

New York's North Country and other communities along our border with Canada. Thousands of jobs in Upstate New York and elsewhere depend on the swift movement of lawful commerce across the northern border, and any illicit activity along the border may undermine this robust trading relationship. H.R. 4748 will help ensure that the U.S. and Canada continue to enjoy the world's largest bilateral trade relationship.

I commend Representative OWENS, a leader on my Committee on northern border security issues, for bringing into focus the need for a strategic approach to stem the movement of illicit drugs across the U.S.-Canadian border, a longstanding northern border security challenge. I congratulate Representative OWENS on bringing H.R. 4748 to the House floor, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Representative OWENS for his work on drafting this bill.

I rise in support of H.R. 4748, the Northern Border Counternarcotics Strategy of 2010. This legislation fulfills a critical need by mandating that the Administration provide a comprehensive strategy to stem the flow of narcotics between the United States and Canada.

Our northern border with Canada is the longest open border in the world. While the Administration has developed a strategy for addressing the flow of drugs across the southwest border, our northern border must not be forgotten.

As a cosponsor of this legislation and as the representative of a district with nearly 60 miles of international border, I understand the critical need to keep our communities safe from the influence of drug trafficking.

It is essential that law enforcement agencies have the tools to minimize the influence of narcotics trafficking. In Washington state, Drug Trafficking Organizations (DTOs) have consistently used the I-5 corridor to distribute meth, cocaine, ecstasy, and marijuana from Canada into our local communities.

It is vital that the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) work with the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a comprehensive northern border counternarcotics strategy to ensure our local communities have the necessary resources to combat this illicit activity.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4748, as amended.

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. SCOTT of Virginia. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 301, PAKISTAN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1556 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1556

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 301) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Pakistan, if called up by Representative Kucinich of Ohio or his designee. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for one hour, with 30 minutes controlled by Representative Kucinich of Ohio or his designee and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1556.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1556 provides for the consideration of H. Con. Res. 301, directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to remove the United States Armed Forces from Pakistan. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate in the House, with 30 minutes controlled by Representative KUCINICH and 30 minutes controlled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution, and provides that the concurrent resolution shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for pressing for greater scrutiny on our involvement in Pakistan. By introducing this resolution, Representative KUCINICH triggered an expedited process for consideration that can be modified only by a special rule. This is why we are doing this concurrent resolution today.

I'm sure my good friends on the other side of the aisle will remember that this is the exact same process used in

1998 and 1999, when the House Republican majority introduced resolutions to withdraw U.S. troops from Bosnia and the Republic of Yugoslavia while our American men and women were stationed in those countries.

As Democrats, we welcome a vigorous debate on this resolution. Just like the debates we have had over U.S. policy and military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, and countless other places around the world, debate has never jeopardized the safety of our troops in the field. American troops are never endangered by Congress doing its job, looking closely at and debating the merits of where we send our troops and the price they might pay for our putting them in harm's way.

There are many reasons, Mr. Speaker, why we should have a broader debate about U.S. military involvement in Pakistan. Over the past 9 years, the United States has provided \$18.6 billion to Pakistan, with about \$12.5 billion of that in security-related aid. The administration has asked for \$3 billion for fiscal year 2011, with over half of those funds going to security assistance.

There are currently about 120 U.S. military trainers, mainly Special Operations personnel, in Pakistan according to a July 11 New York Times article. Pakistan has set that cap on the number of U.S. military personnel, although other statements from the Defense Department indicate that the number of total U.S. military personnel may be as high as 200.

The New York Times also reported on July 13 that the Pakistan intelligence agency exerts great sway over the Afghan Taliban and a wide range of other militant groups that operate from inside Pakistan. Yesterday's revelations in the documents published by WikiLeaks echoed these disturbing conclusions.

There have been a rising number of terrorist plots in the United States with links to militant groups in Pakistan, most recently the failed car bombing in Times Square. A recent study by the Rand Corporation concluded that this might be due in part to continued support by Pakistani leaders for these groups so that Pakistan may continue to influence events in Afghanistan, as well as a U.S.-Pakistan counterinsurgency effort that has not yet proven to be effective, and fails to protect the local population.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, there is Pakistan's continuing development of nuclear weapons and purchase of nuclear reactors from China.

Having said all this, at the same time there are many things the U.S. is doing right in Pakistan: supporting the strengthening of democratic institutions; providing substantial support for primary, middle, technical, and higher education; supporting agricultural development; and providing substantial aid for populations displaced by violence.

Mr. Speaker, I support the privilege of the gentleman from Ohio to bring

this matter before the House and present his arguments on the need to remove all U.S. military personnel from Pakistan.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1450

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, let me begin by expressing my appreciation to my very good friend from Worcester for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no question whatsoever that Pakistan is ground zero in our struggle against violent extremism. The porous border with Afghanistan allowed the Taliban to retreat into Pakistan, regroup, and launch new offenses against our troops. Homegrown insurgents within Pakistan have perpetrated countless attacks killing thousands, including targeting their attacks against our fellow Americans.

And recent news reports that we've just had over this past weekend have only underscored how critically important it is that civilian control—again, Mr. Speaker, civilian control—of the Pakistani military and intelligence services is fully exercised. Again, these reports that we've had just this past weekend underscore the fact that we cannot entrust, we cannot see these other entities within the ISI empowered without having civilian oversight within that structure of democracy that they have.

