United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2007 No. 176

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

Deacon Bob Little, St. Helena Catholic Church, St. Helena, California, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we thank You for the beginning of this new day. Be fully with us today. Open our eyes that we might see goodness in what we do here in this room. Open our ears that we may hear the will of all Your people. Open our hearts that we might be compassionate in all that we do. Share with us Your wisdom, O Lord, that we may know the right decisions to make. Share with us Your strength, O Lord, that we might resist that which draws us away from good and fair judgment.

We humbly ask You to strengthen our courage and resolve to stand up for those issues we know to be just. We ask You, Father, to protect and watch over those who are today in harm's way that we might continue to do our work. Console the families of those heroes, domestic and abroad, who sacrifice their very lives that we might be free. For that freedom and Your love we are truly grateful.

Thank You, Father, for the gift of responsibility that You give to each of us as leaders of this great Nation.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GUTIERREZ led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

GOVERNOR PERDUE OF GEORGIA PRAYS FOR RAIN

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. This morning, the Washington Times has a story about the Governor of Georgia, Sonny Perdue, praying for rain. The Governor said, and I quote, ''It's time to appeal to Him who can and will make a difference.''

I find that ironic, coming from the Governor of the State of Georgia, a State that has no realistic plan about how it's going to use its water resources, has no understanding of what the demands are for the work that they have in place right now.

The good Lord might say, Sonny, why did you have a huge artificial snow mountain so people can ski in Georgia in the middle of the summer in the middle of a drought?

''I believe in miracles,'' one minister said. Perhaps that would be one solution.

But maybe it's time for people to respect and carefully use what God has given them. The good Lord does help those who help themselves.

SECURITY AT O'HARE AIRPORT

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, I rise this morning to address a new development surrounding our Nation's airports. I represent Illinois' Sixth Congressional District, which is the home of Chicago O'Hare International Airport. O'Hare is the world's second busiest airport, and a week ago agents from the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Unit, a division of Homeland Security known as ICE, as well as Cook County sheriffs deputies, raided warehouses and secured areas at O'Hare, arresting over 27 alleged illegal aliens who had received fraudulent identification badges from a local employment agency. These illegal individuals had access to the tarmac, to cargo, as well as other secure areas putting them in direct contact with aircraft.

That is why I am an original cosponsor of legislation introduced by my friend and colleague, Mr. KIRK from Illinois.

It gives authority for any airport Federal security director to designate airport areas that he or she certifies as a critical area for transportation security as a special security zone. Once an

Printed on recycled paper.

area at an airport is declared a security zone, it is off-limits to illegal aliens.

Once an area at an airport is declared a "special security zone" only the airport's Federal Security Director can issue security badges to these zones.

This legislation also states that only U.S. Nationals who have been cleared by Basic Pilot Program verification system can be given security access badges to these zones.

We must be tough when it comes to airport security because it is our first line in defense here at home against terrorists who want to kill more Americans.

I ask my fellow colleague in the House to join me in securing our airports and cosponsor this vital piece of legislation.

OUR IMMIGRATION POLICY

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, more than 21,000 foreign-born men and women currently serve on active duty, willing to die in defense of our Nation. U.S. Navy Second Class Petty Officer Eduardo Gonzalez is one of these brave men, a naturalized U.S. citizen who has served two tours in the gulf region. Despite his valiant service, Eduardo Gonzalez faces the deportation of his wife Mildred. At age 5, she was brought here from Guatemala. Now, in addition to confronting enemies from abroad, Gonzalez must confront a threat at home, losing the wife and mother of their 2-year-old child.

In his testimony before the Immigration Subcommittee, Gonzalez stated: As a citizen of the United States of America, it makes me wonder, if I can die for my country, then why am I not allowed to just be with my family?

Like Petty Officer Gonzalez, immigrant soldiers fight with vigor and valor to protect the American Dream. All of those who serve, regardless of country of origin, are recognized as American heroes. As heroes, they deserve an immigration policy worthy of their sacrifices and nothing less.

KNOW WHO WORKS AT O'HARE

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

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, you do not need a valid Social Security number to get a job at America's busiest airport. Recently, Federal inspectors reported that screeners at O'Hare Airport also missed 60 percent of all bomb test kits designed to test the screeners. The Justice Department then found three dozen illegal aliens using expired airport security badges. Authorities had no idea who the real identity was of workers with direct access to civil aircraft. This is not the way to run America's busiest airport.

Later today, Representatives ROSKAM, BIGGERT, and I will introduce legislation creating Federal security zones where only badged and approved United States citizens can work next to an aircraft. Everyone at the airport Federal security zone will have a background check and have a valid, real Social Security number.

You would think the Transportation Security Agency would know who is working at American airports. Our bill would help implement that commonsense solution.

IN HONOR OF PFC MATTHEW T. SPAULDING

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a brave American who is serving our country with distinction. Private First Class Matthew T. Spaulding of Bluffton, South Carolina, was a recent recipient of the Army's Bronze Star with Valor for his heroic actions in Afghanistan. The former Bluffton High School quarterback has been deployed since January as an Army medic.

On June 9th, PFC Spaulding was on patrol with his unit when their vehicle was struck by an improvised explosive device. Suffering several wounds himself, Spaulding was able to come to the aid of one of his comrades who was severely injured. Through his quick and selfless action in the face of danger, Spaulding was able to save his fellow soldier's life.

The Bronze Star with Valor is awarded to a soldier who has performed an act of heroism in combat. It is the fourth highest combat medal awarded to members of the armed services.

I am grateful for PFC Spaulding's service, and for all the brave men and women who are fighting to protect our freedoms around the world.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11th.

□ 1015

SCHIP AND CITIZENSHIP DOCUMENTATION

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

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to urge my colleagues to support a strong reauthorization of the SCHIP program that prevents additional loss of health care access to U.S. citizen children.

Medicaid citizenship documentation created by the Deficit Reduction Act has caused citizen children to lose access to health care. Low-income white and black U.S. citizen children, not Latino citizens, are disproportionately affected. Documentation requirements are extremely burdensome to low-income families who often lack the resources to pay for that documentation.

In Alabama, Kansas and Virginia, Medicaid enrollment declined by a larger percentage among white and black children than among Latino children who were U.S. citizens.

The Inspector General at the Department of Health and Human Services and the past administrator of CMS concurred that there is no substantial evidence that undocumented immigrants are committing fraud in order to receive Medicaid.

Citizenship documentation, as implemented, is a flawed policy based on inaccurate assumptions that adversely affect our children's health.

I urge my colleagues to allow that we enforce a good SCHIP program. Take care of those 10 million children.

FREE TO MOVE ABOUT THE COUNTRY-ILLEGALLY

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, it is illegal to drive a vehicle without a legal driver's license. Illegals, who aren't even supposed to be here, broke the law to get here, and they break it every day by staying here.

Some States pander to illegals and encourage them to stay. Seven States: Hawaii, Maine, Michigan, Oregon, New Mexico, Utah and Washington, issue legal driver's licenses to illegals. These illegals then can use the driver's license to travel to other States, set up credit, obtain free social services, and in some States that don't verify citizenship, use these licenses to vote. Thus, these States encourage illegals to stay here. This is an absurd policy that gives the same recognition status to illegals that should be reserved only to citizens and legal immigrants.

We need stricter requirements for driver's licenses, not more lax enforcement. The 9/11 terrorists used fake driver's licenses to ''move about the country freely.'' So States that promote violation of Federal immigration policy by issuing these driver's licenses to illegals should lose Federal transportation highway funds.

Millions for border security, not one cent to highways for illegals.

And that's just the way it is.

DEACON BOB LITTLE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I'm honored that Deacon Bob Little, from my home parish and hometown of St. Helena, is serving as today's guest chaplain.

Deacon Little has had a lifetime of exemplary service to our country. He's a 26-year veteran of the Air Force, achieved the rank of major, and served in Vietnam, Panama and eastern Saudi Arabia.

He's also served the community in Napa County. He was a deputy sheriff

for 12 years and an elementary school science and physical education teacher.

He later came to work at the St. Helena Catholic Church. After 5 years of training, he was ordained as deacon.

Among the many services he provides the residents of our community, he also travels throughout Northern California as a military bugler for the funerals of fallen soldiers.

Deacon Little is a distinguished American citizen and important community leader, and I thank him for his service to our country and for the prayer that he led today.

FUNDING OUR VETERANS

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

Mrs. DRAKE. Madam Speaker, this is day 45, that is, 45 days so far that our veterans have not had the use of the increased funding for their benefits and health care. That's $18.5 million a day not able to be used.

This bill has been done for months and the President has already agreed to sign it. Now Veterans Day has come and gone, and the Democrat leadership continues to delay this bill.

I am calling on the Speaker to not adjourn for Thanksgiving until this bill has been sent to the President. And I call on all Americans to contact their Representatives and tell the Democratic leadership to send a clean Veterans appropriation bill to the President now.

How can we celebrate a holiday with our families, knowing that there are benefits our veterans don't have access to simply because of our inaction.

LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill passed by Congress reinvests in our Nation's future in a fiscally responsible way, and it is fully paid for with no deficit spending.

The President vetoed this bill because he apparently believes that a better course of action would be to deliver massive cuts in critical domestic priorities, such as funding community health centers and medical research grants through the National Institutes of Health.

The Labor-HHS-Education bill vetoed by the President strengthens education by training 51,000 more teachers, and helps 173,000 more dislocated workers with job training and employment.

And again, unlike the budget-busting funding bills that were passed by previous Congresses and signed by this President, this bill is fully paid for and does not add one penny to the Federal deficit.

Madam Speaker, we must override the President's veto and pass this fiscally responsible bill.

DENIAL, RETREAT AND DEFEAT IN IRAQ

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, the tide is turning in Iraq. As The Washington Post noted just last week, the number of attacks against U.S. soldiers has fallen to levels not seen since before February of 2006, the bombing of a Shiia shrine in Samara that touched off waves of sectarian killing.

The death toll of American troops in October fell to 39, the lowest level since March of 2006. Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki announced this last Sunday that Sunni-Shiia violence in Baghdad was down more than 75 percent in the last year.

But sadly, today the House of Representatives will bring an Iraq supplemental bridge fund that once again brings the same tired language mandating withdrawal from Iraq.

It seems, Madam Speaker, the Democrats are adding denial to their agenda of retreat and defeat in Iraq. Now is not the time to micromanage a widening success in Iraq. Let's give the American soldiers the resources they need to get the job done, see freedom win, and come home safe.

AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. And SCHIP is prevention, as well as an important investment in our children and the future of our country.

If we don't make an adequate investment now to provide access to health care for our children, we will pay for it later. When is the White House going to get it?

And it must include all children. So let's not agree with the Republicans to put up barriers to doing that. Democrats opposed citizen documentation in Medicaid and we must oppose it now. It will hurt poor children and children who are racial and ethnic minorities, the children who need it most.

The anti-immigrant rhetoric that is raising its ugly head in this body is hurting our country. We must not let it hurt our children.

Not covering all poor legal immigrant children and requiring excess documentation is un-American. Let's end this today with SCHIP, and let's pass a bill that moves us closer to full coverage and to being the better country we ought to be.

CONGRATULATING MAJOR LES BRAUNNS, ARKANSAS STATE POLICE

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to one of my constituents who's dedicated his adult life toward protecting the men and women of Arkansas.

I rise to congratulate Les Braunns of Springdale on his promotion to the rank of major in the Arkansas State Police. A 28-year veteran trooper, Major Braunns was most recently the commanding officer of Troop L, where he earned the respect and friendship of the men he commanded.

According to the men of Troop L, Major Braunns always led his men by example, and led his men from the front, never asking a trooper to perform a task he was unwilling to perform himself.

His men pointed to the most recent example of his leadership from an incident in July when the Hell's Angels descended on my district for their annual get-together. Then Captain Braunns marched into a group of 300 and told them, ''You can police yourselves, or we can do it for you.'' The State police kept their word and so did the Hell's Angels.

I congratulate Major Braunns on his promotion, and I thank him and appreciate all that he's done for the State of Arkansas.

VETERANS GUARANTEED BONUS

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

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, this weekend, communities throughout our Nation honored the brave men and women who have defended our Nation in previous wars, as well as those who are serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. While parades, speeches and ceremonies are important, I believe it is more important for the U.S. Government to properly care for and honor our veterans.

Recently, the Department of Defense has instituted a new policy on bonuses, which does not provide servicemembers with their full enlistment bonus, reenlistment or other bonuses if they are wounded while in combat and cannot return to duty. This means that combat wounded veterans who are discharged from the military because of their serious injuries will not receive their full bonus. This policy is unacceptable and disgraceful. It is unbelievable that the men and women who have sacrificed so much for our Nation are being shortchanged and denied the bonuses they were promised by their government.

Congressman JASON ALTMIRE has legislation to correct this inequity, but we should not have to rely on legislation. I call upon the Commander in Chief, President Bush, to reverse this policy immediately. We have a letter going to the President asking him to terminate this policy and ensure all outstanding bonuses be paid promptly.

GENERAL BOB LIVINGSTON

(Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, it's that time of year when we begin to make plans to travel to be with our families for Thanksgiving, so I want to recognize those American military men and women fighting overseas who will be unable to go home for Thanksgiving.

Specifically, I'd like to recognize General Bob Livingston, who is currently serving with South Carolina's very own 218th National Guard Brigade currently serving in Afghanistan.

General Livingston sent an American flag to his wife, Barbara, who put it into my hands to thank me for supporting their mission. I've never been more honored and never received anything more symbolic of true patriotism.

Our U.S. soldiers are making the sacrifice away from their families during these holidays. They're always serving to protect our freedom and our safety.

My wish during this time is that our citizens offer a salute to these brave soldiers for the loyalty and honor they have had in America and for their courage to fight for freedom.

218th, Fit to Fight.

HONORING FOREIGN-BORN SOLDIERS

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I rise today also to honor the soldiers and veterans that sacrifice so much for this Nation. And this week in which we celebrated Veterans Day, it is an appropriate and necessary time to reflect on that sacrifice. And in the Congress that often feels the need to scapegoat or debase immigrants, this body often forgets how immigrants enrich our lives.

I rise today to take a special moment to thank those foreign-born noncitizens who are serving in this war and have served in wars past. In this current war, there are approximately 21,000 noncitizens in uniform. No other war has produced anywhere near as many posthumous citizens as this one.

Madam Speaker, I ask you and all my colleagues to work toward civility, solutions and humanity when we talk about immigration. Please do not play politics with the lives of current and future immigrants and their family members, like me, who are only a generation removed from the experience.

□ 1030

WELCOME HOME MINNESOTA GUARD

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Speaker, today America and our allies in Iraq are breathing a collective sigh of relief as we continue to receive successful report after successful report of al Qaeda's demise in Iraq.

We continue to pray for a complete end to hostilities, but today we pause to thank America's brave military members and also their family members.

Just recently, 168 brave men and women returned from the famous Red Bulls to Minnesota. They were deployed for 13 months, and we thank them for their sacrifice.

The happy news is that not one of the 168 returned home with serious injury. Everyone was able to walk out and meet their loved ones.

It seems every generation has to learn the lessons of freedom. Freedom is precious, Madam Speaker, and we thank those today who secured our freedom and the freedom of our allies.

IMMIGRATION

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, since 1886 immigrants to the United States have passed the Statue of Liberty, which has inscribed, ''Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses.'' Why is it that now, when those huddled masses happen to be brown, the golden door of freedom is being slammed shut?

Immigrants contribute to the economy. They are free thinkers. They are hard-driven workers who strive for success, not only for themselves and their community but for their families. They come to this country because America is a beacon of hope for them. They are looking for a better life, just like every immigrant since the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock.

So why do some amongst us feel it necessary to place every obstacle possible in their path, to launch bigoted assaults on them, to wrongly blame those who work the hardest at the worst jobs for the ills of all of our society?

Immigrants are the history of the United States. They are our past, they are our present, and I must not rest until we recognize they are part of the future of this great country.

FUNDING THE TROOPS

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Well, here we go again.

Instead of getting down to business and tending to the people's business, the majority wants to play a political game. So to do it, they are going to tie temporary funds for our men and women serving in Iraq and Afghanistan to a timetable for withdrawal. No amendments can be offered. Once again, the leadership of the House is set to embark on a legislative gamble to force the hand of U.S. military leadership. This is their 41st Iraq vote.

But the suspense comes. Will the Houses of Congress, the President, and the American people take their bluff? I think it is very highly unlikely.

The Democrat leadership seems content to write legislation that they know is going to fail. Now, why would you write something you know is going to fail?

Let's get past this. Let's give up the games. Let's take care of the people's business. Let's pass clean legislation to ensure the safety of our troops.

JEC IRAQ WAR REPORT

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

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, by every measure the war in Iraq has cost Americans far too much, whether it's lives lost, dollars spent, or our reputation tarnished around the world.

House Democrats plan to send the President a smaller war funding bill than the one he requested but one with a bigger message: Start bringing our troops home now.

Without a change in course, the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that Federal spending on the war could reach $2.4 trillion by 2017. A new report from the Joint Economic Committee finds that when you add in the ''hidden costs'' of the war, such as higher oil prices, interest payments, and helping to take care of our wounded veterans, the total economic costs will rise by over $1 trillion to $3.5 trillion.

It's time for a new direction in Iraq.

IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, like many other of my colleagues who spoke right before, who told stories about how the lack of immigration reform has affected many families, Madam Speaker, the time for Congress to pass immigration reform is long overdue.

Our system is broken. Our country is less safe. Families are torn apart. And people are living in fear. For the Hispanic Caucus, this is an issue that is personal to a lot of us. Our communities should not be a punching bag for the vocal few. It's time to stop this hateful rhetoric that serves only to divide us and bully the vulnerable.

Children should not be torn apart from their mothers. We have been asked to stand against what are American values of family, providing a chance to do better.

America is a Nation of immigrants, not just from Mexico and Latin America but from Canada, Asia, Europe, and Africa. Immigration is not an Hispanic

issue; it's an American issue. It's an American issue.

We want to work together to create a real plan to combat hateful and often racist rhetoric that affects all of us. I ask my colleagues to do the right thing and not the political easy thing and to support real immigration reform.

URGING SUPPORT FOR H.R. 4102, STOP OUTSOURCING SECURITY ACT

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Today the New York Times reports that at least 14 of the 17 shootings from the September 16 Blackwater incident in Iraq were unjustified and violated deadly force rules.

Even though the FBI concluded that Blackwater, a for-profit contractor, used excessive force, there is no guarantee that anyone will be punished for these killings.

On Monday, the front page of the New York Times ran a story titled ''Security Guard Fires From Convoy, Killing Iraqi Driver.'' The shooter was an employee of DynCorp, and the victim an Iraqi taxi driver. The details of the incident are still unclear, but one thing is certain. The problem of trigger-happy contractors isn't confined to one company; it applies to all private security contractors.

The longer we wait to fix this problem, the worse the situation is going to get for the Iraqis and for our troops. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Stop Outsourcing Security Act, H.R. 4102, to phase out unaccountable private security contractors before they do any more damage.

CAUTIONING SENIORS REGARDING PRIVATE MEDICARE INSURANCE OPTIONS

(Ms. CASTOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, the Medicare open enrollment period begins tomorrow, November 15, and runs through the end of the year. Across the country, private HMOs have placed large newspaper ads and are running TV ads to convince seniors to sign up for their private Medicare insurance.

I am here to advise seniors to be very cautious. These private HMO insurance salesmen are on the streets and are oftentimes luring our seniors into private Medicare coverage that they do not need. If they leave traditional Medicare and sign up for a private HMO, oftentimes they will lose access to their doctor.

Be very cautious. Sons and daughters, grandkids across America, help your parents and grandparents sort through this myriad of options under private Medicare. In Florida, you can seek independent advice from the Department of Elder Affairs and the SHINE Volunteers. Seek independent advice and be very cautious with these private Medicare options.

WARNING AGAINST IMMEDIATE WITHDRAWAL FROM IRAQ

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

Mr. BAIRD. My colleagues, as someone who opposed the invasion of Iraq and believes it was one of the most egregious mistakes in the history of this country, I rise today to implore you to not make a mistake today by demanding that we begin an immediate withdrawal.

The facts on the ground are that the situation is improving in Iraq. Courageous Americans have given their lives and time away from their families to make that happen. Hundreds of thousands of Iraqis have died in a conflict that we created. We have a chance now to try to improve the situation.

Progress is being made. Do not let anyone today say it is not. Violence is down. Political leaders are reaching out across the aisle. Shias are meeting with Sunnis. Sunnis are meeting with Shias. They need more time to succeed, and an insecure situation will undermine the progress, not further it.

We need to have more time to debate this resolution today. We need to take the good parts of it, keep those in, but abandon this requirement for an immediate withdrawal.

There is a big difference between 1 year, which this measure says we have to be out in, or a 10-year horizon. We should find the nuance now that we can agree on.

DEMOCRATS CONTINUE TO FIGHT FOR A CHANGE OF DIRECTION IN IRAQ

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, 2007 has been the deadliest year for American troops in Iraq. No doubt that a change of direction is needed, but President Bush refuses to change course. He envisions a world where our troops will still be on the ground in Iraq 10 years from now.

