

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—423

Abercrombie Davis, Lincoln  
 Ackerman Davis, Tom  
 Aderholt Deal (GA)  
 Akin DeFazio  
 Alexander DeGette  
 Allen Delahunt  
 Altmire DeLauro  
 Andrews Dent  
 Arcuri Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Baca Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Bachmann Dicks  
 Bachus Dingell  
 Baird Doggett  
 Baker Donnelly  
 Baldwin Doolittle  
 Barrett (SC) Doyle  
 Barrow Drake  
 Bartlett (MD) Dreier  
 Barton (TX) Duncan  
 Bean Edwards  
 Becerra Ehlers  
 Berkley Ellison  
 Berman Ellsworth  
 Berry Emanuel  
 Biggert Emerson  
 Bilbray Engel  
 Bilirakis English (PA)  
 Bishop (NY) Eshoo  
 Bishop (UT) Etheridge  
 Blackburn Everett  
 Blumenauer Fallin  
 Blunt Farr  
 Boehner Fattah  
 Bonner Feeney  
 Bono Ferguson  
 Boozman Filner  
 Boren Flake  
 Boswell Forbes  
 Boucher Fortenberry  
 Boustany Fossella  
 Boyd (FL) Foxx  
 Boyda (KS) Frank (MA)  
 Brady (PA) Franks (AZ)  
 Brady (TX) Frelinghuysen  
 Braley (IA) Gallegly  
 Brown (SC) Garrett (NJ)  
 Brown, Corrine Gerlach  
 Brown-Waite, Giffords  
     Ginny Gilchrest  
 Buchanan Gillibrand  
 Burgess Gillmor  
 Burton (IN) Gingrey  
 Butterfield Gohmert  
 Calvert Gonzalez  
 Camp (MI) Goode  
 Campbell (CA) Goodlatte  
 Cannon Gordon  
 Cantor Granger  
 Capito Graves  
 Capps Green, Al  
 Capuano Green, Gene  
 Cardoza Grijalva  
 Carnahan Grijalva  
 Carney Gutierrez  
 Carson Hall (NY)  
 Carter Hall (TX)  
 Castle Hare  
 Castor Harman  
 Chabot Hastings (FL)  
 Chandler Hastings (WA)  
 Clarke Hayes  
 Clay Heller  
 Cleaver Hensarling  
 Clyburn Herseth  
 Coble Higgins  
 Cohen Hill  
 Cole (OK) Hinchey  
 Conaway Hinojosa  
 Conyers Hirono  
 Cooper Hobson  
 Costa Hodes  
 Costello Hoekstra  
 Courtney Holden  
 Cramer Holt  
 Crenshaw Honda  
 Crowley Hooley  
 Cubin Hoyer  
 Cuellar Hulshof  
 Culberson Hunter  
 Cummings Inglis (SC)  
 Davis (AL) Inslee  
 Davis (CA) Israel  
 Davis (IL) Issa  
 Davis (KY) Jackson (IL)  
 Davis, David Jackson-Lee  
 Davis, Jo Ann (TX)  
     Jefferson

Napolitano Roybal-Allard  
 Neal (MA) Royce  
 Neugebauer Ruppersberger  
 Nunes Rush  
 Oberstar Ryan (OH)  
 Obey Ryan (WI)  
 Oliver Salazar  
 Ortiz Sali  
 Pallone Sánchez, Linda  
 Pascrell T.  
 Pastor Sanchez, Loretta  
 Paul Sarbanes  
 Payne Saxton  
 Pearce Schakowsky  
 Pelosi Schiff  
 Pence Schmidt  
 Perlmutter Schwartz  
 Peterson (MN) Scott (GA)  
 Peterson (PA) Scott (VA)  
 Petri Sensenbrenner  
 Pickering Serrano  
 Pitts Sessions  
 Platts Sestak  
 Poe Shadegg  
 Pomeroy Shays  
 Porter Shea-Porter  
 Price (GA) Sherman  
 Price (NC) Shimkus  
 Pryce (OH) Shuler  
 Putnam Shuster  
 Rahall Simpson  
 Ramstad Sires  
 Rangel Skelton  
 Regula Slaughter  
 Rehberg Smith (NE)  
 Reichert Smith (NJ)  
 Renzi Smith (TX)  
 Reyes Smith (WA)  
 Reynolds Snyder  
 Rodriguez Solis  
 Rogers (AL) Souder  
 Rogers (KY) Space  
 Rogers (MI) Spratt  
 Rohrabacher Stark  
 Ros-Lehtinen Stearns  
 Roskam Stupak  
 Ross Sullivan  
 Rothman Sutton

Tancredo  
 Tanner  
 Tauscher  
 Taylor  
 Terry  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tiahrt  
 Tiberi  
 Tierney  
 Towns  
 Turner  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Upton  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walberg  
 Walden (OR)  
 Walsh (NY)  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wamp  
 Wasserman  
     Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watson  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Welch (VT)  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weller  
 Wexler  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (OH)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Yarmuth  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (GA) McCreery  
 Buyer Miller, Gary  
 Hastert Miller, George  
 Herger Murtha

Norwood  
 Radanovich  
 Thornberry  
 Westmoreland

□ 1522

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 21, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree, as Amended (H. Res. 15), had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that with the vote recently completed,

we will move toward research in embryonic stem cells.

My home State of New Jersey asserted real national leadership on stem cell research. In 2005, New Jersey became the first State in the Nation to award public funds for research on human embryonic stem cells. But one State or another supporting this research is not a substitute for Federal support.

Opponents of this legislation that we passed say that we should pursue alternative avenues for research such as adult stem cells, cord blood cells, amniotic fluid cells, and they are correct. We should investigate each one of these avenues. Yet that is not a compelling reason to block the researchers from pursuing embryonic stem cell research, which experts agree hold the greatest potential because of the truly broad nature of these embryonic stem cells.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. TANNER, Tennessee, Chairman.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

IRAQ AND THE WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, after 9/11, the House of Representatives voted in unprecedented near unanimity with one dissenting vote to invade Afghanistan and go after the perpetrators of 9/11, Osama bin Laden, al Qaeda, and also their host, the Taliban. The U.S. Forces with real allies quickly accomplished that mission, displacing the Taliban, Osama bin Laden, al Qaeda.

Unfortunately, because of the administration's diverting its attention already toward Iraq and failing to send adequate troops into Afghanistan and overly relying upon untrustworthy Afghan warlords, Osama bin Laden escaped, as did the one-eyed Omar of the Taliban, al-Zawahiri, his deputy.

They are still at large. They are still planning attacks in the United States. In fact, they are resurgent. For the first year since our invasion of Afghanistan, the Taliban didn't shrink back into Pakistan for the winter. They have set up sophisticated forward bases in Southern Afghanistan.

We are hearing a plea for reinforcements from the NATO forces, from U.S. troops on the ground. And what is the President's reaction? Remember the President, "Osama bin Laden, dead or alive; dead or alive, we are going to hunt him to the ends of the Earth"? He does not talk about that anymore, does he? The Taliban, Afghanistan. He is totally focused on his failed policies in Iraq, where there was no al Qaeda, where there were no weapons of mass destruction, where there was no Osama bin Laden.

□ 1530

And now the President, as part of an attempt to paper over his failed strategy yet once again and pretend there is possibly a military solution, he is going to take U.S. troops out of southern Afghanistan and send them to Baghdad, despite the warnings that the one-eyed Omar and the Taliban intend to try and retake Kandahar against the pathetic NATO troops that are defending that region, hobbled by extraordinarily restrictive rules of engagement.

There is a possibility that there will be a new sanctuary and there will be a resurgence in place for the terrorists to go, but it is not Iraq. The President, in his blind obsession with Iraq, is failing to see the real threats against the United States of America. The President should not, and this Congress should not, support an escalation of the war in Iraq, sending 21,500 troops in Iraq, some of whom are vitally needed in Afghanistan who will be displaced as part of that number because we have taxed our military so heavily.

This is wrong policy for Iraq, wrong policy for America, and wrong policy for the much-touted war in Iraq. We must refocus our efforts on Afghanistan, and we must work more broadly for a solution in Iraq, following many of the recommendations of the Hamilton-Baker report rejected by the President in favor of doing the same thing again and again and again.

This is not a change in policy. It is the same failed policies of the past.

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.)

#### PANCHO VILLA RIDES AGAIN

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I bring you news from the second front: the border war continues.

