

million increase over last year. It also includes \$80 million in additional money for the Byrne grant system.

I was the sheriff in Seattle up until 2½ years ago for the last 8 years of my career. I was in law enforcement 33 years. As a sheriff, I used the Byrne Grant funds. I used the COPS money. We worked together with our communities. We worked together with business. We made our communities safe. It is a vital program, a useful program, a necessary program.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot have freedom, we cannot feel safe in our neighborhoods until we know we are safe, until we know our law enforcement is there to protect us. The COPS grant does that.

THE CHAMP ACT

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we introduced the CHAMP Act, an essential package that addresses the health care needs of our children and seniors while also meeting the needs of our doctors. I am particularly proud of our efforts to ensure that 11 million children receive the health care coverage they need to lead healthier lives.

Today, we are at a crossroads on children's health. Studies show that if we ensure that children receive preventative health care in their formative years, they will lead healthier lives. But over the last year, the number of uninsured children has increased for the first time in a decade. That is why it is so important to strengthen SCHIP.

This is not an expansion of the program. Today we are reaching 6 million children. Under the CHAMP Act, we will reach an additional 5 million children who are already eligible.

Over the past 10 years, SCHIP has received strong bipartisan support because it serves as a lifeline to those most vulnerable among us, our children. It has always received strong bipartisan support. At a time when the number of uninsured is increasing, I would hope Republicans would join us in passing this legislation.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE LONGEST MARRIED COUPLE IN THE UNITED STATES

(Mrs. BACHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, today it is an honor for me to congratulate the longest married couple in the United States, married for 82½ incredible years. They live in my district, Clarence and Mayme Vail of Hugo, Minnesota. They have six wonderful children, 39 grandchildren, 101 great-grandchildren, and 40 great-great-grandchildren. It is almost beyond belief.

At 101 and 99 years of age, what is the Vails' secret to success? Clarence says "Avoid debt, strive for simple, clean living, no public arguments, feed your faith, and accept your spouse as is." Then Clarence went on to say, "Pick a good woman and let her lead the way." That is good advice from a humble Minnesotan.

Congratulations, Clarence and Mayme Vail of Hugo, Minnesota, on 82½ years of marriage; the longest married couple in the United States. Congratulations, lovebirds.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

LIMITING USE OF FUNDS TO ESTABLISH ANY MILITARY INSTALLATION OR BASE IN IRAQ

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2929) to limit the use of funds to establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq or to exercise United States economic control of the oil resources of Iraq.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2929

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) On May 30, 2007, Tony Snow, the President's press secretary, said that President Bush envisions a United States military presence in Iraq "as we have in South Korea", where American troops have been stationed for more than 50 years.

(2) On June 1, 2007, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates elaborated on the President's idea of a "long and enduring presence" in Iraq, of which the "Korea model" is one example.

(3) These statements run counter to previous statements issued by the President and other administration officials.

(4) On April 13, 2004, the President said, "As a proud and independent people, Iraqis do not support an indefinite occupation and neither does America."

(5) On February 6, 2007, Secretary Robert Gates stated in testimony before Congress, "We certainly have no desire for permanent bases in Iraq."

(6) On February 16, 2006, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld stated in testimony before Congress, "We have no desire to have our forces permanently in that country. We have no plans or discussions underway to have permanent bases in that country."

(7) On March 24, 2006, the United States Ambassador to Iraq, Zalmay Khalilzad stated that the United States has "no goal of establishing permanent bases in Iraq."

(8) On October 25, 2006, the President stated, "Any decisions on permanency in Iraq will be made by the Iraqi government.", in response to a question whether the United States wanted to maintain permanent military bases in Iraq.

(9) On February 6, 2007, Secretary Gates said, "We will make that decision, sir" in response to the question: "Is that still our policy, that we're going to be there [Iraq] as long as the [Iraqi] government asks us to be there? . . . Is our presence left up to the Iraqis or do we make the decision?"

(10) The perception that the United States intends to permanently occupy Iraq aids insurgent groups in recruiting supporters and fuels violent activity.

(11) A clear statement that the United States does not seek a long-term or permanent presence in Iraq would send a strong signal to the people of Iraq and the international community that the United States fully supports the efforts of the Iraqi people to exercise full national sovereignty, including control over security and public safety.

(12) The Iraq Study Group Report recommends: "The President should state that the United States does not seek permanent military bases in Iraq. If the Iraqi government were to request a temporary base or bases, then the United States government could consider that request as it would in the case of any other government."; and "The President should restate that the United States does not seek to control Iraq's oil."

(13) The House of Representatives has passed 6 separate bills prohibiting or expressing opposition to the establishment of permanent military bases in Iraq including three of which have been enacted into law by the President: Public Law 109-289, Public Law 109-364, Public Law 110-28.