Mr. Speaker, the democratically elected Government of Pakistan is working to eradicate the terrorist threat on their own soil, to secure the border with Afghanistan, and ensure accountability for the military. Working with the Pakistani Government to ensure that they're successful in doing this is vital to our national security interests. For the sake of our troops in Afghanistan and for the sake of stability and security in a critical region, we must remain engaged with the democratically elected government in Islamabad.

This engagement takes a number of different forms. While we have no combat troops in Pakistan, our military commanders have been building relationships with their Pakistani counterparts. Particularly, as Pakistan continues to go on the offensive against insurgent groups in the tribal border region, the technical advisory role of our military is a very limited yet a very important one.

Mr. Speaker, our national security leaders—Secretary of Defense Gates; Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mullen; Secretary of State Clinton; and the Special Envoy, Ambassador Holbrooke—all agree the democratic and economic development in Pakistan is at the heart of our national security interests. Building strong institutions will ultimately en-

sure that Pakistan is able to fully eradicate the violent extremism that threatens both our troops in Afghanistan and stability for the entire region. That's why Secretary Clinton along with Ambassador Holbrooke and USAID Administrator Shah have put such a heavy emphasis on development during their visits just this past week.

There can be no long-term solution to the security challenges we face in South Central Asia without Democratic and economic capacity building. We have a number of ongoing programs, including, I'm very happy to say, our 20-member House Democracy Partnership, on which I have the privilege of serving with our great chairman, DAVID PRICE. We are currently working, Mr. Speaker, with the Pakistani legislature. And I underscore the House Democracy Partnership because, sadly, not many Members of this institution or among the American people are aware of the work of the House Democracy Partnership.

We have partnered with 15 legislatures in new and reemerging democracies around the world to help build up their parliament. We have one of these programs going with the Pakistani Parliament. Through this partnership, Members of the United States House of Representatives have the opportunity to engage with our counterparts in Islamabad. We've been sharing our experiences as a democracy, providing support and technical assistance in their efforts to strengthen their legislative institutions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the case of civilian control of the military, this has a very clear and direct tie to our national security issues, to the overall national security issues, and to our national security interests. But the connections go well beyond the most obvious arenas. By improving the capacity of the legislature overall, making the government more responsive and accountable to the Pakistani people, support for democracy can be solidified.

Now, as we look at this issue, as Democratic institutions strengthen, so does the economic environment, providing new opportunity and prosperity. There is this interdependence between political and economic liberalization. That's why I also introduced a resolution that will call for us to begin embarking on negotiations for an FTA with Pakistan.

We know very well that democracy and economic opportunity, as I say, are the only effective bulwarks against extremism in the long run. Through greater trade engagement, we can help build the capacity that enables economic growth, which will help to create a more secure, stable, free, and open Pakistan. This is clearly in our own strategic interest.

The resolution before us today is one that is likely motivated by frustrations that many of us share. My very good friend from Cleveland and I, Mr. KUCINICH and I, share a high level of frustration, especially, as I said earlier,

with the reports that just came out this past weekend, the WikiLeaks report that has been carried widely in The New York Times and in other media outlets.

We see the very difficult challenges that our troops are facing in the region, and we know that we must do everything we can to address them. But, frankly, it's a little puzzling why we would attempt to address these challenges through a resolution calling for the withdrawal of combat troops from a country where none are deployed. We should be focusing our efforts, instead, on the kinds of programs that I have described that focus on building of those democratic institutions and creating greater, greater economic liberalization.

As we look at this challenge, we all seek peace and prosperity around the world, but in this most troubled spot in South Central Asia, we have redoubled our efforts to ensure that that happens.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for every single one of my colleagues, Democrat and Republican alike, when I say that we want our troops in Afghanistan to come home safely, successfully, and soon, as soon as possible, and we want to ensure that we will not have to deploy them again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know, repeatedly, as we look at nations around the world where we have focused in on crises that they have gone through jeopardizing our national security interests, we've chosen to deal with them often quickly but we have failed to recognize how important it is in the long term for us to do the kinds of things that will build up democratic institutions and ensure greater economic opportunity for these people in these regions. I believe that's a goal that we all share and we're all committed to.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank Mr. McGovern and Mr. DREIER for enabling me to participate in this debate. A little bit later we're going to get into the substance of the War Powers Resolution.

But I think it's very important for the record to state, as the Wall Street Journal in an article last week stated, that the United States is stepping up a ground presence in Pakistan, and as part of that ground presence, three United States troops were killed in Pakistan. This, according to the Wall Street Journal. And I will put this in the RECORD.

[From The Wall Street Journal, July 20, 2010]

U.S. FORCES STEP UP PAKISTAN PRESENCE

(By Julian E. Barnes)

Washington—U.S. Special Operations Forces have begun venturing out with Pakistani forces on aid projects, deepening the American role in the effort to defeat Islamist militants in Pakistani territory that has been off limits to U.S. ground troops.

The expansion of U.S. cooperation is significant given Pakistan's deep aversion to

allowing foreign military forces on its territory. The Special Operations teams join the aid missions only when commanders determine there is relatively little security risk, a senior U.S. military official said, in an effort to avoid direct engagement that would call attention to U.S. participation.

The U.S. troops are allowed to defend themselves and return fire if attacked. But the official emphasized the joint missions aren't supposed to be combat operations, and the Americans often participate in civilian garb.