This Democratic Congress rejects such a plan. And this week we will once again consider legislation that will require President Bush to redeploy our troops out of Iraq while providing our troops in harm's way with the resources that they need.

President Bush has asked Congress for an additional $200 billion for Iraq. This House will instead vote on a $50 billion package that will require the immediate start of the redeployment of U.S. forces out of Iraq. The legislation sets a goal of having nearly every troop out of Iraq by the end of next year. That is a significant change in the course of the war, and it is a change that will finally hold Iraq accountable for its future course.

Madam Speaker, this Congress will continue to fight to change President Bush's 10-year, trillion-dollar war. We are committed to bringing our troops home soon, repairing the readiness of our military, and refocusing our efforts to fight terrorism around the world.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1429, IMPROVING HEAD START FOR SCHOOL READINESS ACT OF 2007

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 813 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 813

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1429) to reauthorize the Head Start Act, to improve program quality, to expand access, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Madam Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 813.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 813 provides for consideration of the conference report for H.R. 1429, the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007. This is the standard rule for a conference report. It waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. It also provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Madam Speaker, for over 40 years Head Start has served as the premier educational and developmental program for America's children, more than 20 million American children and their families. Head Start works. Head Start works because it is a well-researched, comprehensive initiative that combines all of the children's educational needs, their health care needs, and it requires parental involvement. Years later, after four decades of Head Start, the research shows that children that participate in Head Start are

more likely to graduate from high school than their peers.

Head Start is a comprehensive approach to child health nutrition and learning, and it is one of our best tools in the struggle to close the achievement gap. The achievement gap for children in poverty in America must be tackled, and Head Start tackles the achievement gap through cognitive social and emotional child development, each of which is a key contributor to entering elementary school ready to succeed.

Today, 20 percent of America's 12 million children under the age of 6 unfortunately live in poverty. We know that a family's income level greatly affects their child's access to educational opportunities. The reality of poverty for so many American children in poverty is tied to their low success rates in schools.

But in America, family income simply should not impede a child's educational opportunities, and this is where Head Start comes in to level the playing field. Back home in Florida in my community in the Tampa Bay area, over 5,300 children are served by Head Start. But we've got thousands of children that are eligible and are on the waiting list. Why are they on the waiting list? Because previous Congresses have failed to properly support our Head Start kids, and this White House has flat-lined budgets over the years; so our kids merely have been treading water.

□ 1045

There have been no improvements or increases in funding since 2003. And with inflation, it has been very difficult to maintain the well-known, high-quality elements in Head Start. But the good news is that this Congress will change that today and make the smartest investment in our country's future workforce. And the research statistics bear repeating; children that participate in Head Start are more likely to graduate from high school.

We're going to put more children on a path to success today when we pass this bill and this rule. We're going to improve teacher and classroom quality. We're going to strengthen the focus on school readiness. We're going to expand access so children that are on the waiting list can enter Head Start classrooms. We're going to strengthen those all-important comprehensive services of health care and nutrition. We're going to increase the number of children in early Head Start because the research also shows that it is critical for child brain development that they have interaction by the age of 3, when their brains are developing. We're going to focus on allowing more homeless children to enroll and do a better job for children who are just learning English.

This year marks four decades of success for this holistic wraparound initiative that empowers all of us. These children are eager and ready to learn if we give them the tools.

The administration's slow-motion cuts to Head Start will now be reversed because this Congress, in a bipartisan way, but led by Democrats, is committed to raising strong and healthy children, and Head Start prepares our children to succeed in school and in life.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my friend the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It's important for the future of our children that they develop the skills and receive the education necessary to make them a success later in life. Unfortunately, many children begin their education without a proper foundation, putting them at a disadvantage that has long-term effects on their education. We must do all we can so that low-income children do not begin their education at a disadvantage, and that is why Head Start was created.

In order to give the children the proper foundation they need to begin their education, the Head Start program provides comprehensive early child development services to about 900,000 children from low-income families. These services prepare children to enter kindergarten with a proper educational foundation for their continued educational success to hopefully break the chain of poverty. The underlying bipartisan conference report builds on the success of the program and alleviates some of its shortcomings.

The bill authorizes over $7 billion in fiscal year 2008. For fiscal year 2009, it authorizes a 4.1 percent increase. And for fiscal year 2010, there's an additional 4.5 percent increase.

It is important that the children in Head Start receive the best education possible. There are several provisions in the conference report that will help with that goal. First, the legislation seeks to ensure that a greater number of early Head Start teachers are better trained and educated in early childhood development, with a focus on infant toddler development, no later than September 30, 2012. Additionally, the conference report requires that at least 50 percent of Head Start teachers nationwide in center-based programs have a baccalaureate or advanced degree in early childhood education or related field by September 30, 2013.

Madam Speaker, competition encourages better quality. As recommended by a 2005 GAO study, this legislation seeks to increase competition among Head Start grantees to help weed out poor performers and foster stronger programs.

There is also a need for greater oversight of the program grantees. This legislation requires Head Start agencies to create a formal structure of program governance for assessing the quality of services received by the Head Start children and families, and for making decisions related to program design and implementation.

The bill also seeks greater transparency and disclosure regarding how Head Start funds are spent. This will help prevent abuse and further ensure that Federal Head Start funds reach the disadvantaged children that they are meant to reach.

The conference report kept the House's unanimously passed motion to instruct language limiting the compensation of a Head Start employee to Executive Level II, which equals $168,000. This is to prevent Head Start employees from receiving excessive salaries and bonuses, like in some past experiences.

With regard to a child's eligibility in a Head Start program, the conference report allows Head Start agencies to serve children whose parents earn 130 percent above the poverty level. The conference report caps the amount of participants that can be served at the increased level to 35 percent of all participants, and only if the agency can prove that they are serving all eligible participants at the poverty level.

Other important provisions included in the conference report are to continue the eligibility of faith-based organizations as Head Start agencies. Head Start has a proud history of inclusion of faith-based organizations. Approximately 80 grantees have religious affiliations.

With regard to our children's safety, the conference report requires background checks for those who transport children to Head Start centers.

I wish to thank both Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MCKEON for their bipartisan work on this important legislation. This important legislation goes to show, Madam Speaker, that when we are willing to work together and compromise, we can bring forth good legislation with bipartisan support.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report, which I believe is instrumental to the educational success of many children.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, at this time I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, a member of the Education and Labor Committee and an outspoken advocate for America's kids, Ms. WOOLSEY.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, today we're going to reauthorize Head Start and reaffirm, through this conference report, our commitment to this very, very valuable program.

When I came here 15 years ago, I was insisting that my married children make me a grandmother, and they told me it was just none of my business. But since then, I now have five grandchildren among my four families of young adults, and all of my grandchildren go to preschool. And they are lucky because they have working parents who are professionals who can

pick out very good schools for them and make sure, the oldest child is 7½, and he's the only one in school, he is a second grader, but ensure that when my grandchildren enter grade school, elementary school, that they know what's going on. I mean, I'm telling you, I can't believe it. These kids read, they write, they know their numbers, they know their alphabet, they can play Monopoly, and they aren't even in kindergarten yet. That's what every kid in America deserves, and that's what Head Start does.

Head Start evens the playing field so that the fortunate children in my family aren't the only ones that enter elementary school having read books, having understood that you sit down in a classroom, that you have social needs that you have to learn to deal with when you're a young person and you're going to be dealing with other young people in a classroom situation.

I feel so fortunate, but I also feel so thankful that in a very bipartisan way, under the chairmanship of Mr. MILLER and the good leadership of Mr. MCKEON, we were able to pass legislation that will finally bring to this floor a Head Start bill.

We need to increase the Head Start funding, of course. We aren't covering every eligible child in the United States, and we must do that over time. It's hard to do when you're spending $1.5 trillion in Iraq. But we must get our priorities in order, and one of our top priorities must be our children. Our children are 25 percent of our population, but guess what? They are 100 percent of our future.

We must support programs like Head Start that ensure that our future, when we become really old people and these young people are running our world and running our Congress, they know what they're doing.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report, and I want to join in commending first the managers on both sides of the aisle, our friends from Florida, Ms. CASTOR and Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and of course Mr. MILLER, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. CASTLE, and all those who have been involved.

The Head Start program is a very important program. It has proved to be successful. And I'm pleased that we have a measure that is going to, I believe, become law and ensure that we are able, as we look towards preparing children for that very critical K–12 education, which we all know is facing very serious challenges, the Head Start program can help as they launch into that challenge.

Madam Speaker, I want to take my time, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART and I were just talking about an op-ed piece that was written by the former staff director of the Committee on Rules, Don Wolfensberger, and it got a response in today's Roll Call that I think is a very important one. And I think that, in light of the fact that we're debating rules here, this is a debate on the rule, and we've seen some real challenges when it has come to ensuring that the American people have their right to be heard here on the House floor. I think that I will share an article. And at this time, I would like to insert this article into the RECORD, Mr. WOLFensberger's op-ed piece.

[From Roll Call, Nov. 12, 2007]

MINORITY'S MOTION TO RECOMMIT SHOULD NOT BE CURTAILED

(By Don Wolfensberger)

It is the height of political arrogance for the majority party in the House of Representatives to dictate which minority party motions are legitimate and which are not. Yet that is exactly what the Democratic leadership is threatening through possible House rules changes governing the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit a bill to committee with instructions to amend it was originally used primarily as a majority party device to make last-minute, minor corrections before final passage. All that changed in 1909 when Speaker Joe Cannon (R-Ill.) temporarily headed off a bipartisan effort to amend House rules and remove him as chairman and a member of the Rules Committee. Cannon recognized conservative Democratic Rep. John Fitzgerald (N.Y.) to offer a substitute amendment that, among other things, guaranteed the minority a final opportunity to get a vote on its position using the motion to recommit with instructions. (Cannon would still be booted from Rules in a bipartisan revolt the following year.)

The minority's right was slowly chipped away when Democrats last ran the House. Beginning in the early 1980s, Democratic Speakers and their Rules Committee majority minions used an obscure 1934 precedent to justify not only limiting the contents of the minority's instructions but also eventually denying them the right to offer any instructions. Republicans fiercely fought these limits at every turn and vowed that if they came to power the minority's right to offer its alternative in a motion to recommit with instructions would be fully restored. They fulfilled that promise upon taking control of the House in January 1995, and the Democratic minority enjoyed the right unimpeded over the 12 years of Republican control.

Nothing in the guaranteed right limits the minority to a motion that immediately adopts an amendment—the ''forthwith'' motion. The minority also may move to send a bill physically back to committee with instructions to hold more hearings, conduct a study or make specified changes in the legislation. This latter device, to recommit with instructions to report back an amendment ''promptly'' (instead of ''forthwith'') has been unnerving Democratic leaders every time Republicans have used it to raise politically sensitive issues. In two instances the majority withdrew bills from the floor rather than risk having them sent back to committee.

The most recent example was the leadership's decision to pull the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act amendments in the face of a likely GOP motion to recommit with instructions to ''promptly'' report back an amendment to exempt from FISA court coverage any surveillance of al-Qaida or other terrorist groups.

Democratic Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (Md.) argues that such motions are offered simply for ''political purposes'' rather than for the ''substantive purposes'' of ''trying to change policy.'' At the same time he concedes that Democrats used such tactics when they were in the minority. The only apparent difference is that Republicans have had a higher success rate with their recommit motions (though the only ones to succeed so far have been ''forthwith'' motions).

The majority is attempting to impose its notion that the only ''legitimate'' role of the minority party is to offer substantive policy alternatives in their recommit motions for instant incorporation in a bill. One way Democrats might try to enforce this concept is to only allow the minority to offer ''forthwith'' motions to recommit so that legislation can move immediately to final passage after the motion is voted. This ''amend it now or forever hold your peace'' approach overlooks one important role of an opposition party, and that is to oppose.

Opposing legislation does not carry with it the obligation to offer responsible policy alternatives that conform to the majority's timetable for passing a bill (especially when the minority is being blocked from offering any amendments on a record-breaking 35 percent of major bills). Opposition may include not only trying to defeat a bill, but also to slow it down, including sending it back to a committee for more work.

Yes, a straight motion to recommit without instructions would accomplish this same purpose. But who is to say that the minority should not be able to score its own political points by sending a bill back to committee with a message attached? After all, the majority routinely gets plenty of PR mileage out of reporting and passing bills on its political agenda. To assert that the minority is playing politics with its motions to recommit while the majority is somehow above such things in advancing its bills is laughable.

The difference, the majority would have us believe, is that it is achieving a serious public policy purpose for the betterment of humankind while the minority is merely engaging in ''cheap shot'' political tricks with no redeeming social value. That may be true at times, but the minority should be allowed to stand or fall on public and media perceptions of its actions—whether they be seen as foolish or heroic. The majority also will stand or fall on public perceptions of the quality of its legislative enactments and may well look just as foolish if well-intentioned bills produce bad results.

At a time when Congressional Democrats are under heavy fire and record low public approval ratings for a lackluster performance (including their inability to put even one of the 12 regular appropriations bills on the president's desk over a month after the start of the fiscal year), they would do well to spend more time honing their governance skills and less trying to control minority party behavior.

This paper, Roll Call, which we all get around here on the Hill, has been very critical of whichever party has been in control. I will say that when we were in the majority, this paper was often very critical of us. And today they have an editorial. Again, this is not Republicans speaking. It's not Republicans whining. It's not Republicans claiming that their rights are being trampled on. This is from the editorial page of today's Roll Call, and the editorial is entitled as follows, Madam Speaker, it's entitled ''Let 'Em Move.''

''Embarrassed though House Democratic leaders may be by Republican

success in proposing, and, often, passing politically loaded motions to recommit, it would be an outrage for the majority to limit the minority's right to do so.

''Despite promises to manage the House on a more open basis than Republicans did during their 12-year rule, Democrats have been every bit as authoritarian, prohibiting any floor amendments, for instance, at more than double the rate of the previous Congress.'' I'm going to repeat that, Madam Speaker, ''more than double the rate of the previous Congress,'' the number of closed rules that they've had. ''Motions to recommit legislation to committees with instructions on how to alter it are often the only opportunity the minority has to affect the legislative process.

''When they actually win a majority on the House floor, because a number of Democrats vote with Republicans, they constitute a huge embarrassment to Democratic leaders. This has happened 21 times this year, versus practically never during Republican rule, and each time Republicans have crowed that Speaker NANCY PELOSI and her team 'have lost control of the floor.'''

And let me remind you, Madam Speaker, I am simply reading from the editorial page of today's Roll Call.

They go on to say, ''Democratic leaders routinely fume at the practice, as when House Majority Leader STENY HOYER accused the GOP of using the motion 'for political purposes, not substantive purposes . . . not to change policy, but to try to construct difficult political votes for Members,' meaning potentially vulnerable Democrats.

□ 1100

''As Roll Call reported last month, Democrats are searching for ways to change House rules to limit the minority's right to propose motions to recommit. They have done so before, so far without success—once, because Republicans halted proceedings on the House floor to protest the attempt. We suggest that Democrats just drop the idea and learn to live with the GOP motions as a legitimate part of legislative work in a democracy.

''It's certainly true that many of the Republican motions have been politically designed, especially repeated motions to deny government benefits to illegal immigrants. Any Democrat who cast a vote against the measure, even if government aid was already barred by law, might well fear that it would be used by a potential opponent in a political commercial.

''At the same time, many of the GOP motions have been substantive and have gained majority support because they contained popular ideas or posed politically difficult choices.'' Roll Call goes on to write, ''Examples include a ban on Federal funding to colleges that prohibit military recruiting on campus and an increase in funding for missile defense.''

Madam Speaker, this Roll Call editorial reads, ''On two occasions, GOP motions were so threatening to the Democrats' purposes that they actually pulled legislation on terrorist wiretapping and voting rights for the District of Columbia.

''Rather than limit one of the minority's few rights to affect legislation, we suggest that Democrats expand those rights by allowing Republicans to offer amendments on the floor. Would some of them be 'purely political'? Of course. But more open and democratic debate also might produce better policy and reduce partisan rancor.''

Now, again, Madam Speaker, those are not my words. Those are the words of the editorial board of the Roll Call as printed in today's paper. I want to say again, this paper was often critical of us when we were in the majority, and they have now, I believe, been right on target in pointing to the fact that the notion of trying to deny the American people their opportunity to be heard through this motion to recommit would be a horrible thing. I believe the Democratic majority, Madam Speaker, should, in fact, follow this encouragement from Roll Call and allow more amendments to be made in order.

I also want to say that I will join with my friend when he seeks to defeat the previous question on this rule so for the 11th time, we will be seeking to bring assistance to our veterans to the floor. This is Veterans Week. We marked Veterans Day Monday. I will say that it is absolutely imperative that any Member of the House who wants to ensure that we have the resources necessary for our veterans should vote ''no'' on the previous question so that we can, in fact, get that assistance that they so desperately need.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I always enjoy hearing the ranking member from the Rules Committee, because 1 year ago, the American people demanded a new direction, to make America safer, to help restore the American Dream, to restore accountability and fiscal responsibility to the people's government. This 110th Congress has brought new faces, new energy and a steadfast commitment to a new direction.

In January, the first female Speaker of the House in American history gaveled open the Congress in honor of America's children, and we will keep that commitment today by acting on the Head Start bill in this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. CASTOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I would simply say to my friend, I joined in heralding the selection of my fellow Californian, Ms. PELOSI, as the first woman, the first Italian American Speaker of the House of Representatives. It was a great day for this institution. I should say she was the first Californian as well. But I will say this, the record that was outlined in today's Roll Call is one which can't be denied by either the Members of the majority or the minority.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Ms. CASTOR. I am happy to debate the record of this Congress under Democratic leadership. The Congress is focused on a new direction, first, to make America safer. We have already taken action to implement the 9/11 Commission recommendations to protect America from terrorism. This Congress has passed the largest veterans health care funding increase in the history of the VA. We have adopted energy security legislation that will reduce the threat of global climate change. We continue to hold the White House accountable for this unending war in Iraq.

In addition, this Congress is restoring the American Dream because now the law of the land is the largest college age expansion since the GI Bill in 1944, where we raised the Pell Grant and we cut the interest rate on student loans. It has been this Congress, and this is important if you are keeping track of the record of this Congress, it was this Congress that raised the minimum wage for millions of Americans. We have also adopted an innovation agenda promoting 21st century jobs in a global economy. We have sent aid to the gulf coast for Hurricanes Katrina and Rita and for the millions of Americans that continue to struggle day to day with the impact of those disasters. And we are fighting for health care, to expand health care to 10 million more American children.

Madam Speaker, we have also adopted a widely acclaimed and landmark lobby and ethics reform bill. And it has been this Congress that has returned to financial sanity and fiscal responsibility by adhering to pay-as-you-go discipline, no new deficit spending.

So I am very pleased to debate the record of this Congress on the floor of the House. We will work in a bipartisan way to build consensus. More than two-thirds of this legislation has passed in a bipartisan manner. We will strive to find common ground where we can, like here on the Head Start bill. But where we cannot, we will stand our ground, like on the Iraq bill that we will bring later today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, the record brought out today by the Roll Call editorial, that I am very pleased, by the way, that our ranking member brought forth and read into the RECORD, I think is important for a number of reasons.

Again, I was also here when the distinguished Speaker was elected in January. I recall the promises at that time and during the campaign, the electoral campaign that preceded that ceremony in January. The promises were, and I am sure they will be recalled, to have a more open process, a more transparent House. So the reason why I think it is most appropriate now to bring out the record that Roll Call in

an editorial has outlined is that instead of seeing, during this year, this first year of this Congress, a more open process, a more transparent process, a more democratic process, what we have seen is a more than doubling of the closed rules, of the gag rules, if you will, the gag rules that don't permit any amendments on legislation.

Since we are discussing the rule, by the way, on legislation that is an example of bipartisanship, the Head Start program is one that has been supported from its inception in a bipartisan manner, but we are discussing the rule, the means to debate this legislation, the procedure, if you will, to debate the legislation, I think it's appropriate to bring out the more than doubling by a majority that promised more transparency and more democracy in the running of the House, a more than doubling of gag rules that prohibit debate, that prohibit any amendments for debate. So I think that is appropriate to bring forth. And I commend Roll Call that, yes, was very critical when we were in the majority of many of the things that happened at that time. But a doubling, more than doubling of the impropriety, of the gag rules by a majority that promised more transparency is not only important to bring out but I think it is most unfortunate.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to a distinguished colleague who has worked so much on this legislation in an admirable way, as he has on many issues of great importance to the American people, Mr. CASTLE of Delaware.

Mr. CASTLE. I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding, and I apologize for returning to such a mundane subject as the rule before us, but that is what I am here to do.

I do rise in support of this rule, and I would like to thank Chairman MILLER along with Mr. MCKEON and Mr. KILDEE, as well as their staffs, for the work they have done over the last several Congresses to strengthen and improve the Head Start program.