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States not to establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq and not to exercise United States control of the oil resources of Iraq.

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.

No funds made available by any Act of Congress shall be obligated or expended for a purpose as follows:

(1) to establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq; and

(2) to exercise United States economic control of the oil resources of Iraq.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSENLEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2929.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, there have been many justifications for why we went to war in Iraq. Take your pick: We invaded to capture Saddam's weapons of mass destruction, or we invaded to oppose a

dictator and bring democracy and human equal rights to the Iraqi people, or we invaded to fight al Qaeda and prevent them from attacking us here.

So many reasons have been offered that you can mix and match one from column A, two from column B.

Whatever your favorite reason for invading Iraq, the one reason that was never offered was that we are invading Iraq to occupy their land, establish permanent bases and control their oil. Yet, among Iraqis, this perception is that the establishment of permanent bases is precisely why we invaded. The insurgents use that perception to recruit fighters and incite attacks on our troops.

The bill before us today, introduced by our colleagues, BARBARA LEE and TOM ALLEN, along with JIM MORAN and DAVID PRICE, will help combat that perception. It states that it is the policy of the United States not to establish permanent bases in Iraq and not to control Iraq's oil resources.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that the House has spoken on the issue. Six separate times the House has passed legislation prohibiting or expressing opposition to the establishment of permanent military bases in Iraq. Three of those bills have been signed into law. Yet, from the President, we continue to get mixed messages.

In May, the President's spokesman talked about a U.S. presence in Iraq that looked like our presence in South Korea. Last month, Secretary Gates suggested that the President was considering a long and enduring presence in Iraq.

Whatever your position on the war, I don't think anyone here in this House believes that we should be in Iraq for over 50 years. In case anyone needed any further convincing that pursuing a long-term presence in Iraq is unwise, the Iraq Study Group was unequivocal on the point of permanent bases. "The President should state that the United States does not seek permanent military bases in Iraq". But instead of standing down when the Iraqis stand up, the President seems intent on putting down roots. It is the wrong policy yet again.

The Lee-Allen bill will send an important message again that the United States has no interest in permanent bases.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to support it.

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

MS. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as has been said, this legislation cites the fact that the House of Representatives has passed six, one, two, three, four, five, six separate bills prohibiting or expressing opposition to the establishment of permanent military bases in Iraq, including three, one, two, three, which have been enacted into law by the President.

In fact, the language contained in H.R. 2929, which is before us today, is nearly identical to the language adopted under a Republican-controlled Congress in section 1519 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007.

This is the bill before us today. This is the law.

The fiscal year 2007 bill states:

"No funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in this Act may be obligated or expended for a purpose as follows:

(1) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq.

(2) To exercise United States economic control of the oil resources of Iraq."

That is law. That has been passed a couple of times. And now the bill before us this morning says this:

"No funds made available by any Act of Congress shall be obligated or expended for a purpose as follows:

(1) to establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq; and

(2) to exercise United States economic control of the oil resources in Iraq."

Once, twice, three times. We can pass it again. But why are we here? Why are we spending valuable time, Mr. Speaker, debating an issue that the Congress on a bipartisan basis already has agreed to, once, twice, three times, four times, five times, six times? The majority's attempts to score political points on a range of issues, including particularly Iraq policy, has already paralyzed precious months of military planning and congressional business, including the 9/11 bill.

It was only last night when the majority conferees finally agreed to incorporate into the 9/11 conference report critical language offered by the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee, my good friend Mr. KING of New York, which would provide immunity to passengers and commuters who report suspicious activities.

In a post-9/11 world, Mr. Speaker, passenger vigilance is essential to our Nation's security. An alert citizenry is our first line of defense against those who may seek to do us harm.

Yet, some of our colleagues, rather than supporting or encouraging such personal commitment and involvement from our citizens, would have preferred to leave them vulnerable to frivolous lawsuits and, instead, engage in debates on legislative items and policy already enacted into law and discussed once, twice, three times, four times, five times and six times.

However, since we are having this "Groundhog Day" discussion, it is important to once again note that there are no permanent United States bases overseas. Rather, the scope and the duration of U.S. basing rights are deter-

mined by individual agreements and entered into with host governments throughout the world.

It is also important to clarify that a policy position that does not support permanent bases in Iraq does not translate into either a prohibition against the American troop presence in Iraq, we could have that discussion on another bill, or a prohibition against the existence of any U.S. military installation in that country.

But that is not what is before us today. The bill before us in its "findings" section states that the Iraq Study Group Report recommends that "the President should state that the United States does not seek permanent military bases in Iraq."

Correct.

The bill also specifically highlights the other component of that recommendation, which says, "If the Iraqi Government were to request a temporary base or bases, then the United States Government could consider that request as it would be in the case of any other government."