Ninety years after his example, Pancho Villa would be proud knowing that armed banditos from Mexico con-

tinued to invade the United States border to harass U.S. citizens, and the U.S. Government won't do what is necessary to stop this invasion.

The Associated Press reports on January 3 of this year: gun-toting Mexican outlaws encountered U.S. National Guard troops along the U.S.-Mexico border near Sasabe, Arizona. After supposedly bringing drugs into our land, these outlaws were headed back home to Mexico when they overran this Arizona National Guard "outpost."

Make no mistake about it. These criminals were not "undocumented migrant workers" who daily cross the U.S. border illegally, but fierce outlaws armed with AK-47 automatic rifles. They were taking full advantage of our weak border rules of engagement policy, or shall I say non-policy.

According to the National Guard, the gunmen defiantly approached our border troops in what was described as an "aggressive manner." But instead of holding steady against this threatening approach, our Guardsmen fled. That's right, they retreated. Why? Because it is the policy that the National Guard may not fire their weapons unless fired upon or in danger of serious bodily injury and can only fire if no civilians are in close proximity.

In other words, when approached by armed intruders, the National Guard must flee. With these restrictions, the hostility left troops with the only choice they had, follow the retreat when confronted policy.

An ongoing investigation into the January 3 threat is being conducted by the U.S. Border and Customs Patrol. A spokesman for the U.S. Customs and Border Patrol stated, "The exceptional job of these agents and troops is angering drug dealers, and that is probably the reason that they were so bold, and that heightened frustration may be connected" with the incursion on January 3 and overrunning the outpost.

These narcoterrorists act as if America is their country and the National Guard are the intruders. Our government must allow our troops to engage the criminal invaders. If they come onto our land armed, we should fight, not flee from the scene. The war on the border is escalating. Ignoring these attacks only encourages Mexican drug dealers to be more aggressive in their criminal enterprises.

Homeland security begins at home by protecting our borders from these illegal invaders. In the days of Pancho Villa, banditos encroached upon the border on horseback. But U.S. soldiers and Texas Rangers fought back and took control of our border. Now these banditos come across by any means necessary: in Humvees, in the backs of trucks, on foot, and they are saddled with deadly fire power. They traffic drugs, illegal aliens, and they are armed while doing it.

In 1916, our government ordered thousands of National Guardsmen to protect the borders and to protect U.S. citizens. General John J. Pershing did

that. He defended our borders, and he chased banditos back to Mexico.

In 2007, the U.S. Government has once again called the National Guard to protect and defend. But the U.S. engagement policy is beneficial only to the intruders by not allowing the National Guard to defend themselves or our sovereignty with their weapons.

How is the National Guard to shield our country from this invasion when they can't capture armed bandits? Or should they be called "undocumented firearm enthusiasts"? If our National Guard is on the border, they should be allowed to protect our country from hostile invaders using any means necessary. After all, they are the National Guard, not national bird watchers. Let's not send our National Guard or border agents to perform a task with a no-detain or no-shoot policy. Otherwise, how can they protect America?

Armed renegades attacking our borders are invaders and should be treated as such. Mexico refuses to crack down on their criminals encroaching on U.S. land. In fact, they encourage this intrusion.

Has our Nation lost the moral will to protect our border? We protect the border of other nations. We protect the Korean border. We protect the Iraqi border. Let us protect our own border. A line must be drawn in the sand ordering these desperados to leave or the U.S. Calvary will deal with them like General Pershing did 100 years ago.

And that's just the way it is.

#### PRESIDENT HEADED IN WRONG DIRECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last night we heard from a President who plans to continue in the wrong direction, believing that our military can solve a political quagmire; but every day that we are there, our military presence makes the situation worse.

Mr. Speaker, sending more troops will only fuel the insurgency. We don't belong there, and our brave and capable troops need to come home.

I ask you: How can we believe a President who had already sent troops to Baghdad before his speech and he didn't mention it? Unbelievably, he is sending troops, and of course he didn't mention this, that don't have the most advanced armor.

But, Mr. Speaker, while the President was giving his remarks, the U.S. military was attacking the Iran consulate, the consulate in the Kurdish region of Iraq. As yet, their consul has not heard why from the United States. The President didn't tell us about that attack.

It is troubling and it is sad that the President has misrepresented so many facts about Iraq. It seems he can't distinguish between what he wants to believe and what is real. What he is calling sectarian violence is really civil war.