Since 1965, the Head Start program has given economically disadvantaged children access to the same educational, health, nutritional, social and other services that were enjoyed by their more affluent peers. The goal of the program was, as it remains today, to provide children a solid foundation that will prepare them for success in school and later in life. As the centerpiece of the Federal Government's efforts to support quality early childhood education for our Nation's most disadvantaged youth, Head Start has served nearly 20 million low-income children and their families. Currently, Head Start serves over 900,000 children every day and has over 1,600 grantees across the United States. In my home State of Delaware, Head Start programs serve over 2,000 children with over 800 additional 3- and 4-year-olds receiving assistance through State Government funding.

Although we can agree on the need for Head Start and its successes, we must also recognize that the Head Start program is capable of producing even greater results for our children. Students who attend Head Start programs do start school more prepared than those with similar backgrounds who do not attend Head Start. Head Start students continue, however, to enter kindergarten well below national norms in school readiness. By moving to close the school readiness gap, the bipartisan Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act will improve results for almost a million Head Start students across the Nation.

I believe strongly in the Head Start program, particularly because of how the program helps children later in their academic lives. Despite the positive reputation of Head Start overall, however, there have been reports which have unfortunately uncovered the fact that some individuals have taken advantage of the taxpayer dollars that fund the program to line their own pockets. Along with the expertise of the Government Accountability Office and through reforms made in this bill, changes will be made to avoid these issues in the future. I feel this is the right step to take for the benefit of the program, and I thank everyone for finding what I hope will be a resolution to the pockets of abuse.

As I said at the outset, Head Start is an important and very popular program. The importance of early childhood education and services cannot be overstated. I believe strongly that the reforms sought with this bill will go a long way to institute needed reforms to an already successful program.

I support passage of this rule and the conference report to H.R. 1429.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to continue the debate on this important rule, the bipartisan Head Start conference report, by recognizing for 1 minute a member of the Education and Labor Committee, my good friend and colleague from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding.

I want to commend Chairman MILLER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KILDEE and Mr. CASTLE on their impressive work on this truly bipartisan legislation. This conference report is proof positive that in spite of the rancor evident this morning, when we put our minds to it and work together, we can, in fact, get things done in this Congress.

Head Start offers comprehensive early childhood development services to our Nation's neediest children. These comprehensive services are key to the program's success. Head Start engages parents and the community in students' lives and provides important nutritional, health and social services.

Studies show that children who enroll in Head Start excel academically, they have fewer health problems, and adapt better both socially and emotionally. I am proud to say that over 9,600 children are enrolled in the program in Iowa.

I grew up in poverty, and I know firsthand how important programs like Head Start are to low-income families. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report and this rule, and I hope it will be quickly signed into law.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege at this time to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Education Committee, Mr. MCKEON of California.

Mr. MCKEON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am pleased to rise in support of the rule on the conference report for the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act. This rule will allow the House to give final endorsement to a bill that will strengthen and improve the Head Start early childhood education program.

I would like to begin by recognizing members of the Education and Labor Committee for their efforts to produce this bipartisan conference report. Representatives CASTLE and KILDEE, along with Chairman MILLER and our staffs, have done great work to strengthen and improve this critical program.

In more than 50,000 Head Start classrooms around the Nation, nearly 1 million disadvantaged children are being given the tools and resources to help put them on a path to success which is a win-win for the country.

We have spent a great deal of time this year working to strengthen the No Child Left Behind Act. That law is, at its most basic level, about closing the achievement gap in our Nation's schools. However, the gaps between disadvantaged students and their peers do not begin in elementary school. That's why we have Head Start. This program is designed to help close the readiness gap in children before they ever enroll in school. The health, developmental and educational services offered through this program truly do give a head start to those children than they otherwise enter school already lagging behind.

□ 1115

Some studies have shown that children enrolled in Head Start do make progress, but there's significant work yet to be done in closing that readiness gap. I also believe it's critical to strengthen the financial controls in Head Start so that we can prevent the types of waste, fraud and abuse that have been uncovered over the past 5 years. Republicans acted aggressively to root out cases of financial abuse and mismanagement. We sought the expertise of the Government Accountability Office to identify weaknesses in the financial control network of the program. Through this bill, we will institute structural changes to prevent future breaches in the program's trust.

Our committee has been working to strengthen and reform this program going on 5 years, and I believe that dedication has paid off. Certainly this

bill is not perfect, but on issues where there were disagreements, I am pleased that we have forged compromises. Head Start is a good program, capable of achieving even greater results. With this bill, I believe we can make that happen.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of this rule, and I look forward to House passage of this conference report so it can go to the President for his signature.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I am the last speaker for our side, so I will reserve the balance of my time until the gentleman from Florida has made his closing remarks.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I will be asking for a ''no'' vote on the previous question so that we can amend this rule and move toward passing a conference report on the bipartisan Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations act. The House passed this veterans affairs and military funding bill on June 15 by a vote of 409–2, with the Senate following suit and naming conferees on September 6. Unfortunately, the majority leadership in the House has refused to move the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill. They have even refused to name conferees.

Why has the majority decided to hold off on moving this bill that has such bipartisan support? Well, according to several publications, including Roll Call, the majority intends to hold off sending appropriations bills to President Bush so that they can use an upcoming anticipated veto, actually, the veto of the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, to serve as ''an extension of their successful public relations campaign on the SCHIP program.'' Fortunately, that purely political move failed last week when the Senate removed the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill from the Labor-HHS bill.

Recently the Republican leader, Mr. BOEHNER, took a step toward naming House Republican conferees. Now the Speaker must follow suit and take the steps necessary to ensure that work can begin on writing the final veterans funding bill that can be enacted into law.

Madam Speaker, every day that the majority chooses not to act on this bill, our Nation's veterans lose $18.5 million. Our veterans deserve better than that; they deserve better than partisan gamesmanship holding back their funding. I urge my colleagues to help move this important legislation and oppose the previous question.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, by passing the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007 and this rule, we will build on the great success of Head Start for America's hardworking families. I would like to salute the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, GEORGE MILLER; subcommittee Chair, DALE KILDEE; the ranking member, Mr. MCKEON; and Congressman CASTLE from the committee, and all the committee members from Education and Labor for their wonderful work on this Head Start bill.

I would also like to thank the parents across America who are struggling to provide all that they can for their children. We are on their side. This Democratic Congress is charting a new direction with wise investments in education and health care for our kids, which are certain to pay dividends in the years to come.

Madam Speaker, this is an important day for America because Congress is going to keep the promise that it made four decades ago to children who are born with the same potential but, because of their life circumstances, are in need of a little extra attention, health care, nutrition and the guiding hand of a knowledgeable and talented teacher, which together provides them with a true ''head start.'' I urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 813 OFFERED BY MR. DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. The House disagrees to the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2642, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference requested by the Senate thereon. The Speaker shall appoint conferees immediately, but may declare a recess under clause 12(a) of rule I for the purpose of consulting the Minority Leader prior to such appointment. The motion to instruct conferees otherwise in order pending the appointment of conferees instead shall be in order only at a time designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within two additional legislative days after adoption of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the

previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 813, if ordered; motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 812; motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 3320; motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 811.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 190, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 1086]

YEAS—224

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

NAYS—190

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Carson
Cubin
Davis, Tom
Doyle
Garrett (NJ)
Hastert
Hayes
Jefferson
Johnson (IL)
Larsen (WA)
Marchant
McMorris Rodgers
Moore (WI)
Oberstar
Paul
Sessions
Sestak
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 3 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1145

Mr. PETRI changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY AND PLEDGING SUPPORT FOR VICTIMS OF FLOODING IN SOUTHERN MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 812, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to speak out of order.)

REGARDING TIME FOR VOTING

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I made this announcement some 10 days ago or a week ago, and we frankly didn't follow it very well, but I want to take another try.

On both sides of the aisle, you have correctly expressed concern about how long our votes are taking. There are times when votes take a longer time, we have Members down at the White House, we are just going to finish a committee markup, they are voting, or something like that. We understand that.

Madam Speaker, I would like everybody to hear this, because you are going to be angry with me. You are going to be angry with me today.

There were some 140 votes cast by the time the time ran out on this vote. That meant there were some 280 people who had not voted after 15 minutes. This vote took 25 minutes, give or take. Both sides of the aisle and the committee chairmen who are in a markup and it takes so long to get back to the markup, and we have witnesses standing there, both sides had this problem.

So I am asking you for your cooperation. Look at the clock, and when the clock hits 5 minutes left, come over here. Don't look at how many Members have not voted and think to yourself because there are so many Members that haven't voted, we're going to call the roll.

I want to say to my side, I am not going to, frankly, want to lose votes. You don't want to lose votes. They didn't want to lose votes when they were in charge. I didn't blame them. Either side. But don't take the position that they will wait for as long as they need to wait, because that is inconsiderate to every Member who comes here in a timely fashion and then has to wait because somebody else doesn't.

Now, I will tell you this: I am an offender. I am not pointing a finger. If I am pointing a finger at you, I'm pointing four fingers at me. I have in the last week, so I could get up here and pontificate, tried to make sure that I got here on time. But I haven't been getting here on time. I have done the same thing as you. That's why I know you do it. Look at that.

So I am asking all of us to try to work together so that when the bell is rung and the roll is called, you are here on time. We will keep these votes in the vicinity of 17 minutes, and some of you are going to miss votes.

Let me clarify so you understand. The Speaker's position articulated at the beginning of the session, if you are in the well with a card in your hand, you will be allowed to vote. But if somebody yells in the back of the room

''one more,'' if somebody is walking through the door, I do not guarantee you that you will be able to vote. We are going to call the vote.

Thank you very much.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I don't think anybody is going to argue with you, Mr. Majority Leader, but that means that you have got to do something about the elevators. I mean it. I'm not kidding. If you are going to make it work, if you are going to make the 15 minutes work, we have to have people in the elevators or the doorkeepers or somebody keeping everybody out of the elevators.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, ladies and gentlemen, if the elevators are slow, you leave with 10 minutes remaining on the vote. You be here.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will re-report the title of the next question on which proceedings now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 812, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 1087]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
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)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Carson
Cubin
Davis, Tom
Doyle
Hastert
Johnson (IL)
Oberstar
Paul
Sessions
Sestak
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain on this vote.

□ 1157

So (two-thirds being 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.

SUPPORT FOR THE MUSEUM OF THE HISTORY OF POLISH JEWS ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3320, 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 gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3320.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 13, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 1088]

YEAS—407

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge

Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—13

Broun (GA)
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Duncan
Flake
Garrett (NJ)
Hall (TX)
Hensarling
Rohrabacher
Shadegg
Wamp

NOT VOTING—12

Carson
Cubin
Davis, Tom
Doyle
Hastert
Johnson (IL)
Oberstar
Paul
Sessions
Sestak
Slaughter
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1206

Messrs. HALL of Texas and GARRETT of New Jersey changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 1088. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 1088.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE AUGUSTUS FREEMAN (GUS) HAWKINS OF CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, it is often as the dean of the California delegation a sad duty to report the passing of a colleague, but I have to say today that I want to announce and celebrate with you the life of a distinguished former colleague who died last Saturday at 100 years of age. Augustus Freeman Hawkins had a 28-year career in this body, and I just briefly want to celebrate with you the accomplishments of this gentleman.

Gus, as we all knew him, was born in Shreveport, Louisiana on August 31, 1907, about the same time my dad was born in California. He moved to Los Angeles. He was elected to the State assembly in 1935. He was elected to Congress in 1962, and served here 28 years.

During that 28-year service, he chaired the House Administration Committee, he chaired the Committee on Education and Labor, a whole host of joint committees, Printing, the Library Committee, and decided not to run for reelection in 1990. But among his many accomplishments, and Gus authored more than 300 State and Federal laws in his career, but what he will be most known for, I think, is authoring title VII of the Civil Rights Act which created the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission.

He was a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus. He sponsored and was noted and will be remembered most perhaps for the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment Act that he sponsored with Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota at that time.

I just want to pay tribute to one of the great careers of one of our great colleagues.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate very much my colleague yielding, and I rise also to pay tribute to one of the great Americans who provided a level of leadership in terms of public policy in this House like few have and most would want to be.

Gus was a wonderful friend over time, and his best roommate, a guy by the name of Frank Baca served us in and around the Vatican for some years, a wonderful guy as well. They lived a short distance from our house. My bride and I used to walk in the park and run into Gus often. The conversations were about the House first, briefly, but then from there the fact that the best thing about this place, if we will let it, it is a place where people of great difference can become very dear and warm friends.

Gus Hawkins was one of the great Americans to ever serve in the Congress. While he has passed, it is a tribute to America that we can have men and women in the House of Representatives of the style and class of Gus Hawkins.

I appreciate my colleague yielding.

Mr. STARK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman, and I thank him for taking this time.

As one who had the honor of serving under Gus Hawkins when he was Chair of the Education and Labor Committee, I would just like to say to my colleague that this was a man of great vision for young people, for students, and for working families. I knew Gus long before I came to the Congress. I knew him as a young man when he and my father served together in the State legislature and they were engaged in the great civil rights battles at that time, the great battles over education and school quality. Gus died when he was 100, but he was thinking about things 120 years from now because that's the way he always was.

Gus was always looking over the horizon for new opportunities and new ideas and new ways of doing things. He was a great pioneer, but he was also a great visionary and he honored us with his service in this body.

I thank the gentleman for taking this time.

Mr. STARK. I would like to yield, if I may, to the gentlewoman from California who now represents the district that our friend Gus Hawkins represented.

Ms. WATERS. Thank you very much.

I would like to join with the head of our delegation, Representative STARK, and others, in paying tribute to an extraordinary man.

Gus Hawkins was one of the most profound public policymakers that ever served in this House. You heard PETE STARK allude to some of that legislation. That legislation has been good for America, it's been good for African Americans, it's been good for this House.

I am so proud that when Gus Hawkins decided that he was not going to stand for reelection in 1990, he called me and he said, ''I'm calling you first because I believe that you would do well representing this district by serving as a Member of Congress.'' And so I have tried to live up to his legacy.

Gus Hawkins, however, was very, very strong. He understood how government works. He was understated. He got along with everybody. He made a lot of friends in this House. And people responded to him in a terrific manner.

And so I am standing here in great sympathy and in pain, because I know that we wanted to get him up here one more time when we focused on the Hawkins-Humphrey Act with BARNEY FRANK in the Financial Services Committee. We were not able to do that. And so all that we can do now is honor him with this tribute and say, ''Rest well, Gus.''

I would request a moment of silence, please, before we resume our schedule.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will resume.

There was no objection.

CONDEMNING THE NOVEMBER 6, 2007, TERRORIST BOMBING IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 811, 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 motion offered by the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 811.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 1089]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
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)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Baker
Carson
Cubin
Davis, Tom
Dicks
Doyle
Hastert
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Oberstar
Olver
Paul
Sessions
Weller

□ 1221

Mr. FEENEY changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately earlier today, November 14, 2007, I was unable to cast my votes and wish the Record to reflect my intentions had I been able to vote.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 1086 on ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 813, providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1429, I would have voted ''nay.''

Had I been present for rollcall No. 1087 on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 812, Expressing sympathy and pledging to support the victims of the devastating flooding in southern Mexico, I would have voted ''aye.''

Had I been present for rollcall No. 1088 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3320, Support for the Museum of the History of Polish Jews Act, I would have voted ''aye.''

Had I been present for rollcall No. 1089 on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 811, Condemning the November 6, 2007, terrorist bombing in Afghanistan and expressing condolences to the people of Afghanistan and the members of the Wolesi Jirga, I would have voted ''aye.''

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1429, IMPROVING HEAD START FOR SCHOOL READINESS ACT OF 2007

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 813, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1429)

to reauthorize the Head Start Act, to improve program quality, to expand access, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). Pursuant to House Resolution 813, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 9, 2007, at page H13462.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be here today to reauthorize Head Start. And I know that everyone agrees that it has been far too long since we have authorized the Head Start Act.

Head Start has served millions of our most vulnerable children and families well for 42 years. More recently, Early Head Start has done the same for infants and toddlers.

These are our country's premiere early childhood programs, Mr. Speaker. Head Start works, and this bill will make it work even better.

Nothing is more critical to a child's success than a great teacher, and this bill will ensure that by 2013, half of Head Start teachers nationwide will have bachelor's degrees. This will improve professional development so that teachers can keep up with the best practices in early childhood education.

The bill increases funding for Early Head Start so that children will receive comprehensive services during the most critical stages of brain development.

Mr. Speaker, our predecessors 42 years ago initiated Head Start even before we realized, as we do today, that early and regular stimulation was critical to the very physical development of the brain.

Head Start requires the Secretary to update early learning standards using the best science, and puts an end to the ill-advised National Reporting System.

It authorizes significant increases in resources so that we can expand access. And I want to work with our friends on the Appropriations Committee to do just that.

It enhances the quality of Head Start boards, while maintaining a shared governance structure that empowers parents.

And it is especially important to me that the bill prioritizes significant resources for Indian and migrant and seasonal Head Start programs, both to expand existing programs and create new programs, so that these children, whose communities face such terrific challenges, can grow up to help their communities overcome those challenges.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman MILLER and Senator KENNEDY, Senator DODD, Ranking Members MCKEON and CASTLE, and Senator ENZI and Senator ALEXANDER, my staff and theirs, and all the conferees and their staffs for their hard work. I especially want to thank Lloyd Horwich, who has worked so hard with me to produce this bill.

We do our best work in this Congress when we work in a bipartisan way, and we do our best work, especially in education, when we work in a bipartisan way. It's been my pleasure through the years to have the advantage of working with Mr. MCKEON from California. We've grown to really commit ourselves to education and we trust one another and like one another, which is very important.

I was privileged, Mr. Speaker, to introduce this bill in March with Chairman MILLER, Governor CASTLE, Mr. MCKEON and many others, and look forward to its becoming law very soon.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Since 1965, the Head Start program has been instrumental in our efforts to close the gap between disadvantaged children and their peers. This program provides health, developmental and educational services to low-income and at-risk children before they enroll in school in order to help close the readiness gap. Head Start helps establish a foundation for these children's future success.

This conference report is the product of a bipartisan collaboration and compromise. I'd like to thank Chairman MILLER, along with Mr. CASTLE and Mr. KILDEE. And I appreciate Mr. KILDEE's words, and I appreciate the opportunity I've had to get to know him and work with him closely over the years. I thank them for their work to strengthen and improve Head Start.

I'd also like to acknowledge the staff on both sides for their instrumental role in developing this legislation. Their work was critical to producing such a strong, widely supported measure. On my staff, I'd like to recognize Kirsten Duncan, along with Susan Ross and James Bergeron, for their tireless efforts on this legislation.

Studies have shown that children enrolled in Head Start do make some progress. We also know that even greater results are possible.

With this in mind, the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act will strengthen Head Start's academic standards by emphasizing cognitive development and the results of scientifically valid research in topics critical to children's school readiness. The conference report will improve teacher quality by ensuring a greater number of Head Start teachers have degrees and are adequately trained in early childhood development, particularly in teaching the fundamentals.

Despite the many successes of the Head Start program, it's reputation has, unfortunately, been marred in recent years by instances of financial abuse and mismanagement. In communities across the country, we've heard reports of taxpayer dollars being squandered. A March 2005 report from the Government Accountability Office warned the financial control system in the Head Start program is flawed and failing to prevent multimillion dollar financial abuses that cheat poor children, taxpayers and law-abiding Head Start operators.

This conference report builds on efforts of Republicans in the 109th Congress to address weaknesses in the Head Start financial control system in order to better protect taxpayers and ensure funds are being used to help prepare disadvantaged children for school.

I'm particularly pleased that the conference report includes strong protections to ensure Head Start dollars are not used to pay excessive salaries to program executives. The House voted unanimously last week to instruct conferees to include clear, unambiguous protections in this area. Thanks to that vote, we were able to visit the negotiations and agree to even stronger language.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act is a solid reauthorization bill built on bipartisan collaboration. Head Start is a good program capable of achieving even greater results, and the bill before us will help achieve that goal.

I support passage of this conference report so we can send the bill to the President.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, we must acknowledge that America's continued success will not be ensured unless we equip the leaders of tomorrow with the tools they need today. This means cultivating not just the most privileged and brightest students but the students who grow up with disadvantages. We must nurture the potential of all our children from the very beginning of their lives. We don't have one mind to waste or one citizen to waste. We need everyone to have the greatest ability and preparation to live productive, meaningful lives in our society.

For a million students, Head Start is the answer. For those who work hard but remain stuck just above the poverty level, the reauthorization of this program will give their children a chance to soar. I am proud to say that just as we did by increasing the minimum wage, doubling college assistance, and providing health care to uninsured children, this Congress continues to put working families first.

With nine in 10 Americans reporting no increase in income the last 6 years, cynicism has replaced hope for too many. We are in a position to restore faith in the future. And as we pass the

reins of our Nation to future generations, we must invest in that future by guaranteeing every child a chance to succeed.