Pakistan has told the U.S. that troops need to keep a low profile. "Going out in the open, that has negative optics, that is something we have to work out," said a Pakistani official. "This whole exercise could be counter-productive if people see U.S. boots on the ground."

Because of Pakistan's sensitivities, the U.S. role has developed slowly. In June 2008, top U.S. military officials announced 30 American troops would begin a military training program in Pakistan, but it took four months for Pakistan to allow the program to begin.

The first U.S. Special Operations Forces were restricted to military classrooms and training bases. Pakistan has gradually allowed more trainers into the country and allowed the mission's scope to expand. Today, the U.S. has about 120 trainers in the country, and the program is set to expand again with new joint missions to oversee small-scale development projects aimed at winning over tribal leaders, according to officials familiar with the plan.

Such aid projects are a pillar of the U.S. counterinsurgency strategy, which the U.S. hopes to pass on to the Pakistanis through the training missions.

U.S. military officials say if U.S. forces are able to help projects such as repairing infrastructure, distributing seeds and providing generators or solar panels, they can build trust with the Pakistani military, and encourage them to accept more training in the field.

"You have to bring something to the dance," said the senior military official. "And the way to do it is to have cash ready to do everything from force protection to other things that will protect the population."

Congressional leaders last month approved \$10 million in funding for the aid missions, which will focus reconstruction projects in poor tribal areas that are off-limits to foreign civilian aid workers.

The Pakistani government has warned the Pentagon that a more visible U.S. military presence could undermine the mission of pacifying the border region, which has provided a haven for militants staging attacks in Pakistan as well as Afghanistan.

The U.S. has already aroused local animosity with drone strikes targeting militants in the tribal areas, though the missile strikes have the tacit support of the Pakistani government and often aid the Pakistani army's campaign against the militants.

Providing money to U.S. troops to spend in communities they are trying to protect has been a tactic used for years to fight insurgencies in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The move to accompany Pakistani forces in the field is even more significant, and repeats a pattern seen in the Philippines during the Bush administration, when Army Green Berets took a gradually more expansive role in Manila's fight against the terrorist group Abu Sayyaf in the southern islands of Mindanao.

There, the Green Berets started in a limited training role, and their initial deployment unleashed a political backlash against the Philippine president. But as the Phil-

ippine military began to improve their counterinsurgency skills, Special Operations Forces accompanied them on major offensives throughout the southern part of the archipelago.

In Pakistan, the U.S. military helps train both the regular military and the Frontier Corps, a force drawn from residents of the tribal regions but led by Pakistani Army officers.

The senior military official said the U.S. Special Operations Forces have developed a closer relationship with the Frontier Corps, and go out into the field more frequently with those units. "The Frontier Corps are more accepting partners," said the official.

For years the Frontier Corps was underfunded and struggled to provide basic equipment for its soldiers. A U.S. effort to help equip the force has made them more accepting of outside help.

Traveling with the Frontier Corps is dangerous. In February, three Army soldiers were killed in Pakistan's Northwest Frontier Province when a roadside bomb detonated near their convoy. The soldiers, assigned to train the Frontier Corps, were traveling out of uniform to the opening of a school that had been renovated with U.S. money.

The regular Pakistani military also operates in the tribal areas of Pakistan, but they are less willing to go on missions with U.S. forces off the base, in part because they believe appearing to accept U.S. help will make them look weak, the senior U.S. military official said. The Pakistani official said the military simply doesn't need foreign help.

During the past two years, Pakistan has stepped up military operations against the militant groups that operate in the tribal areas. Although Washington has praised the Pakistani offensives, Pentagon officials have said Pakistan's military needs help winning support among tribal elders. If successful, More interactive graphics and photos the joint missions and projects may help the Pakistani military retain control of areas in South Waziristan, the Swat valley and other border regions they have cleared of militants.

In Pakistan, the U.S. Embassy in Islamabad will retain final approval for all projects, according to Defense officials. But congressional staffers briefed on the program said the intent is to have Pakistani military forces hand out any of the goods bought with the funding or pay any local workers hired.

"The goal is never to have a U.S. footprint on any of these efforts," said a congressional staffer.

Now, the War Powers Resolution requires the President to report to Congress when he introduces U.S. Armed Forces abroad in certain situations. And section 4(a) requires reporting within 48 hours whenever, and in the absence of a declaration of war or congressional authorization, the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces "into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances."

□ 1500

This is a report from the Congressional Research Service which indicates that, since we have had troops involved in hostilities, otherwise they would not have been killed by roadside bombs, that in effect the War Powers Act is triggered.

So this debate is in order and the purpose of the debate, to remove us from Pakistan, becomes urgent in light

of the WikiLeaks expose, which has indicated that the intelligence agency in Pakistan has been collaborating with the Taliban in Afghanistan against our troops. Pakistan wants us in Pakistan to help the Pakistan Government resist the Taliban in Pakistan, but they want to play a double game, as the New York Times pointed out in an editorial today, with the United States by aiding the Taliban against our troops in Afghanistan. How can we advance our national interests when a country which is supposed to be our partner is duplicitous?

I insert the New York Times editorial in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, July 26, 2010]

PAKISTAN'S DOUBLE GAME

There is a lot to be disturbed by in the battlefield reports from Afghanistan released Sunday by WikiLeaks. The close-up details of war are always unsettling, even more so with this war, which was so badly neglected and bungled by President George W. Bush.