This legislation therefore accepts the prospect of a negotiated agreement for a future relationship with the Government of Iraq to, among other things, allow U.S. military and security forces to operate from U.S. installations within Iraq, including through a possible status of forces agreement that would define the legal status of U.S. personnel in Iraq and would define the rights and responsibilities between the United States and the Government of Iraq. Furthermore, this legislation before us today does not prohibit the United States from entering into the interoperability agreements that allow the United States and Iraq to share common infrastructure and bases.

Mr. Speaker, I do not object to this legislation. We have supported it before and look forward to supporting it again.

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

MR. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the chief sponsor of the resolution.

MS. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership. Also, I would like to thank our Speaker, our leadership, Chairman SKELTON, Chairman LANTOS, Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN and others for really bringing this critical measure to a vote today.

What this legislation does is really simple. It does what the Iraq Study Group and other experts have recommended that we do. It makes a clear state of policy that the United States does not intend to maintain an open-ended military presence in Iraq and that we will not exercise control over Iraqi oil, and it backs up that policy with the power of the purse.

□ 1045

And the President and his administration to this date, and I mean to this

date, have not made a clear statement of this policy. Putting Congress on record with this clear statement helps take the target off our troops' backs; it supports our goals of handing over responsibility for security and public safety to Iraqi forces.

Mr. Speaker, the perception that the United States plans to maintain a permanent military presence in Iraq strengthens the insurgency and fuels the violence against our troops. That is why experts ranging from former adviser to the Coalition Provisional Authority Larry Diamond to the Iraq Study Group have called on the President to make a clear statement of policy that the United States does not intend to maintain permanent military bases or an open-ended military presence in Iraq.

Unfortunately, the administration has refused to do that. In fact, there are conflicting accounts as to who will decide if we stay in Iraq permanently. When the President was asked that question at a press conference last October he said: "Any decisions on permanency in Iraq will be made by the Iraqi Government." But when Secretary Gates was asked is our presence left up to the Iraqis, or do we make the decision in testimony before the Senate this February, Secretary Gates said, we will make this decision.

More recently the administration has further muddled the waters by saying that they envision a United States military presence in Iraq similar to that we have in South Korea where American troops have been stationed for more than 50 years and won't be leaving anytime soon.

We must soundly reject the vision of an open-ended occupation as bad policy which undermines the safety of our troops, and we must recognize it for what it is: Another recruiting posture for terrorists.

To those who raise objections or want to suggest this is only a symbolic measure, or raise semantic questions about what a permanent base is, let me say this: This is a serious issue, and I think we should all recognize how much is at stake.

The question is simple: Do we support an endless occupation, or do we oppose it? We may disagree on many things about Iraq, but I hope we can agree that an endless occupation is not the answer. Let's make that commitment today. Let's put the so-called Korea model to bed, and let's tell our young men and women that when they come home, they will all come home. Let's pass this legislation, and I want to thank Congresswomen WOOLSEY and WATERS, and Congressmen PRICE and ALLEN for their support.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

If I could point out that the most recent reincarnation of this very same issue was passed earlier this year in this very House, and I would like to read verbatim what it said. I was proud to vote for it, and I will vote for it.

Sec. 1222. Continuation of prohibition on establishment of permanent military installations in Iraq or United States control over oil resources of Iraq.

Section 1519 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364; 120 Stat. 2444) is amended by inserting after "this Act" the following: "or any other Act for any fiscal year".

Mr. Speaker, with that I am pleased to yield with great pleasure such time as he may consume to a great American, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), who has also voted for this measure six times.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady for her leadership and also thank the author of this measure and simply point out that we have already passed this measure, and we did pass it on our defense bill last year.

Very simply, no American troops are permanently stationed in countries around the world by virtue of the fact that we station them with the permission of the host country. The idea that we are going to insist or enforce, or unilaterally lodge American troops in Iraq is not something that is contemplated by anybody.

I just say to the gentlelady that we may have a time in the future, and we have dozens and dozens of countries around the world which on a regular basis give us permission to move our troops across their land area. We may have a time in the future, for example, 5 or 10 years from now, when we have to have an early warning for a missile strike from Iran to Israel.

I know that the gentlelady wouldn't object to American forces going in and establishing an early warning station so that we can save the lives of people living in Tel Aviv from a strike similar to the Scud strike that Saddam Hussein launched in the early 1990s at Israel.

We may have a time when we have to project American forces for a contingency around the world, and when you do that, regardless of what country you are talking about of the dozens of countries that host us on a regular basis, you go through a protocol. You contact the country. You receive their official permission going through their government, and that describes the parameters of the American presence that will be there, how long it will be there, what the usage will be, whether it is an airfield or a radar station.

