

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS) having assumed the chair, Mr. DREIER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5576) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 865, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 406, noes 22, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie Bono Cleaver
 Ackerman Boozman Clyburn
 Aderholt Boren Coble
 Akin Boswell Cole (OK)
 Alexander Boucher Conaway
 Allen Boustany Conyers
 Andrews Boyd Costa
 Baca Bradley (NH) Costello
 Bachus Brady (PA) Cramer
 Baird Brady (TX) Crenshaw
 Baker Brown (OH) Crowley
 Baldwin Brown (SC) Cubin
 Barrett (SC) Brown, Corrine Cuellar
 Barrow Brown-Waite, Culberson
 Bartlett (MD) Ginny Cummings
 Barton (TX) Burgess Davis (AL)
 Bass Burton (IN) Davis (CA)
 Bean Butterfield Davis (FL)
 Beauprez Buyer Davis (IL)
 Becerra Calvert Davis (KY)
 Berkley Camp (MI) Davis (TN)
 Berman Campbell (CA) Davis, Jo Ann
 Berry Cannon Davis, Tom
 Biggert Cantor DeFazio
 Bilbray Capito DeGette
 Bilirakis Capps Delahunt
 Bishop (GA) Cardin DeLauro
 Bishop (NY) Cardoza Dent
 Bishop (UT) Carnahan Diaz-Balart, L.
 Blackburn Carson Diaz-Balart, M.
 Blumenauer Carter Dicks
 Blunt Case Dingell
 Boehlert Castle Doggett
 Boehmer Chandler Doolittle
 Bonilla Chocola Doyle
 Bonner Clay Drake

Dreier Knollenberg Pryce (OH)
 Duncan Kolbe Putnam
 Edwards Kucinich Radanovich
 Ehlers Kuhl (NY) Rahall
 Emanuel LaHood Ramstad
 Emerson Langevin Rangel
 Engel Lantos Regula
 Eshoo Larsen (WA) Rehberg
 Evans Larson (CT) Reichert
 Etheridge Latham Renzi
 Everett LaTourrette Reyes
 Farr Leach Reynolds
 Fattah Lee Rogers (AL)
 Feeney Levin Rogers (KY)
 Ferguson Lewis (GA) Rogers (MI)
 Filner Lewis (KY) Rohrabacher
 Fitzpatrick (PA) Linder Ros-Lehtinen
 Foley Lipinski Ross
 Forbes LoBiondo Roybal-Allard
 Ford Lofgren, Zoe Royce
 Fortenberry Lowey Ruppertsberger
 Fossella Lucas Rush
 Foxx Lungren, Daniel Ryan (OH)
 Frank (MA) E. Ryun (KS)
 Frelinghuysen Lynch Sabo
 Gallegly Mack Salazar
 Garrett (NJ) Maloney Sánchez, Linda
 Gerlach Manzuolo T.
 Gibbons Marchant Sanchez, Loretta
 Gilchrist Markey Sanders
 Gillmor Marshall Saxton
 Gingrey Matsui Schakowsky
 Gohmert McCarthy Schiff
 Gonzalez McCaul (TX) Schmidt
 Goode McCollum (MN) Schwartz (PA)
 Goodlatte McCotter Schwarz (MI)
 Gordon McCrery Scott (GA)
 Granger McDermott Scott (VA)
 Graves McGovern Serrano
 Green, Al McHenry Shaw
 Green, Gene McHugh Shays
 Grijalva McIntyre Sherman
 Gutierrez McKeon Sherwood
 Gutknecht McKinney Shimkus
 Hall McMorris Shuster
 Harman McNulty Simmons
 Harris Meehan Simpson
 Hart Meek (FL) Skelton
 Hastings (FL) Meeks (NY) Slaughter
 Hastings (WA) Melancon Smith (NJ)
 Hayes Mica Smith (TX)
 Hayworth Michaud Smith (WA)
 Hegerger Millender-Snyder
 Herseith McDonald Sodrel
 Higgins Miller (FL) Solis
 Hinchey Miller (NC) Souder
 Hinojosa Miller, Gary Spratt
 Hobson Miller, George Stark
 Hoekstra Mollohan Stearns
 Holden Moore (KS) Strickland
 Holt Moore (WI) Stupak
 Honda Moran (KS) Sullivan
 Hooley Moran (VA) Sweeney
 Hostettler Murphy Tanner
 Hoyer Murtha Tauscher
 Hulshof Musgrave Taylor (NC)
 Hunter Myrick Terry
 Hyde Nadler Thomas
 Napolitano Thompson (CA)
 Neal (MA) Thompson (MS)
 Neugebauer Tiahrt
 Issa Ney Tiberi
 Istook Northup Tierney
 Jackson (IL) Norwood Towns
 Jackson-Lee Nunes Turner
 (TX) Nussle Udall (CO)
 Jefferson Oberstar Udall (NM)
 Jenkins Olver Upton
 Jindal Ortiz Van Hollen
 Johnson (CT) Osborne Velázquez
 Johnson (IL) Owens Visclosky
 Johnson, E. B. Oxley Walden (OR)
 Johnson, Sam Pallone Walsh
 Jones (NC) Pascrell Wamp
 Jones (OH) Pastor Wasserman
 Kanjorski Payne Schultz
 Kaptur Pearce Waters
 Keller Pelosi Watson
 Kelly Peterson (MN) Watt
 Kennedy (MN) Peterson (PA) Waxman
 Kennedy (RI) Petri Weiner
 Kildee Diaz-Pickering Weldon (FL)
 Kilpatrick (MI) Platts Weldon (PA)
 Kind King (IA) Poe Weller
 King (IA) King (IA) Pombo Westmoreland
 King (NY) King (NY) Pomeroy Wexler
 Kingston Porter Whitfield
 Kirk Price (GA) Wicker
 Kline Price (NC) Wilson (NM)