But the most alarming of the reports were the ones that described the cynical collusion between Pakistan's military intelligence service and the Taliban. Despite the billions of dollars the United States has sent in aid to Pakistan since Sept. 11, they offer powerful new evidence that crucial elements of Islamabad's power structure have been actively helping to direct and support the forces attacking the American-led military coalition.

The time line of the documents from WikiLeaks, an organization devoted to exposing secrets, stops before President Obama put his own military and political strategy into effect last December. Administration officials say they have made progress with Pakistan since, but it is hard to see much evidence of that so far.

Most of the WikiLeaks documents, which were the subject of in-depth coverage in The Times on Monday, cannot be verified. However, they confirm a picture of Pakistani double-dealing that has been building for years.

On a trip to Pakistan last October, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton suggested that officials in the Pakistani government knew where Al Qaeda leaders were hiding. Gen. David Petraeus, the new top military commander in Afghanistan, recently acknowledged longstanding ties between Pakistan's Directorate for Inter-Services Intelligence, known as the ISI, and the "bad guys."

The Times's report of the new documents suggests the collusion goes even deeper, that representatives of the ISI have worked with the Taliban to organize networks of militants to fight American soldiers in Afghanistan and hatch plots to assassinate Afghan leaders.

The article painted a chilling picture of the activities of Lt. Gen. Hamid Gul of Pakistan, who ran the ISI from 1987 to 1989, when the agency and the C.I.A. were together arming the Afghan militias fighting Soviet troops. General Gul kept working with those forces, which eventually formed the Taliban.

Pakistan's ambassador to the United States said the reports were unsubstantiated and "do not reflect the current on-ground realities." But at this point, denials about links with the militants are simply not credible.

Why would Pakistan play this dangerous game? The ISI has long seen the Afghan Taliban as a proxy force, a way to ensure its influence on the other side of the border and keep India's influence at bay.

Pakistani officials also privately insist that they have little choice but to hedge their bets given their suspicions that Washington will once again lose interest as it did after the Soviets were ousted from Afghanistan in 1989. And until last year, when the Pakistani Taliban came within 60 miles of Islamabad, the country's military and intelligence establishment continued to believe it could control the extremists when it needed to.

In recent months, the Obama administration has said and done many of the right things toward building a long-term relationship with Pakistan. It has committed to long-term economic aid. It is encouraging better relations between Afghanistan and Pakistan. It is constantly reminding Pakistani leaders that the extremists, on both sides of the border, pose a mortal threat to Pakistan's fragile democracy—and their own survival. We don't know if they're getting through. We know they have to.

It has been only seven months since Mr. Obama announced his new strategy for Afghanistan, and a few weeks since General Petraeus took command. But Americans are increasingly weary of this costly war. If Mr. Obama cannot persuade Islamabad to cut its ties to, and then aggressively fight, the extremists in Pakistan, there is no hope of defeating the Taliban in Afghanistan.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. If I could get an extra minute.

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to Mr. DREIER.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me just say very quickly that obviously I'm very sympathetic with the concern and I argue that the revelation of this WikiLeaks, you know, thousands and thousands of documents that came forward, is evidence that we need to work to continue to build the democratic institutions and greater economic opportunity and civilian control.

Now it is no secret over the past several decades the relationship between the ISI and problems in Afghanistan; everyone has been aware of that. These documents have underscored the importance of it, but I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that it is essential for us to make sure we build up greater civilian control, and I think that's what we are trying to do.

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank the gentleman, my friend.

I want to quote from The New York Times. You can understand how serious this debate is. The Times said, "But the most alarming of the reports" relating to WikiLeaks "were the ones that described the cynical collusion between Pakistan's military intelligence service and the Taliban. Despite the billions of dollars the United States has sent in aid to Pakistan since September 11, they offer powerful new evidence that crucial elements of Islamabad's power structure have been actively helping to direct and support the forces attacking the American-led military coalition."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KUCINICH. I appreciate that.

So we have special forces now at least 20 miles inside the border of Pakistan by news accounts, and they want us to help them there, while Pakistan at the same time is helping those who are shooting at our troops in Afghanistan.

Now, who are our allies? Who are our enemies here? That's the danger of getting increasingly involved on the ground in Pakistan. That is why I brought this resolution forward with the help of Mr. PAUL. We have to have this debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield my friend an additional minute.

Mr. KUCINICH. The Times quotes General Petraeus as acknowledging "longstanding ties between Pakistan's Directorate for Inter-Services Intelligence" and what he calls the "bad guys."

And the Times goes on to say in this editorial, "The Times's report of the new documents suggests the collusion goes even deeper, that representatives of the ISI—that's their spy agency in Pakistan—'have worked with the Taliban to organize networks of militants to fight American soldiers in Afghanistan and hatch plots to assassinate Afghan leaders.'"

I'm saying, do we want these people to be our partners, people who are playing a double game with us? This is why we've got to get out of Pakistan. We have to take a different approach here, and in the debate that will ensue in the next, you know, few hours, whenever it's scheduled, I hope to be able to get to some of the specifics of why this resolution is important at this time.

Thank you, Mr. McGOVERN. Thank you, Mr. DREIER, for the opportunity.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Lake Jackson, Texas (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding, and I thank you both for bringing this rule to the floor. Even though it is a privileged resolution, a privileged resolution has to qualify under the law, and under the War Powers Resolution, this does qualify.