But there could be a time, should Iran develop weapons of mass destruction or continue on this path to develop weapons of mass destruction and at some point attack a neighbor or prepare to attack a neighbor, and it could well be in the interest of the United States, for example, to have early warning capability should Iran want to make a strike on a country like Israel when that request will be made. And hopefully it would be responded to affirmatively by the free nation of Iraq.

I support this legislation, and I will vote for it again, as I voted for it six times. But I would hope that Members would understand and realize that we use dozens and dozens of assets around the world which are all done permissively by the host nations.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished coauthor of the resolution before us, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2929, the Lee-Allen bill to ban permanent bases in Iraq.

Regardless of one's position on U.S. military operations, we can all agree on the need for the Iraqi Government to succeed. The perception that the United States plans a permanent presence in Iraq fuels the resentment against our troops and complicates the path towards political reconciliation in Iraq. Too many Iraqis believe that we intend to stay in their country indefinitely.

A clear statement by Congress, not part of a larger bill, that we do not intend a long-term or permanent military presence in Iraq is necessary to send a strong signal to the Iraqi people and to the world. It supports our goal of handing over responsibility for security and public safety to Iraqi forces.

Passage last year of prohibitions on permanent bases in Iraq based on legislation I wrote with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) marked perhaps the first time Congress legislated to change the direction of our Iraq policy. In total, three "no permanent base" provisions have been enacted. H.R. 2929 make these permanent. Twice the House has rejected amendments to weaken these provisions.

Recent statements by administration officials, however, are troubling. The White House Press Secretary said recently the President envisions a United States military presence in Iraq "as we have in South Korea," where American troops have been based for more than 50 years. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates made similar comments.

H.R. 2929 reaffirms that the United States has a clear and consistent policy against a permanent U.S. military presence in Iraq. I urge its adoption.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, today we are sending a clear message that our commitment to the Iraqi people will be ongoing, but that our military presence will not be permanent. Over and over this Congress and the American people have clearly called for an end to the occupation in Iraq. We are calling for bold action, action to bring our troops home and return Iraq to the Iraqi people.

The actions of this administration have clearly put our troops in danger.

Troops were sent in without adequate training, and even yet without appropriate equipment, and now our heroic soldiers are being returned to extended and repeated tours of duty. All of this is unacceptable, and now the administration says they want to leave the troops there for future Presidents to sort out the mess.

We say "no way." No more putting our troops in danger, and no permanent bases. Show the American people, show the Iraqis, show the international community we have no plans to occupy Iraq. Vote "yes" on the Lee amendment.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the cosponsor of the resolution, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a sponsor of this important legislation to prohibit the establishment of permanent U.S. bases in Iraq.

We have passed similar legislation before by a wide margin. The first time was a few weeks after I questioned General Abizaid in an appropriations hearing. He could not unequivocally disavow permanent bases, and so the House stepped in and asserted its prerogative on foreign policy by prohibiting permanent bases in Iraq.

Now, my colleagues might understandably ask, why are we voting on this bill again today? The reason is that the Bush administration continues to stubbornly reject the will of Congress, of the Iraq Study Group, and of the American people.

Defense Secretary Gates recently stated his goal of "a long and enduring presence" in Iraq. President Bush has stated his vision for a presence "as we have in South Korea," where U.S. troops remain 50 years after an armistice. That kind of rhetoric suggests that they have not yet gotten the message, and it seriously damages our cause.

The Iraqi people and the American people need assurance that there is light at the end of the tunnel, that occupation is not a permanent state of affairs. So I urge my colleagues to support this legislation today, and to once again unequivocally state that the U.S. will not establish permanent bases in Iraq, because this administration and the world need to understand that America's misadventure in Iraq must and will come to an end.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), a cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York.

I wish those on the Republican side that are objecting to this resolution

would ask the President what is it about the word "no" that you don't understand? How many times do we have to say that there will be no permanent military bases in Iraq?

Sure, we have said it in legislation before, but as recently as last month the Secretary of Defense elaborated on the President's statement about envisioning a long and enduring military presence in Iraq similar to the Korean model. Well, imagine how that plays into the propaganda of our enemy. No wonder al Qaeda is gaining in strength and effectiveness. No wonder people are believing in what they are saying, because we are playing into their hands. They are saying we are there as occupiers of an oil-rich Arab country.

We believe that we went there as liberators, those who supported the war. But gosh sakes, don't play into al Qaeda's strength. Take away this recruiting tool and this rallying cry.

Let's pass this resolution today and say clearly and unequivocally: No permanent military bases in Iraq, period.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly support H.R. 2929, a bill to prohibit permanent bases in Iraq, and I thank the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for their persistent leadership on this important issue.

The House passed the Responsible Redeployment from Iraq this month to get our troops out of Iraq by April. The question now is not whether we will redeploy our troops, but when and how.

This resolution makes it emphatically clear to the Iraqi people and to President Bush that we do not intend to keep troops in Iraq indefinitely.

