

□ 1030

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 2956, RESPONSIBLE RE-
DEPLOYMENT FROM IRAQ ACT

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 533 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 533

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2956) to require the Secretary of Defense to commence the reduction of the number of United States Armed Forces in Iraq to a limited presence by April 1, 2008, and for other purposes. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) four hours of debate, with three hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services and one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 2956 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 533 provides for consideration of H.R. 2956, the Responsible Redeployment from Iraq Act, under a closed rule. The rule provides 4 hours of debate, with 3 hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services and 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The rule waives all points of order against the bill and its consideration except those arising under clause 9 or 10 under rule XX. The rule provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, let's be very clear about what we will be told today by the President. We will be told that adequate progress has been made in some

areas of Iraq but more work needs to be done in others. What this really means, of course, is that once again security and political benchmarks have not been met, that vast areas in Baghdad that were supposed to be under control by now are not, that a drop in violence in some areas has been met with increases in violence elsewhere, that political compromises are not being made with sufficient speed by the Iraqi leadership, nor is there any available evidence that the situation is going to change, that the escalation will suddenly become more effective next week or next month. Instead, all signs indicate that in September when General Petraeus reports to Congress, he will deliver the exact same message that we are hearing today: to be patient.

But patience means nothing when deadlines are constantly moved. In January a leading Member of the minority said that we would be able to tell in a few months if the escalation was working. Now we hear it is still too early to tell. It has been 7 months. Which prediction are we supposed to believe?

As time has advanced, an absence in progress has not been met by an absence in tragedy. At the present rates, between now and September, another 200 Americans will be killed, 200 more families changed forever. And hundreds, if not thousands, more innocent Iraqis will have died as well.

We will hear today that to change our course in Iraq will signal defeat. But this willfully ignores the entire history of the Iraq War. After more than 4 years of relentless conflict, including recent months of historically high troop numbers, experts tell us that in Iraq al Qaeda is stronger than ever. A military official told ABC News yesterday al Qaeda's "operational capability appears to be undiminished."

The conclusion is clear: The American military is not being given a chance to bring peace to Iraq or to fight our enemies, not because our troops are not good enough but because the current mission is inherently flawed.

It is not weakness to admit a strategy is not working and to change it. It is the very opposite: a sign of strength. Our leaders corrected failing courses when they arose during the Civil War and during World War II. Why should this war be different?

What Democrats are calling for today is not a retreat. It is not a surrender. It is a statement that Congress will not wait for another ambiguous so-called progress report and will not give the administration another chance to move the goalposts. Instead, we will refuse to needlessly sacrifice our soldiers, weaken our military, undermine our national security, and bleed our country in ways that even the worst terrorists could ever dream of. And it is a statement to the Iraqi people that they will no longer have to live as dual victims: victims of violence and victims of a flawed military strategy that is at best

failing to bring peace to the country and at worst perpetuating their suffering.

The bill will refocus our troops on fighting terrorists. By doing so, the disastrous strain being placed on our Armed Forces will be lifted without sacrificing security objectives, and their healing can begin.

Second, it will remove a strategy from the playing field that is certainly not working and throw open the door to new approaches which may actually succeed. For example, the legislation requires the President to report by January on how he is engaging U.S. allies and regional powers in the effort to bring stability to Iraq. Far from abandoning the Iraqis or lessening American security, we will finally make the rehabilitation of Iraq the international priority that it must become. The only thing we will be abandoning, in other words, Mr. Speaker, is this administration's mistakes.

And to my friends on both sides of the aisle, yesterday I received an advance copy of a report from the Defense Department's Inspector General that will be made public today. It detailed the work of some of the first companies to make armored vehicles and armored kits for our soldiers in Iraq. They were given sole-source, unbid contracts even though senior defense officials objected, favoring a competitive process instead.

I hope people heard what I said. Senior officials at DOD wanted competitive bidding for these machines, but they were overridden by the Under Secretary of Defense.

The results were sadly predictable. The companies failed to meet demand and sent critically important equipment late. Some of the armor that our soldiers were sent had cracks that had simply been painted over to try to fool them instead of fixing it. In certain instances two left doors were sent for the same vehicle. Troops already fighting a deadly foe had to use their precious time and energy to improvise and come up with ways to turn useless equipment into something that could protect them.

Our soldiers have been asked to endure terrible hardships, as well have their families, some of which, I am ashamed to say, have been the direct result of the practices of this administration, and they are enduring them to this day and at this very hour. For Congress to leave them there, to ask them to continue fighting to survive under the mounting weight of a flawed mission—that, Mr. Speaker, is the true definition of abandonment. And after 4 years, Democrats are tired of this Congress abandoning our troops to a fate they have never deserved.

I would ask everyone in this Chamber how they would justify this continued carnage to the families of our soldiers. With all we know now, how can we still say to the children of those killed or to the young men and women maimed for life, your loss was needed?

We cannot. What we must say to them is this: You have given enough. It is time to come home.

The American people know what must be done and the majority of this Congress knows what must be done. And all that remains is for those of us here who are still opposed to this bill to decide that they too have had enough and that they will join their countrymen in voting not with the President but with the troops, with the people of Iraq, and with the people of the United States.

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

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. It has actually been several weeks now since we have had a meaningless vote on the issue of Iraq, and so I suppose we are overdue for another one. This Democratic leadership, Mr. Speaker, as we all know very well, still bereft of any real ideas, has been forced once again to resort to demagoguery, bringing up a bill that they know, they know full well, will not be enacted into law. And knowing that their proposal cannot withstand any critical scrutiny, they have once again shut down the process and brought this to us under a completely closed rule, not allowing any of the very thoughtful proposed alternatives to be considered whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment that would have allowed us to have the opportunity to substitute their policy with the very thoughtful and responsible recommendations that were included in this bipartisan Iraq Study Group package of recommendations proposed by Mr. Baker and Mr. Hamilton, a group of Democrats and Republicans, very respected, authorized by this Congress. And they refused to allow us to have any opportunity whatsoever to even debate, much less vote, on the issue of the Iraq Study Group recommendations.

Now, just yesterday morning in an interview on National Public Radio, our former colleague Mr. Hamilton, who, as I said, was the co-Chairman of the Iraq Study Group, had a very eloquent and thoughtful interview on the need for us to implement the Iraq Study Group recommendations. Unfortunately, the Democratic leadership, I guess fearful that responsible policy would prevail and that this institution might, in fact, pass the measure calling for implementation of the Iraq Study Group, prevented us from having the chance to debate or vote on the Iraq Study Group recommendations.

The last time we went through this charade, they at least had the luxury of making dire predictions of failure for the new strategy in Iraq led by General Petraeus, and the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules once again basically talked about failure

and said that we haven't met any benchmarks. Even then, Mr. Speaker, the strategy was actually showing early signs of success. But this time, this time, the counterinsurgency offensive is well under way and making clear and irrefutable progress.

I will say once again, Mr. Speaker, that we are seeing clear and irrefutable progress taking place. As one major newspaper recently editorialized, "Demands for withdrawal are no longer demands to pull out of a deteriorating situation with little hope. They are now demands to end a new approach to this conflict that shows every sign of succeeding."

Mr. Speaker, U.S. forces, working side by side with Iraqi Army and police forces, have penetrated enemy strongholds in the belt surrounding Baghdad and are driving them out. They have cut off al Qaeda's supply lines and transport routes. They are destroying car bomb factories. Sectarian deaths have plummeted. Al Qaeda operatives are finding themselves increasingly isolated, their safe havens destroyed, and their ability to move freely between neighborhoods severely diminished.

Mr. Speaker, our efforts have been significantly bolstered by former Sunni insurgents who have joined the fight against al Qaeda. I am going to say that again. Former Sunni insurgents have now joined our effort in the fight against al Qaeda. Nowhere has this process been more critical than in the al-Anbar province.

□ 1045

Last year, a leaked Marine intelligence report conceded this province as completely lost. That was the report that came out. Today, Mr. Speaker, al-Anbar is our best success story, and a template for U.S. Forces working together with both Sunni police and Shia army forces to combat al Qaeda.

General David Petraeus, the man who has received bipartisan praise and was confirmed unanimously by a vote of 82-0 in the United States Senate as he began his work, he said to the New York Post, "We are beginning to see a revolt of the middle against both extremes."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is our commanders on the ground who have repeatedly pointed out that the tipping point didn't come until the tribal leaders sought a prolonged offensive by U.S. and Iraqi forces.

Now, let's think back to what life was like in Iraq under Saddam Hussein. After a quarter-century reign of terror by Saddam Hussein, Iraqis clearly would not immediately rise up against any force until that force has been driven into retreat. We had to demonstrate our strength and our commitment before we earned the trust of the tribal leaders and their support in the fight against al Qaeda. That is exactly what we're doing today in Baghdad and the surrounding areas.