The question is, why are we doing it at this time? It seems like Pakistan is a minor problem compared to what's going on in Afghanistan as well as Iraq, but I think people have to realize that we go into war differently these days. We don't make declarations of war and the people get behind it. We slip into war. We fall into war. We get into these messes, and it seems to me like it's so much easier to get into these problems than getting out. We debate endlessly about getting out of Afghanistan. We've debated for years about how and

when it's ever going to end in Iraq, and we bring this up now because this is an appropriate time. It is escalating. The war is spreading, and we're trying to stop this. We're trying to let the people know and let the Congress know that this war is getting bigger. It is not getting smaller. A lot of people thought with this administration war would get smaller and we would end some of this.

It has been said that we need to be in Pakistan for national security reasons. I disagree with that. I think the fact that we're in there makes me feel more threatened because Pakistan is not about to attack us. We talk about the few troops there and that they're insignificant and we shouldn't worry about it, it's not significant, but that's the way we started in Vietnam. People were training soldiers, and before you knew it, we lost 60,000 people.

But you know, in this day and age, with the type of wars that we fight, occupation with combat troops is not exactly how we get involved, and I believe the way I read the War Powers Resolution, it does involve attacks on countries with bombs. This is what we're doing. We're attacking this country. The people of Pakistan don't like it. The number of drone attacks in Pakistan now has doubled the number that it was under the Bush administration. So it is escalating. There have been 14 al Qaeda leaders killed by these drone attacks, but there were also 687 civilians killed. So, therefore, the efficiency of this isn't all that good, and now there's reports coming out that these drones don't always come back, and a lot of times they crash, and a lot of times we have to go out and find them. So there's a lot of activity going on.

There is another reason we bring this up at this time. It is financial. We can't afford to expand the war. We can't afford the wars we have already. We can't afford to take care of our people at home. This costs money, and since we see this as an escalation and more provocation and a greater danger to us, because people are going to get upset. The people don't like this. There has actually already been a court ruling in Pakistan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield my friend an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

But the finances are certainly important. In the Congress, because we're slipping into this war, we have just recently granted \$7.5 billion of aid to Pakistan. And what did they do with this money?

□ 1510

Well, it's supposed to not be military. It's supposed to help rebuild their country, help their infrastructure. Well, we need a couple of dollars here for our infrastructure. But they can take that money; it's fungible. It goes into their intelligence. Their intelligence observations are being used for

the Taliban, and we are fighting the Taliban.

So it's totally inconsistent that we are on both sides of so many wars and what's going on. The mujahedin, they were our allies and we were fighting the occupation of the Soviets. It's the occupation that is the issue, and we were on their side and the Soviets were run out.

But now that same group, who are called the Taliban now, the Taliban, we have to remember, had nothing to do with 9/11. It was the al Qaeda, not the Taliban. The Taliban are people who are unified with one issue, one concern they have, foreign occupation or foreign bombings of those countries.

We need to make sure the American people know what's going on and that there are sometimes revelations that we don't hear about. Too often our government is involved in secret wars. There was secret bombing of Cambodia back in the 1960s, and here we are slipping and sliding once more into the escalation of this war which, unfortunately, is going to cost us a lot of money; it's going to cost us a lot of lives, a lot of innocent lives.

Unfortunately, I wish I could believe that we are going to be more secure for this. I think we are going to be less secure because of this activity, and we will finally someday have to meet up to the question of why do they want to come here to kill us? Do they want to do it because of their religion? Do they want to do it because we are rich and because we are free? No. They want to come here because we occupy their territory.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, a member of the Committee on Rules, Mr. POLIS.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and in opposition to the supplemental funding to escalate the war in Afghanistan.

This Nation does face a very real terrorist threat, but the terrorist threat is a stateless menace, a menace that is not rooted in any one location or has any dominion in one particular area and is, in fact, mobile. In fact, the two countries that our Nation continues to occupy, namely, Iraq and Afghanistan are not significant bases of operation for al Qaeda.

This discussion should absolutely include Pakistan and the border area, particularly between Afghanistan and Pakistan. We have in Pakistan a better partner than we have in Afghanistan with regard to the war on terror. It is not an ideal partner, but it is a better partner than we have found, and I hope our Nation continues to work with the good people of Pakistan and the good forces within the Government of Pakistan to help keep the American people safe and the Pakistani people safe.

We need to continue our efforts to battle terrorists wherever they are. How to focus on this stateless menace? We need to use intelligence gathering, targeted special operations, and a re-

focused emphasis on homeland security. All these are very costly and expensive and are ongoing and an indefinite occupation of Afghanistan reduces our ability to do the things we need to do to keep the American people safe.

That's why I have consistently opposed the escalation of troops in Afghanistan and will continue to do so today by voting against the supplemental funding. There is a real threat, but the answer is not to continue to indefinitely occupy countries where we only breed more sympathy with those who would do us harm. We must bring the war in Afghanistan to a responsible end. That's why I will vote against the war supplemental, and I call upon my colleagues to join me in helping to protect Americans with a new foreign policy in the region.

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

I have to say it's fascinating to see my two very good friends, our former Presidential candidates, Mr. PAUL and Mr. KUCINICH, who have obviously come together working very thoughtfully on this. I think, Mr. Speaker, they are both making some very interesting arguments about the cost, about the challenges that exist, and I do concur with that.

I would simply say that we are where we are today. It's very unfortunate that we are where we are today. Where we are, we are; but fact of the matter is, that is what we do face.