□ 1100

The United States must not be seen as an occupier. Otherwise, our presence there will be used to recruit insurgents, to keep Iraq entrenched in violence and to create an even more dangerous environment for our troops.

This House, too, has already expressed its opposition to permanent bases, but today, we do it clearly with bipartisan support and send a very clear statement. I urge all of our colleagues to listen to the will of the American people, of the Iraqi people, and to support H.R. 2929.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2929.

From the beginning of the President's invasion and occupation of Iraq, he has insisted that the United States has no intention of permanently occupying that country. I think there is no better way to reassure both our friends and our adversaries that the United

States does not intend to become an imperial occupier of Iraq than to make clear that the U.S. will not build permanent military bases there.

The American people are seeking clear assurance that their government has a plan for leaving Iraq. If the President fails to embrace this legislation, it would only confirm for many Americans that the President has no strategy for bringing our troops home and, in fact, intends to keep them there forever.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I hope the President will listen to the American people and sign it into law.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for yielding.

I want to thank my good friend and colleague from the Bay Area, BARBARA LEE, for bringing this timely legislation before us today.

The last thing Congress and the American people want in Iraq is to keep U.S. troops there permanently. We need a rational and reasonable exit strategy. Yet the administration has signaled that it intends, instead, to put down roots in Iraqi soil, soil that is already soaked with the blood of our soldiers and countless Iraqis.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. Building huge military bases in Iraq to last the ages is not the answer. We want to bring our servicemen and servicewomen home to Nebraska and Idaho and California. Our legislation will prohibit spending funds to establish permanent military bases in Iraq, and I support it wholeheartedly.

Let me be clear. This measure does not prohibit us from protecting our embassy and other vital interests and fighting terrorism. It only ensures that our troops do not put down permanent roots.

The administration has drawn a parallel between our proposed, sustained presence in Iraq and the U.S. obligation to South Korea after the Korean War. Mr. Speaker, we have been in South Korea for more than 54 years, and I hope we won't be as long as that in Iraq.

The Korean peninsula for over half a century was vital to our security interests during the Cold War, but Iraq is not Korea. It is now beyond question that our national security is being harmed, not helped, by our continuing vast footprint in Iraq.

As long as huge numbers of our forces are there, the Iraqi Government will limp along, failing to undertake the far-reaching political and security changes desperately needed to promote lasting stability in that long-suffering country.

And it will only anger the Iraqi people to promote the erroneous impression that our troops will be there permanently. In fact, a commitment not

to establish permanent bases may facilitate an earlier, safer, more orderly exit, as it will reassure Iraqis that our intention is not to have a permanent presence in that country.

I, therefore, strongly support this resolution to ensure that the administration heads in the right direction in Iraq.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully request of the gentlewoman, the distinguished ranking member of the committee, if she would be kind enough to yield us 3 minutes of her time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Absolutely. I would love to yield you 3 minutes. We have two speakers, Mr. POE, who is already here, and Mr. ROHRABACHER. I just want to make sure that they would have enough time. But once they're done, I would be glad to yield you the time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Sure. Why don't you take that time now.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from Texas, a member of our Foreign Affairs Committee, Judge POE, who is very cognizant of Public Law 109-364, which already says that they will have no permanent military bases in Iraq.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from Florida for yielding me the time.

There has been a consistent message that has been put forth by Congress that we are not interested in permanent bases in Iraq, but that should not diminish our need to have a presence there at this time. We must not jeopardize United States security interests. At issue here is the definition of the word "permanent." No one can quite agree on what that really means.

This bill is similar to one we passed earlier when we passed language in the supplemental on this topic. The point is, we do not intend to be in Iraq permanently. We are not interested in Iraqi oil.

I do believe our military is stretched too thin throughout the world. We literally have a U.S. troop presence in almost every country on the globe, from military bases in Germany to Korea and other places in between. Some of those bases seem like they are permanent because we have been in those areas for so long. Our troops in those nations remain an issue of really another debate.

The issue here is over permanent basing in Iraq. We should have installations or naval ships in an area where our troops can quickly deploy, and Iraq really should be no different. But we've never set out to occupy any nation. We are not an imperial Nation. We do not intend to violate the sovereignty of another nation by occupying it. This has always been United States policy. The United States came to liberate, not conquer, Iraq, and this is our policy.

In a letter one of my colleagues addressed to Chairman Peter Pace, Chair-

man of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Pace was asked his thoughts on the need to have the U.S. enter into and retain the ability to enter into agreed military basing rights agreements with Iraq and in Iraq. In his response, General Pace stated it's the intention of the United States military to "work closely with Iraq's sovereign government to decide the terms and what foreign military forces . . . will remain in Iraq."

Historically, basing rights agreements have been a necessary part of diplomatic relations with foreign governments, but they've always been agreed to by the United States and that other nation. These agreements outline guidelines and conditions for operating American military bases and troops worldwide.

It is both common and responsible for the United States to enter into temporary basing agreements with other countries hosting our troops. This is being done in every country hosting United States troops, and the representative Government of Iraq should not really be an exception. And we should continue to work with them on temporary basing, but not permanent basing.

We shouldn't somehow put Iraq in some type of different category than we have other allies in the world, but we should make it clear that our basing rights are only temporary. So, designating that we may have temporary basing rights is only logical in Iraq, but a permanent presence in Iraq is not desired. And it has been the statement of this Congress before.

So I support this legislation.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation and salute the bill's sponsor, BARBARA LEE from California, as a courageous and clear voice in this Congress.

It's interesting listening to this debate that there seems to be no disagreement about a resolution that will help build stability in Iraq, as others have said. It will make clear that the U.S. is not an occupying force, and it will deny al Qaeda a key recruiting tool.

It is also clear that we are not prohibiting a U.S. presence in the region, even a U.S. temporary presence in Iraq. We have bases in other neighboring countries and the Middle East, and we will have an over-the-horizon force.

I'm really surprised that not only is the White House refusing to follow the law, but those senior White House officials with whom I've spoken numerous times about this issue all seem to agree we don't need a permanent military presence, and yet, stubbornly, they refuse to make clear that we won't have one.

Pass this resolution. Let's do the right thing. Congress, as an article I body, needs to get this White House to follow the law.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on International Operations.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

Let me note, I have all along argued, and I think the people on our side of the aisle have argued, that we are not in Iraq in order to have permanent bases or any other such thing. American efforts in Iraq have been totally based on benevolent and noble motives, and I would hope that this is well-understood and appreciated by the people of Iraq themselves.

The fact is that there is some confusion because, during the public debate on what American foreign policy should be, far too often we have heard in the hype of emotions the charges, even from people in this body, that America is being imperialistic. I mean, that word "imperialism" has actually sprung up in several hearings that I've been at as a Member of Congress. That is an insult to American military personnel. We can honestly disagree about what's going on in Iraq without having to debase the people of the United States of America by claiming we're imperialists like the former empires in Russia and Germany, et cetera.

No, I think we've been benevolent from the beginning. Our people wanted to come in, to liberate Iraq from a bloody tyrant who slaughtered hundreds of thousands of his own people. We came there to help the people of Iraq and hopefully establish a democratic government. Now, whether or not we succeed or not, I'm not sure. I would hope the majority of people in Iraq appreciate that, and today, we are reaffirming to them we are not there to have any permanent presence.

I, in fact, will be proposing legislation this coming week which suggests, as a sense of the House, and I would ask the Speaker of the House to be aware of this, that we need to have a sense of the House resolution calling on the Iraqi Government to have a referendum of whether they want the American troops that are there today to begin an immediate withdrawal or whether they would like American troops to stay there until order has been restored and order has been brought to the people of Iraq. I think that if the Iraqi people vote that we should have an immediate withdrawal, we should go. We should go. But if the people of Iraq decide they appreciate and want us to be there to help them fight off radical Islamists and others who would impose their brand of dictatorship on the people of Iraq, well, then, perhaps we should take into consideration that the Iraqi people want us there.

So I will be proposing legislation later on in the week calling for this referendum, and in the meantime, let us reaffirm with this legislation that it had never been the intent of the United

States of America to use Iraq as a permanent base for America's military presence in that region.

I thank you very much for your leadership, Madam Speaker. Thank you for your leadership in this, and I appreciate you are an activist. Since I've been in this Congress, you have always been an activist, and we have been on the same side in that activism.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority leader of the full committee is prepared to close, we have one final speaker.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, were we seen as occupiers in Haiti, in Bosnia? Do we not, as some have said on Iraq, have a sustained military presence in these countries? Did we not intervene in Haiti to restore democracy and remain to prevent the increased violence?

In fact, as our distinguished Speaker, whom we'll be hearing from in just a few moments, when she argued for a sustained U.S. deployment in Bosnia, Speaker PELOSI said, Is the Bosnian mission without danger and risk? No. With strong leadership there are always risks. These risks have been minimized. They are risks for peace, risks for ending years of bloodshed, risks for freedom. We risk far more by failing to act.

□ 1115

We risk far more if we allow the tenuous peace to collapse and watch the flames of war ignite again. I agreed with Speaker PELOSI then when she said that on December 13 of 1995, and I agreed with her when she said on September 19 of 1994, when advocating for a sustained U.S. presence in Haiti, the Speaker said, setting a date certain for troop withdrawal will unnecessarily endanger both our troops on the ground and our efforts at promoting democracy in Haiti.