Wilson (SC) Wu Young (FL)
 Wolf Wynn
 Woolsey Young (AK)

NAYS—22
 Capuano Hefley Ryan (WI)
 Chabot Hensarling Sensenbrenner
 Cooper Matheson Shadegg
 Deal (GA) Obey Tancred
 English (PA) Otter Taylor (MS)
 Flake Paul Thornberry
 Franks (AZ) Pence
 Green (WI) Pitts

NOT VOTING—4
 Lewis (CA) Rothman
 Miller (MI) Sessions

□ 1745

So the bill was passed.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 5576, TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 5576, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?
 There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2048

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2048.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?
 There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.
 (Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IRAQ DEBATE

Mr. DEFAZIO. I ask unanimous consent to take the time of Mr. EMANUEL.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has shirked its constitutional duties when it comes to the issue of Iraq.

The most solemn of duties that this body can undertake is the declaration of war, reserved to the United States Congress. Now, in the case of Afghanistan, the known perpetrators of the 9/11 attacks, Osama bin Laden and his collaborators in the Taliban, this Congress did act, with near unanimity. One person dissented. And we passed a resolution that was compliant with the War Powers Act and the Constitution of the United States to authorize an attack on Iraq and others who aided and abetted in the 9/11 attacks.

Now, if George Bush had had proof or had really thought that Saddam Hussein and Iraq were involved in 9/11, he would have needed no further authority. But, clearly, he had no proof, and he couldn't make the case. But he, nonetheless, wanted to attack Iraq. And Congress, reaching a new low point here, in my opinion unconstitutionally, vaguely delegated its solemn duties in the case of the making of war to the President.

Now, I don't believe that Congress can do that, but we did, and the President then, some 5 months later, used that very broad grant of authority to preemptively attack Iraq, ostensibly to remove weapons of mass destruction and the threat of Saddam Hussein, which later morphed into connections to 9/11, which later morphed into any number of other things, and which finally became we went into Iraq to bring freedom and democracy.

Now, since that time, this Congress, this Republican-led Congress, has refused to conduct any meaningful oversight of what happened about the distortion or the misuse of intelligence, about the huge scandals surrounding the more than \$10 billion which has disappeared in the so-called reconstruction effort or the actual conduct of the war itself, the unbelievable incompetence of Donald Rumsfeld and his cronies, and the impact on our troops in the military. Not one meaningful hearing. No debates here on the floor of the House.

So, finally, the Republican leadership says, well, we are going to have a meaningful debate. Now, let's see what they mean by meaningful debate. Tomorrow, the House of Representatives will take up a bunch of time, that is good, at least we are going to discuss it on the floor, but it will be to debate a nonbinding resolution; that is, something which has no force of law and no authority. It is a sense of the United States Congress.

And if you read that sense of Congress, you will find a nonbinding resolution which will not be amendable. No Democratic alternative or substitute will be allowed. What the Republicans wrote in secret will be voted on here on the floor of the House. That is it, up or down. This resolution, if you vote for

it, is a vote for the status quo. It is a vote for staying in Iraq indefinitely, perhaps a decade or longer. It is to continue the current policies with no end in sight.

On March 21, President Bush himself even said that the question of bringing home U.S. troops from Iraq will be decided by future Presidents. Future Presidents. Remember, unfortunately, he still will be President until 2 years from last January. Now, that is a pretty extraordinary statement for the President to make.

Now, I wish that the Republican leadership really wanted to have a full and fair debate. They could at least allow us to have and debate an alternative. I am a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus. I am a cosponsor of Representative JACK MURTHA's legislation, legislation that would lead to a thoughtful and appropriate redeployment of our troops, and would also say that we would be ready should they need to reintervene in a crisis situation in Iraq. But what it would do is get us out of the business of day-to-day getting between the Shiias, the Kurds, and the Sunnis.

Now, Bush administration said, well, we never could have predicted the Shiias, the Sunnis, and the Kurds wouldn't get along. Rummy said they would welcome us like liberators, with flowers and stuff. He just ignored the last 1,400 years of history, that is all. He also ignored the State Department and the intelligence agencies, other than the little select group he had who said the same thing.

And now, I believe that the Shiias, the Kurds, and the Sunnis, and many others, will not meaningfully move to share power, get their act together and develop a national government as long as we are staying forever, which is what the President and what this resolution says. So I believe that if we go down the path of adopting this resolution that there will be Members of Congress debating this issue years and years from today about what is the U.S. future in Iraq.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IMMIGRATION

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consume the time of Mr. JONES.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, immigration has been the number one concern of many Americans in recent months. The House passed a bill last December which dealt mostly with

tough border security. It provided for more Border Control agents, a 700-mile fence, different penalties for illegally entering the U.S., and substantial penalties for employers who employ illegal immigrants.

The Senate, more recently, passed a bill with tight border security but also had language which addresses the problem of the 11 to 12 million illegal immigrants now in the United States. Some believe the Senate's three-tiered approach to dealing with undocumented workers now in the U.S. amounts to what many would refer to as amnesty. Their approach is as follows:

Those illegal immigrants that have been in the United States for 0-2 years would be deported; those who have been illegally in the United States between 2 and 5 years would have to return to the border for processing and then reenter the country receiving a work permit; those who have been in the country for 5 years or more illegally would be able to obtain a legal status by paying a fine and meeting some other requirements.

So many have been concerned about this because it does mean that you could enter the country illegally and gain a legal status while still in the United States, which again many people would refer to as amnesty. So there is obviously tension between the House and the Senate bills, and the concern right now is that there may not be a bill that will be suitable to both bodies that can be achieved in conference.

The big concern I think, in the House at least, is what has been referred to as the three-tiered approach in the Senate. And, obviously, most people who are here illegally at the present time are going to claim they have been here 5 years. It may be very difficult to ascertain how long somebody who is undocumented has been in the country because they are undocumented. It is very hard to ascertain what records are valid, which are not, and how long they have actually been here.

As a result, I have introduced legislation that could represent some common ground. This obviously will be controversial. No one agrees entirely on how we might go about bringing the two bills together, but I have introduced a bill called H.R. 4065, and the basic requirement are as follows:

It would require illegal aliens to return home to apply for a visa. In other words, they would have to return to their country of origin and apply at their home country consulate. Much of the paperwork could be done in the United States before they leave here, but it would have to be stamped in their home country. They then could reenter the country with a legal status and cross that border with papers as documented workers.

Secondly, this would provide for a 3-year visa which is conditional on continuous employment. It would be renewed every 3 years. This would be open to undocumented workers with, first, a demonstrated U.S. employment