There are a number of people who, as leaders on this issue within the Obama administration, are working overtime to seek to address this. I mentioned Secretary Gates, Admiral Mullen, Secretary Clinton and Ambassador Holbrooke. I have spent time with virtually all of them talking about the challenge of this issue.

As I mentioned earlier, I am very privileged to work closely with DAVID PRICE and the other 18 members of our House Democracy Partnership because we concur, the notion of anything other than civilian control of the military and the intelligence services in Pakistan or any other country for that matter is not acceptable. And that's why I believe that while we look at the cost of both lives, as well as the financial burden that is imposed on us, we need to ensure that we are not going to face the kind of threat that we have before.

Now, we know that al Qaeda and those al Qaeda-inspired terrorists, not necessarily tied to al Qaeda, but inspired, exist all over the world. We recognize that; but we also have to, Mr. Speaker, realize that Pakistan to this day continues to be ground zero.

As I said, the porous border with Afghanistan has provided an invitation for al Qaeda in Afghanistan to move into Pakistan. As we look at the difficulty that exists, for decades, there have been problems with the ISI. I just mentioned in a private discussion I had with my friend from Cleveland that I remember very vividly in the 1980s, in

1987, to be exact, when I had the opportunity to travel with our former colleague, the late Charlie Wilson, who took me to Pakistan and at that time we witnessed problems within the ISI.

But the fact that there are problems within the ISI, appropriately or inappropriately, I mean the leaks that came out, I know that there are more than a few who believe this could jeopardize the lives of our fellow Americans who are over there. But the fact of the matter is, it is not a completely new revelation.

That's why doing everything within our power to strengthen democratic institutions and opportunities for greater economic liberalization so that we can see the economy of this country of 140 million people in South Central Asia grow to the point where we will diminish the kind of threat that we faced on September 11. I mean, it's hard to believe that here it is now, almost August, and we will be marking the ninth anniversary of one of the most tragic days in our Nation's history.

I mean, that is the reason that we are doing what we are in Pakistan and Afghanistan. Has it gone perfectly? Absolutely not. No one can point to a war that has gone absolutely perfectly. Maybe Grenada, the invasion that Ronald Reagan had in the 1980s; but it is very rare that one can point to a conflict, the likes of which we have never seen before, and come to the conclusion that this has been handled perfectly.

Confirmation hearings are going on right now for the new CENTCOM leader. We have a new general who is leading the effort in Afghanistan, the highly, highly acclaimed General David Petraeus, who successfully oversaw the surge in Iraq. We are all very gratified that we are seeing the democratic institutions build up in Iraq. Still problems: just the news this morning of an al Qaeda attack in Mosul in Iraq.

So we are continuing to see problems, but I believe that if we were to take this action that we would undermine the ability for us to continue our quest to strengthen both the democratic institutions and the opportunity for greater economic opportunity to exist in this very, very critically important country.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have one question about the rule: How will the time be divided?

Mr. MCGOVERN. The time will be 30 minutes for Mr. KUCINICH, and 30 minutes for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

□ 1520

Mr. PAUL. So it will be a total of 1 hour?

Mr. MCGOVERN. That's correct.

Mr. PAUL. Thank you.

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

simply use this opportunity to again talk about the very important work that is taking place in Pakistan today.

We all know that it is among the most troubled regions in the world. We just had the resolution read from the desk. As we look, 1 year from this coming September will mark the 10th anniversary of September 11. And it was, as I said a moment ago, one of the most tragic days in our Nation's history. We all can, those of us who were privileged to be serving in the Congress, recount the time here in the Capitol on September 11. And of course I'm immediately thinking about what a horrible, horrible day it was. Like many people, I knew people who were killed on September 11, and it changed our world forever.

We are dealing with a difficult and absolutely unprecedented situation. And I have to say that I am troubled with the notion of this resolution, respecting my colleagues, and actually agreeing with a number of the arguments that they make. But I believe that the resolution that will be made in order under this rule—as was said, we don't actually need a rule to do it, but the structure that has been put in place under this rule that will allow for consideration of the gentleman's resolution—is one that I think could create the potential to undermine something that I believe we all want to achieve, and that is we want to make sure that Pakistan, as it's developing its sea legs—and I was just thinking about a meeting that Mr. PRICE and I and other members of our House Democracy Partnership had with Prime Minister Gilani not long ago and with the Speaker of the Pakistani Parliament.

And as we look at these democratically elected leaders there who, on a daily basis, are striving to make sure that they can have adequate oversight of both the military and the intelligence agencies—I remember seeing General Musharraf, who was President at the same time. I was with him the day that he gave up his military uniform and became a civilian leader. So they are continuing to work through this. And the support that we are providing, which is in our national security interest, is very important.

And I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the notion of a free trade agreement with Pakistan. I think that creating an opportunity for the greater free flow of goods and services will strengthen, again, the economies of both the United States of America and Pakistan as well. So these are the kinds of things that need to be done in our national security interest.

If I've said this once, I've said it 100 times here on the House floor. The five most important words in the preamble of our U.S. Constitution—that inspired document authored by the great Virginian, James Madison—the five most important words are “provide for the common defense.” Virtually everything else that's done can be done by other levels of government, whether it

be individuals, families, churches or synagogues or mosques, cities, counties, States, but national security can only be handled by the United States of America's Federal Government. That is why I believe that we need to do what we can to ensure that we are successful and, as I said, that our men and women come home as quickly as possible and safely.