I say that we have no less at stake here in Iraq. The bill before us, as we have said before, is a fine bill. We support what it seeks to do because, in fact, it is law. It is already United States law.

We want to make sure that the Iraqi people have the same level of commitment that we have shown to other oppressed people throughout the world. We should not ignore the consequences of a rapid withdrawal from Iraq in a vitally important region of the world.

But, like I have said, this is not the issue addressed in this bill. Some have remarked about the greater issue of Iraq in their discourse today. On the bill before us, it is already public law. We have passed it six times in the House. It has been law three times, and we have no objection to the bill becoming law a fourth time, a fifth time or a sixth time.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield the balance of our

time to the distinguished gentlewoman from California, Speaker PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and to acknowledge the exceptional leadership of my colleagues from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY, for their leadership on this issue, and Congresswoman BARBARA LEE's authorship of this legislation. Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY, Congressman TOM ALLEN, Congressman DAVID PRICE, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS have all been important in the leadership of bringing this legislation to the floor and continuing our debate on the involvement in Iraq.

The legislation is timely and a key part of our strategy for a new direction in Iraq. Thank you all.

I am very pleased to join our distinguished colleagues on the minority in support of this legislation. Yes, I have had the privilege of working with Mr. ROHRBACHER, with Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN and others, Mr. WOLF and Mr. SMITH, over the years on issues that relate to human rights throughout the world. I respect them for their leadership in so many arenas. It has been a privilege to work with them. I am so glad they are supporting this legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's very important for us to measure any initiative in relationship to the war in Iraq against the backdrop of what does this do to contribute to a vision for stability in the Middle East, whether we are talking about no permanent bases, whether we are talking about redeploying our troops out of Iraq, a change of mission there, to leave troops only for specific limited purposes. This is what the generals have told us. General Odom, for one, has said any vision for stability in the Middle East must begin with the redeployment of troops out of Iraq. So, too, this issue today, no permanent bases.

Yes, our colleagues are correct that this has been brought before the Congress before and has been passed into law, but the fact is that it may not have been heard adequately by the administration and certainly not by the people in the region.

This legislation clearly signals that the United States does not seek a permanent military presence in Iraq. This action is necessary to clarify confusing and contradictory statements from the administration regarding our Nation's long-term strategic relationship with Iraq.

In its final report, the bipartisan Iraq Study Group recommended that the United States clearly state that our Nation does not seek permanent military bases in Iraq or to control Iraq's oil. It did so to help shape "a positive climate for . . . diplomatic efforts," which are essential to ending the U.S. presence in Iraq and bringing greater stability to the Middle East.

While the administration has previously indicated it would not seek per-

manent bases in Iraq, recent statements raise contrary questions. Administration officials have remarked that the President envisioned a continued military presence in Iraq similar to our presence in Korea, where U.S. forces have been stationed for more than 50 years.

The American people have made it clear in the election that they want a new direction in Iraq that brings the troops home. The Iraqi people and regional powers must also be reassured that the United States does not seek to exploit Iraq either by building permanent military facilities there or by exercising control over its oil. We can make that statement by passing this legislation overwhelmingly today as part of our strategy for a new direction in Iraq and for stability in the Middle East.

The President's remarks in South Carolina yesterday were really saddening. Just when you think you have seen it all, just when you think you have heard it all, the President mentioned al Qaeda nearly 100 times to justify his course of action in Iraq. Let us remove all doubt. This Congress, every single person here, is committed to fight the war on terror, but let us not misrepresent what the troops in Iraq are doing.

Everyone who examines the situation with the knowledge says we do not belong in a civil war in Iraq. So, again, the President's statements give great cause for grave concern. They crystallized why the Congress must continue to pressure the administration to change course in Iraq. Yet again, President Bush mischaracterized the facts on the ground in Iraq and the latest intelligence on the real threat of international terrorism.

Just yesterday news reports were that the administration plans a continued substantial troop presence in Iraq through the summer of 2009; heaven knows, beyond then.

As the latest National Intelligence Estimate reveals, the war in Iraq has not made America safer or turned the tide against terrorism. In fact, while we have been tied down in Iraq, al Qaeda has been regenerated, has regenerated its ability to attack the United States while enjoying safe haven in vital areas of our ally in the war on terrorism, Pakistan.

The President's Iraq policy is unacceptable to the American people, and to Democrats in Congress, because it has allowed al Qaeda to regain its footing, reinforce its numbers, and refocus on another spectacular and deadly attack on the United States. That is why we must change direction in Iraq and do it now before it is too late.

America cannot afford another 2 years of war in Iraq. We have already lost more than 3,600 brave Americans to this bloody conflict. There can be no discussion of the situation in Iraq without pausing to remember and acknowledge the sacrifice, the courage and the patriotism of our men and

women in uniform and their families who have sacrificed so much for our country. We thank them, we honor them, and we think they deserve better than no plan for a redeployment of troops out of Iraq.