The New York Times recently reported on the Anbar success and how

we are currently applying it to the fight to secure Baghdad. According to a July 8 report, former insurgents in Sunni neighborhoods of Baghdad are now taking up arms against al Qaeda. Now, that is July 8th, a report that came out just 4 days ago. Now, it quotes Petraeus as saying, "Local security is helped incalculably by local support and local involvement."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this success is so critical because it gets to the heart, it gets to the very heart of our twin goals in Iraq. First, that Iraqis will be able to provide their own security, that we have an increased ISF, the Iraqi Security Forces, and that they are trained adequately; and second, that this security will provide the environment that makes a political solution possible.

The quicker that Iraqis achieve security and a peaceful, stable democracy, the quicker our troops will come home. And as we listen to the speeches that will come following mine about the quest for our troops to come home, make no bones about it, I share the goal and the vision that is put forth by our friends, Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. SLAUGHTER, and others, who will argue to bring our troops home. We all want to make sure that that happens.

Our new strategy, Mr. Speaker, has clearly brought us closer to that goal. And if our fight against extremism was not urgent enough, the Associated Press report that came out just late yesterday afternoon that al Qaeda's global network is again on the rise and has regained much of the strength that it had in September of 2001 is an important thing for us to recognize.

Mr. Speaker, as the terror network rebuilds and regroups, it seems absolutely preposterous that we would abandon not only a key front in the global war on terror, but a place where we have al Qaeda on the defensive and where we are diminishing their capabilities, especially in light of that report that came out just last night about their renewed strength. Yet, the Democratic leadership inexplicably wants to pull the rug out from under our military commanders. Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps not so inexplicable if we consider that their planned withdrawal would be complete just in time for the 2008 elections.

But let's pretend that there is no election looming on the horizon here. Regardless of this bill's impact on American electoral politics, what would be the effects on Iraq? Now, Mr. Speaker, even the New York Times editorial board, which apparently doesn't often read its own news reports and is calling for an immediate withdrawal, acknowledges the inevitable dire consequences of its recommended course of action. In the very editorial calling for surrender, it outlines the overwhelming refugee and humanitarian crisis that would immediately ensue, how the fight would spill out all across the region. And Mr. Speaker, in the most callous way, it acknowledges the terror that would be inflicted upon

those Iraqis who worked with us because they believed our promises. How cold and cynical. How callous can we be to stand here and debate the notion of abandoning the Iraqi people, not only to genocide, but to the targeting of the very individuals who have bravely worked with us.

The Democratic leadership wants to wave a magic wand and make this war go away. I wouldn't mind a magic wand myself, and certainly the American people would appreciate a quick and tidy solution. But I'm afraid that this solution attempts to salvage nothing but party politics. The Iraqi people, Mr. Speaker, would not be quite so lucky.

Furthermore, NPR recently reported that the quick withdrawal time frame that the Democratic leadership dreamed up has no basis in reality. It would take a year or more to safely withdraw all U.S. troops from Iraq, and it would take significant combat forces to protect the withdrawal. We would have to fight our way out all the way to the Kuwaiti border. There simply is no magic wand in this war, Mr. Speaker.

Perhaps the greatest irony of this bill is that it calls for detailed reports for a strategy in Iraq. Mr. Speaker, we have a strategy, and while it was only fully operational less than 1 month ago, it is already succeeding. The Democratic leadership, in their absurdist logic, want our military to abandon their strategy, go home and write a report about what they would have wanted to accomplish if they had stayed. And if that weren't cruel enough, Mr. Speaker, they would have to watch terror and genocide unfold as they retreated. Now, I cannot fathom a more disastrous policy for our security or the Iraqis'.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and the underlying bill itself.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD an article from the Washington Post this morning entitled, "White House Isn't Backing Iraq Study Group Follow-Up," and points out that the House voted 355-69 last month to reestablish the study group, but the President is blocking it.

[From washingtonpost.com, July 12, 2007]

WHITE HOUSE ISN'T BACKING IRAQ STUDY GROUP FOLLOW-UP
(By Robin Wright)

Despite an overwhelming House vote last month to revive the Iraq Study Group, the White House has blocked reconvening the bipartisan panel to provide a second independent assessment of the military and political situation in Iraq, said several sources involved in the panel's December 2006 report.

Co-Chairman Lee H. Hamilton, several panel members and the U.S. Institute of Peace, which ran the study group, were willing to participate, according to Hamilton and the congressionally funded think tank. But the White House did not give the green light for co-chairman and former secretary

of state James A. Baker III to participate, and Baker is unwilling to lead a second review without President Bush's approval, according to members of the original panel and sources close to Baker.

White House support is critical for any follow-up review. "It is not likely to happen unless the White House approves it," Hamilton, a Democratic former congressman from Indiana, said in an interview. "The group can't go ahead without its concurrence or acquiescence, as we need travel support and access to documents."

The White House does not want independent assessments to rival the upcoming Sept. 15 reports by Gen. David H. Petraeus and Ambassador Ryan C. Crocker, U.S. officials said.

The White House indicated that it sees no need for an immediate follow-up to the report, noting that it is implementing a strategy consistent with many of the panel's recommendations. "The next report due in September by General Petraeus must include an assessment of our objectives as they relate to Baker-Hamilton. September will be the appropriate time to determine how that strategy is progressing," said National Security Council spokesman Gordon Johndroe. "We look forward to remaining in contact with members of the group."

The House voted 355 to 69 last month to allocate \$1 million for the U.S. Institute of Peace to reestablish the group of 10 prominent Republicans and Democrats, which included former Supreme Court justice Sandra Day O'Connor, former defense secretary William J. Perry and, until his appointment, Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates.

Congressional sponsors called the White House's reluctance a missed opportunity. "The ISG provides an opportunity to bring the country together. . . . If you had a serious illness, you would want a second opinion. We are at war. You want to have the best minds looking at a problem," said Rep. Frank R. Wolf (R-Va.), who proposed the ISG and co-sponsored the bill to reconvene it. "Having another independent, bipartisan assessment will take out the venom in the debate."

Rep. Christopher Shays (R-Conn.), another co-sponsor, warned that the White House's move would cost further support among Republicans.

"It's really shortsighted," he said. "It's going to further isolate the president. . . . You can't rely just on Petraeus and Crocker. They are good people, but they're still in the thick of battle and you need the view from the outside. The fact the White House doesn't want it indicates they are afraid of what the ISG might say."

The White House did not initially embrace the ISG report. But it has gradually adopted key recommendations, including the controversial proposal to pursue diplomatic talks with Iran and Syria, the countries that have most aided or abetted Iraq's insurgents and illegal militias. Last month, 23 Democrats and 34 Republicans co-sponsored a House bill to implement all the ISG recommendations as the way forward in Iraq.

But other groups are pursuing independent reviews of U.S. policy and Iraq's performance. The Iraqi Security Forces Independent Assessment Commission—made up of 14 former generals and defense officials—is examining Iraqi military capabilities. The panel, which is mandated by Congress, is chaired by retired Gen. James L. Jones. The group is currently in Iraq; its report is due in October.

The Government Accountability Office is doing a separate congressionally mandated study on the 18 benchmarks set for the Iraqi government to meet. And the U.S. Institute of Peace is reconvening many of the experts

the ISG originally relied on to discuss Iraq's future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 2956, the Responsible Redeployment from Iraq Act.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this House ought to voice its gratitude to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. SKELTON, for bringing before this House a thoughtful, responsible bill that outlines what we must do next in Iraq.

The bill clearly notes that our uniformed men and women have carried out and completed their mission for which they were authorized by Congress. The search for weapons of mass destruction is over. There were none, not a single one. The regime that put Iraq in an impossible international position no longer exists. So it's time that we draw down our troops from Iraq and require this administration to clearly define what the troop requirements and costs will be for the next phase of U.S. involvement in Iraq, a far more limited mission to root out al Qaeda and protect our diplomatic personnel inside Iraq.

The bill also promotes the kind of active diplomacy with Iraq's neighbors necessary for achieving a more lasting climate of stability in Iraq and throughout the region. Much, much more, Mr. Speaker, must be done. I expect to see stronger legislation in September, but this bill puts us on the right path.

For 5 long, deadly years, this Congress has done nothing but rubber-stamp a tragically flawed policy. It is shameful. Whatever the cause the President and many Members of Congress thought they were pursuing in Iraq, it is lost. Political leaders inside Iraq appear incapable of putting national interest ahead of sectarian and personal agendas. Iraqi security forces operate more like sectarian militias. And despite their best efforts, the additional military forces we have poured into the Baghdad region have not been able to change the equation.

Over 3,600 of our troops have lost their lives to this battle. Thousands more have been wounded. It is wrong, Mr. Speaker, simply wrong to ask them to continue to sacrifice their lives and their limbs for this failed policy.

The war in Iraq is breaking the back of our military. It is causing severe damage to the Federal budget to the tune of \$10 billion each month, and causing grave harm to the future fiscal health of our Nation. It continues to undermine our most important political, diplomatic, military and strategic alliances. It saps our ability to focus on global terrorism and to safeguard our own people. And it has contributed to the chaos inside Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, it is past time for change. And while President Bush keeps scorning deadlines and promising

breakthroughs that never come, it is clear that he lacks the vision, the wisdom or the courage to chart a new course. It is frighteningly clear that the President plans, instead, to stay the course and dump this mess on the next President.