So I will say that my colleagues are working diligently on this, but I do believe that, at the end of the day, this resolution is not worthy of our support.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me, first of all, begin by saying I'm not sure whether the underlying resolution introduced by Mr. KUCINICH is necessarily the right way to approach this issue, but he and Mr. PAUL are reflecting the anxiety, the growing anxiety, the growing fear of a lot of Members of Congress and a lot of people throughout this country that the United States of America is continuously getting sucked into wars that have no end, wars that are costing us dearly in terms of the lives of our brave men and women who serve in uniform, and it is costing us dearly in terms of our treasury. We're going bankrupt.

People talk about the deficit all the time around here, but the reality is that these wars, by and large, are not paid for—the war in Afghanistan, the war in Iraq. It's all going onto our credit card, and it's going to be paid for by my kids and my grandkids and my great-grandkids. We are going bankrupt by the wars that we are fighting.

And I think they also reflect this feeling that we seem unable to make the necessary adjustments to our policy when they appear to not be working in the way we would like them to work. In Afghanistan, for example, we've been there for nearly 10 years. And the WikiLeaks documents that were published all over the world yesterday remind us that, notwithstanding all the sacrifices of the American soldiers and their families and all the money we have poured into that country, that we don't have any reliable partners.

The Afghan Government is corrupt and incompetent. The President of that country oversaw an election where they stuffed the ballot boxes, and our men and women are sacrificing their lives to prop that government up. We don't have a reliable partner in the Afghan police or in the Afghan military. And as we learned from these documents—again, it isn't new, but it was emphasized by the release of these documents—that we don't have a reliable partner, by and large, with certain elements of Pakistan. That does not mean that we should walk away from Pakistan, and I want to agree with much of what my colleague from California (Mr. DREIER) said.

I believe it is important for the United States to support civilian insti-

tutions and to support democratic movements in Pakistan. I want the civilian government in Pakistan to be able to have control over the security forces and the military forces in a way that we believe that they are actually in control.

So I think this debate that we are going to have here today on the Pakistan War Powers Act is important. I'm not quite sure that this is the way we should deal with Pakistan with the underlying resolution, but I will conclude by making reference to another measure we are going to be voting on here today, and that is the supplemental war funding bill.

In light of what was released yesterday, in light of all the questions that have been raised, it seems to me that it is inappropriate for us to vote “yes” on a blank check for this administration to do whatever they want in Afghanistan. I have great respect for the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State and the President of the United States, but I have to tell you I am deeply troubled that, with all that is coming out, that we are not doing hearings, we're not doing our oversight. We're basically going to be asked to vote for a \$33 billion package—all borrowed money—and kick the can down the road and let's hope when we come back in September that maybe things will get better.

We were told almost 1 year ago that we would never have another supplemental. Well, here we are doing another supplemental and we have a policy in Afghanistan that is not clearly defined. And so I understand the anxiety and the frustration of Mr. PAUL and Mr. KUCINICH. I share that anxiety and frustration as well. But it seems to me that we in Congress have a responsibility, too. These wars are not just the administration's wars. They are our wars, too. We fund them. We're the ones who go along with it. We're the ones who decide whether we're going to condition aid or whether we're going to withhold aid, and I think we should be doing a better job.

We have known for a long time that the Pakistan intelligence agencies have been undercutting our efforts in Afghanistan. They have put our soldiers at risk. We have known that for a long time, yet what have we done? So this may be a time for us to raise some of these issues, raise some of these questions, hopefully prompt more Members of this body to get involved in this debate, but also to send a signal to the administration that we really need to reevaluate what we're doing. We need to rethink some of these strategies. And if we are going in the wrong direction, we need to have the courage to change course if necessary.

□ 1530

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge a “yes” vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5822, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-570) on the resolution (H. Res. 1559) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5822) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume in the following order:

Adoption of House Resolution 1556, motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 5730; and motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 1366, each by the yeas and nays.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 301, PAKISTAN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 1556, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 196, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 470]

YEAS—222

Ackerman	Bocieri	Chandler
Andrews	Boswell	Chu
Arcuri	Boyd	Clarke
Baca	Brady (PA)	Clay
Baird	Braley (IA)	Cleaver
Baldwin	Brown, Corrine	Clyburn
Barrow	Butterfield	Cohen
Bean	Campbell	Connolly (VA)
Becerra	Capps	Conyers
Berkley	Capuano	Cooper
Berman	Cardoza	Costa
Berry	Carnahan	Costello
Bishop (GA)	Carney	Courtney
Bishop (NY)	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Cuellar