We have lost 4 years that could have been spent bolstering Homeland Security, strengthening counterterrorism efforts, and focusing all of the resources at our disposal on combating the terrorist threat. Today's vote can again make clear to the President, and to the administration, to the American people, to the people in the Middle East, to the people in Iraq that the American people are opposed to a permanent military presence in Iraq.

The American people are demanding a new direction. The Democratic Congress will go on record every day, if necessary, to register a judgment in opposition to the course of action that the President is taking in Iraq. The Democratic Congress will go on record every day, if necessary, to fight for a redeployment of our forces as a central element of a new direction strategy for Iraq.

I urge my colleagues to vote in overwhelming numbers for this important legislation.

Again, I thank our colleagues, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY, Congressman TOM ALLEN, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, and Congressman DAVID PRICE and all the others who played such an important role in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the H.R. 2929, which I voted for, and which overwhelmingly passed the House of Representatives. This common-sense legislation limits the use of funds to establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq or to exercise United States economic control over the oil resources of Iraq.

In December 2006, the bipartisan Iraq Study Group released its recommendations for U.S. policy in Iraq. Included in those recommendations were two important provisions—the first advises the President against seeking permanent military bases in Iraq and the second encourages the Iraqi Government to take control of their own oil resources.

Accordingly, H.R. 2929 solidifies those recommendations and sends a very clear message to the Iraqi people that the United States is not an occupying force. The perception that the United States plans to keep a permanent military presence in Iraq and use its oil resources has only fueled the insurgency and violence against our troops. That has been exacerbated by President Bush's recent comments that our military presence in Iraq could extend 50 years into the future. In response, this legislation puts Congress on record opposing any permanent bases or attempts to control Iraq's oil revenues and helps take the target off our troops' backs.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this war. I believe it is long past time to bring our troops home and end our involvement in this civil war. Although our withdrawal from Iraq will not happen to-

morrow, this legislation is one way we can help put an end to our involvement today.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the distinguished Congresswoman from California, BARBARA LEE for her work on H.R. 2929, which bans permanent military bases from being established in Iraq. She has long been a voice on ending the war in Iraq and I commend her and the work of Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS and Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY for their fortitude on this issue. I would also like to recognize Congressman TOM ALLEN and Congressman DAVID PRICE for their commitment and contributions to the bill.

In-line with the Iraq Study Group report, this bill would prohibit the establishment of permanent U.S. military bases. It would also prohibit the United States from exercising control over Iraqi oil resources. This bill signals a larger issue and bigger picture—our presence in Iraq is not permanent. Let it be clear to the Bush Administration and the Iraqi people that this Congress will not support an open-ended military occupation in Iraq.

The American people have spoken. The American Congress has acted. If necessary, we will go on the record everyday until we bring the troops home—we owe it to them and their families. I am proud to support this bill and I urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

This week, the White House announced that it foresees American troops in Iraq into at least 2009, and the President has even gone so far as to suggest that our presence in Iraq may evolve to look like our presence in South Korea. We've had troops stationed in South Korea—on permanent bases—for over 50 years. This resolution says clearly to the President and the people of Iraq that we will not turn our temporary presence in Iraq into a permanent one. The Congress should take whatever additional measures are necessary to ensure that no funds are expended for the construction of permanent bases in that country, and to that end I urge my colleagues to vote for this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2929.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SECOND HIGHER EDUCATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2007

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1868) to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 1868

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Second Higher Education Extension Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.

Section 2(a) of the Higher Education Extension Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-81; 20 U.S.C. 1001 note) is amended by striking "July 31, 2007" and inserting "October 31, 2007".

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or in the Higher Education Extension Act of 2005 as amended by this Act, shall be construed to limit or otherwise alter the authorizations of appropriations for, or the durations of, programs contained in the amendments made by the Higher Education Reconciliation Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-171) to the provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Taxpayer-Teacher Protection Act of 2004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPPS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLMANN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert materials relevant to S. 1868 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1868, a bill to extend the Higher Education Act through October 31, 2007.

This bill is very straightforward. It simply extends the current programs authorized under the Higher Education Act until October 31, 2007, giving us the time to fully consider and complete the reauthorization before us in the 110th Congress.

We are making progress. We have passed a historic investment in student financial aid in the College Cost Reduction Act. We have also laid the groundwork to reauthorize the other core higher education programs, including teacher preparation, developing and strengthening institutions, college readiness and outreach programs, including international education, graduate education and others. We put out a call for recommendations and received over 85 responses from individuals, organizations, and coalitions from across the Nation. We hear them loud and clear.

I am looking forward to working with all of my colleagues in the House to produce a strong reauthorization of the Higher Education Act that will earn broad support.