I know that in my hometown of Louisville, Kentucky, thousands and thousands of young children have gotten adequate preparation for schooling that they might not otherwise have gotten because of the wonderful training they received in Head Start. It is not just a head start; it is a very strong foundation to success in education and success in whatever careers our young children may select.

So I'm proud to stand here in the House of Representatives, the people's House, and urge my colleagues to support a program which will help ensure that the people we represent are able to enjoy the prosperity and the happiness that our Founding Fathers hoped they would have.

With that, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Head Start and begin restoring faith in the future for millions of American families.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy now to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the ranking member on the subcommittee and at the same time thank him for the key role he played in getting this legislation to this point.

Mr. CASTLE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding and for his work on this legislation.

I do rise to ask my colleague to support this bipartisan conference report before us today. Like almost every other Member of this body, I believe strongly in the benefits of this program. I trust that the conference report on H.R. 1429, the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act, will improve Head Start by emphasizing that every child, regardless of his or her economic status, should have the best possible chance to succeed.

As Mr. MCKEON stated, this report is a byproduct of bipartisan collaboration and compromise. I would also like to thank Chairman MILLER, along with Mr. KILDEE and Mr. MCKEON, as well as the committee staff for their work on Head Start. I see Ms. WOOLSEY in the room. I have worked with her on this issue before, too, and thank her.

This legislation builds upon efforts made in the past several Congresses to address weaknesses in the Head Start program and improves upon language contained in the bill to help make the program even stronger. Specifically, this report preserves and enhances the vital role of parents in ensuring the success of Head Start by establishing both a governing body and a policy council, each with specific detailed responsibilities. This conference report also maintains the current income eligibility requirement to provide services to those who need them the most. Additionally, this legislation ensures that curriculum and other materials used in Head Start classrooms are based on the principles of scientific research and scientifically valid research. Equally important, this conference agreement ensures that a greater number of Head Start teachers are adequately trained and educated in early childhood development, and that applies to Early Head Start as well. Finally, consistent with the motion to instruct I introduced last week, this conference agreement limits the compensation of a Head Start employee to Executive Level II, that of an Assistant Secretary, currently $168,000.

Mr. Speaker, the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act builds upon the success of the Head Start program and will assist in having the program achieve even greater results. I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this conference report.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding and I also want to commend him for introducing this legislation, H.R. 1429, the Head Start for School Readiness Act.

I applaud the leaders in both Chambers for crafting such a strong bill that builds on the accomplishments of Head Start and promotes the success of young children. It is clear from this product that you and your staffs have toiled long and hard to strengthen the quality of the Head Start program, and I say to you, well done.

Foremost, let me thank you for maintaining the role of parents in governing Head Start. For more than 40 years, one of the most unique and important aspects of the Head Start program has been its emphasis on parental involvement. I worked actively with Mr. SOUDER and Mr. PAYNE, along with 88 other Members of the House, to advocate for maintaining this hallmark of equal responsibility for parents in governing Head Start.

I am also pleased that the bill strikes a balance between the House and Senate versions on the issue of program eligibility. In high cost-of-living areas such as Chicago, low-income families can lose access to this critical child development program not due to lack of need but because we fail to adequately consider the cost of living when calculating the poverty level. The conference report grants local programs flexibility in opening the eligibility while also requiring them to demonstrate the need.

I am especially grateful that the final report includes so many issues near and dear to me, such as recruiting minority male teachers, emphasizing children's social and emotional well-being, recognition of the expanding role of grandparents and kinship caregivers in children's lives, incorporating the best practices from the field of home visitation into the Early Head Start program, and increasing funds for salaries and education for Head Start teachers.

Finally, in addition, I am very pleased that this bipartisan bill preserves the anti-discrimination history of Head Start advocated so ardently by the Head Start and religious communities. Federal funds are not meant to support discrimination of any type, and I applaud the Members on both sides for maintaining this fundamental commitment to justice and fairness.

This bill expands access, improves teacher quality, expands accountability, and strengthens school readiness. I am proud to be a member of the Education Committee and proud to serve in a Congress that will pass this bill into law.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes at this time to the gentleman from Indiana, a member of the committee (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. I thank our distinguished ranking member.

I am very supportive of this bill, but I want to share some vague uncomfortability with what I think is potentially happening here in Head Start, and I think it's very important to clarify for this administration and for future administrations what this bill is intended to do and not intended to do.

From the time the Republicans took over in Congress, I remember then Subcommittee Chairman Frank Riggs had a number of hearings talking about the lack of an academic focus to Head Start. There was a big debate about what the original role was, but it was supposed to certainly prepare kids who didn't have the same opportunities for their ability to be prepared when they started school.

But there's a reason that Head Start, while it was in the old Department of HEW, didn't move with the Department of Education and stayed with HHS. If it was intended to be merely another education program run by educational bureaucrats, run the same way that every other education program was run, it would be over in the Department of Education. It wouldn't have been a grassroots Head Start program with parent councils that voted and participated and ran it. It would have been part of a pre-K program or a kindergarten program run by the public schools. Increasingly, we see this pressure where the public schools are trying to take over the Head Start program.

The original origins of the Head Start movement came out of the sixties. Saul Alinsky was an organizer in Chicago. The populist movement and the community action organizations led to a wave of saying, we need programs where local low-income groups are empowered to make their own decisions. What this meant many times was it didn't exactly meet the professional goals or standards of where the public schools thought it should be, necessarily where the professionals in Washington thought it should be, but they were engaged at the community level, participating in a way that we have tried to reach in kindergarten and public schools forever. We can't get

low-income parents engaged. It's one of the biggest challenges we have. Yet in the Head Start program, they were engaged all over the country, whether it was rural low income, urban low income. And then when you talk to those parents, you say, What's it like when you go to school? Well, they don't really want us at the public school. There they want us to do fundraisers or they want us to come to back-to-school night. But participating in the governance, participating in the organizations was different.

Now, we had wide support in this body, 91 Members, including Mr. DAVIS and Congresswomen LORETTA SANCHEZ and MAXINE WATERS, myself and RIC KELLER and many conservatives on the right, who share the concept of empowerment. None of us want malfeasance in office or funding problems, people who aren't accounting. All of us would like to see more professional development. All of us would like to see quantified goals. But in this drift towards trying to use the word ''professional'' all the time, we need to make sure that that doesn't lead to an exclusionary concept that basically says, okay, now really the white middle class is going to take over and run this program like we would like it run.

The fact is when you get groups of parents and give them votes, they're going to make some judgment mistakes. We need to have accountability. I am for accountability. We need to have measurement. We need to empower those people. But this can't be a typical takeover project, because I believe that the major reason Head Start has, in fact, worked in communities across the country is it's engaged with the people at the grassroots level. And sometimes when we use some of the language here, what we really mean is we're going to take it away from these people because they're not quite as skilled and that we don't quite trust their judgments as much.

Now, I appreciate that there was a strong compromise to the side of parents in the conference committee, that, in fact, the language keeping the voting powers to the parents is still there. And it still says that in any major decision, they get a vote. It still says that when there is a conflict with the other people who are governing this, it has to be resolved. There was an additional clause added that seemed to potentially demean the parent councils, where it says ''meaningful consultation and collaboration.'' Now, that was originally going to replace the vote just like we saw in HIDTAs, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas, where we tried to have the Federal Government, initially in the proposal of the Bush administration, take voting power away from sheriffs and local police chiefs and use the same words ''meaningful consultation and collaboration.'' That is usually a code word for we're going to pat you on the head and invite you to an occasional meeting but not put you in the decision power.

What's great about this bill is we left the voting power there and no future administration or this one should mistake that the parents still have the voting power. Any meaningful decision, they have a right to have a vote, and there has to be a resolution with the policy councils. This additional language that was Senate language is supplemental and did not alter the policy council. Of course, parent councils should be a meaningful consultation and collaboration, not just as a ''term'' but real meaningful consultation. They should also have the vote.

I want to thank the leadership on the Democratic side and the Republican side in the House and Senate in leaving the real vote to parents. It was a huge victory, a grassroots, bipartisan, liberal-conservative victory that should stand and hopefully will not be undone by administrative interpretation.

□ 1245

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1429, the Improving Head Start Act.

I represent part of Suffolk County, New York, where over 20 Head Start and three Early Head Start centers have been serving the community since 1966. I am also proud to say that my wife's first teaching job was as a Head Start teacher, and that she remains today an early childhood teacher.

Parents, teachers, and many of my colleagues can all agree that Head Start is one of our Nation's most prominent and successful early education programs. This bill continues to build on Head Start's success by ensuring that kids are prepared for school, by improving teacher and classroom quality, strengthening the focus on school readiness, increasing accountability, and boosting coordination.

Research has found that children who attend Head Start enter school better prepared than their low-income peers who do not attend the program, and that children who do attend Head Start make significant learning gains.

If we are serious about achieving the goals set forth by NCLB, then passing Head Start reauthorization is a down payment on achieving these goals.

I was proud to offer an amendment during the Education and Labor Committee's consideration of this bill to allow Head Start programs to use up to 10 percent of their quality improvement funds for transportation costs. This amendment was in response to concerns brought to me by my constituents, as many Head Start programs are being forced to choose between providing transportation to children or sacrificing the quality of their program. This is a decision that no Head Start program should have to make.

With this amendment, and with so many other worthwhile improvements to Head Start, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this balanced reauthorization for the benefit of our children and future generations of Americans.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time we have left, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 19 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan has 18½ minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield now 3 minutes to the gentlelady from California, a member of the committee and a very active worker on this bill, Ms. WOOLSEY.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I want to thank Chairman KILDEE and Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MCKEON, who was the Chair when we were working on this, and Ranking Member CASTLE for a bipartisan success. We can be proud of ourselves today.

Anyone who has been around small children knows that they're sponges for information, they just sop it up if you make it available to them. And it's widely accepted that early childhood education is absolutely critical to their development and directly tied to their success when they get into school, elementary school, and their ongoing future. So getting children in a structured classroom environment earlier in their young lives provides a critical window of opportunity.

Head Start provides our Nation's poorest children with a quality start that puts them on a level playing field with others when they start elementary school. No matter where a child comes from or what his or her background is, Head Start provides an equal opportunity to succeed by starting with a quality early childhood education. That's why I'm glad I'm here today as we authorize Head Start, reaffirming our commitment to this valuable program.

This bill expands access to Head Start, it improves teacher and classroom quality, and it strengthens the services children and their families receive when they enroll in the program.

The administration, however, can and should do better when it comes to funding. Too many eligible children are still denied an opportunity to participate in a Head Start program because there isn't enough funds. Well, if this administration wasn't spending $500 billion in Iraq, we would have the necessary resources to increase funding to allow for program improvement to give every child the Head Start experience and to increase teacher quality and salaries. It just depends on where we put our priorities.

Children are 25 percent of our population, Mr. Speaker, but they are 100 percent of our future. We must provide them with the best possible beginning to their lives. So, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues to increase our Nation's commitment to education for all of our children and to ensure that Head Start remains the successful experience that it is.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio, the Republican leader, former chairman of our committee, Mr. BOEHNER.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, let me thank Mr. MCKEON for yielding time and take a moment to congratulate Mr. MILLER and Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCKEON and Mr. CASTLE, the two Republican rankers on the committee, for a job well done.

We have been at this reauthorization for a number of years, and I think that the work that is represented in this reauthorization of Head Start is very important for our Nation's children.

Those of us who have worked in the area of education for a long time know that for low-income children, having some type of early childhood development is critically important to their success. Head Start is among a number of programs, both public and private, that are out there that supply this type of early childhood development for these children. The reforms that are included in this bill I think are critically important so that Head Start can really be all that many of us want it to be.

There are some tremendous Head Start programs around the country, I have visited a number of them, but there are also some programs that don't fulfill the promise that we're making to parents and to their children of what this program could be.

We all know that if we're serious about educating all of America's kids, we will never get there unless we find a way to help low-income children get the development they need that many of us take for granted, things that happen in our homes, for those who have means, things that happen in our communities that these children are not exposed to. And so to make sure that they do have an equal chance to get a good education, that early childhood development for these 3- and 4-year-olds is very, very important.

I do want to congratulate my colleagues for the bipartisan way this bill has come together. This is a great example of what Congress can do in a bipartisan way when it chooses to.

I have been on the floor a lot this year, being critical of the fact that there was some partisan bill on the floor of the House that was going nowhere. But here is an example of Members on both sides of the aisle working together for the interests of America's low-income kids, and I just wanted to come to the floor and say, job well done.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I appreciate the very kind words of the Republican leader and my former Chair on this committee. His work through the years on this bill has been very, very helpful.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I am pleased to be here in support of a conference report that will make Head Start even stronger. This program serves nearly 1 million underprivileged children and eases the divide between the haves and the have-nots when it comes to preparing them for kindergarten. The bipartisan support we've seen today should lend all of us confidence that the program will remain on a solid foundation for generations to come.

By reauthorizing Head Start, we're going to strengthen academic standards by emphasizing cognitive development using scientifically valid research, improve teacher quality by ensuring more Head Start teachers have degrees and are adequately trained in early childhood development, increase financial disclosure requirements by Head Start operators as custodians of Federal Head Start grants, and require local governance boards to actively oversee grantees. These are commonsense reforms that I wholeheartedly support.

I would like to join the Republican leader and my other colleagues who have spoken here today in commenting on the bipartisanship with which this bill was brought to this point. It's one that the President will sign. It's one that will bring good reforms to a good program.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this conference report.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CASTLE, and all those on the other side of the aisle who have worked so hard on this bill to produce a very good bill. I also want to thank Ruth Friedman, with Chairman MILLER, for her tireless work on this bill over the last 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, America can watch this Congress at work today on this bill, Head Start, and feel good about its Congress, and that's very important. This process in working on Head Start has shown Congress at its best, and I think we owe that to the American people. And we can feel a certain pride in having demonstrated to the American people what Congress can do. This is one of our better days, one of our better bills, and it's been a process that we've enjoyed. We've had differences. We resolved those differences. We produced a very good bill.

And people do make a difference. People in this Congress make a difference. And I want to especially, again, commend my friend, my colleague, Mr. MCKEON from California, who has worked tirelessly on this bill. This bill is better because of his input.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Improving Head Start Act of 2007 Conference Report.

In 1964, President Lyndon Johnson laid out his domestic agenda, one that made Americans reevaluate what it means to be a Great Society. We learned much from that time in our Nation's rich history: that we must all fight together for civil rights, for equality, for peace and security, against poverty, and for future generations.

One year later, the Head Start program began as a product of Lyndon Johnson's vision of a Great Society. Now, over 40 years later, Head Start is truly one of our Nation's most successful programs.

Head Start takes a holistic approach to ensuring that our country's most at-risk children are educated and healthy. Kids who are vibrant and in school are put on a path to success. The program provides grants to local public and private agencies to offer comprehensive child development services to disadvantaged children and families.

I want to thank Chairman MILLER and Chairman KILDEE and all of the conferees for their important work on this conference agreement.

I am glad to see that this agreement authorizes 7.35 billion dollars for the program. Unfortunately, a number of residents in my hometown of Sacramento are eligible for enrollment in Head Start, but are currently on a waiting list because the program does not have enough funds. This funding authorization will help correct this urgent problem. It will help put Head Start back on track to ensuring that all eligible children will be able to participate in the program.

Also important is the expansion of the Early Head Start program. This program serves low-income youth from birth to age 3. It puts special focus on helping preschoolers develop the early reading and math skills they need to be successful in school. It recognizes that starting our children's education early is crucial to their long-term achievement.

The Conference Report also includes an increase in income eligibility. This is especially important in California due to my State's high cost-of-living. I want to thank the conferees for recognizing the growing needs in communities across the Nation by increasing income eligibility.

Study after study confirms that early education is the key to success later in life. And I am glad that Leadership has made educating our children a priority. With passage of this bill today, the 110th Congress indeed becomes the Children's Congress.

Mr. Speaker, no child should be without early education. The Head Start program provides access to education for all of our children, regardless of their parents' economic status.

As Lyndon Johnson said, "The purpose of protecting the life of our Nation and preserving the liberty of our citizens is to pursue the happiness of our people. Our success in that pursuit is the test of our success as a Nation."

I believe that reauthorizing the Head Start program reaffirms our commitment to the Great Society that Lyndon Johnson envisioned. I am proud to support the rule and the Head Start Improvement Act.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, more than 40 years ago, we recognized that poverty was robbing millions of children of the opportunity to do well in school and succeed in life.

As a nation, we made a decision to help poor children reach school age ready to succeed by creating the Head Start early childhood program.

In the last four decades, it has helped nearly 25 million children by providing them with high-quality, comprehensive education, health, and nutrition services.

Head Start remains a cornerstone in this country's efforts to help all children learn, to

combat poverty, and to provide all Americans with the opportunity to meet their fullest potential.

We know that Head Start works. Research shows that not only do Head Start students make important educational gains while they attend the program, they also continue to gain ground after they leave Head Start.

Research shows that by the end of kindergarten, Head Start graduates are ''essentially at national norms in early reading and writing'' and have further narrowed the achievement gap in vocabulary, general knowledge and early math.

In other words, Head Start is doing what we expect and demand that it should do—help prepare children to succeed in school and in life.

We also know that there are ways we can improve Head Start.

That is why I am so pleased to be here today with a bipartisan conference report to reauthorize and reinvigorate Head Start.

This bipartisan legislation improves teacher and classroom quality, expands access to Head Start for more children, improves comprehensive services that help children and their families, and ensures that taxpayer dollars only fund Head Start centers that are well-run and high quality.

First, this legislation builds on Head Start's success by integrating the best available science on child development to inform classroom instruction.

Each year we learn more and more about how children's brains develop. This legislation ensures that we improve teacher quality and update classroom practices based on what the research tells us.

It requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to re-evaluate and update early learning standards and use of assessments with the best available science, including a forthcoming study from the National Academy of Sciences.

And it terminates further use of an inappropriate and ineffective testing regime for 4-year-olds. This wasteful testing regime cost taxpayers over $25 million dollars, it took up valuable classroom time and hasn't been useful for improving program quality.

Of course, Head Start is much more than an educational program. Head Start provides health, nutrition and parent education services in addition to a strong educational curriculum.

The conference report recognizes this by also strengthening Head Start's role in meeting these important needs of the children it serves.

This legislation takes important steps to ensure that Head Start centers are well-run and effectively managed. This will ensure that taxpayer dollars are used wisely and that every Head Start center is high quality.

The report allows the Secretary of Health and Human Services to more quickly take funding away from bad programs. It requires that new and detailed fiscal management protocols be included in program reviews.

Finally, the legislation also expands access to Head Start in many important ways.

Expansion of Early Head Start is prioritized so more infants and toddlers can attend Head Start during the years their brains are growing the fastest.

And expansion of Migrant and Indian programs is prioritized so more of these children can have access to this important program.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I'd like to take a minute to thank Congressman MCKEON, Chairman KILDEE, Congressman CASTLE, Chairman KENNEDY, Senator ENZI, Senator DODD, and Senator ALEXANDER for their hard work in getting us to this point.

I'd also like to thank the staff for their work and expertise.

In particular, I'd like to thank Liz King and Jean Harmann with Legislative Counsel; Lloyd Horwich with Mr. KILDEE; James Bergeron, Susan Ross, Kirsten Duncan, and Jessica Gross with Mr. MCKEON and Mr. CASTLE; Roberto Rodriguez and David Johns with Senator KENNEDY; Catherine Hildum with Senator DODD; Lindsay Hunsicker and Beth Buehlmann with Senator ENZI; David Cleary and Sara Rittling with Senator ALEXANDER; and from my own staff—Lamont Ivey, Molly Carter, Kate Scully, Stephanie Moore, and Ruth Friedman.

This bill will build on Head Start's past successes to create an even stronger program to provide Head Start children with a better future.

I am pleased that we are about to send this legislation to the President for his signature.

I thank my colleagues for their efforts.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Head Start conference report and I thank Representatives MCKEON, CASTLE, MILLER and KILDEE for their work on producing an agreement with the Senate.

For several years, I have worked to improve Head Start's academic and Migrant and Seasonal Head Start provisions.

For thousands of children, Head Start serves as their first formal learning experience. Three- and four-year-olds are open to learning about the world around them, and they should be presented with a wide range of early academic concepts. I am very pleased that this conference agreement includes provisions to ensure that these children are exposed to math and science. I certainly do not intend for Head Start to teach ''rocket science,'' but rather for its teachers to equip Head Start preschoolers with the extremely basic concepts of math and science. Perhaps it will spark the imagination of some kids, and lay the foundation for them to become rocket scientists many years later.

With regard to Migrant and Seasonal Head Start, I joined with Representatives GRIJALVA, HINOJOSA and SANCHEZ in securing a 5 percent funding floor for Migrant and Seasonal Head Start in the House version of the bill. For far too long, funding for Migrant and Seasonal Head Start has lacked parity with other Head Start programs. I am disappointed that the conference report abandoned the House- and Senate-passed 5 percent floor, but I recognize the difficulty conferees had in finding a workable formula. I hope that Members will join me in supporting funding for Migrant and Seasonal Head Start in the future since it is a sorely needed program for workers of our fields and their children.