Cummings	Kaptur	Price (NC)	Linder	Nunes	Shadegg
Davis (AL)	Kennedy	Quigley	LoBiondo	Nye	Shimkus
Davis (CA)	Kildee	Rahall	Lucas	Olson	Shuler
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rangel	Luettkemeyer	Paulsen	Shuster
Davis (TN)	Kilroy	Reyes	Lummis	Paulsen	Simpson
DeFazio	Kind	Richardson	Lungren, Daniel	Peters	Smith (NE)
DeGette	Klein (FL)	Rodriguez	E.	Peterson	Smith (NJ)
Delahunt	Kucinich	Ross	Mack	Petri	Smith (TX)
DeLauro	Langevin	Rothman (NJ)	Manzullo	Pitts	Stearns
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard	Marchant	Platts	Sullivan
Dicks	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger	McCarthy (CA)	Posey	Tanner
Dingell	Lee (CA)	Rush	McCaul	Price (GA)	Taylor
Doggett	Levin	Ryan (OH)	McClintock	Putnam	Teague
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Salazar	McCotter	Rehberg	Terry
Driehaus	Lipinski	Sanchez, Linda	McHenry	Reichert	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	Loebach	T.	McIntyre	Roe (TN)	Thornberry
Edwards (MD)	Loftgren, Zoe	Sanchez, Loretta	McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Tiberi
Ellison	Lowey	Sarbanes	McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Turner
Eshoo	Lujan	Schakowsky	Rodgers	Rogers (MI)	Upton
Etheridge	Lynch	Schauer	Melancon	Rohrabacher	Walden
Farr	Maffei	Schiff	Mica	Rooney	Wamp
Fattah	Maloney	Schrader	Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Westmoreland
Filner	Markey (CO)	Schwartz	Miller (MI)	Roskam	Whitfield
Foster	Markey (MA)	Scott (GA)	Miller, Gary	Royce	Wilson (SC)
Frank (MA)	Marshall	Scott (VA)	Minnick	Ryan (WI)	Wittman
Fudge	Matheson	Serrano	Mitchell	Scalise	Wolf
Garamendi	McCarthy (NY)	Sestak	Murphy, Patrick	Schmidt	Wu
Gonzalez	McCollum	Shea-Porter	Murphy, Tim	Schock	Young (AK)
Gordon (TN)	McDermott	Sherman	Myrick	Sensenbrenner	
Grayson	McGovern	Sires	Neugebauer	Sessions	
Green, Al	McMahon	Skelton			
Green, Gene	McNerney	Slaughter			
Grijalva	Meeks (NY)	Smith (WA)	Akin	Matsui	Tiahrt
Gutierrez	Michaud	Snyder	Boren	Meek (FL)	Watson
Hall (NY)	Miller (NC)	Space	Engel	Moran (KS)	Waxman
Halvorson	Miller, George	Speier	Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)	Young (FL)
Hare	Mollohan	Spratt	Heller	Radanovich	
Harman	Moore (KS)	Stark			
Hastings (FL)	Moore (WI)	Stupak			
Heinrich	Moran (VA)	Sutton			
Herseht Sandlin	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (CA)			
Higgins	Murphy (NY)	Thompson (MS)			
Himes	Nadler (NY)	Tierney			
Hinchey	Napolitano	Titus			
Hinojosa	Neal (MA)	Tonko			
Hirono	Oberstar	Towns			
Hodes	Obey	Tsongas			
Holt	Olver	Van Hollen			
Honda	Ortiz	Velázquez			
Hoyer	Owens	Visclosky			
Inlee	Pallone	Walz			
Israel	Pascarella	Wasserman			
Jackson (IL)	Pastor (AZ)	Schultz			
Jackson Lee	Paul	Waters			
(TX)	Payne	Watt			
Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter	Weiner			
Johnson (IL)	Perriello	Welch			
Johnson, E. B.	Pingree (ME)	Wilson (OH)			
Jones	Polis (CO)	Woolsey			
Kagen	Pomeroy	Yarmuth			

NAYS—196

Aderholt	Carter	Gohmert
Adler (NJ)	Cassidy	Goodlatte
Alexander	Castle	Granger
Altmire	Chaffetz	Graves (GA)
Austria	Childers	Griffith
Bachmann	Coble	Guthrie
Bachus	Coffman (CO)	Hall (TX)
Barrett (SC)	Cole	Harper
Bartlett	Conaway	Hastings (WA)
Barton (TX)	Crenshaw	Hensarling
Biggert	Critz	Henger
Bilbray	Culberson	Hill
Bilirakis	Dahlkemper	Hoekstra
Bishop (UT)	Davis (KY)	Holden
Blackburn	Dent	Hunter
Blunt	Diaz-Balart, L.	Inglis
Boehner	Diaz-Balart, M.	Issa
Bonner	Djou	Jenkins
Bono Mack	Donnelly (IN)	Johnson, Sam
Boozman	Dreier	Jordan (OH)
Boucher	Edwards (TX)	Kanjorski
Boustany	Ehlers	King (IA)
Brady (TX)	Ellsworth	King (NY)
Bright	Emerson	Kingston
Brown (GA)	Fallin	Kirk
Brown (SC)	Flake	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Brown-Waite,	Fleming	Kissell
Ginny	Forbes	Kline (MN)
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Kosmas
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Kratovil
Burton (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Lamborn
Buyer	Gallegly	Lance
Calvert	Garrett (NJ)	Latham
Camp	Gerlach	LaTourette
Cantor	Giffords	Latta
Cao	Gingrey (GA)	Lewis (CA)

NOT VOTING—14

Akin	Matsui	Tiahrt
Boren	Meek (FL)	Watson
Engel	Moran (KS)	Waxman
Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)	Young (FL)
Heller	Radanovich	

□ 1604

Messrs. GARRETT of New Jersey, BROWN of South Carolina, GARY G. MILLER of California, BARRETT of South Carolina, HOLDEN, KANJORSKI, BACHUS, EDWARDS of Texas, Ms. KOSMAS, and MR. TANNER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CORINNE BROWN of Florida, Messrs. CAMPBELL and SPRATT changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 470, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EARMARK RESCISSION, SAVINGS, AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5730) to rescind earmarks for certain surface transportation projects, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. MARKEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 23, not voting 15, as follows: