al Qaeda that

will enable it to conduct operations against their targets in the Middle East, particularly against Israel, in addition to Europe and other U.S. global interests. Al Qaeda is particularly interested in the Persian Gulf oil fields, and Iraq would serve as a valuable staging area for such attacks.

□ 1700

Right now the Iraqi forces, security forces working in partnership with U.S. forces, are building momentum to erode al Qaeda's influence over Sunni insurgent groups in Iraq. A premature withdrawal would derail those efforts.

Al Qaeda in Iraq has been conducting indiscriminate attacks on Iraqi civilians. Sunni Arabs reject this tactic, and there is a growing backlash among the population. Sunni communities have encouraged thousands to join the local police forces and improve security. This is real progress.

A few days ago, al Qaeda's deputy warned Iraqi citizens that have supported the U.S. to consider what will happen to them after the Americans leave. If we abandon them now, we will be hard-pressed to gain their trust any time again in the future.

Iran also has an interest in seeing us fail and leave Iraq early. We know that Iran has been arming militia groups within Iraq. We know that Iran has infiltrated various levels of Iraqi government and its security forces.

If we redeployed from Iraq before the Maliki government has the capability to contain this threat, we would leave Iraq vulnerable to becoming an Iranian surrogate.

The porous Iraqi-Syrian border would provide Iran with contiguous, unfettered access to the coast of Lebanon. Through its support of Hamas and Hezbollah, Iran would then become even more a danger to the prospect of security and stability in the Middle East.

It would be irresponsible for us to even consider withdrawing from Iraq before the Maliki government has the capacity to deter these two threats. We must be conscious of the dangerous message we are sending with an early withdrawal.

First, we would lose the trust and will of the Iraqi people and the democratically elected government we worked so hard to create. The extremists associated with al Qaeda will hear a message that will tell them that Americans acknowledged defeat, and do not have the stomach for this war or any other war with al Qaeda. Our defeat would only inspire like-minded jihadists to take up their cause.

One need only look as far as yesterday to see the headlines of what could happen here in this country. A couple of days ago, we were reminded how close to home the terror threat is. The Fort Dix, New Jersey, individuals are just one example.

I ask everyone on both sides of the aisle to support this motion to recommit.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this recommittal motion is something that we have seen for approximately 5 minutes. I think it is a dubious proposition to be voting on something this serious with less than 10 minutes of consideration.

But upon a cursory reading of it, it is apparent that the purpose of this proposition is simply to prevent people from voting on the underlying bill. It is designed to gut the bill by adding two additional conditions that would enable our troops to stay in Iraq indefinitely. Those conditions make reference to the regional security of the Middle East and the national security interest of the United States. That language is so broad that virtually any deployment of any armed force could be justified under that language.

It is obvious that would in fact essentially gut the proposal, and so I would urge a "no" vote on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN).

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would simply say that obviously this is yet another cynical attempt to try to avoid dealing with the issue that I think both Democrats and Republicans want to deal with, and that is whether or not we should have a timetable for withdrawal and redeployment from Iraq.

This is a procedural motion that, as the gentleman from Wisconsin pointed out, is so broad, this could justify keeping us in Iraq forever and ever and ever. And for the "regional security of the Middle East," what does that mean? This is an open-ended invitation for our military involvement and for our permanent occupation of Iraq forever. This in and of itself is not particularly well thought out.

I understand what you are trying to do, and that is to avoid giving people the opportunity to vote on this. But essentially what you are doing is gutting this legislation.

I would strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this motion. We are on our fifth year, our fifth year of this war, no accountability and no admission that perhaps we need to take a different course; and the best you can do is come before us with this motion that would, again, if passed, would allow us to stay and occupy Iraq indefinitely.

I think this is a bad idea. I think it is a cynical idea. I think the people on the other side should have the guts to vote "no" on the timetable if you don't want to withdraw our troops. If you want a never-ending war, then have the guts to vote for it, but this is not the way to do it. I urge rejection of this motion.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair may reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 218, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 329]

YEAS—210

Aderholt	Flake	McKeon
Akin	Forbes	Mica
Alexander	Fortenberry	Miller (FL)
Bachmann	Fossella	Miller (MI)
Bachus	Foxx	Miller, Gary
Baker	Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)
Barrett (SC)	Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Tim
Barrow	Gallegly	Musgrave
Bartlett (MD)	Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Barton (TX)	Gerlach	Neugebauer
Biggert	Gilchrest	Nunes
Bilbray	Gillmor	Pearce
Bilirakis	Gingrey	Pence
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	Peterson (PA)
Blackburn	Goode	Petri
Blunt	Goodlatte	Pickering
Boehner	Granger	Pitts
Bonner	Graves	Platts
Bono	Hall (TX)	Poe
Boozman	Hastert	Porter
Boren	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Boustany	Hayes	Pryce (OH)
Brady (TX)	Heller	Putnam
Brown (SC)	Hensarling	Radanovich
Brown-Waite,	Herger	Ramstad
Ginny	Hobson	Regula
Buchanan	Hoekstra	Rehberg
Burgess	Hulshof	Reichert
Burton (IN)	Hunter	Renzi
Buyer	Inglis (SC)	Reynolds
Calvert	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Camp (MI)	Jindal	Rogers (KY)
Campbell (CA)	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Cantor	Jones (NC)	Ros-Lehtinen
Capito	Jordan	Roskam
Cardoza	Keller	Royce
Carter	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Castle	King (NY)	Sali
Chabot	Kingston	Saxton
Coble	Kirk	Schmidt
Cole (OK)	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Knollenberg	Sessions
Costa	Kuhl (NY)	Shadegg
Cramer	LaHood	Shays
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Shimkus
Cubin	Latham	Shuler
Culberson	LaTourette	Shuster
Davis (KY)	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Davis, David	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NE)
Davis, Jo Ann	Linder	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Lincoln	Lipinski	Smith (TX)
Davis, Tom	LoBiondo	Space
Deal (GA)	Lucas	Stearns
Dent	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Diaz-Balart, L.	E.	Tancredo
Diaz-Balart, M.	Mack	Terry
Doolittle	Manzullo	Thornberry
Drake	Marchant	Tiahrt
Dreier	Marshall	Tiberi
Ehlers	Matheson	Turner
Ellsworth	McCarthy (CA)	Upton
Emerson	McCaul (TX)	Walberg
English (PA)	McCotter	Walden (OR)
Everett	McCrery	Walsh (NY)
Fallin	McHenry	Wamp
Feeney	McHugh	Weldon (FL)
Ferguson	McIntyre	Weller

Had I been able to vote, I would have voted
"yea."

**MOTION TO RESOLVE INTO
SECRET SESSION**

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 9 of rule XVII, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XVII of the rules of the House of Representatives, Mr. ISSA moves that the House be cleared of all persons except the Members, Delegates, Resident Commissioner, and officers of the House to consider communications which he believes should be kept secret for the present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 198, nays 216, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

YEAS—198

Aderholt	Dreier	Latham	Royce	Smith (TX)	Walsh (NY)
Akin	Duncan	LaTourette	Ryan (WI)	Space	Wamp
Alexander	Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Saxton	Stearns	Weldon (FL)
Bachmann	Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Schmidt	Sullivan	Weller
Bachus	English (PA)	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner	Tancredo	Westmoreland
Baker	Everett	Lucas	Shadegg	Terry	Whitfield
Barrett (SC)	Fallin	Lungren, Daniel	Shays	Thornberry	Wicker
Barrow	Ferguson	E.	Shimkus	Tiaht	Wilson (NM)
Bartlett (MD)	Flake	Mack	Shuster	Tiberi	Wilson (SC)
Barton (TX)	Forbes	Manzullo	Simpson	Turner	Wolf
Biggert	Fortenberry	Marchant	Smith (NE)	Upton	Young (AK)
Bilbray	Fossella	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NJ)	Walberg	Young (FL)
Bilirakis	Foxx	McCaull (TX)		Walden (OR)	
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	McCotter			
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	McCrary			
Blunt	Gallegly	McHenry			
Boehner	Garrett (NJ)	McHugh			
Bonner	Gerlach	McKeon			
Bono	Gilchrest	Mica			
Boozman	Gillmor	Miller (FL)			
Boustany	Gingrey	Miller (MI)			
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Miller, Gary			
Brown (SC)	Goode	Moran (KS)			
Brown-Waite,	Goodlatte	Murphy, Patrick			
Ginny	Granger	Murphy, Tim			
Buchanan	Graves	Musgrave			
Burgess	Hall (TX)	Myrick			
Burton (IN)	Hastert	Neugebauer			
Buyer	Hastings (WA)	Nunes			
Calvert	Hayes	Paul			
Camp (MI)	Heller	Pearce			
Campbell (CA)	Hensarling	Pence			
Cannon	Herger	Peterson (PA)			
Cantor	Hobson	Petri			
Capito	Hoekstra	Pickering			
Carney	Hulshof	Pitts			
Carter	Hunter	Platts			
Chabot	Inglis (SC)	Poe			
Coble	Issa	Porter			
Cole (OK)	Jindal	Price (GA)			
Conaway	Johnson (IL)	Pryce (OH)			
Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Putnam			
Cubin	Jones (NC)	Radanovich			
Culberson	Jordan	Ramstad			
Davis (KY)	Keller	Regula			
Davis, David	King (IA)	Rehberg			
Davis, Jo Ann	King (NY)	Reichert			
Davis, Tom	Kingston	Renzi			
Deal (GA)	Kirk	Reynolds			
Dent	Kline (MN)	Rogers (AL)			
Diaz-Balart, L.	Knollenberg	Rogers (KY)			
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kuhl (NY)	Rogers (MI)			
Doolittle	LaHood	Rohrabacher			
Drake	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen			

NAYS—216

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Napolitano
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Neal (MA)
Allen	Hall (NY)	Oberstar
Altmore	Hare	Obe
Andrews	Harman	Olver
Arcuri	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Baca	Herseth Sandlin	Pallone
Baird	Higgins	Pascarella
Baldwin	Hill	Pastor
Bean	Hinchey	Payne
Becerra	Hinojosa	Perlmuter
Berkley	Hirono	Peterson (MN)
Berman	Hodes	Pomeroy
Berry	Holden	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Holt	Rahall
Bishop (NY)	Honda	Reyes
Blumenauer	Hooley	Rodriguez
Boren	Hoyer	Ross
Boswell	Inslee	Rothman
Boucher	Israel	Royal-Allard
Boyd (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Rush
Boyd (KS)	Jackson-Lee	Ryan (OH)
Braley (IA)	(TX)	Salazar
Brown, Corrine	Jefferson	Sánchez, Linda
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	T.
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Capuano	Jones (OH)	Sarbanes
Cardoza	Kagen	Schakowsky
Carnahan	Kanjorski	Schiff
Carson	Kaptur	Schwartz
Castor	Kennedy	Scott (GA)
Chandler	Kildee	Scott (VA)
Clarke	Kilpatrick	Sestak
Clay	Kind	Shea-Porter
Cleaver	Klein (FL)	Sherman
Clyburn	Kucinich	Sires
Conyers	Lampson	Skelton
Cohen	Langevin	Slaughter
Conyers	Lantos	Smith (WA)
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Snyder
Costa	Larson (CT)	Lee
Costello	Larson (CT)	Solis
Courtney	Larson (WA)	Spratt
Cramer	Lavin	Stark
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Taylor
Cuellar	Lewis, Lincoln	Thompson (CA)
Cummings	Lipinski	Thompson (MS)
Cummins	Loebback	Tierney
DeFazio	Lofgren, Zoe	Towns
DeGette	Lofgren, Zoe	Udall (CO)
DeLauro	Lynch	Udall (NM)
DeLaurenti	Mahoney (FL)	McCullom (MN)
Davis, Lincoln	Malone (NY)	Malone (NY)
Davis, Lincoln	Markley	Thompson (CA)
Davis, Lincoln	Matheson	Thompson (MS)
Davis, Lincoln	Matsui	Tierney
Davis, Lincoln	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Davis, Lincoln	McCarthy (NY)	Udall (CO)
Dicks	McCormick (MN)	Udall (NM)
Dingell	McDermott	Van Hollen
Doggett	McGovern	Velázquez
Dooley	McIntyre	Visclosky
Doyle	McNulty	Walz (MN)
Edwards	Meehan	Wasserman
Ellison	Meek (FL)	Schultz
Ellsworth	Meeks (NY)	Waters
Eshoo	Melancon	Watson
Etheridge	Michaud	Watt
Farr	Miller, George	Waxman
Filner	Mitchell	Weiner
Fitzgerald	Mollohan	Welch (VT)
Frank (MA)	Moore (KS)	Wexler
Gillibrand	Moore (WI)	Wilson (OH)
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Woolsey
Gordon	Murphy (CT)	Wu
Green, Al	Murtha	Wynn
Green, Gene	Nadler	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Brady (PA)	Lowey	Roskam
Castle	Marshall	Ruppersberger
Engel	McMorris	Sali
Fattah	Rodgers	Serrano
Feeney	McNerney	Souder
Giffords	Miller (NC)	Rangel
Linder		

□ 1757

So the motion to resolve into secret session was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 331, I placed my voting card in the machine and pushed the button. I don't know if it locked me out or if I didn't press hard enough. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' CARE, KATRINA RECOVERY, AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 387, I call up the bill (H.R. 2206) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2206

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—FUNDING FOR MILITARY OPERATIONS IN IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN
TITLE II—OTHER INTERNATIONAL AND SECURITY-RELATED FUNDING
TITLE III—ADDITIONAL HURRICANE DISASTER RELIEF AND RECOVERY
TITLE IV—OTHER EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS
TITLE V—OTHER MATTERS
TITLE VI—ELIMINATION OF SCHIP SHORTFALL AND OTHER HEALTH MATTERS
TITLE VII—FAIR MINIMUM WAGE AND TAX RELIEF

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The following sums in this Act are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007.

TITLE I—FUNDING FOR MILITARY OPERATIONS IN IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

CHAPTER 1—IMMEDIATE FUNDING NEEDS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Army", \$4,528,215,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Navy", \$754,347,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Marine Corps", \$802,391,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Air Force", \$689,944,000.