I urge Members to support the conference report.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

Let me start by commending the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, and the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California, Mr. MILLER for their work on this bill. I offer my thanks to the House and Senate conferees for bringing forth this important piece of legislation today.

In 1965, with a great deal of hard work, Head Start was created. It soon became a ''legislative Lamborghini'' of social programs, going from 0 to 561,000 thousand participants in only a few months. In the 42 years since its inception, Head Start has become the educational foundation for more than 20 million American children.

Education serves as both a ladder of opportunity and an investment in our future. Our Nation's security, economy, and position in the world all depend on the success of our education system. We must take advantage of this opportunity to fund our future.

Head Start and Early Head Start are linchpins in the effort to prepare our country's most disadvantaged children to succeed in school and life. Many studies indicate that children enrolled in Head Start make significant progress in closing the readiness gap to their more advantaged peers as they enter kindergarten.

The congressionally mandated impact study recently published its results, which noted that after less than 1 year in the program, children in Head Start had narrowed the readiness gap by 45 percent in reading skills and 28 percent in writing skills. This momentum continues well beyond the ages of 3, 4, and 5, as another large academic study has noted that Head Start graduates continue to mount academic gains well after leaving the program.

The bill we see before us today helps to raise the academic standards of American children and ensures that every child in our country has an equal opportunity to a high quality education. It aims to improve teacher quality by requiring a greater number of Head Start teachers to have a bachelor's degree and be adequately trained in early childhood development. This is clearly good news for the children that will be participating in Head Start in the future.

On multiple occasions, the President has advocated that all 3- and 4-year-old participants in Head Start should take standardized tests to assess their improvement. For President Bush, No Child Left Behind means no child left untested. I am happy that this conference report terminates the further use of the National Reporting System, an inappropriate, ineffective, and expensive testing regime.

This conference report notes that Head Start is not without the opportunity for evaluation, however, and there is strengthened program accountability at the Federal, regional, and local levels included in the legislation. The report also requires the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to initiate classroom evaluations, thereby ensuring optimal teacher-child interactions.

We have known for some time that when children are not provided high-quality day care and early childhood services, once in school, their academic achievement and limited language proficiencies become cumulatively worse over time, over grade levels, and across all subject areas. By passing this conference report, we build on the past 42 years of success for this program and help ensure that both Head Start children as well as our Nation as a whole have a brighter tomorrow.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I supported this measure as a member of the conference committee that drafted the final version of the

bill. I'm proud to have served on the committee of House and Senate leaders that negotiated the final version of this legislation. This important bill will help prepare Louisiana's neediest children for kindergarten by improving their access to medical, nutritional, and educational services.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Head Start is a critical part of this country's effort to combat the effects of poverty and ensure that all of our children have the opportunity and skills they need to thrive.

Since its creation in 1965, it has proven to be our most valuable school readiness program in the history of this country—especially, now that we know more about the importance of early-childhood education.

Study after study demonstrates that by age 6, a child's capacity to learn is largely formed, and time after time, we have seen reports that prove students who attend Head Start perform better than those who don't.

By doing this, Head Start is helping to close the achievement gap between students of differing socio-economic status across our country, and helping the children in our communities by providing opportunities that they might not otherwise have.

Additionally, people often forget the wonderful things that this program does for the parents.

The key to Head Start's approach is its level of actively involving parents and the community in all aspects of the program—and this reauthorization would further this goal.

Parents are a child's first teachers, and Head Start helps build and foster a person's parenting skills in various ways.

Parents are also urged to improve their literacy skills, obtain adult basic education, and make their homes a place where reading is part of everyday life.

Head Start also tackles a wide range of poverty issues through its family and community partnerships, including: substance abuse, violence, HIV, homelessness, single-parent households, inadequate child care, unemployment, and numerous other stressors that challenge families' resources.

This program is clearly instrumental to our country.

The Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007 will reinvigorate Head Start and help more children arrive at kindergarten ready to succeed.

I urge my colleagues to support this report.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act, to strengthen and expand Head Start programs across the country.

Last Spring, we held a National Summit on America's Children here at the Capitol. We heard from leading experts on child development and neuroscience, who emphasized the vital importance of early childhood education. Early interventions can dramatically increase a child's chances for future success.

Head Start is based on this idea and it works. For more than 40 years, it has been helping to close the achievement gap and teach our children that they can succeed, regardless of background or family income. More than 20 million children and families have benefited from its services. With this bill today, we will open the door to more children to enter both Head Start and Early Head Start and will ensure that they are better prepared for kindergarten and elementary school.

Today's bill also recognizes the importance of early childhood educators, targeting new funding to improve teacher salaries and professional development. It ensures that teachers are highly qualified and able to meet the needs of children with disabilities and improves accountability for Head Start programs.

I also urge my colleagues to support the funding necessary to continue Head Start's success. Last week, we sent the President a bill increasing Head Start funding by 2.2 percent to simply help it keep pace with inflation. The President vetoed this funding. I encourage my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto to prevent Head Start program closures and ensure that children get the services they were promised.

I thank Chairman MILLER, Chairman KILDEE, and the Conference Committee for putting together this bipartisan piece of legislation, and urge its passage today.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 1429, the Head Start for School Readiness Act.

As a member of the Education and Workforce Committee for 6 years, I was pleased to have the opportunity to work on this important issue. While visiting Head Start centers in the Fourth District, I was able to see firsthand the difference Head Start makes to children and families. In addition, the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis published a study in 2004 showing that investment in early education has a rate of return of 12 percent. Even with all the evidence showing the social, educational and economic value of this program, the Republican-controlled Congress was unable to pass an acceptable bill.

Thanks to the hard work of Chairman MILLER and Speaker PELOSI, the bill before us today is a bipartisan, bicameral agreement that does what earlier reauthorization bills did not—it focuses on preparing children for school. This agreement includes an increased emphasis on teacher quality and compensation, maintains parent involvement in the governing structure of Head Start, and increases coordination with other early childhood programs. It also maintains Head Start's commitment to comprehensive services and places greater emphasis on identification of child and family mental health needs.

H.R. 1429 terminates the inappropriate high stakes testing system for Head Start students implemented by the Bush Administration and replaces it with best practices for early learning. It also strengthens monitoring of Head Start programs, allows quicker action against failing or fraudulent programs and rejects a proposal to allow discrimination in hiring with Head Start funds.

Congress still faces the critical issue of providing enough resources to Head Start to serve all the children who are eligible to participate. The Head Start for School Readiness Act authorizes increased funding, as well as some flexibility in funding, to allow more children to access this important education. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I will continue to work towards improving our investment in children, families and communities.

I am pleased to vote in support of H.R. 1429 because this bill will make a real difference in the lives of children and families, and for our economy. I urge all my colleagues to support this investment in our future.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 1429, the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act. This bipartisan legislation provides services to one of our most vulnerable populations—children from low-income families. By passing this measure today, over 900,000 disadvantaged children ages 3 to 5—including over 3,000 in Rhode Island—will have access to health services, the necessary tools to enter kindergarten, and a foundation for their success later in life.

Studies show that low-income children often lack the richness of books in the home, proper nutrition, or access to a continuum of health services. For over 40 years, Head Start has provided comprehensive early childhood development services to low-income children, with strong emphasis on the involvement of families and the local community. H.R. 1429 would increase funding for quality improvements to Head Start and requires that by 2013 at least half of Head Start teachers nationwide have at least a baccalaureate degree in early childhood education.

Today, half of the children enrolled in Head Start are from working poor families. For this reason, I am pleased that this conference agreement increases the income eligibility to 130 percent of the poverty level so that families struggling with work and childcare will have another option. I also believe that stopping the program's National Reporting System is essential until proper testing methods for these young children are carefully developed. H.R. 1429 also establishes a set of procedures to improve accountability in the Head Start program, which will lead to improvements for all those served by Head Start.

Earlier in the year, H.R. 1429 passed both the House and the Senate with overwhelming support. I am proud that the 110th Congress is on the verge of passing this conference report after nearly a decade of failing to reauthorize Head Start. For all the children who benefit from this program, I look forward to sending this bill to the President for his signature.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report for H.R. 1429, the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act. Since 1965, Head Start has provided 22 million American children with the education and health and social services to lead productive lives. It is the most successful school readiness program in the Nation and has always enjoyed bipartisan support.

Today, we are continuing this tradition by passing strong bipartisan legislation to reauthorize this vital program. In fact, this legislation marks the first time in almost a decade that Congress has reauthorized Head Start.

The Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act will invest in America's future by providing children and their teachers with the resources they need to take advantage of the opportunities that the Head Start program has offered America's youth for over 40 years.

In addition to providing additional resources for increasing teachers' salaries and State Advisory Councils, this reauthorization will expand the reach of both Head Start and Early Head Start by providing greater funding and flexibility. The increases in funding will enable tens of thousands more children to have access to the program. H.R. 1429 will also improve Head Start by providing the Secretary of Health and Human Services and local teams

with tools to hold teachers and programs accountable and requires the implementation of best practices for family service workers. Head Start has served America's children well since 1965, and this legislation will expand the reach and ability of this program to positively impact lives across the country.

I want to thank Chairman MILLER for his dedication to Head Start and to education in general. Head Start is an investment in America's future. Thanks to Head Start, we can give our children the best start possible so they can lead productive lives and grow up to be outstanding citizens. I am proud to support these efforts to continue the legacy of Head Start, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 1429.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support the Conference Report on H.R. 1429, the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007. This bipartisan legislation takes significant steps to strengthen the Head Start program so that children will be better prepared and ready to succeed when they begin kindergarten. H.R. 1429 increases funds targeted at improving teacher quality and provides additional support for the program's extensive monitoring process and the comprehensive services offered to the students' families. In addition, it expands access to Head Start for more children, increases coordination efforts with State and local programs, and eliminates any further development of the controversial and ineffective National Reporting System.

For over 40 years, the Head Start program has worked to break the cycle of poverty by providing access to early childhood education for low-income children and families. In the House budget for FY 2008, the State of Texas is estimated to receive approximately $490 million in Head Start funding which will go towards providing services for over 68,000 students. Since it first began in 1965, the program has served more than 20 million children, and it continues to play a major role in our Nation's efforts to close the achievement gap, reduce poverty, and ensure that all Americans have the opportunity to succeed.

Studies have shown that students with a high quality pre-Kindergarten education enjoy greater success in academics as well as their overall lives. The Head Start program goes a long way in addressing educational inequity by aiding low income children in their social and cognitive development. I am a firm supporter of this program and the lifelong benefits it provides. It is only by addressing this critical need that we will be able to ensure a better future for all our Nation's children.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, Head Start has been the premiere early childhood education program in the United States since 1965. Since that time, it has benefited 20 million children and families and has become one of the cornerstones of this country's efforts to close the achievement gap, combat poverty, and provide all Americans with the opportunity to thrive. By passing the conference report to H.R. 1429, the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, we will reinvigorate Head Start and help more children arrive at kindergarten ready to succeed.

The fact is that quality education and early engagement, from both parents and teachers, are essential for our kids' success. Recent findings from the congressionally mandated impact study found that after less than 1 year, Head Start narrowed the achievement gap by 45 percent in pre-reading skills and 28 percent in prewriting skills. Another large study found that Head Start graduates continue to gain ground after they leave the program. Furthermore, Head Start graduates are less likely to need special education services, to be left back a grade or to get into trouble with the law. They are more likely to go on to college and to have professional careers.

This bipartisan reauthorization improves teacher and classroom quality, strengthens Head Start's focus on school readiness, expands access to Head Start for more children, ensures that centers are well-run, boosts coordination between Head Start and State and local programs, and improves comprehensive services that help children by helping their families.

I commend and thank Congressmen KILDEE, CASTLE, and Chairman MILLER for their leadership on this critical legislation. Head Start has proven its self as a strong and effective program. The growth and success of millions of American children and families is living proof. We have a responsibility to embrace their success, support it, and strengthen it for years to come. I know that my colleagues will join me in sending this critical reauthorization to ensure the Head Start program meets its full potential.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, as the only former State superintendent of schools serving in Congress, I have devoted my life to the well-being and development of children, and I strongly support Head Start. I rise in support of H.R. 1429, the Head Start for School Readiness Act.

In the global economy of the 21st century, lifelong learning is the pathway to the American Dream, and for many of our Nation's children, learning begins with Head Start. Over 20,000 children in North Carolina get prepared for school in Head Start or Early Head Start.

This act takes and builds on the success of Head Start, expanding and enhancing this fundamental initiative that has served over 20 million children and families nationwide since 1965. H.R. 1429 extends the benefits of Head Start to more of our Nation's low-income children, and raises the bar so that we can attract highly qualified Head Start providers through performance accountability, greater compensation, and higher standards.

Research continues to show that the first few years of a child's life are critical to a child's mental development: their brains grow exponentially and learning patterns are set. We must invest in these youngsters so that they may take full advantage of one of the premier education systems in the world by ensuring their school-readiness by age 5. Head Start successfully provides the stepping stones to lifelong learning.

This act provides the parents and children of our country an additional 4 years of this vital service, guaranteeing a 20 percent increase in funding by 2012. Education is the best investment we can make for our children, grandchildren, country, and world.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1429 updates, improves, and expands the successful services of Head Start. I commend Chairman MILLER for his leadership on this bipartisan legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to pass it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. KILDEE. 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, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the conference report will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules with regard to H.R. 3845 and H.R. 719.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 381, nays 36, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 1090]

YEAS—381

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee

Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—36

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Broun (GA)
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Coble
Culberson
Doolittle
Duncan
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Hensarling
Inglis (SC)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Lamborn
Mack
Marchant
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Neugebauer
Pence
Poe
Price (GA)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sali
Shadegg
Stearns
Tancredo
Walberg
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—15

Boustany
Carson
Cubin
Davis, Tom
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doyle
Hastert
Jindal
Mitchell
Oberstar
Paul
Platts
Roybal-Allard
Sessions
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 5 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1317

Messrs. POE and HENSARLING changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the conference report 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. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1090, I was inadvertently absent from the floor at the time the Head Start for School Readiness Act [H.R. 1429] was voted. Had I been present, I would have vote in favor of said Act.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall vote No. 1090 on H.R. 1429, the Improving Head Start Act. I supported this measure as a member of the conference committee that drafted the final version of the bill and if I had been able to vote, I would have voted ''aye.''

PROTECT OUR CHILDREN ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3845, as amended, 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 Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3845, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 2, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 1091]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
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)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Broun (GA)
Flake

NOT VOTING—15

Brown-Waite, Ginny
Carson
Cubin
Davis, Tom
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doyle
Hastert
Jindal
Lewis (CA)
McCollum (MN)
Oberstar
Paul
Roybal-Allard
Sessions
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 3 minutes remaining in this vote.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1324

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIDS ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 719, as amended, 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 gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 719, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 1092]

YEAS—417

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
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)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Carson
Cubin
Davis, Tom
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doyle
Hastert
Jindal
Oberstar
Paul
Sessions
Simpson
Spratt
Sullivan
Tancredo
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 3 minutes remaining in this vote.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute is left in this vote.

□ 1331

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: ''A Bill to authorize additional appropriations for supervision of Internet access by sex offenders convicted under Federal law, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO CORRECT THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1429

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 258) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

H. CON. RES. 258

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 1429), An Act to reauthorize the Head Start Act, to improve program quality, to expand access, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall correct the bill by striking subsection (m)(1) of section 640 of the Head Start Act, as added by section 6(g) of the bill, and inserting the following:

''(1) to implement policies and procedures to ensure that homeless children are identified and prioritized for enrollment;''.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3074, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 817 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 817

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3074) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes. All points of

order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 817 under section 2 of H. Res. 491 because the resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against the conference report and its consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEINER). The gentleman from Arizona makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 2 of House Resolution 491.

Such a point of order made under that resolution shall be disposed of by the question of consideration under the same terms as specified in clause 9(b) of rule XXI.

The gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed, the gentleman from New York, each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

After that debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration, to wit: ''Will the House now consider the resolution?''

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Speaker.

And while the Speaker of the House is actually in the Chamber, I want to read a quote from March of this year. In March of this year, the Speaker of the House said, ''Before Members vote on a bill, there should be an appropriate time for people to read it. That should be a matter of public record. If there is an earmark that can stand the scrutiny, then that transparency will give the opportunity for it to be there.''

Let me just ask, if I can, the representative from the Rules Committee, don't we have a rule that says that we are not to consider a bill or a rule until 24 hours after the bill is actually out there? I would yield to the gentleman to answer.

My understanding is that this bill was posted on the Web last night at just after 7 o'clock, yet here we are at 1:35 already considering the rule. I think that is important, because when you look at the bill, we didn't just get it on the Internet where it would be searchable, where we could find things in it. We got a PDF file that is not searchable.

When you look at the bill itself, you find complete sections that have been X'd out, or little insertions with little notations here that are barely legible. You have another big insertion here of an entire page. Again, there are little insertions there within the insertion. You have within it ''3 percent'' stricken. It says ''4 percent'' now. To what?

This is really difficult to wade through. And when we don't even get 24 hours? I mean, 24 hours, frankly, is far from sufficient to consider a bill that is 531 pages long. Then when you consider the bill itself is not searchable, it was given in a PDF file, and then you also have 141 pages of earmarks that are part of the report. That is not a searchable index, either. It is just given. You can wade through it.

The earmarks that are air-dropped into the conference report are supposed to be asterisked. You can see some of those. We identified 21. But is that all there is? We're not sure. But when you look through that list of earmarks that were air-dropped in, you have to be suspicious of why in the world we waited until now to air-drop these earmarks in when nobody can challenge them.

Keep in mind, this is a point of order against consideration of the rule. Because the majority has chosen to waive the rule against points of order on the bill, we can't challenge any of the earmarks in the bill, so we have 21 earmarks air-dropped into the bill at the last minute that we have no ability to challenge.

You might think that, well, if they were air-dropped into the bill, then they certainly must be vital spending, vital projects, that we just couldn't do during the regular consideration of the bill.

I will read a couple of them and you can make your own decisions on whether or not this was vital spending, something that couldn't wait, something that was so important that you had to, at the last minute, in the last 24 hours, include it in where nobody could see it.

One is for $200,000 for the Intergenerational Research Center in Atlanta, Georgia, for a community center. The Intergenerational Research Center, Inc., Atlanta, Georgia, for a community center. This is part of the Economic Development Initiative.

Another one: Waynesburg College Center for Economic Development in Pennsylvania for a multipurpose facility. That is $300,000 there.

Tell me, please, somebody tell me, what was so vital here that we had to violate the rules that we have had in the House to insert this at the last minute, when nobody has the ability to challenge it?

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would like to point out to my friend and colleague from Arizona that this point of order is about whether or not to consider this rule, and ultimately to consider a measure that invests in our Nation's vital transportation infrastructure and housing program at a time when we desperately need it so much in this country. In fact, I would say it is simply an effort to try to kill this conference report, and on a faulty premise at that.

Every single earmark in this conference report has been properly disclosed in conformance with the House rules. The blanket waiver against consideration of the conference report did not include a waiver of either clause 9 or rule XXI of House Resolution 491.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Well, we've waived other requirements as well here. What this point of order is about is transparency. Again, we got this bill last night, less than 24 hours ago. It has always been the understanding you would have at least 24 hours, and we are violating that even.

When you look at the bill itself, here I found another page, section 409, we're not sure what was there, because it is now gone. It is gone from the bill. It is very difficult to go through a bill that is 534 pages that is not even searchable and wade through the earmarks.

The gentleman mentioned this is vital spending we have to get done. Let me give you an example of some of what is in the bill itself. $150,000 for the Atlanta Botanical Gardens in Atlanta, Georgia. $275,000 for the Berkshire Music Hall in Pittsfield, Massachusetts.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me clear up this issue here about the time requirements. The rules of the House say there shall be a 72-hour, or 3-day layover on these bills. That was waived. That was waived by the majority party. Then as a courtesy in their ''new directions,'' they say it should be at least 24 hours. So here they are even waiving a promise of a waiving of a rule of 3 days.

So I wanted to clarify that. It is supposed to be 3 days, that is the premise from which we start, and then we come down to a promise of 24 hours. They are even waiving that promise.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for that clarification.

Let me get back to this list of these vital projects that we somehow have to rush through here. There is $400,000 for the Bel Alton High School Alumni Association in Bel Alton, Maryland. Again, $400,000 for the Bel Alton High School Alumni Association. Why in the world is this in the bill at all? Is it any wonder that somebody wants to move this bill through quickly and without following the rules?

□ 1345

$500,000 for the Los Angeles Fire Museum in Bellflower, California; two earmarks totaling $300,000 to revitalize downtown Clearwater, Florida; $150,000 for the Edmunds Arts Center in Edmunds, Washington; $100,000 for Cooters Pond Park in Prattville, Alabama; $100,000 for the reuse of the Coca-Cola Bottling Plant in Romney, West Virginia; $100,000 for the Crystal Lake Art Center in Frankfort, Michigan; $750,000 to the Detroit Science Center in Detroit, Michigan; and $300,000 to the Houston, Zoo in Houston, Texas.