It is time for Congress to step up to the plate and change direction in Iraq. It is time for every Member of this House to work together to draw down our forces and bring our troops home to their families and their communities.

For too long Congress has been complicit, and the American people are frustrated, and they are angry. We don't need more studies or commissions. We don't need more excuses. We don't need more delay. Too many lives are being lost. What we need is for Members of Congress to make a choice, to stand up and be counted. Will you continue to rubber-stamp the current disastrous policies in Iraq or will you vote for change?

We must act now, Mr. Speaker. This is simply too important to wait any longer. Too many lives are on the line.

All of us, no matter how we originally voted on the war, share in the responsibility in what is happening in Iraq. All of us, by not voting to change course, are responsible for sending so many of our brave men and women into a civil war where far too many of them have been killed.

If the President of the United States will not respect the will of the American people and end this war, then Congress must.

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 11, 2007]

U.S. TROOP BUILDUP IN IRAQ FALLING SHORT
(By Julian E. Barnes and Ned Parker)

BAGHDAD.—In the Ubaidi neighborhood in the eastern part of this city, American soldiers hired a local Iraqi to clean the Porta-Potties at their combat outpost. Before the man could start, members of the local Shiite militia threatened to kill him.

Today, the Porta-Potties are roped off, and the U.S. soldiers, who could not promise to protect their sewage man, are forced to burn their waste.

As part of the Bush administration's troop "surge" strategy, the U.S. unit here had moved into an abandoned potato chip factory hoping to push out the militia, protect existing jobs and provide stability for economic growth. Instead, militia members stymied development projects, cut off the water supply and executed two young Iraqi women seen talking to U.S. soldiers, sending a powerful message about who really controls Ubaidi's streets.

In the next few days, the Bush administration is scheduled to release a preliminary assessment of its overall Iraq strategy. Officials may point to signs of progress scattered across the country: a reduction in death-squad killings in Baghdad, agreements with tribal leaders in Al Anbar province, offensives north and south of the capital.

President Bush defended his strategy Tuesday, demanding Congress give his administration more time and insisting that America can "win this fight in Iraq." To underscore his request, Bush sent top aides to lobby lawmakers on Capitol Hill.

But as the experience of the troops in Ubaidi indicates, U.S. forces so far have been unable to establish security, even for them-

selves. Iraqis continue to flee their homes, leaving mixed areas and seeking safety in religiously segregated neighborhoods. About 32,000 families fled in June alone, according to figures compiled by the United Nations and the Iraqi government that are due to be released next week.

U.S. forces have staged offensives to push insurgents out of some safe havens. But many of the insurgents have escaped to new areas of the country, launching attacks where the U.S. presence is lighter.

And there has been no sign of any of the crucial political progress the administration had hoped to see in Iraq.

U.S. commanders are painfully aware that they are running out of time to change those realities. Army Gen. David H. Petraeus, the top American commander in Iraq, has made several efforts to slow the clock in Washington. Each time, it has sped up.

The full complement of the "surge" arrived in Iraq last month, bringing the total to 28,500 additional troops. Military officers originally hoped to have until 2008 before they had to render a verdict on the strategy. Then the Washington timeframe shrank to September. Now, it is shrinking further, with Congress demanding answers even sooner.

Supporters of the troop buildup insist that small steps could grow into larger and more long-term successes if lawmakers are patient.

"Right now we are three weeks into this. It's not like flipping a light switch," said a military officer in Baghdad, expressing the frustration of many commanders. "Time has to be given for things to work."

Commanders point to Ramadi, the capital of Al Anbar province, as a showcase for the kind of results the military wants from the current strategy. Once a battlefield, the city is now largely peaceful, calm enough that in March, Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri Maliki was able to pay his first official visit.

But military officers stress that it took about nine months of sustained effort to make Ramadi a relatively pacified city. And with its volatile mix of Sunni and Shiite Muslims, Baghdad presents a far more complex challenge than all-Sunni Ramadi.

The interim progress report that Bush promised to release this week is likely to emphasize the success the military has had in killing Sunni militants in the "Baghdad belts," the cities and towns that dot the major rivers and highways leading to the capital. In recent weeks, the newly arrived U.S. forces have been focused on fighting members of Al Qaeda in Iraq, a militant Sunni group made up of Iraqis and foreign fighters.

Top generals say the strategy is crucial to securing Baghdad. Only by controlling the routes into the capital, and denying militants safe havens, can the U.S. and Iraqi militaries keep out the car bombs that stoke sectarian violence inside the capital.

But leading Iraqis are less sure of the strategy.

Mahmoud Othman, a Kurdish member of the Iraqi parliament, said the U.S. approach may be successful at weakening Al Qaeda in Iraq. But he said Americans would not be able to solve Iraq's sectarian conflict or stop clashes between armed groups in Baghdad neighborhoods.

"The surge has an important effect in fighting Al Qaeda," the independent politician said. "On the Sunni-Shiite conflict, it hasn't had any effect. . . . Extremist Shiites and Sunnis are fighting each other. The Americans can't stop this."

U.S. officials have made little, if any, progress with their persistent calls for Iraqi officials to take steps toward reconciliation between Shiites and Sunnis.

Key administration officials, most prominently Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates and Vice President Dick Cheney, have visited Iraq to push for passage of an oil-revenue sharing law, provincial elections and reform of rules barring members of the former ruling Baath Party from government jobs.

But the Iraqi government is bogged down by fighting among Shiite, Sunni and Kurdish parties. It is unclear whether the oil law, the one piece of benchmark legislation still given hopes for passage before September, will reach a vote any time soon.

The number of death-squad killings in the capital, one sign of sectarian divisions, is down from earlier this year. But the number remains roughly at the level seen after the 2006 bombing of Samarra's Golden Mosque, which served as a catalyst for the extreme sectarian violence.

In Baghdad, the number of bodies found dumped in the streets dropped to 540 last month from 830 in January. Some American officers say those numbers could rise again. And others say that the decline may simply represent the depressing reality that most Baghdad neighborhoods are now segregated, meaning there are fewer people left for death squads to kill.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Fil, Jr., the commander of U.S. forces in Baghdad, said that American troops at the end of June controlled about 42% of the city's neighborhoods, up from 19% in April.

But to many Iraqis, that is little comfort. "The Americans do not make me feel safe," said Amin Sadiq, a 30-year-old Shiite worker in the Ghadeer neighborhood of east Baghdad. "When you hear the speeches of the top U.S. military leaders, you think that everything is ideal and perfect and Iraq will be better. But when you see how the U.S. soldiers behave, I really feel I should not trust the leaders."

The American military has helped bring a tense truce in some areas, but has not re-integrated once-mixed neighborhoods.

The western Baghdad neighborhood of Ghazaliya, once a prosperous mixed middle-class area, was riven by sectarian violence in 2006. It is now divided between Shiites in the northern end and Sunnis in the south, with the U.S. military stuck in the middle, trying to keep the peace.

"Last year, things were bad. This year is worse than before," said a man in his 50s who identified himself as Qais Qaisi.

The presence of Iraqi and American security forces means that Sunnis cannot fight back against the Shiite militias, which have the tacit support of the Iraqi army unit in the area, Qaisi said. But he nevertheless voiced concern about a possible American pullout.

"If the multinational forces withdraw, there will be very bloody sectarian battles," he said.

Military officers routinely say that improving the economy is a prerequisite to improving security. And U.S. forces, by putting up barriers and controlling traffic, have been able to reopen some marketplaces that had been targeted by suicide bombers. Although that has allowed some neighborhood commerce, success with other projects has proved more elusive.

The Pentagon is working to reopen state-owned factories and has identified several dozen that can be renovated and restarted. But that work is slow, and many residents say they see few improvements in their neighborhoods.

Although U.S. forces have been able to overcome militia threats and start small neighborhood projects such as installing streetlights, they are not able to initiate larger undertakings.

"We aren't doing anything meaningful," said one mid-level noncommissioned officer. "Where are the real projects? We aren't offering these people enough safety, or money, or jobs."

Amid the political setbacks and continuing violence, however, there are signs of relative calm in some areas.

Earlier this year, the streets of Baghdad were desolate at sunset. Now, in places, there are signs of life.

In Yarmouk, a neighborhood in west Baghdad, 18-year-old Ahmed Shakir used to see bodies on the street every day. Snipers fired from hidden perches and gunmen clashed with U.S. and Iraqi soldiers. But last month, after weeks of U.S. patrols, his neighborhood started to feel safe—safe enough for Shakir to stay outside on the basketball court until 8:30 p.m.

"It is usually me and three of my friends, we always go play basketball," he said. "Now we have U.S. and Iraqi patrols roaming the streets every day. If they continued doing this, things will remain better. If not, then it will get worse for sure."

CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS

To: Members of the 110th Congress.

From: John Podesta, Lawrence Korb, and Brian Katulis.

Re: Iraq Study Group's Recommendations Overtaken by Events in Iraq.

Date: July 11, 2007.

Senators Ken Salazar (D-CO) and Lamar Alexander (R-TN) have introduced legislation that would adopt all of the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group. There are growing signs that the White House and Republican legislators, having previously rejected the ISG report late last year, will now seek to co-opt the ISG recommendations this summer and fail to provide a bipartisan veneer to their efforts to pretend they are shifting course in Iraq.

We acknowledge the important contributions made by the ISG and its co-chairmen James Baker and Lee Hamilton, but progressives need to point out that some of the ISG's recommendations are ambiguous and others have been overtaken by events. Congress needs to understand that the ISG's three main recommendations face five key issues that raise questions about the relevance of the ISG's recommendations today.

The ISG report had three main recommendations:

1. Place greater emphasis on political benchmarks for the Iraqi government to ensure disaffected groups (specifically the Sunnis) are brought into Iraq's political process.

2. Accelerate and increase the training of Iraqi security forces to allow them to take over from U.S. forces and transition U.S. forces from combat missions in 2008.

3. Initiate a region-wide diplomatic offensive to contain and resolve Iraq's conflicts.

The ISG recommendations now face five practical obstacles:

1. Conditioning U.S. troop withdrawal from Iraq on the outdated "We'll stand down when the Iraqis stand up" formula.

The main problem with the ISG report is that it conditions the eventual U.S. troop withdrawal on Iraq's splintered national leadership. The ISG report spells out a long list of preconditions for withdrawing U.S. troops, which actually gets the situation backwards—the United States needs to put Iraqis and the countries in the region on notice to motivate them to act more constructively in their own self-interest in order to contain and resolve Iraq's multiple internal conflicts.

The fundamental challenge with Iraq's security forces is not skills building and train-

ing. It is instead a problem of motivation and allegiance. The last six months in Iraq have reinforced the point that Iraqis will not take responsibility as long as U.S. forces remain in the country in such large numbers. Despite the latest escalation, the Iraqi government has not made any progress toward reconciliation.

The Bush strategy as well as the core ISG recommendations ignore a fundamental reality—that the situation in Iraq has little chance to improve until U.S. troops begin re-deploying.

2. Placing too much focus on Iraq's central government, a dysfunctional and divided government that lacks the unified support of its own leaders.

The ISG recommendations place a strong emphasis on getting the Iraqi national government to meet several political benchmarks that are not only unachievable in the short term but irrelevant today because of changed conditions in Iraq. In fact, the Iraqi national government is increasingly trapped in bitter disputes along sectarian lines that have paralyzed the government.

Iraq's leaders fundamentally disagree on what Iraq is and should be. The benchmarks passed by Congress in May—the subject of a forthcoming report from the Bush administration—ignore the key reality that Iraq may suffer from unbridgeable divides.

Meeting these political benchmarks will likely have no effect on the major conflicts in Iraq and may well exacerbate the Kurd-Arab and intra-Shi'a conflicts emerging in Iraq's northern and southern regions. As such, these benchmarks provide false hope for resolving a series of conflicts that require a much deeper solution than the United States can provide unilaterally.

3. Paying insufficient attention to the 2005 Iraq Constitution and the will of the Iraqi people.

The ISG report outlines a course that would lead to the unraveling of Iraq's constitution. One of the ISG's main recommendations is that "the [United States] should support as much as possible central control by governmental authorities in Baghdad, particularly on the question of oil revenue." But this cuts against the grain of what Iraqis supported in their own constitution, passed by popular referendum in 2005. Iraq's constitution establishes a framework for a strongly decentralized federal system.

Not surprisingly, many Iraqi leaders objected to the recommendations of the ISG report. Iraqi President Jalal Talabani, a Kurd, rejected the ISG report. In addition to criticisms from Iraq's leaders, the ISG recommendations lack a broad-base of support among Iraqis, a strong majority of whom want U.S. forces to leave Iraq within a year.

According to a poll of the Iraqi public conducted in 2006, 71 percent of Iraqis wanted the Iraqi government to ask for U.S.-led forces to be withdrawn from Iraq within a year or less. Another 61 percent support attacks on U.S.-led forces. In short, many Iraqis are opposed to the ISG recommendations, and as a result the United States would face severe problems attempting to implement them.

4. Supporting the unconditional training of Iraq's security forces, which is deeply problematic.

The core of the ISG report is the recommendation that the United States accelerate and increase the training of Iraqi security forces. It proposes an American advisory effort of between 10,000 and 20,000, comparable to the U.S. advisory strength in Vietnam at its height. Increasing the capacity of the Iraqi security forces, however, won't rectify their three main problems:

The Iraqi security forces are far from reliable. The Pentagon estimates that at least

one-third of the Iraqi Army is on leave at any one time; desertion and other problems bring the total to over half in some units. Of the 11,000 Iraqi soldiers assigned to the recent U.S.-led offensive in Baquba in June, only 1,500 showed up. Infiltration by sectarian militias into the Interior Ministry has been identified as a severe problem. Many Iraqi security forces have been implicated in sectarian violence, most notably the National Police and certain elements of the Iraqi Army. Allegations have emerged during the Baquba offensive that Sunni and Shiite soldiers cooperated with Sunni insurgents and Shiite militias, respectively. Some have even tried to kill American troops. Giving weapons and training to Iraq's security forces in the absence of a national political consensus in Iraq risks inflaming Iraq's conflicts. In fact, the violence has escalated at the same time as the number of trained Iraqi security forces has increased.

Iraq's government has used Iraqi security forces to promote their sectarian interests rather than the national interest. Most troubling is the manner in which the government of Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki has used the Iraqi security forces. He has focused primarily on going after Sunni insurgents with Iraqi forces, leaving the impression that he is acting on behalf of Shi'a sectarian interests. Worse still, officials in the prime minister's office have often replaced officers that are perceived as competent and non-sectarian.

Force protection concerns for the United States. The ISG's training recommendation suffers from two more flaws: force protection and time. The number of troops dedicated to protecting American advisors from insurgents would drain resources needed to perform other missions crucial to U.S. interests such as counterterrorism. In addition, many experts observe that it takes years if not decades to train a professional, competent army. Past experiences of unpopular foreign military forces facing an insurgency while training local security forces do not inspire confidence in the success of future efforts. There is no reason to presume we will be able to do any better even if we had unlimited time in Iraq (which we don't).

5. Offering undeveloped ideas on a regional diplomatic offensive.

The ISG proposed creating a regional contact group to help solve Iraq's internal and external problems diplomatically. While it is important for the United States to undertake a diplomatic offensive as it begins a phased redeployment from Iraq, the ISG approach is too broad.

Rather than dealing with Iraq's multiple internal conflicts as discrete problems that require separate attention, the ISG approach could result in a "one-size-fits-all" diplomatic package. Progressives should recognize that each of Iraq's neighbors have differing interests in each of Iraq's conflicts, and then advocate that the United States tailor its diplomacy to each conflict in an attempt to deal individually with the myriad problems confronting Iraq.

CONCLUSION

Progressives should not allow the recommendations of the ISG report to be accepted without question. Nor should they allow the White House to legitimate its still-stay-the course policy by paying lip service to the ISG recommendations.

Rather, progressives should advocate a policy that allows us to strategically reset our military forces, our diplomatic personnel, and our intelligence operations by redeploying out troops in 12 months, partitioning our diplomatic effort to better deal with Iraq's multiple conflict, rethinking our approach to Iraq's government and its security

forces, and redirecting our immense national power toward destroying those terrorists who attacked us on 9/11. The time is past for more half-way measures.

The United States needs to move toward a "Strategic Reset" of its policy in Iraq and the Middle East, one that recognizes the increasingly fragmented situation on the ground and build a more sustainable approach to advancing long-term U.S. interests in the region.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania, let me just say, we do have a great chance to work together, that's why we were, in fact, proposing an alternative, that being a chance for us to work on the bipartisan Iraq Study Group recommendations.

With that, I'm happy to yield 4 minutes to my very good friend from Erie, Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in the strongest possible opposition to this rule.

In the panoply of public policy issues, there is no more important question than starting or ending an armed conflict. The decision we make today will determine whether men and women will live or die, not only on the battlefields of Iraq but also potentially in the cities of Europe and America.

The discussion that we conduct today should transcend crass political partnership and narrow ideology to reflect our deepest concern for the Nation and, indeed, for the community of nations.

The House of Representatives today should be prepared to engage in a free and fair debate regarding all of the potential options for the future conduct of combat operations and diplomatic initiatives in Iraq and the broader Middle East. We should be discussing the recommendations of the Baker-Hamilton Iraq Study Group. We should be examining some of the ideas laid out by Senator LUGAR. We should be considering the suggestion of Congresswoman HEATHER WILSON and I that we made to the President recently encouraging him to convene a high-level summit of Iraqi sectarian leaders. We should exclude no viable alternative, even that offered by my colleague from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

The legislation we will consider later today does have the potential to serve as a starting point of determining a new course of action in Iraq, but it is badly flawed, and it needs substantial improvement, and unfortunately, that will not be possible. The rule the Democrats have laid before the House today demonstrates their motivations are, at core, political. And I remember when politics ended at the water's edge.

They do not offer us an open rule, allowing full and free debate. They don't even allow us a structured rule, permitting, at the very least, discussion of some of the major alternatives that I've outlined.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that certain parties want things from this de-

bate today. They've already recorded their robo calls, purchased airtime for their attack ads. They've scheduled buses for their rent-a-mobs. And the last thing they really desire is a free, open and informed debate that might result in a unified policy regarding our Nation's future efforts in Iraq. They seek not to unite our Nation but to divide it.

The people who bring this rule to the floor today do not allow amendments because they're afraid. They're afraid that some of these amendments might prevail. They're afraid that, given viable alternatives, some Members of their own party will choose cooperation over confrontation.

□ 1100

Mostly, they are afraid they might lose a major issue for their campaign to maintain their majority. Their fear may or may not be justified, but its very existence is a sad commentary on their faith in the Members of their own party, this body, and the American people.

I remind my colleagues that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself. Reject this cynical rule. Vote "no" on the previous question. Let's have a full and fair debate on this, the most critical issue of our generation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, give me 3 seconds to say that under the Republican administration, not a single Iraqi measure was brought up under an open rule.

And now I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me time and for her leadership on the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying bill. Today presents us with another opportunity to change direction in Iraq, a change that is desperately needed. I have opposed this war from the beginning. I have long supported ways to bring this war to a responsible close. I urge my colleagues to seize this opportunity now before we do further disservice to the brave men and women in Iraq.

The last time I rose in opposition to Iraq policy, I talked about George and Dee Heath from my hometown of Sacramento. All three of their sons served in Iraq. Recently, I learned that one of their sons, David, was hit in an RPG attack on his convoy. Thank goodness he was not wounded gravely, and he will be coming home to recover.

Mr. Speaker, today's vote is about our responsibility to the Heath sons and to the more than 150,000 other men and women in harm's way. They are doing what is being asked of them heroically and patriotically. It fills me with sorrow that more than 3,600 soldiers have paid the ultimate price for their heroism, including 385 from my home State of California.

Our responsibility to them as their elected leaders should be, it must be, to

ensure that their mission is clear and achievable. Today, we have the opportunity to fulfill our responsibility as the President has not. Sadly, the President's disastrous leadership is ignoring his duty to the troops. We cannot sit idly by.

The Iraqi Government is not meeting any of its political, economic, or military benchmarks. The President's surge policy has had disastrous results. In fact, 600 troops have been killed and more than 3,000 have been wounded since he announced this policy.

Our troops are stranded on the front lines without clear guidance and without a clear mission. In light of such inept leadership by the President, the American people have lost their patience. Most Americans support removing troops by April. They want us to refocus on terrorism. Yet, still the President refuses to reconsider. It is clear from the President's blind stubbornness that Congress must show the President the way.

Our troops are at the breaking point. We are refereeing a civil war. The solution is a political one, not a military one. But in this late and crucial hour, you have to do more than talk about change. You have to vote for it. You have to fight for it. Chairman SKELTON's bill keeps the safety of our troops and our Nation's security at the forefront by changing course in Iraq. I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely laughable to listen to the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules, after having berated us for the longest period of time, use us as a model for the procedure around which we are considering this legislation. This is a bill, not a resolution, which is what we brought up in the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3¼ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman, a former member of the Rules Committee, from Marietta, Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my former chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this rule and condemn the underlying bill, hastily leaving Iraq without any clear exit strategy.

Mr. Speaker, the timing of this legislation should raise some serious questions for the American people. It comes at a critical point in the global war on terror, a point at which our efforts should be focused on defeating terrorism inflicted by Islamic jihadists, not usurping the power of our military commanders, as this bill clearly does.

Today's debate comes on the heels of an intelligence analysis stating al Qaeda has regrouped to a level not seen since 9/11 with a greater ability to strike inside the United States. It comes in the immediate aftermath of the Muslim extremist attacks in London and Glasgow. In sum, it comes at a time when our decisions must be based

on strategic interests and not political grandstanding.

However, Mr. Speaker, this bill is not designed to help us fight terrorism to secure the United States' interests. In fact, its timing has nothing to do with national security at all.

Today, the Democratic leaderships want us to vote on a change of course before we have had the opportunity to fully analyze the President's interim report on our strategy in Iraq, and well ahead of the much anticipated September report to be delivered by General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker.

So why are we debating this now? Curiously, it comes at a time when this Democratic Congress has an approval rating as low as 14 percent. That's right, Mr. Speaker, their approval is at an all-time low. Their base, the extremist left, is very angry. They are angry at the Democrats' Out of Iraq Caucus because they failed to deliver. Indeed, Cindy Sheehan, their poster child, has now announced her candidacy against Speaker PELOSI.

So what do the Democrats do? They take another shot at Old Faithful. When all else fails, when they can't get anything accomplished, when all they can deliver to the American public is the most closed Congress in history, they engage in another round of political theater engineered to do nothing but grab a few headlines and appease that liberal base.

Mr. Speaker, let's not waste the time of this body by debating vague bills with absolutely no chance of becoming law. Let's instead examine the upcoming September report from our top military commanders and then, yes, then make informed decisions on the best path forward.

My friend, the distinguished chairwoman of the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from New York, stated in her opening remarks that if we wait until September, as I suggest, 200 more troops would be lost and the lives of 200 families would be changed forever.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues that within a 20-minute period of time on September 11, 2001, 3,000 lives were lost, some of our brightest and best; and, indeed, the lives of 3,000 families were changed forever.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and to oppose the irresponsible underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I vigorously opposed the war in Iraq before it began, and now, well into its fifth year, the need for a new policy has never been clearer. The toll of this war has been devastating: more than 3,600 of our most courageous men and women killed, tens of thousands seriously wounded; the toll on civilians much higher still. And while we struggle to fund domestic priorities in Vermont, in all our States across this Nation, health care, a crumbling infra-

structure, transportation, the cost of education, we now spend \$12 billion every single month on this war.

From last November's elections, to public opinion polls, to the comments I hear from Vermonters every single day, the voice of the American people is loud and it is clear: we must end this war. And since the President refuses, absolutely refuses, to act, Congress must. Since the President refuses, Congress must make it clear that the United States will not maintain permanent military bases in Iraq. Since the President refuses, Congress must denounce the use of torture. It must finally close Guantanamo Bay. And since the President refuses, Congress must bring our troops home and ensure they receive the care they deserve when they return.

Mr. Speaker, 7 months ago, under the leadership of the previous Congress, a bill like this never would have been allowed to come to the floor. Now, 7 months later, today, there is an emerging bipartisan consensus that the President must be forced to change his course.

By passing this bill today, Congress will demonstrate with the force of law what the American people well know: it is time to end the war in Iraq.

I cosponsored and voted in favor of legislation offered by my colleague Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts that called for redeployment of our troops from Iraq within 6 months. I voted against additional funds for the war without a timeline. And I cosponsored legislation that would close Guantanamo Bay, outlaw torture, defend the right of habeas corpus, and prohibit the establishment of permanent military bases.

At the end of the day, Americans know that no action in the House of Representatives is not enough until all of our troops are returned home. This bill provides a starting point for progress towards realizing that goal. Until our troops are home, I will not stop, and Congress must not stop in its efforts to compel the President to end this war.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me at this time yield 2 minutes to our friend from Bridgeport, Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), who has made 17 trips to Iraq and unfortunately was denied an opportunity to have us consider and vote on a very thoughtful amendment that he proposed in the Rules Committee last night.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as I walked into this Chamber, Congressman MCGOVERN said we need to work together to bring our troops home. He is right. But the resolution we will be debating today does not allow us to consider bipartisan proposals. There were a number of amendments presented to the Rules Committee, and they rejected all of them.

The gentlewoman from New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, can say, when Republicans were in control, they didn't do

that, they didn't allow bipartisan amendments. That is about the most insignificant and meaningless statement she could make, because Democrats are now in charge, and they are in charge in part because of the war in Iraq and because they promised to be different and have open debate and allow us all to say what we needed to say and from that find consensus.

There are two things I agree on: we need to bring our troops home, and we need a deadline to do that. But this deadline begins in 120 days and concludes by April of next year, guaranteeing absolute failure, laying waste to all the investment we have talked about.

We need to bring our troops home, but not by the deadline that has been offered. It is the only deadline. So when I vote against what I think is a foolish deadline, the media is going to say exactly what my Democratic colleagues want them to say, that we voted against a deadline and that we are not sincere about bringing our troops home.

Give me a deadline I can support, and I will vote for it. Give me an opportunity to at least debate a deadline that I could support.

We are going to bring our troops home because we can't maintain this level of engagement in Iraq without extending troops from 15 months to 18 months. We are not going to allow that to happen. Our troops will be coming home, but not by April. They will be coming home in a more thoughtful way.

I urge defeat of this resolution. In particular, it did not allow for the Wolf amendment, which was the Iraq Study Group proposal. This is what we need to be voting on. We all say that we agree with it and support it. Well, why not bring it to the floor? What are we afraid of?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me have about 2 seconds to say that we have allowed 4 hours of general debate. I think everybody will have an opportunity to discuss what they think of the deadline.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

□ 1115

Ms. CASTOR. I thank the distinguished chair of the Rules Committee for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor of the Responsible Redeployment from Iraq Act under this rule, and urge my colleagues to pass it today, because in this summer of 2007, in the fifth year of the Bush-Cheney war in Iraq, it is imperative that we chart a new direction for our national security and be more strategic in the defense of America.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, it is clear to me that the reckless White House policy and now the escalation of the war is undermining our country's readiness and ability to respond to other global

threats to our national security. Indeed, in testimony before our committee, top commanders have testified that America runs a strategic risk by staying on the same course in Iraq.

The generals confirm that because our personnel and equipment are tied up in Iraq, our ability to handle future threats and contingencies is reduced. In my State of Florida, for example, the National Guard does not have all of the equipment it needs to train and deploy soldiers. They are only 28 percent equipped. In effect, President Bush's war in Iraq is impairing our country's ability to prepare for any other threat to our national security.

Florida also feels the pinch of multiple deployments because, time and again, our brave men and women are being asked to go back, to leave their families, leave their jobs, return to the field of battle after inadequate rest at home. Florida currently has the second highest number of troops out of the 50 States deployed in Iraq, over 23,000. And 172 Floridians have been killed and over 1,200 have been wounded since military operations began there over 4 years ago. Hardly a week goes by that my office is not contacted and informed of another sad but heroic death in this cause. In fact, last week, two more Tampa Bay area brave, heroic soldiers were killed by IEDs.

People ask me, why are our young American men and women refereeing the ongoing Shiite-Sunni civil war? American troops cannot resolve the Iraqi sectarian and religious conflict; only Iraqis can find the political resolution required to stabilize Iraq. America has now spent over \$450 billion in Iraq. When will the Iraqi government take responsibility for the future of their country?

President Bush's war in Iraq has been very costly. Over \$10 billion a month now, costly not just in terms of degradation of our Nation's readiness, the waste and fraud due to the lack of oversight, but President Bush is sacrificing the health care of our children and our seniors and investments in our towns and neighborhoods while continuing this war without end.

So after 4 years of war and over 3,500 American lives, and the Bush-Cheney failure to aggressively pursue a political solution, we demand a new direction and a comprehensive strategy for our great Nation.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, for 4 long years our country has endured a tragic war, a treacherous journey down a dark and winding path, with no clear routes, no clear destination and fatal hazards lurking around every blind corner.

Today I rise again with Chairman SKELTON and my colleagues to act to

clear the road ahead, to bring its end into the light. I rise again to push, to prod, to urge my colleagues to help us end the President's failed policy; to help us change the mission to a mission based in reality; to help us end the ravages that our brave soldiers who have performed so heroically, remove them from the crossfire in which they are caught, to remove them from the snipers' bullets and the life-ending IEDs.

I rise with the hope that those who have stood with the President and have given his Iraq policy a chance to succeed and another chance to succeed and another chance to succeed, that they will today choose a responsible change in direction based in reality that will establish a comprehensive and clear strategy for our role in Iraq.

Congress has allowed the President to lead our troops down this path for too long. It is time to demand accountability, to demand an exit strategy that is clear, and to demand an end to the injury and death that our brave soldiers face every day as they courageously proceed down this undefined road on which the President has placed them and they have dutifully traveled.

The President's ambling course has led our troops through the deadliest 3 months of the war in April, May and June of this year. During those three deadly months, 329 American soldiers died in Iraq. The cost of continuing down this path is too great. We must act to bring direction and accountability to the United States' mission for the sake of our troops and the families that love and support them.

It brings me great sadness to report that, since the war began in the spring of 2003, 163 brave men and women from Ohio have been killed. And 25 of those precious lives have been lost since the surge. The President's escalation of this war means six more grieving families in Ohio since when I last spoke in favor of the redeployment bill in May of this year. How many more times will we come to this floor to demand responsibility and accountability from our President? How many more families will be devastated by the loss of a loved one? How many more times will we hear the administration continue to argue that we are, quote, "just about to make progress"?

Last November, the people of the 13th District of Ohio made their voices heard when they went to the polls. Their voices joined with the voices of people across this Nation. They voted for a change in direction, and today we act to give it to them.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to one of the most respected Members of this House on intelligence and defense matters, the gentlewoman from Albuquerque, New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to let my colleagues know that I will be asking for a recorded vote on the previous question on this rule.

We have a problem, a very serious problem that we must address before the House adjourns in August, and this resolution which we have done before does not deal with the real issues that this House must address because of the threat that we face.

If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act that clarifies one very simple and critical thing, that the United States Government will no longer be required to get a warrant to listen to terrorists who are not in the United States.

The Director of National Intelligence has testified to us, as has the director of the CIA, that their hands are currently tied. They are being tied up, requiring warrants with probable cause, to listen to people who are terrorists who are not even in the United States because of the way the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act is written.

We cannot allow ourselves to be deaf and blind because of a law that is woefully outdated. All of us have heard what the Department of Homeland Security has said, the chatter is at levels we have not seen since the summer of 2001. And the Director of National Intelligence has testified we are missing significant portions of intelligence. We have to open our ears and open our eyes to keep this Nation safe. That is the critical issue we should be debating here today. And if we defeat the previous question, I will immediately offer that for the consideration of the House.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would point out to our colleagues that the action just described in my view is not necessary.

I rise in support of the rule, the underlying bill, and in strong support for ending our combat mission in Iraq and redirecting our efforts towards stability in the region, including Iraq, but also in trouble spots like Iran, Lebanon, Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Let me make three points.

First, based on firsthand experience from my fourth visit to Iraq just weeks ago, Baghdad is not safer. True, we have worked successfully with tribal leaders against al Qaeda in Anbar Province, but the major population center, Baghdad, the focus of our military surge, is not turning around. Progress will not be made by a continuation of our combat mission.

Second, the Skelton bill mirrors a companion bill in the other body which has impressive bipartisan support. I urge Republicans to support this measure, and know that some will do so.

The message our constituents want to hear is that 290 of us, a veto-proof bipartisan majority, insist on a responsible end to our combat mission in Iraq beginning now with passage of this bill.

Third, though I feel Homeland Security Secretary Chertoff's use of the words "gut feeling" was unwise, I share

the view that our country could be attacked at any time. Al Qaeda has regrouped in Pakistan and expanded its reach throughout North Africa. Home-grown cells in England and elsewhere are increasing, and our assumption must be that they are here as well.

Low-tech, low-scale vehicle-borne attacks are, sadly, not hard to execute. At a minimum, those, and attacks on soft targets like our mass transit systems, may be in our near future.

DHS, FBI and our exceptionally talented local police departments are working overtime, though their ranks are depleted and their equipment and they are surged in Iraq. But 100 percent protection is impossible.

Mr. Speaker, this is where our attention must be, and our resources. Pass the Skelton bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 4 minutes to my friend from Holland, Michigan, the former chairman, now the ranking member of the Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, later on, my colleague from California will make a motion to defeat the previous question, as the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) indicated. That will then enable us to address a very serious issue, the problem that, right now, we are blind and deaf to people who may want to attack the United States.

As Secretary Chertoff indicated earlier this week, all of the indications are that we still remain very, very vulnerable. The chatter, the signals, indicate more clearly that America is still at risk. And it is not only the chatter. All you really need to do is take a look at what al Qaeda says. They are clear on their intent to attack the United States again.

Take a look at what happened in the U.K. 2 weeks ago. Planned attacks in the heart of London, a planned attack at an airport indicate that al Qaeda and radical jihadists want to attack the U.K.; they want to attack in Europe, and they want to attack us in the United States.

One of the things that needs to be clear is that what has helped keep us safe is our intelligence community. And as our ability to gain information has changed and adapted over the last couple of years, it has become even more clear that FISA needs to be updated, and FISA needs to be updated now. It needs to be done before we go home in August because if we expect to stay safe, we need to make sure that our intelligence community has all of the tools at its disposal to identify risks, to identify potential terrorists and to identify individuals who want to do us harm.

FISA should not be used to protect international terrorists. It should not be used to protect radical jihadists. It should not be used as a screen to protect members of al Qaeda. Remember, FISA was designed in the 1970s, designed to handle a Cold War surveil-

lance of countries like the Soviet Union. Back then and into the 1980s and early 1990s, our intelligence community only needed to be one step faster than the former Soviet Union. We didn't have to be that fast. And the risks and the threats were not as real or as immediate to our homeland as what they are today.

Today our intelligence community needs to be one, two, three steps faster than radical jihadists, radical jihadists who use technology and who use the Internet and who use the communications world of today to drive their message and to plan their attacks. We need to be able to penetrate into it and penetrate into it very effectively.

□ 1130

Now is the time to modernize FISA. Now is the time to make sure that the intelligence community has the capability to identify the threats and the individuals who may want to attack the United States and make sure that they are in a position to identify these threats and get this information to our law enforcement individuals in the United States in a seamless way.

We've made progress in a number of areas in intelligence reform. There's still much work to do, but one of the areas that we have not done is update FISA.

Defeat the previous question and allow for the modernization of FISA now.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today it was reported that al Qaeda is as strong now as it was prior to the 9/11 attacks. Meanwhile, our troops who have served with honor and distinction are mired in the middle of a religious civil war in Iraq. The men and women of Iowa's National Guard have faced multiple redeployments at great sacrifice to them and their families.

The American people continue to demand a new way forward in Iraq. Even Members of the President's own party are demanding change. We must immediately begin to chart a new course.

I'm a cosponsor of the Responsible Redeployment from Iraq Act because it provides for the safe withdrawal of combat troops by April 1, 2008. We must bring home our troops safely and responsibly. We must also redirect our efforts against terrorism.

This bill represents a step forward, and I urge its passage and the rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my very good friend from Rochester, New York, the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules, how many speakers she has remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Certainly, Mr. Speaker. I have two.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule and also the underlying bill, the Responsible Redeployment from Iraq Act. We can't afford to spend \$10 billion a month on this failed war and continue to see the loss of lives, 3,600 now. From my district alone, 14 individuals have not come home to see their families. 27,000 have come home injured from the war.

I want to tell you that in March I had the opportunity to visit some of our troops in Iraq, many from California representing southern California's San Gabriel Valley. Many of them told me they did not have appropriate equipment, that they were there for an insurmountable time, many on their second, third and fourth tour. One family member from the City of Azusa told me that he had not even seen his child. It had been already 14 months.

I would ask Members of Congress to remember who our constituents are. I have the adjoining district next to Congressman DREIER. In my district alone, 4-1 in a survey said, Republican and Democrat, we want the Congress to get us out of the war.

I ask for support of our bill and the rule.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we were reassured that "progress" was being made in Iraq 500 deaths ago, 1,000 deaths ago, 2,000 deaths ago, and 3,000 deaths ago.

Like the boy who cried wolf, this President cries "progress." What progress?

With all this talk about benchmarks, I think it's time to get off the bench and bring our troops home now, with an immediate, responsible, and safe redeployment.

President Bush says as we approach five years of being in Iraq, he says "listen to the generals."

Well, we've listened to them, and his top general says if we followed his course, if we stay his course, we'll be in Iraq fighting for another five to ten years.

Real progress would begin by adopting today's very modest proposal and moving forward united so that our troops are not caught up in a final disastrous position in Iraq, and that we responsibly redeploy to protect our families, rather than generating one generation after another of jihadists.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time and ask if the gentleman has more requests.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to close the debate now, so I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just begin by talking about procedure. We continue

to hear the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules talk regularly about an open amendment process, and I will say with absolute certainty, I had the privilege of chairing the Rules Committee for 8 years, and I will tell you that we have brought more rules to the floor of this House under a completely closed process during the first 7 months of this year than we did during any 7 months during the 8 years that I was privileged to serve as chairman of the Rules Committee. So much for a new and open process.

Now, let's look at what it is we're considering here, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we know full well that this is a bill, unlike resolutions that may have been brought up under closed rules in the past, this is actually a bill, a bill that's scheduled to go to the President's desk. Everyone knows that this bill is not going to become law.

What we've found is gross politicization once again, a commitment made that every week we're going to have some kind of vote on Iraq.

We all know that the war in Iraq is very unpopular. We know that the President is a great punching bag on this for virtually everyone, but the fact of the matter is we are in the midst of a very important global war on terror, and as the President said in the past, you know, we all like to be loved, but I'd much rather be right than be loved.

The fact of the matter is, we want to bring this war to an end. The President stood right here in this chamber in January and said I wish that this war were over and that we had won, but we need to ensure victory. And, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, we are not given the opportunity to consider any thoughtful, bipartisan alternative to this measure which calls for the withdrawal to begin within 120 days. I mean, how crazy is that when we're looking for a report to come in September and as we are looking at success that has begun even after only 1 month, 1 month of this plan having

been put into place under the greatly heralded General David Petraeus?

Now, Mr. Speaker, as my friends from New Mexico and Michigan have said, I'm going to move to defeat the previous question. I'm going to move to defeat the previous question so that we can actually ensure that we have the tools to win this war on terror. We've had a number of anniversaries marked. We've spent a lot of time talking about them, but we fail to remember the success that we've had at preempting attacks on this country.

Just last month, we marked the first anniversary of the discovery of the proposed attack on the Sears Tower and the FBI headquarters in Miami.

Just last week, we marked the first anniversary of the proposed attack on the plan to blow up the Hudson River tunnel between New Jersey and Manhattan.

Just in May, we had a report of the plan, as you all know, to see some of these people go in and start killing our people at Fort Dix in New Jersey.

And then of course, just a few weeks ago, we had the plan to blow up JFK International Airport.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we've been able to discover those, but we know full well from those in our intelligence operations and the Department of Homeland Security that we are, as Mr. HOEKSTRA said, blind and deaf, and I believe that we need to make sure we defeat the previous question so that we'll be in a position to amend this proposal so that we can ensure that we have the tools necessary to win this war on terror.

So vote "no" on the previous question.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 583 OFFERED BY MR. DRIER OF CALIFORNIA

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert the following:

That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2956) to require the Secretary of Defense to commence the reduction of the number of United States Armed Forces in Iraq to a limited presence by April 1, 2008,

and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) four hours of debate, with three hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services and one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; (2) the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in section 3 of this resolution, if offered by the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Hoekstra, or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for two hours equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 2956 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 3. The amendment in the nature of a substitute to be offered by Mr. Hoekstra of Michigan, or his designee, referred to in section 1 is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

Subsection (f) of section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801) is amended to read as follows—

“(f) ‘Electronic surveillance’ means—

“(1) the installation or use of an electronic, mechanical, or other surveillance device for acquiring information by intentionally directing surveillance at a particular known person who is reasonably believed to be in the United States under circumstances in which that person has a reasonable expectation of privacy and a warrant would be required for law enforcement purposes; or

“(2) the intentional acquisition of the contents of any communication under circumstances in which a person has a reasonable expectation of privacy and a warrant would be required for law enforcement purposes, if both the sender and all intended recipients are reasonably believed to be located within the United States.”

COMPARISON OF 110TH TO 109TH TYPES OF AMENDMENT PROCESSES FOR BILL CONSIDERED BY THE HOUSE THROUGH JULY 12, 2005 (EXCLUDING MEASURES CONSIDERED BY SUSPENSION OR UC) CURRENT AS OF JULY 12, 2007

	109th—Through July 12, 2005		110th—To date	
	Percent		Percent	
Open: 12 (including approps)	27.3		6 (including approps)	9.4
Modified Open: 0	0		7	10.95
Structured: 21	47.7		25	39
Closed: 11	25		26	40.6
Total: 44	100		64	100
Open: 12 (including approps)	27.3		6 (including approps)	9.4
Restrictive: 32	72.7		58	90.6
Total: 44	100		64	100

* Prepared by the Committee on Rules Republican Staff.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, once again, we're always treated to the inventive memory of the former Chair of the Rules Committee.

Let me just state for the record that this time last when he was Chair, we had three open rules. At this time, we've had eight open rules.

I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and also on the rule.

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 533, if ordered; and approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 197, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 620]

AYES—225

Abercrombie	Green, Al	Murphy (CT)
Ackerman	Green, Gene	Murphy, Patrick
Allen	Grijalva	Murtha
Altmire	Gutierrez	Nadler
Andrews	Hall (NY)	Napolitano
Arcuri	Hare	Neal (MA)
Baca	Harman	Oberstar
Baird	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Baldwin	Hereth Sandlin	Olver
Bean	Higgins	Ortiz
Becerra	Hill	Pallone
Berman	Hinchey	Pascarell
Berry	Hinojosa	Pastor
Bishop (GA)	Hirono	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Hodes	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Boren	Holt	Pomeroy
Boswell	Honda	Price (NC)
Boucher	Hooley	Rahall
Boyd (FL)	Hoyer	Rangel
Boyd (KS)	Inslee	Reyes
Brady (PA)	Israel	Rodriguez
Braley (IA)	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Brown, Corrine	Jackson-Lee	Rothman
Butterfield	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Jefferson	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Cardoza	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Carnahan	Jones (NC)	Salazar
Carson	Jones (OH)	Sánchez, Linda
Castor	Kagen	T.
Chandler	Kanjorski	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Clay	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kildee	Schiff
Clyburn	Kilpatrick	Schwartz
Cohen	Kind	Scott (GA)
Conyers	Klein (FL)	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Lampson	Serrano
Costa	Langevin	Sestak
Costello	Lantos	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Cramer	Larson (CT)	Shuler
Crowley	Lee	Sires
Cuellar	Levin	Skelton
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Davis (AL)	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Snyder
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Solis
Davis, Lincoln	Lowey	Space
DeFazio	Lynch	Spratt
DeGette	Mahoney (FL)	Stupak
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)	Sutton
DeLauro	Markey	Tanner
Dicks	Matheson	Tauscher
Dingell	Matsui	Taylor
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Donnelly	McCollum (MN)	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	McDermott	Tierney
Edwards	McGovern	Towns
Ellison	McIntyre	Udall (CO)
Ellsworth	McNerney	Udall (NM)
Emanuel	McNulty	Van Hollen
Engel	Meek (FL)	Velázquez
Eshoo	Meeks (NY)	Vislosky
Etheridge	Melancon	Walz (MN)
Farr	Michaud	Wasserman
Fattah	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Filner	Miller, George	Waters
Frank (MA)	Mitchell	Watson
Giffords	Mollohan	Watt
Gillibrand	Moore (KS)	Waxman
Gonzalez	Moore (WI)	Weiner
Gordon	Moran (VA)	Welch (VT)

Wexler
Wilson (OH)Woolsey
WuWynn
Yarmuth

NOES—197

Aderholt	Franks (AZ)
Akin	Frelinghuysen
Alexander	Gallegly
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)
Bachus	Gerlach
Baker	Gilchrest
Barrett (SC)	Gillmor
Barrow	Gingrey
Bartlett (MD)	Gohmert
Barton (TX)	Goode
Biggert	Goodlatte
Bilbray	Granger
Bilirakis	Graves
Bishop (UT)	Hall (TX)
Blackburn	Hastert
Blunt	Hastings (WA)
Boehner	Hayes
Bonner	Heller
Bono	Hensarling
Boozman	Herger
Boustany	Hobson
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra
Brown (SC)	Hulshof
Brown-Waite,	Hunter
Ginny	Inglis (SC)
Buchanan	Issa
Burgess	Johnson (IL)
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam
Buyer	Keller
Calvert	King (IA)
Camp (MI)	King (NY)
Campbell (CA)	Kingston
Cannon	Kirk
Cantor	Kline (MN)
Capito	Knollenberg
Carney	Kuhl (NY)
Carter	LaHood
Castle	Lamborn
Chabot	Latham
Coble	LaTourette
Cole (OK)	Lewis (CA)
Conaway	Lewis (KY)
Crenshaw	Linder
Culberson	LoBiondo
Davis (KY)	Lucas
Davis, David	Lungren, Daniel
Davis, Tom	E.
Deal (GA)	Mack
Dent	Manzullo
Diaz-Balart, L.	Marchant
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marshall
Doolittle	McCarthy (CA)
Drake	McCaul (TX)
Dreier	McCotter
Duncan	McCrery
Ehlers	McHenry
Emerson	McHugh
English (PA)	McKeon
Everett	McMorris
Fallin	Rodgers
Feeney	Mica
Ferguson	Miller (FL)
Flake	Miller (MI)
Forbes	Miller, Gary
Fortenberry	Moran (KS)
Fossella	Murphy, Tim
Fox	Musgrave

NOT VOTING—9

Berkley
Cubin
Davis, Jo AnnJindal
Jordan
KucinichStark
Tancredo
Young (AK)

□ 1204

Mr. GRAVES changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House floor during today's rollcall vote on ordering the previous question on the rule, H. Res. 533, for H.R. 2956.

Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 196, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 621]

YEAS—221

Abercrombie	Green, Gene	Nadler
Ackerman	Grijalva	Napolitano
Allen	Gutierrez	Neal (MA)
Altmire	Hall (NY)	Oberstar
Andrews	Hare	Obey
Arcuri	Harman	Olver
Baca	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Baldwin	Hereth Sandlin	Pallone
Barrow	Higgins	Pascarell
Bean	Hill	Pastor
Becerra	Hinchey	Payne
Berman	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Berry	Hirono	Peterson (MN)
Bishop (GA)	Hodes	Pomeroy
Bishop (NY)	Holden	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Holt	Rahall
Boren	Honda	Rangel
Boswell	Hooley	Reyes
Boucher	Hoyer	Rodriguez
Boyd (FL)	Inslee	Ross
Boyd (KS)	Israel	Rothman
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Braley (IA)	Jackson-Lee	Ruppersberger
Brown, Corrine	(TX)	Rush
Butterfield	Jefferson	Ryan (OH)
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Salazar
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Cardoza	Jones (OH)	T.
Carnahan	Kagen	Sanchez, Loretta
Carson	Kanjorski	Sarbanes
Castor	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Chandler	Castor	Schiff
Clarke	Kennedy	Schwartz
Clay	Kildee	Schmitt
Cleaver	Kilpatrick	Scott (GA)
Clyburn	Kind	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Klein (FL)	Serrano
Conyers	Lampson	Shea-Porter
Cooper	Langevin	Sherman
Costa	Lantos	Shuler
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Sires
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Skelton
Cramer	Lee	Slaughter
Crowley	Levin	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Snyder
Cummings	Lipinski	Solis
Davis (AL)	Loeb sack	Space
Davis (CA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Spratt
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Stupak
Davis, Lincoln	Lynch	Sutton
DeFazio	Mahoney (FL)	Tanner
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Tauscher
Delahunt	Markey	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Matheson	Thompson (MS)
Dicks	Matsui	Tierney
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Doggett	McCollum (MN)	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McDermott	Udall (NM)
Doyle	McGovern	Van Hollen
Edwards	McIntyre	Velázquez
Ellison	McNerney	Vislosky
Ellsworth	McNulty	Walz (MN)
Emanuel	Meek (FL)	Wasserman
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Schultz
Eshoo	Melancon	Waters
Etheridge	Michaud	Watson
Farr	Miller (NC)	Watt
Fattah	Miller, George	Waxman
Filner	Mitchell	Weiner
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Welch (VT)
Giffords	Moore (KS)	Wexler
Gillibrand	Moore (WI)	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Wu
Gordon	Murphy (CT)	Wynn
	Murphy, Patrick	Yarmuth
	Murtha	

NAYS—196

Aderholt	Barton (TX)	Bono
Akin	Biggert	Boozman
Alexander	Bilbray	Boustany
Bachmann	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Bishop (UT)	Brown (SC)
Baird	Blackburn	Brown-Waite,
Baker	Blunt	Ginny
Barrett (SC)	Boehner	Buchanan
Bartlett (MD)	Bonner	Burgess

Cuellar	Keller	Price (GA)
Culberson	King (IA)	Pryce (OH)
Davis (KY)	King (NY)	Putnam
Davis, David	Kirk	Radanovich
Deal (GA)	Kline (MN)	Ramstad
Diaz-Balart, L.	Knollenberg	Regula
Diaz-Balart, M.	LaHood	Reichert
Donnelly	Lamborn	Renzi
Drake	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (AL)
Dreier	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (MI)
Ehlers	Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher
Ellsworth	Linder	Ros-Lehtinen
English (PA)	LoBiondo	Roskam
Fallin	Lucas	Royce
Feeney	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (WI)
Ferguson	E.	Sali
Flake	Mahoney (FL)	Saxton
Forbes	Manzullo	Schmidt
Fossella	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Foxo	Matheson	Shadegg
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)	Shays
Frelinghuysen	McCotter	Shuler
Galleghy	McCrery	Shuster
Garrett (NJ)	McHenry	Smith (NE)
Gerlach	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Giffords	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Gilchrest	Melancon	Space
Gillibrand	Mica	Stearns
Gingrey	Miller (FL)	Stupak
Goode	Miller (MI)	Sullivan
Granger	Miller, Gary	Thompson (CA)
Graves	Moore (KS)	Tiberi
Hall (TX)	Moran (KS)	Turner
Hastert	Musgrave	Udall (CO)
Hayes	Myrick	Upton
Heller	Neugebauer	Walberg
Hensarling	Nunes	Walden (OR)
Herger	Pastor	Walz (MN)
Herseeth Sandlin	Pearce	Wamp
Hobson	Pence	Weldon (FL)
Hoekstra	Perlmutter	Weller
Hunter	Peterson (MN)	Westmoreland
Inglis (SC)	Peterson (PA)	Wicker
Issa	Pitts	Wolf
Johnson, Sam	Platts	Wu
Jordan	Poe	Yarmuth
Kagen	Porter	Young (FL)

Berkley	Kucinich	Simpson
Cubin	Marshall	Slaughter
Davis, Jo Ann	McNerney	Tancredo
Jindal	Murphy, Tim	Young (AK)

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

It is the sense of Congress that—

Altmore	Bonner	Calvert
Bachus	Boren	Camp (MI)
Baird	Boustany	Campbell (CA)
Barrett (SC)	Boyd (KS)	Cannon
Barrow	Brady (TX)	Cantor
Bartlett (MD)	Brown (SC)	Carney
Barton (TX)	Brown-Waite,	Carter
Billirakis	Ginny	Chabot
Bishop (UT)	Buchanan	Chandler
Blackburn	Burgess	Cole (OK)
Blunt	Burton (IN)	Conaway
Boehner	Buwer	Cramer

Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carney
Carter
Chabot
Chandler
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cramer