Again, this is just a tiny sliver of the 141 pages of earmarks in the bill, more than 1,000 of them. And again, 21 air-dropped earmarks that we have never

seen before, never had the ability to challenge on the House floor for such vital things as the Grand Teton National Park Pathway System in Wyoming. This may be a good project, but it should receive the scrutiny it deserves, not air-dropped into a report that we are given less than 24 hours to consider, that we have no ability, none, to amend out.

Or $500,000 for Park Street Streetscape Improvement in Alameda, California. Why in the world was this that vital where we had to violate our own rules to bring this to the floor and hide these earmarks where they don't see the light of day?

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to Mr. CAMPBELL from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Let's talk about what is really going on here. If somebody is an alcoholic, they understand they shouldn't drink. What they will do oftentimes is they will ask their friends to help them, you know, come in the house. Make sure I don't have any alcohol here. Keep me honest. Make sure I don't do this.

This Congress is drunk on earmarks. The majority party has said, well, we want to get better. We want to stop drinking. We want to stop doing these bad earmarks, so we set up a point of order on the bill so we can stop this.

But it is the equivalent of the alcoholic saying, I want you to help me, Mr. Speaker, and I want you to come check my house to make sure that I don't have any alcohol, but then locking the door so you can't go in and you can't look. That is what the majority party is doing here.

They say we have this point of order on earmarks, but we are waiving it. We are going to bury them in the bill so you can't see. The majority here in this Congress is not serious about controlling earmarks, and they should be, because of the ones that the gentleman from Arizona read, and whether it is teaching people how to play golf in the defense budget or monuments, to me, whatever it is. We have budget problems, we all agree. We disagree on how to take care of them. But one thing we must do is stop these earmarks, and the majority is not doing that.

Mr. FLAKE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEINER). The gentleman yields the balance of his time to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FLAKE. How much time remains on this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I did the math for you, sir; 1 minute remains.

Mr. FLAKE. I am glad to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. I appreciate my colleague for yielding. This is exactly what the American people are disgusted with. We can't balance the budget. We can't send the President appropriation bills that are within the budget. This bill is some $3.5 billion over the President's request. But having said that, we have all of these projects that didn't go through the House, didn't go through the Senate, that got air-dropped into a conference. And we wonder why the American people look at us like our heads have been cut off.

There is nobody in my district who would ever vote for any of these projects that got air-dropped into this bill. And we have this process, this point of consideration on these earmarks, on consideration of this bill, in exactly the time when we are supposed to have a better look at what these earmarks are.

All we have are these brief descriptions, if you can find them in the bill, because this bill should not be up on this floor until tonight. It is one thing to waive the 3-day rule, but the 24-hour rule, most Members believe, is almost sacrosanct. And yet, not even 24 hours after the bill was filed, it is on the floor of the House. Members don't know what is in it. That is why this point of order that we fought for this summer was put into effect.

I would urge my colleagues to vote for the gentleman's point of order to stop consideration of this bill so we have a chance to look and see what else is in here that we haven't seen, because this place is out of control.

Mr. FLAKE. In my remaining 30 seconds, let me just say, in January when we passed transparency rules on earmarks, I was the first one to compliment the majority on what they had done. We put some decent rules into play. But rules are only as good as your willingness to enforce them. And we have seen a pattern over the past several months culminating in this kind of thing, breaking the rules so we can bring a bill to the floor with 21 air-dropped earmarks into it where we are simply not following our own rules.

This institution deserves better than this. I plead with my colleagues to vote to stop this bill from moving forward until we can actually see what's in it.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague on the Rules Committee for yielding to me.

I think my friend from Arizona raises issues, and sometimes it is not clear with reference to earmarks. I don't recall hearing too many people argue about the earmarks that the President of the United States has within the prerogative of the President. Two-thirds of Federal spending is nondiscretionary. And in a budget the size of ours, which is $2.9 trillion, that means discretionary funds in this particular budget are about $935 billion.

What they fail to do in their point of order or that we hear in the Rules Committee is to say to the general public that the name of the Member requesting the earmark exists, the name and address of the intended recipient, and if there is no specifically intended recipient, the intended location of the activity, the purpose of such earmark, a certification that the Member or spouse has no financial interest in such congressional earmark, and it requires the House Appropriations Committee to make open for public inspection approved earmarks.

Now each of these earmarks has an asterisk and each of these earmarks is easily identifiable. Clearly, there are things that people disagree with as to whether or not in the particular constituency that that constituency is going to benefit.

Democrats cut in half the number of earmarks. I believe my friend from Arizona knows that when this measure was sent to the Senate, the Senate increased the number of earmarks that are here. But I don't care whether you call it earmark, toe mark, arm mark, elbow mark, whatever it is, it is something that benefits the American people. And in a budget that has $2 trillion in it, we can find some reason for us to control that as opposed to the executive branch.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, we must consider this conference report which provides funding for our Nation's priorities. For example, Community Development Block Grants to provide communities with funds to assist low and moderate-income persons; housing for the elderly, disabled, and homeless veterans; foreclosure mitigation and reconstruction of the Minnesota bridge and the repair of aging bridges throughout our Nation that is desperately needed.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the new House Democratic majority has implemented the most honest and open earmark rule in the history of the United States House of Representatives. But don't take my word for it. A few weeks ago, Ryan Alexander, president of Taxpayers for Commonsense, was quoted in CQ Weekly as saying, ''The House has given us more information than we have ever had before on earmarks, and they deserve credit for that.''

I am troubled with the analogy given by my colleague from California comparing it to a drinking problem. I would say the comparison, considering the way the Republicans abused the process, would be to a person who started a fire, then called the fire department, and when the fire department came and put out the fire, they then turned around and criticized the fire department for the way that the fire was put out.

That is the situation that they have. They abused the earmarks when they were in control of the House, and now they are critical of our majority when we attempt to fix it. It is important to remember which side actually abused the earmark process and who actually stepped up to the plate to reform the system and provide transparency.

We didn't wait until 2 months before the election. We responded to the people's call for more openness on the first day of Congress. It seems quite clear to me that the minority is more concerned with obstructionism, while we are focused on actually meeting the needs of our constituents and the people in this country.

This question of consideration is the result of an unwarranted point of order against our rule. A ''no'' vote will prevent consideration of a critical package that has strong House and Senate bipartisan support.

So despite whatever roadblock the other side tries to use to block this bill, we will stand up for housing and we will stand up for the critical infrastructure upon which our economy depends. We must consider this rule and we must pass this conference report today.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' to consider this rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

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

Mr. FLAKE. 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, this 15-minute vote on the question of consideration will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 186, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 1093]

YEAS—197

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

NAYS—186

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—49

Barton (TX)
Bishop (GA)
Blunt
Boucher
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Buyer
Carson
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cubin
Davis, Tom
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doyle
Hastert
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Langevin
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
Lynch
Meeks (NY)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Oberstar
Paul
Payne
Rangel
Rush
Scott (GA)
Sessions
Shays
Smith (NJ)
Taylor
Turner
Udall (CO)
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weller
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are less than 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1414

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1093, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 2007, I was participating in an Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearing and inadvertently missed 1 recorded vote.

I take my voting responsibility very seriously. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on recorded vote number 1093.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, November 14, 2007, I was unavoidably detained and thus I missed rollcall votes No. 1090 through 1093. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

On rollcall vote NO. 1090, on Adoption of the Conference Report on H.R. 1429, the Head Start for School Readiness Act, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 1091, on H.R. 3845, the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2007, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 1092, on H.R. 719, the KIDS Act of 2007, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 1093, on H. Res. 817, Providing for consideration of the conference report on H.R. 3074, Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development and Related Agencies Appropriations for FY 2008, I would have voted "nay."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 181, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 1094]

YEAS—221

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Buyer
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Heller
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Whitfield
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—181

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Goode
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Gohmert
Tancredo

NOT VOTING—28

Brown, Corrine
Carson
Cubin
Davis, Tom
Dicks
Doyle
Feeney
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Jindal
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Knollenberg
Levin
Linder
McCrery
Oberstar
Paul
Rush
Schiff
Serrano
Sessions
Udall (CO)
Weller
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are less than 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1420

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1093 and 1094 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on both votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3074, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, for purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of this rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on House Resolution 817.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 817 provides for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3074, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the ranking member for bringing a conference report to the floor that makes critical investment in our Nation's transportation infrastructure at levels guaranteed in SAFETEA-LU.

The conference report also rejects the administration's proposed funding cuts to the Federal Aviation Administration's Airport Improvement Program, highway programs, and critical housing and community development programs.

The conference report provides $151 million more than current funding for the FAA, $765 million more than the President's request for FAA Airport Improvement Program, which provides grants for airport planning, construction and development.

Recipients of AIP funds such as Griffiss Park Airfield in my upstate New York district have benefited greatly from this program. Over the last few years, AIP funds have helped Griffiss continue to fully develop as a regional aviation facility, become the new home for the Oneida County Airport, create long-term regional economic growth for a region seeking to attract new investment.

The conference report also maintains our commitment to keeping our airways safe by providing $7 billion for air traffic organization, including $16 million to hire more than 1,400 new air traffic controllers to replenish the work force as the rate of retiring air traffic controllers continues to grow, and provides critical funding to hire and train more safety inspectors and for other aviation safety activities.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report provides $3.5 billion more than current

levels for the Transportation Department. These additional funds will provide for much needed investments in our Nation's highways, road construction and repair, and transportation safety.

This conference report boosts funding for the Federal Transit Administration by providing $227 million more than the President's request for mass transit programs. Local transit authorities, such as the Central New York Regional Transit Authority and Centro in my district, will now be able to expand their hybrid bus fleet and continue to provide low-cost, convenient, clean and energy-efficient transportation services to commuters in both upstate New York and in New York City.

This conference report also increases funding for the Housing and Urban Development Department by $3.1 billion above the President's request.

The President's budget request sought to eliminate funding for the HOPE VI program, but I am so pleased that this legislation will maintain our commitment to providing affordable housing for the many disadvantaged individuals across our country, individuals that still struggle daily to meet their family's needs, even while working full-time jobs.

In 2003, the City of Utica, New York was the recipient of an $11.5 million HOPE VI grant for revitalization of a local residential community. This grant has allowed for significant improvements in safety and greater access to service and facilities for its residents. It would be a shame if similar communities around the country were unable to reap the benefits of the HOPE VI program.

The conference report restores funding for the Community Development Block Grant program, which this administration has cut since 2001 by nearly 35 percent. This conference report provides $922 million more than the President's request for CDBG grants, which allow local governments in cities such as Utica, Rome and Auburn, New York to provide critical service to revitalize neighborhoods, promote economic development and improve quality of life for those starved of financial resources.

Localities across my upstate New York district rely on CDBG funds to support vital redevelopment efforts that improve housing, assist local businesses, and offer services that promote safety and reduce crime. CDBG funds have been used by the City of Utica to prepare sites like those in the Corn Hill area for new housing construction by demolishing existing structures, replacing antiquated sewer lines, planting trees, constructing new sidewalks and curbs and paving streets, improving the quality of life for all the citizens of that city.

CDBG funds have been used in the City of Auburn to provide small business assistance loans to help new businesses make it through their first critical year of start-up, retain their employees, and grow their business. CDBG funds are also used by Auburn to support after-school programs, child care subsidies, and even counseling for children in crisis.

In the City of Rome, these funds are also used to assist new small businesses and also to assist low- to moderate-income persons make needed health and safety improvements to their homes, such as helping seniors with the installation of ramps and railings that allow them to remain living in their homes, and helping people deal with emergencies like failure and roof collapse. These are important parts of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there are, I'm certain, very important programs that are funded by the legislation being brought forth today. And without any doubt, the Transportation and HUD appropriations bill is one of the most important appropriations bills that we face and we consider and we pass every year.

What is unfortunate is that it has been brought forth, it has been brought to this floor by the majority in a manner that is consistent with a pattern that is most unfortunate, objectionable.

As a matter of fact, that pattern, another aspect of that pattern is the subject of an editorial today by a newspaper that analyzes and informs on a daily basis with regard to this Congress. The newspaper is called Roll Call, and it has an editorial today about another aspect of the pattern that is most unfortunate and that we're seeing with the way in which this, albeit, very important piece of legislation is being brought forth today. Because it wasn't until, and we'll talk a little bit about the other aspect of the pattern that is the object of the Roll Call editorial in a minute. But with regard to this legislation, it was publicly available at 7 p.m., approximately, last night for the first time.

□ 1430

By the way, not in a very accessible way, in a format that's not very accessible: it was put online. There was no way to look at all of the legislation in that manner, in the format in which it was made available around 7 p.m. last night.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the rules of the House, there is a requirement that before an appropriations bill is considered by this House, 3 days, 72 hours, must pass. That rule was waived by the majority in the Rules Committee last night.

Now, in addition to that rule, there is a custom and a custom that is repeatedly made reference to. As a matter of fact, it's not only custom, but in the promises made by the new majority in a document during the campaign the last election, the new majority in a document entitled ''A New Direction for America,'' they talked about that at the very least, if not 3 days for an appropriations bill to be able to be considered by the membership before it is brought forth that there should be at least 24 hours. I read from the document ''A New Direction for America'': ''Members should have at least 24 hours to examine bill and conference reports texts prior to floor consideration.''

So not only do we not have the 3 days because that's waived by the rule, it's a rule but it was waived by the majority of the Rules Committee, which is what we saw last night, but, in addition, not even the 24 hours now for Members to be able to look at the legislation that is before them. Most unfortunate. It violates the promise of the majority in addition to what I would say is an elemental required fairness for this process to work.

Now, I talked about the pattern. It's not just the lack of 24-hour notice; it's a pattern. Let's look at Roll Call today. They talk about the fact that there have been multiple threats by the majority to restrict something that hasn't been restricted since 1822, and that is one of the few legislative means, procedural means by which the minority can seek to amend legislation, and it's called, Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit. And that hasn't been restricted since 1822. The majority has repeatedly now during this year, the first year of this Congress, this year that is already coming to an end, it's talked about that it wants to restrict that right that the minority has, one of the few vehicles that the minority has had since 1822 to try to amend legislation.

Roll Call, a newspaper, Mr. Speaker, that covers what we do here, observes us very carefully, has an editorial in today's edition: ''Despite promises to manage the House on a more open basis than Republicans did during their 12-year rule,'' Roll Call says today in an editorial, ''Democrats have prohibited any floor amendments at more than double the rate of the previous Congress.''

And then Roll Call goes on to ask the Democrats not to do what they have threatened to do, and that is restrict the procedural vehicle that has been available and unrestricted since 1822, the motion to recommit. So note, Mr. Speaker, the pattern.

Now, I wish, I really wish, because of the importance of the programs funded by this legislation that we could discuss those programs. But when we are seeing this pattern of unfairness, of constant tightening, restricting the legislative process despite, and in contrast to, the promises made by the majority included in this ''A New Direction for America'' where they said, well, if we're not going to give 3 days, which is what the rules require, because sometimes we might have to waive that in the interest of time, then at least 24 hours. So, no, this legislation, the first time it was posted was 7 p.m. That's when it could be seen.

By the way, I am informed by people who are a lot more expert than I am at the format by which the legislation was posted at 7 p.m. that at 7 p.m. with that format, the details of the legislation could not be accessed. So really, Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about is a lot less than even that time if we wouldn't have come to the floor until 7 p.m., which is what the New Direction for America promised, the majority repeatedly promised, and which would have been elementally fair in addition to in compliance with the promise of the majority.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would ask my friend, and he is my friend, Mr. ARCURI from New York, how many speakers he has wishing to speak.

Mr. ARCURI. I have no other speakers.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 150, nays 244, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 1095]

YEAS—150

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Pearce
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Wamp
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—244

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—38

Baker
Capuano
Cardoza
Carson
Cubin
Davis, Tom
Doyle
Hastert
Higgins
Jindal
Levin
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McMorris Rodgers
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Moran (VA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Paul
Pence
Poe
Radanovich
Roskam
Ruppersberger
Sessions
Smith (WA)
Souder
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there is less than 1½ minutes remaining.

□ 1456

Messrs. BRALEY of Iowa, ROTHMAN and HINCHEY, and Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mrs. MYRICK changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. TURNER and BARTLETT of Maryland changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1095, I was unable to vote due to medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3074, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will be asking for a ''no'' vote on the previous question so that we can amend this rule and move toward passing a conference report on the bipartisan Military Construction-Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act.

The House passed the veterans and military funding bill on June 15 by a vote of 409–2, with the Senate following suit and naming conferees on September 6. Unfortunately, the majority leadership in the House has refused to move the Military Construction-Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act. They have even refused to name conferees.

Now, the question that is begged, Mr. Speaker, is why has the majority decided to hold off on moving this bill that obviously has such bipartisan support. Well, according to several publications, including this one, Roll Call, the majority intends to hold off sending appropriations bills to President Bush so that they can use the veto of the Labor-HHS appropriations bill to serve as ''an extension of their successful public relations campaign on the SCHIP program.''

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield for one moment?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Yes, I will yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. DREIER. Was that quote that my friend provided something that was written by Republican staff members? Where exactly did that come from?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Roll Call.

Mr. DREIER. Oh, okay. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Reclaiming my time, fortunately that purely political move, Mr. Speaker, failed last week when the Senate removed the Military Construction-Veterans Affairs bill from the Labor-HHS bill.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, the Republican leader, Mr. BOEHNER, took a step toward naming House Republican conferees. Now the distinguished Speaker must follow suit and take the steps necessary to ensure that work can begin on writing the final veterans funding bill that can be enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, every day that the majority chooses not to act on this bill, veterans lose $18.5 million. Our veterans deserve better than partisan gamesmanship holding back their funding.

I urge my colleagues to help move this important legislation and oppose the previous question.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I will yield to my friend.

□ 1500

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I would just like to ask him to clarify one more time before we vote on this issue, I think this is going to be the 11th time we have had an opportunity to vote on this.

I have just been reminded by our crack Rules Committee staff that this is, in fact, the 12th time that this House has had the opportunity to vote on this issue. I guess the second or third time in Veterans Week. We have just marked the date on which we honor our Nation's veterans, and this House has repeatedly, repeatedly denied us the opportunity to move ahead and get the very much-needed assistance to our Nation's veterans. I think that this vote is going to be critically important in our quest to move that effort forward.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank my friend. I think that it is critically important that we get this legislation passed as soon as possible and sent to the President. It is the 12th time that we have attempted in this House to get this bill sent to the President. Mr. Speaker, obviously this is critically important legislation, a critically important moment. And so I urge my colleagues to help move the important veterans legislation along by opposing the previous question.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, if the American people have just heard the last colloquy between my two colleagues, perhaps they wouldn't have understood that when my two colleagues were in the majority in this House, for 12 years, the last time they passed a Veterans appropriation bill on time wasn't in 2005, 2004, no, not in 2003 either, not in 2002, not in 2001. You have to go back to 1996 to find when they passed an appropriations bill for veterans on time.

I can understand why the gentleman wouldn't want the facts to get out to the people who might have just watched him on television have a colloquy that was not factual in explaining the fact that when he was chairman of the Rules Committee, it was 11 years ago when they last passed a Veterans appropriation bill on time.

Mr. Speaker, let me also point out they forgot conveniently, perhaps convenient political memory here, they forgot conveniently to explain to the people listening that under the Democratic leadership we have passed $8.1 billion of increase in veterans funding this year, most of that going to veterans health care, the largest in the history of America.

One final point, Mr. Speaker. The two gentlemen also forgot to make one other point, and that is that as they chastise this Congress as being a little over 1 month late in passing the Veterans bill, even though we have already passed an $8.1 billion increase, they forgot to tell the American people that last year they didn't pass the VA bill in October, not in November, not in December. In fact, they adjourned the Congress for their Christmas holiday without passing the Veterans appropriation bill.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. My parliamentary inquiry is as follows: When I asked the gentleman if he had any further speakers before yielding back the reminder of our time, I was informed that he did not. Is it correct for the gentleman to say that he has no further speakers, and then after, based on that statement, I yield back our time, he yields to someone else in contradiction to what he has told me?

Is that appropriate, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is free to yield his time as he sees fit.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Is that appropriate, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. ARCURI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would also point out that the gentleman from Florida indicated that he had no further speakers, and he recognized the gentleman from California.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I didn't recognize. I yielded. No. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York controls the time, and the gentleman is recognized.

Mr. ARCURI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Additionally, I would like to point out that whenever anybody makes factually incorrect statements on the floor, I am going to yield to my colleagues to make sure that the record is made clear, and that is why I yielded to Mr. EDWARDS on that point.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, the Transportation-HUD appropriations bill, like very few other things that we as a body deal with, deals and helps and touches many, many millions of Americans, whether it is CDBG money that goes to help the elderly make a senior center more accessible, or whether it is fixing our roads that thousands of commuters travel on every day, it is a bill that is critically important. All we have heard from the other side of the aisle are procedural reasons why we shouldn't go forward. That is what the American people are tired of. They are tired of the process, the procedure. They want action. They want things accomplished.

During the break, I had an opportunity to talk to my friend and colleague from Wisconsin, Representative KAGEN, and he made a good point. He said, you know, while we spend billions of dollars in Iraq, and no one talks about it, we hear all kinds of complaints when we try to spend millions of dollars domestically on programs that help Americans, needy Americans, people that need it most.

Mr. Speaker, that's why we need to pass this rule. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 817 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. The House disagrees to the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2642, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference requested by the Senate thereon. The Speaker shall appoint conferees immediately, but may declare a recess under clause 12(a) of rule I for the purpose of consulting the Minority Leader prior to such appointment. The motion to instruct conferees otherwise in order pending the appointment of conferees instead shall be in order only at a time designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within two additional legislative days after adoption of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 195, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 1096]

AYES—221

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

NOES—195

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Cannon
Carson
Cleaver
Cubin
Doyle
Hastert
Jindal
Levin
Oberstar
Paul
Ruppersberger
Sessions
Towns
Udall (CO)
Weller
Wilson (OH)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are less than 2 minutes remaining on this vote. Members are further reminded to stay in the Chamber. There are votes immediately following this one.

□ 1526

Mr. PEARCE changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1096, I was unable to vote due to medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote on the previous question.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Did the gentleman cast a vote on the prevailing side?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, yes, I did.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. ARCURI

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 196, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 1097]

AYES—221

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

NOES—196

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kaptur
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Carson
Cubin
Doyle
Hastert
Jindal
Levin
Oberstar
Paul
Reyes
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sessions
Udall (CO)
Weller
Wilson (OH)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are less than 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1534

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1097, I was unable to vote due to medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 194, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 1098]

AYES—224

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

Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—194

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Carson
Cubin
Doyle
Granger
Hastert
Jindal
Levin
Oberstar
Paul
Ruppersberger
Sessions
Udall (CO)
Weller
Wilson (OH)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded they have less than 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1540

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1098, I was unable to vote due to medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Did the gentleman cast his vote on the prevailing side?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Yes, I did.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. ARCURI

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 194, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 1099]

AYES—213

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

NOES—194

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—25

Bean
Berman
Blackburn
Carnahan
Carson
Cubin
Cuellar
Dicks
Doyle
Gutierrez
Issa
Jindal
Levin
Linder
Moore (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Oberstar
Paul
Ruppersberger
Sessions
Sires
Taylor
Udall (CO)
Weller
Wilson (OH)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote).

□ 1547

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1099, I was unable to vote due to medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3074, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 817, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 3074) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 817, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 13, 2007, at page H13598.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 3074.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 3074. Before I explain the contents of the conference report, however, I would like to thank my ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan, JOE KNOLLENBERG, for his great help in crafting a well-balanced Transportation and Housing bill. JOE and I have put together a strong bipartisan bill that will help address the Nation's important transportation and housing needs.

I think JOE and I have been a good team and I look forward to working closely with him again next year. I would also like to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for all of their hard work. On the minority side, Dena Baron and Dave Gibbons and Jeff Goff. And on the majority side, Kate Hallahan, our clerk; Cheryle Tucker; David Napoliello; Laura Hogshead; Alex Gillen; Mark Fedor and Bob Letteney. They performed well under stress and trying circumstances, and without their dedication we would not be here today debating this bill.

Mr. Speaker, Members can and should be proud of this bill because it provides critical investments in our Nation's transportation and housing infrastructure, and does so within a fiscally sound manner and within our conference allocation.

Unlike some other issues we debate in Congress, transportation and housing have a long history of bipartisanship, and I hope we can continue in that spirit of bipartisanship today.

At their core, both transportation and housing have a direct impact on the people we represent. All of us are affected by congestion on our roads, travel delays in our airports, and the lack of dependable public transportation. We also all benefit from community development investments and the availability of affordable housing in our communities. This bill in so many ways affects each and every one of us.

Let me briefly explain some of the highlights of the conference report.

For the first time in 13 years, our bill includes $75 million for the Veterans Affairs Supported Housing program, commonly known as VASH, to provide roughly 10,000 housing vouchers and supportive services to homeless veterans.

While we do not know the exact number of homeless veterans, the Veterans Administration has estimated that there were as many as 196,000 during a point-in-time count just last year. Surely we can all agree that 10,000 homeless veterans are 10,000 too many homeless veterans. Even one homeless veteran is a homeless veteran too many.

We have also included $30 million for about 4,000 new housing vouchers for the disabled, the first new housing vouchers for the disabled in 5 years. The need for housing for the disabled has been well documented, with average housing rents rising much faster than a disabled person's monthly supplemental security income, SSI.

Secondly, the bill provides $250 million to help with the current foreclosure crisis. We have included $200 million over the President's request for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, a recognized national intermediary between lenders and homeowners, to help individuals and families forestall foreclosure and keep their homes. A separate $50 million is provided for HUD's housing counseling program to help new potential home buyers avoid future foreclosures.

According to the Mortgage Bankers Association, the second quarter of this year saw the highest percentage of mortgages go into foreclosure since 1972. Many of those foreclosures and delinquencies are due to the proliferation of subprime and other adjustable-rate loans. With 2 million subprime mortgages expected to reset over the next 18 months, the number of homeowners facing delinquency is staggering in many parts of the country.

The funds included in this bill for foreclosure counseling is the first major Federal investment into this growing crisis. The President has stated on a number of occasions that he wants to help solve this problem. If he is serious, he would sign this bill into law and help many tens of thousands of families receive the help they need to manage their finances and the refinancing of their mortgage so they can keep their homes.

In addition, the bill also makes significant investment in our transportation infrastructure. The Minnesota bridge tragedy put a national spotlight in the State, on the state of America's transportation infrastructure, especially with the number of lives lost in that tragedy. More than 20,000 out of some 100,000-plus bridges on the national highway system are characterized as "structurally deficient" or "functionally obsolete." Traffic on these bridges is over 190 million trips per day.

The conference report includes an additional billion dollars over the President's request for the bridge program as a downpayment to help States fix their long list of substandard bridges; $195 million is specifically included for the I–35 bridge in Minnesota, which alone carried 140,000 passenger vehicles per day. And that sum will make Minnesota whole for the full replacement of that Interstate 35 bridge in Minneapolis.

Those are the new initiatives, but there are numerous other positive transportation and housing investments in this bill. The bill honors the highway guarantees which were set in the authorization bill in 2005, the SAFETEA–LU authorizing bill which was brought forward by the now minority just 2 years ago. That guarantee provides a record level of investment in transit as well. This funding will improve the Nation's transportation and infrastructure and is expected to create close to 80,000 new jobs between highways and transit.

The bill also provides $1.375 billion for Amtrak, plus an additional $75 million for a new intercity passenger rail program to create a faster, safer, and more reliable intercity passenger rail system. That $75 million was requested by the President.

We have included $3.5 billion for the Airport Improvement Program, the same as last year, for critical airport safety capacity and security upgrades.

We have also provided almost $3.8 billion for Community Development Block Grants, the extremely popular CDBG program, which is $100 million above fiscal year 2007 but still $400 million below the fiscal year 2001 level. It is estimated that every dollar of community block grant funding leverages $3 in private investment for critical community and economic development priorities in over a thousand localities around the country.

The bill restores housing for the elderly and disabled to last year's level. And finally, we have provided enough funding to ensure that no one that has

a section 8 tenant or project-based housing voucher will lose that voucher in this fiscal 2008 year.

Mr. Speaker, transportation and housing is not a Republican, not a Democratic issue. A broad consensus exists affirming the great needs for transportation and infrastructure investment and affordable housing nationwide. As such, this budget should be above partisan politics and should be passed and signed into law. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to adopt the conference report.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Chairman OLVER, has already detailed many of the aspects of the fiscal year 2008 conference report. I am pleased to say that I will support the conference report. The conference report has much to commend. I want to thank JOHN OLVER; JOHN and JOE I guess is what it amounts to. But we have worked together very hard on this, along with the staffs on both sides, and I commend him for working with us to bring this product forward.

We meet the majority of the transportation funding guarantee as mandated by SAFETEA–LU, plus included some wise legislative provisions such as raising the airline pilot mandatory retirement age to 65 and prohibiting towing on Federal roads in Texas.

We didn't go overboard on funding Amtrak and kept the reforms we put in place 2 years ago in hopes of bringing the railroad into the modern age. One unfortunate point I would like to make is one of the Transit New Starts Project, a project for the Chicago area's commuter rail, Metra, the UP West Line, was inadvertently not included in the bill. It was funded in the House bill, and in the negotiations all sides supported conference funding, and I am very hopeful we can work a little magic to get that included.

In housing, we provided more than $100 million for about 11,000 new incremental vouchers for three of our most vulnerable populations: veterans, including those returning from Iraq who might face homelessness without rental assistance; nonelderly disabled individuals, the so-called Frelinghuysen vouchers; and vouchers to keep families together when facing homelessness rather than forcing the children into foster homes.

Further, the bill insists that these vouchers retain their use and purpose upon turnover when the current individuals and families no longer need them.

The vouchers for veterans are important and will certainly be welcomed throughout Michigan as well as the rest of the country. I want to note the intent here is not just for HUD to administer these vouchers, but for HUD and VA to work together so that the full array of eligible services are coordinated and administered jointly.

□ 1600

Along that same line, I strongly support a new demonstration in the homeless program to avoid forcing children through the trauma of homeless shelters by rapidly rehousing these families in secure rental units and providing the care and training in that setting, rather than through the shelter plus care process. We need to be sure, however, that in doing so we do not end up subsidizing drug or other illegal activity.

I want to also express my appreciation for the provision in the bill that waives the Medicaid cap on income and allows citizens in Michigan to voluntarily pay more and still receive rental assistance. This has made a tremendous difference in my district, and the new statewide provision will apply to all Michigan residents. Obviously, it is available for consideration in other states, too.

As many of my colleagues know, Michigan has been facing a severe credit crunch due to defaults and foreclosures resulting from the subprime lending boom a few years ago. The resets are around the corner and the problem may well get worse for Michigan before it gets better. But no one wants to see foreclosure, not the homeowner, not the banks, and certainly not the Federal Government which has insured many of these loans.

As a result and through extensive collaboration with my colleague, Chairman OLVER, and our Senate counterparts, we included a provision that I am sure will go a long way towards stemming if not reversing the trend in the home mortgage market. We have included $200 million in new funds for intensive and extensive loan foreclosure mitigation guidance plus counseling and targeted funds to those areas which are facing the largest threat of foreclosure.

We have ensured that the funds will be in the hands of the expert counselors and State housing finance agencies before the loan resets dates hit homeowners who will find it difficult to meet the higher payments. We have not placed the funds in HUD, or created a financial handout for mortgage companies or homeowners. Instead, we are using the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, which is in itself expert and has a network of expert loan counselors throughout the country. As a federally chartered corporation, they will be able to avoid the many delaying regulatory hurdles that would result if funded through HUD, but still must meet all the requirements to ensure the integrity of the funds provided to expert counseling agencies. I firmly believe that Michigan will benefit greatly from the one-time funding being provided in this bill to help at-risk homeowners get through this difficult period.

Having said that, there are clearly areas in the bill that could and should be reduced in funding or for which funding should be allocated.

All of us have heard about the shortfall that HUD now faces in meeting contracts with longstanding low-income assistance providers under the project-based section 8 program. While better than the Senate bill, let's face it, we did not solve the problem. We only delayed the date at which the crisis will occur. Yet at the same time, the voucher program has $300 million in excess funds based on the new methodology instituted by the majority as part of the 2007 continuing resolution. Apparently the majority does not trust their new methodology that much, yet those funds could have further reduced the shortfall that HUD faces with project owners under the project-based program, or reduced the cost of the bill itself.

Furthermore, the Department continues to receive funds for a long list of small boutique and duplicative programs, all of which could be eliminated as the administration requested without harming any of the program.

Finally, I want to emphasize that there are no new air-dropped earmarks from the House minority.

I want to thank my colleague and chairman, Chairman OLVER, for his work on this bill. I have to say he was most fair. This was a very inclusive conference and, because of his cooperation and the highlights of the bill, I will be voting ''yes'' on passage of the conference report.

I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time 3 minutes to the vice chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. PASTOR from Arizona.

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

Mr. PASTOR. I thank my chairman, JOHN OLVER, for recognizing me.

First of all, I want to congratulate Chairman OLVER and Ranking Member KNOLLENBERG for the fine work they have done on this bill. It is quite an accomplishment. If you look at last year, we were not able to conference the bill and here we are talking about a bill that has been conferenced with the Senate. Both the chairman and the ranking member have talked about some of the programs that have been given additional funding, but I would like to talk about a few that this bill starts a new initiative.

One is a program that the railroad administrator spoke to us about at one of our hearings, and that is the ability of the Federal Railroad Administration being able to provide grants to have intercity connection by rail. And in Arizona, it is a program that we are looking forward to see implemented. As you may know, Arizona is growing very quickly, and the two metro areas, the Phoenix metro area and the Tucson metro area, in a very short time are going to be growing into each other, and there is a great need to connect them because the freeway that connects them today is no longer efficient.

So by applying for these grants, hopefully we will be able to connect 90 percent of the Arizona population with a rail.

With the possibility of that connection, then there is a possibility that Arizona may be connected with Amtrak. So it is an initiative that this conference bill brings forward that those of us in Arizona are very happy to see implemented, especially in this city-to-city rail connection.

For those of us who were local elected officials, I am very happy to report that CDBG is in this bill and will receive additional money, so local officials can use these monies to develop the social infrastructure that is needed in many of our locations that do not have the economic development activity that other parts of the city has.

The other initiative I want to talk about is one that you will begin to see cooperation with the Federal Transit Authority and HUD. As the transit lines are being developed, there are initiatives in this bill that will encourage the development of affordable housing and development of small businesses along the transit line. This is something that, again, those of us who have transit lines that are being developed, that with these initiatives we can develop affordable housing, because many of the people who will be on the transit lines are people that will be going to work and in many cases need to have the affordable housing that the transit line will bring it.

I congratulate both the chairman and the ranking member for this fine bill, and I ask for its passage.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio, MARCY KAPTUR, a senior member of our subcommittee and someone who has been very much involved in planning for communities over the years.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the chairman very much for the time, Chairman OLVER and Ranking Member KNOLLENBERG, for just a fantastic effort on this conference report. Let me say I rise in full support.

There are so many programs in it, such as our community development block grant program which helps over 1,180 communities across this country. We have been able to provide $3.79 billion in this bill, which is still, though responsible, $400 million less than we spent as a country in 2001, with many of our cities finding revenues on the decline or stuck because of the condition of the economy. So I know many of our mayors will welcome this.

I rise especially to point to the programs dealing with housing counseling, $250 million in this bill through the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, dollars to be disbursed within the next 60 days to help parts of the country that are just suffering so greatly because of the home mortgage foreclosure crisis.

There is no more important form of savings that any American family can have than their home. What has been happening across our country is we not only have a negative savings rate, but now we have a $1 trillion housing crisis in which hundreds of thousands of people have lost their homes or are about to lose their homes. This $250 million that is included in this bill that will go through the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for counseling will help to try to allow some of these families to retain their homes as these mortgages are reset.

Frankly, I have been so disappointed in HUD's just sitting on the dime. As FEMA sat on the dime as people drowned in Louisiana, we've got people drowning all across this country because they're losing their homes and there's been no action. So we hope that this housing effort will make a big difference in helping them to be able to maintain their largest form of savings.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention the program for housing for special populations in this bill. There is a total of 7,500 vouchers for homeless veterans that are living in missions across this country, that are in our jails, that are on the streets. Surely we can do better than this as the American people. There are also 4,000 vouchers in the bill for the nonelderly disabled and another 4,000 vouchers for families with children, where children are separated from their families because the families have no housing. Ask yourself the question, how well will that child perform in school when their home situation is so uncertain that they don't even know where they're going to stay at night?

I think that this bill provides some important stimulus to the housing sector, and the funding that we have provided is certainly not enough in view of what we are facing as an economy as funds are drained away from our communities as a result of this subprime lending crisis, but at least we have done something in this bill to recognize that there ought to be dispatch in the subprime lending market, and if HUD can't do a very good job of it, then let's let the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation try to deal with these families that are dropping off the edge. I know that our mayors and those involved in housing for special populations will see this bill as a step forward.

I compliment the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for moving this legislation.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) who has been very helpful with thoughts and suggestions about how transportation and housing should fit together in the planning of communities.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, as I deeply appreciate the work that the subcommittee has done. This is not just about spending money; it's about spending money right.

It is important that resources are being focused to being able to ''fix it first,'' to be able to deal with the fraying of our Nation's infrastructure. As the gentleman pointed out, there are 100 million trips on tens of thousands of substandard bridges across the country.

There is an important step in this legislation to have more robust funding for Amtrak. We have avoided the problems of past sessions where we have come through here to have an ideological battle fought about how somehow the United States should be the only country in the world without government-supported rail passenger service. Given skyrocketing oil prices and congestion in our highways, people understand that that is a prescription for disaster. I appreciate the hard work of the committee coming forward with a proposal to help put a floor underneath the rail passenger infrastructure, not making a difference just for Arizona but throughout the country.

I appreciate looking at the big picture. The committee's willingness to look at how land use, housing, and transportation fit together to coax maximum advantage out of those investments is very, very important.

□ 1615

I hope that we can continue to work with the subcommittee, with the whole Appropriations Committee, with the authorizing committees to be able to get more out of these investments.

Last but not least, it should be pointed out that this will be the last budget that we'll be able to have with the transportation funding at this level. The refusal of the administration to work with us to increase transportation investment in the last Congress resulted in a reauthorization level that is higher than the trust fund can support. We're going to be running out of money here in a couple of months. That means that the task of the subcommittee will be extraordinarily difficult, given the slow payout rate of transportation funding. It means you're going to have to cut probably four times the amount of the deficit this next year, and it's going to be even greater in subsequent years. So I'm hopeful that, working with the subcommittee dealing with appropriations and with Ways and Means, with the authorizers, we can come forward to make sure that we don't lose the opportunity to make the right investments in transportation and housing, because these are going to help us with greenhouse gases. These are going to help us with economic development, with energy efficiency. It's a tall order ahead of us, but I appreciate the foundation that the subcommittee has laid, and look forward to working with them.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like, at this point, to enter into the

RECORD a couple of letters which we have from public organizations. One is Americans for Transportation Mobility. And this is an organization which is an umbrella of the American Public Transportation Association; the American Road and Transportation Builders Association; the Associated Equipment Distributors; the Associated Equipment Manufacturers; Associated General Contractors; American Society of Civil Engineers; International Union of Operating Engineers; Laborers International Union of North America; the National Asphalt Pavement Association; National Construction Alliance; National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association; and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, who are cosigners on this letter of support for H.R. 3074.

And I have, secondly, a letter from the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, commonly known as AASHTO. I think every one of us who has ever worked at the State levels of public funding, as well as the national levels, understands what AASHTO is. And this is a letter of support signed by the executive director of AASHTO, also in support of the conference report on H.R. 3074. And I offer that for inclusion in the RECORD.

AMERICANS FOR TRANSPORTATION MOBILITY,
Washington, DC, November 14, 2007.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The Americans for Transportation Mobility (ATM) Coalition strongly urges you to support the conference report for H.R. 3074, the ''Transportation Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008.''

H.R. 3074 honors the commitments to capital investment in highway and public transportation infrastructure made by Congress in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA–LU) and will not increase the federal budget deficit. Although H.R. 3074 under-funds public transportation by $81 million, the ATM Coalition still feels strongly that this conference report should pass as a stand alone measure in order to maintain and improve the nation's highway and public transportation systems in fiscal year 2008.

America's transportation system is being stretched beyond its capacity. Both public and private usage of highways, transit, and aviation systems are increasing at rates far outpacing infrastructure investment. A decaying surface transportation system costs the U.S. economy $78 billion annually in lost time and fuel while congestion adds significant pollution to the air, and substandard roads claim thousands of lives every year.

As representatives of over 400 major users and providers of the nation's surface transportation infrastructure network including the business and labor communities, our unique coalition is dedicated to ensuring the global competitiveness, economic prosperity and the American way of life by promoting investment in transportation infrastructure. SAFETEA–LU provided record levels of investment in highways and transit programs by ensuring that revenues flowing into the Highway Trust Fund are only used for their intended purpose: fixing and maintaining the nation's transportation infrastructure. By passing the H.R. 3074 conference report, Congress will maintain its commitment to a safe, efficient and competitive transportation system.

Sincerely,
Americans for Transportation Mobility.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS,
Washington, DC, November 14, 2007.

Hon. DAVID OBEY,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As the House begins consideration of the Conference report on the Housing and Transportation Appropriations, H.R. 3074, I wish to advise you the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and its 50 State members strongly support and urge that the legislation be passed as submitted.

The Nation's transportation system is the foundation of our economy. If investments are delayed it will impact the economy and add to increased costs because States will not have the full funding that would be available given the guaranteed spending provisions of SAFETEA–LU. Given the timing of the construction season it is also of immediate importance that the bill be passed promptly.

Sincerely,
JOHN HORSLEY,
Executive Director.

At this point, I would like to yield 7 minutes to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few observations about the White House comments on this bill, because we are told that the White House intends to veto this bill.

Let me point out some facts about this bill. This bill spends about $105 billion, all told. Much has been made in the debate this morning or this afternoon about earmarks in this bill. Earmarks are about 1 percent of all of the funds that are provided in this bill, around $1.2 billion.

For reference, last year, the appropriation, or rather the transportation authorization bill included about $20 billion in earmarks. I didn't see the President talking about vetoing that bill. I find it quaint that he now purports to be upset because this bill contains 1/20 the earmark level of bills that he has previously signed.

I would also note that the President objects to the elimination of the deep cuts which this bill contains for the Community Development Block Grant and for housing programs. There is no individual in this country who is a greater beneficiary of taxpayer-subsidized housing than the President of the United States. He lives in that big white house on Pennsylvania Avenue. He doesn't have to worry about having a driver's license to drive on the roads in this country because he has nice chauffeurs and nice limousines which are transported everywhere around the country. He has lots of people in the kitchen to prepare any meal that he wants prepared. If he wants to have a relaxing weekend, he can go out to Camp David, and he can take a helicopter so he doesn't have to worry about beating the traffic. And yet, this President objects to the fact that we are trying to do a mite more than his budget does for low-income housing in this country.

Section 8 housing, he's very unhappy about the fact that we've increased funding for that. It just seems to me that this is one case of the pot calling the kettle black if the President objects to that kind of funding.

When we first started putting together appropriation bills, Mr. Speaker, I asked each of the subcommittee Chairs to disregard the year-to-year arguments that we've usually had in this place, and I asked all of the chairmen and chairwomen to ask themselves: What is this country going to look like in 5 and 10 years? And in the case of this bill, how many more cars are there going to be on the road? How much more pressure are we going to have for our rail traffic, both passenger and transport, or freight?

I asked people to look at what the expanded population would mean in terms of added demand for housing for the elderly, as well as low-income housing. And then I asked the Chairs to try to prepare a bill which would get us to where we needed to be over a 5- or 10-year period in order to meet those challenges. And that is essentially what this bill tries to do with very limited available funds.

Now, this bill contains about $5 billion increase in funding above the President's level. That's about 2 weeks of what we spend in Iraq. I make no apology for it. I wish it were more. No country can have an efficient economy if it doesn't have an efficient transportation system and if it doesn't have modern infrastructure. This is one of the bills that tries to meet those demands.

So the President, if he wants, can invent a disagreement with the Congress and veto the bill if he wants. But I think the American people will recognize, the American taxpayer will recognize, while they may not agree with every choice made in the bill, that this is a far more reasonable response to the future needs of the country than is the President's very pinched view of the investment needs that we have here at home.

So I would urge support to this bill on both sides of the aisle. It's been put together on a bipartisan basis. To my knowledge, every single Republican on the subcommittee signed the conference report. I think that there is not really very much in terms of policy which would recommend a ''no'' vote on this bill. And I urge Members to recognize that we've got an obligation to deal with the needs of the least visible people in our society, the least powerful, and the least well connected. This is one of the bills that tries to do that.

I urge an ''aye'' vote for the bill.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield as much time as he may wish to consume to the gentleman who is the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. LEWIS from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate very much my colleague yielding. And before making the remarks I have in mind, I want to extend my congratulations to the chairman and the ranking member for a very thoughtful effort to put together a very reasonable bill, while it is a bit over the funding levels of the President, and as a result of that I'll probably vote against it.

I had not planned to speak on this bill, for I had an understanding from the other side that maybe neither the chairman or the ranking member would spend too much time speaking.

I must say that some years ago it was my privilege to chair this subcommittee, and I took that responsibility very, very seriously. I know that the chairman of the committee has been very frustrated with me this year as I've suggested, more than one time, that the solution on the other side to every problem, it seems, is to throw more money at it.

And the chairman just was wringing his hands a bit about the section 8 funding in this bill and suggesting we certainly should be doing a better job.

Well, let me say, Mr. Speaker, we absolutely should be doing a better job.

And back then, when I had a chance to chair this subcommittee, I spent some time with then-Secretary Henry, under a different administration than this one, and he and I went to section 8 housing circumstances and both wrung our hands with some frustration about the way many of those housing authorities are operating and the way they're using the money that we send out there to help the poorest of the poor have a chance for reasonable housing.

We found that there were some serious questions to be raised, and that led to a thing called the Housing Fraud Initiative. And we gave extra money to the Inspector General of the Housing Authority, and the Inspector General went around the country, and, indeed, found serious problems in any number of housing authorities about the way the money was being spent that supposedly was designed for the poorest of the poor.

It is not a fact that those housing authorities automatically respond in a way that would reflect the best use of our money. And if that's an illustration, indeed, the chairman has made my point. We don't solve problems by just throwing money, especially if we're not willing to follow the money and see if it's getting to the people we pretend to want to help in the first place.

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

I hesitate to get involved between my chairman and my big ranking member here, but since they've gotten into it and the ranking member has made the comment that every suggestion that we make is to throw money at the problem, I just wanted to point out that the President has actually indicated that he will veto this legislation. It provides $3 billion more in budget authority than he requested in the original budget.

And I'd like to remind people on both sides of the aisle that in each of the last 6 years, each of the last 6 years, the President, rightly, signed transportation and housing budgets into law that were above his initial request. The irony here is that in fiscal year 2003, the President signed into law the transportation and housing budgets that were over $9 billion above his request. Ours is 3, on budget authority. And in fiscal 2004 it was $4.2 billion above his request, and in fiscal 2006 it was $7 billion above the President's request.

□ 1630

And he did that at times, he signed those bills, without a whimper, without any objection, when the deficits, the budget deficits, were much larger than they are today. This bill is a responsible piece of legislation, and I hope that it will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), who is the authorizing Chair for the housing portion of this legislation.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Prior to my speaking, Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEINER). The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Are we debating the Defense appropriations bill here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. We are debating the conference report on H.R. 3074.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Is the subject matter of that HUD or Defense?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk has reported the title of the bill. Would the gentleman like it to be restated?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will re-report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was confused, Mr. Speaker, because I had to go up to the Rules Committee and I came back and I heard the gentleman from California saying stop throwing money at the problem, that's not the way to solve the problem. And when I think about what we're throwing money at, I assumed we were talking about the Defense bill and Iraq and reconstruction, because so much money has been thrown at that, none of us can keep track of it. Then it turns out he's talking about a relatively small increase in CDBG. I certainly agree we should not solve problems by throwing money at them. That, however, led me to think we must be talking about the bill that spends so much more money than anything else and that has had more documented waste and abuse and fraud, the Defense bill and the Iraq spending, than all the other appropriations bills put together.

As to this bill, now that I know what we're talking about, not to be taken for granted on the floor of this House, I want to be congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts for doing an excellent job with the limited resources he was given, far too limited.

There is an increase in here for the Community Development Block Grant program. The President apparently wanted to continue his path of reducing Community Development Block Grants, having them be lower than they were years ago when he came into office. In fact, that is a very important program for our municipalities, and I am very pleased to see that it is not being reduced.

As to section 8, every year when the Republicans were in power, we would approach the point when we were running out of section 8s. And as a member of the committee that has the authorization role here, we would hear from Members, Democratic and Republican, about the importance of keeping this going. Now, I agree it should be improved. And what we have done here in this House, we began something last year but we finished it this year and sent it to the Senate. We passed a bill we called SEVRA, the Section 8 Voucher Reform Act. So, yes, we think there should be reform. This House has passed on a bipartisan basis, support from everybody in the authorizing committee, a bill to improve it. So we are trying to make things better. And I guarantee you that you will not find anywhere under HUD, and I know a lot about that department, anything like the wanton expenditure waste that we have seen in Iraq and elsewhere.

What the gentleman from Massachusetts has done in the housing area is sensibly to respond to important needs. I particularly want to say earlier this year, the Secretary of HUD, Secretary Jackson, asked me to meet with a group called ADAPT. These are people who represent people with disabilities. They were concerned about the availability of section 8 vouchers for people with disabilities, particularly those who may have been turned away from public housing projects. In response to that, in collaboration, the bill we have today increases that pool of vouchers. Now, they're not earmarked for that group, and we will have further conversations about how to deal with that, but there are additional vouchers here that the Secretary of HUD came to me and said, look, will you listen to this group and try to respond? And these are vouchers that respond to their needs.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I wish he was able to throw money at the problem. I wish we had a set of priorities in this country that were more respectful of genuine human needs. But given the limited resources he has, he and his subcommittee have done an excellent job.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman that just spoke talked about how the committee had done so well with such limited resources and makes it sound like this is positively a skinflint bill, that we're just making do with what we have.

The truth is we are well over the President's budget that he submitted. Let me just give people a flavor for what's in this bill. This is just a slice of the 150 pages of earmarks, more than 1,000 earmarks that were in this bill, 21 of them air-dropped last night that we had no idea were here until today, but here is just an example of some of them in the House-passed version:

There is $100,000 for the Crystal Lake Art Center in Frankfort, Michigan; $750,000 to the Detroit Science Center in Detroit, Michigan; $300,000 for the Houston zoo; $200,000 for the Huntsville Museum of Art in Huntsville, Alabama; $100,000 for the Los Angeles Fashion District in Los Angeles, California; $150,000 for the Louis Armstrong House Museum in Flushing, New York; $50,000 for the National Mule and Packers Museum in Bishop, California; $150,000 to the Renaissance Art Center, Inc., in Rupert, Idaho; $200,000 to the Fruitvale Cultural and Performing Arts Center in Oakland, California; $100,000 for the 1924 Vaudeville Theater in Plattsburgh, New York; $200,000 for the Hunting and Fishing Museum of Pennsylvania; $100,000 for the Lincoln Museum in Hodgenville, Kentucky.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just point out that every one that you have recited, and I have listened to probably 18 or 20 of them along the way, every one of them was in the legislation as it passed the House of Representatives.

Mr. FLAKE. That is correct.

Mr. OLVER. They were not air-dropped, as has been suggested.

Mr. FLAKE. No. These were all in the House version, the House version that we had just a couple of days to digest, and we were only able to offer in reality few amendments in keeping with the comity of the House.

This shouldn't substitute for real vetting or real scrutiny when you have earmarks like this. And particularly, I didn't mention and I could read the 21 air-dropped earmarks, the ones that were put in last night that because the majority has waived the rules, we have no ability to actually challenge. We don't know if these earmarks are meritorious or not because they were air-dropped in last night. I'm reading these that were in the House-passed version of the bill.

Let me read through a few more and maybe this will clarify it: $150,000 for the Atlanta Botanical Gardens in Atlanta, Georgia; $275,000 for the Berkshire Music Hall in Pittsfield, Massachusetts; $400,000 to the Bel Alton High School Alumni Association in Maryland; $500,000 for the Los Angeles County Fire Museum in Bellflower, California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise Members that the gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 18 minutes remaining.

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

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

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 154, nays 252, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 1100]

YEAS—154

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
Dent
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—252

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Poe
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—26

Baird
Bono
Capuano
Carson
Cubin
Delahunt
Dingell
Doyle
Gilchrest

Gutierrez	Murphy, Tim	Waters
Hunter	Oberstar	Watson
Jindal	Paul	Weller
Levin	Ruppersberger	Wilson (NM)
Mack	Rush	Wilson (OH)
McCollum (MN)	Sessions	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 1½ minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1700

Messrs. PALLONE, MELANCON, POE, REYES, DAVIS of Virginia, TIERNEY and PAYNE and Ms. BERKLEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1100, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1100, I was unable to vote due to medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1100, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3074, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 18 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to enter into the RECORD two more letters, which I have in hand now, one from The United States Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, the National Associations of Local Housing Finance Agencies, the Association for County Community and Economic Development, and the National Community Development Association in support of the conference report on H.R. 3074. And also, the second letter from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce urging support of the conference report for H.R. 3074, signed by the executive director of the U.S. Chamber.

NOVEMBER 14, 2007.

Hon. JOHN W. OLVER,

Chair, Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing And Urban Development and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN OLVER: The undersigned organizations of local elected and appointed officials urge passage of the conference report on H.R. 3074 that provides funding of transportation and housing programs at $105.6 billion. Housing and community development is a major challenge. Local government officials know that decent, safe, affordable housing is at the core of family stability and strong neighborhoods. Your bill will assist us in achieving affordable housing and community development goals.

H.R. 3074 provides funding for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships Program, Public Housing, Section 8, Homeless, and other housing and community development programs. As you know, more than 260 mayors signed a letter calling for increased funding for the CDBG program. HOME continues to be an effective affordable housing program having assisted the development and rehabilitation of nearly 900,000 affordable homes for very low and moderate-income families. These are just two examples of effective programs. Virtually every housing and community development program in your bill can be cited as having an exemplary record.

We urge the House to pass the conference report to the bill, H.R. 3074.

Sincerely,

The United States Conference of Mayors; National Association of Counties; National Associations of Local Housing Finance Agencies; National Association for County Community and Economic Development; and National Community Development Association.

NOVEMBER 13, 2007.

To: The Members of the U.S. House of Representatives:

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing more than three million businesses and organizations of ever size, sector, and region, strongly urges you to support the conference report for H.R. 3074, the ''Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008.'' This bill provides the necessary funding to ensure that the U.S. transportation system is the safest and most efficient in the world.

The business community depends on a safe and reliable transportation system to remain competitive and efficient. The nation's transportation system is the foundation of the nation's economy. If the investments necessary to maintain this foundation are not made, the U.S. economy win suffer. The inadequate surface transportation system costs the economy $63 billion annually in lost time and fuel.

H.R. 3074 addresses the enormous demands of the nation's transportation infrastructure system by providing funding for the highway and transit programs authorized by Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA–LU), which President Bush signed into law two years ago as well as funding for the Federal Aviation Administration to improve the safety, performance and capacity of the nation's aviation system.

While the Chamber strongly supports passage of H.R. 3074, it is important to note that the Chamber is disappointed that H.R. 3074 under-funds public transportation by $81 million. These investments are vital to the safety of our system and the health of the nation's economy. It is imperative that commitments made under SAFETEA–LU be maintained as is required by law.

For these reasons, the Chamber urges you to support the conference report for H.R. 3074 and may consider using votes on, or in relation to, this issue in our annual How They Voted scorecard.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 3074 provides critical funding for construction of new roads, repairs, and overall improvements to our Nation's infrastructure. The legislation also provides needed funding for housing vouchers and new vouchers for veterans and disabled and low-income families.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to passing a funding bill that has a positive economic impact on our Nation, none is more important than the fiscal year appropriation for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development.

America's transportation system is being stretched beyond its capacity. Both public and private usage of highways, transit, and aviation systems are increasing at rates far outpacing infrastructure investment. A decaying surface transportation system costs the U.S. economy $78 billion annually in lost time and fuel while congestion adds significant pollution to the air, and substandard roads claim thousands of lives every year.

By investing $40 billion in the Nation's highway system for construction of new roads, repairs and improvements and $1 billion to address deficient bridges across America, H.R. 3074 honors the commitments to capital investment in highway and public transportation infrastructure made by Congress in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA–LU) and will not increase the Federal budget deficit.

This bill also addresses many of our Nation's pressing housing needs, at a time when we are facing a housing crisis that has directly impacted millions of American homeowners and millions more as the effects have rippled through the U.S. and world economy. National estimates indicate that as many as 2.5 million mortgages will reset to higher interest rates in the near future.

The fiscal year 2008 appropriation for the Department of Housing and Urban Development also addresses the plight of homeless veterans. According to the National Coalition for Homeless Veterans, one out of every three homeless men who is sleeping in a doorway, alley or box in our cities and rural communities has put on a uniform and served this country. By providing $75 million in housing vouchers to homeless veterans, we are beginning to address this problem by providing safe, affordable, permanent housing access to 7,500 of our homeless veterans.

Another housing program strongly supported by my constituents that this bill funds is the Section 8 Project Based Vouchers. If passed the conference report will allocate $6.4 billion, $405 million above 2007 and $568 million above the President's request, to provide affordable housing to 1.3 million low- and very low-income families and individuals, two-thirds of whom are elderly or disabled.

When we pass this bill today and send it to the President, the House of Representatives will be addressing the important challenges of keeping our Nation's transportation system safe and strong, ensuring that every American has adequate shelter, and doing so in a way that strengthens the economy.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report for the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations for 2008.

The funding provided in the conference report helps enhance our national transportation system at a critical time. Our transportation system is extended beyond its capacity. Public

and private use of highways, transit, and aviation systems are growing far beyond the current level of investment.

I am particularly pleased the agreement provides funds for a number of important projects not just in my own district but throughout Colorado. Our State faces a number of transportation challenges as a result of rapid expansion in the northwest Denver sububs and mountain and resort communities. Without the passage of this conference report, critical transportation and infrastructure needs for Colorado and the Nation will continue to be shortchanged.

I am committed to continue working with the rest of the Colorado delegation, local communities, the Transportation Committee and the administration to secure essential Federal funding to get people and goods from one place to another with a focus on transit and other transportation alternatives, and improving current modes of Colorado's transportation network.

The report also includes a number of important provisions with national implications.

The United States and Colorado are facing a housing crisis that has caused dire impacts to millions of homeowners. Very often a home purchase represents the largest single investment that individuals and families will make in their lifetimes. Homeownership is a cornerstone of the American Dream, and Congress needs to treat it as a top priority. I am pleased the report provides additional funding for counseling assistance for at-risk homeowners. Funding in the bill will assist thousands of borrowers with mortgage changes and restructuring to help them keep their homes.

I am also pleased the report makes changes to inequities in the retirement age of U.S. pilots. Like the Senate bill, the report raises the mandatory retirement age for pilots to 65, with certain exceptions. I supported similar provisions that passed the House in the reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration. We must take urgent action to ensure that more competent pilots are not lost.

Mr. Speaker this legislation is far from perfect but by passing the conference report, Congress will maintain its commitment to a safe, efficient and competitive transportation system that will fuel job creation. I urge its passage today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. LEWIS of California. In its present form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEWIS of California moves to recommit the conference report on the bill, H.R. 3074, to the committee of conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the conference report.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 231, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 1101]

YEAS—182

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—231

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

NOT VOTING—19

Bono
Carson
Cubin
Doyle
Gutierrez
Hunter
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jindal
Keller
Langevin
Levin
Mack
Miller (NC)
Oberstar
Paul
Ruppersberger
Sessions
Watson
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are less than 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1718

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1101, I was unable to vote due to medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on the previous motion to recommit vote, in light of the new extraordinary and difficult and strenuous voting time, I was unavoidably delayed in an Iraq briefing. If I was present, I would have voted ''nay'' on the motion to recommit on the Transportation-HUD appropriations bill.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, during the previous vote on the motion to recommit, number 1101 on H.R. 3074, I was unavoidably detained and I missed that vote. I would like the record to show that I would have voted ''nay.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 270, nays 147, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 1102]

YEAS—270

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—147

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
English (PA)
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Bishop (UT)
Bono
Carson
Cubin
Doyle
Gutierrez
Jindal
Levin
Mack
Oberstar
Paul
Ruppersberger
Sessions
Watson
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised they now have less than 2 minutes remaining in which to cast their vote.

□ 1725

Mr. TURNER changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report 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. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1102, I was unable to vote due to medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I was unavoidably detained and could not cast my vote for H.R. 3074, on agreeing to the Conference Report for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing, and Urban Development and Related Agencies Appropriations for FY 2008.

Had I been able to cast my vote, I would have voted "yea" for H.R. 3074.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 258. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to correct the enrollment of H.R. 1429.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1429) ''An Act to reauthorize the Head Start Act, to improve program quality, to expand access, and for other purposes.''.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4156, ORDERLY AND RESPONSIBLE IRAQ REDEPLOYMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up H. Res. 818 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 818

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4156) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 4156 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). 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.

I yield myself 6 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 818.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 818 provides for consideration of H.R. 4156, the Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations Act of 2008. The rule provides 2 hours of debate and provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq has gone on for nearly 5 years. Thousands of our brave men and women have lost their lives. Many more thousands have returned home with injuries so severe that they will require a lifetime of medical treatments.

We have spent hundreds of billions of dollars on the war, virtually none of it paid for, almost all of it on our national credit card. That means that the bill will be paid for not by us, but by our kids and our grandkids.

The war has diminished our standing in the world. It has distracted us from the war in Afghanistan, the very place where those responsible for 9/11 are now regrouping. And it has put incredible strain on the readiness of our Armed Forces.

The President of the United States and many of my Republican friends have argued fiercely over the years for a blank check. They want no strings, no conditions, no benchmarks, no end dates, no accountability, no nothing.

Today, they will tell us that the President's strategy is working; that the recent decrease in deaths and casualties in certain areas of Iraq prove it, and, therefore, we should provide yet another blank check.

Mr. Speaker, let me caution my friends about declaring ''mission accomplished'' yet again. While all of us pray that the violence continues to subside, we should also appreciate history enough to know that lulls in intense violence are not always permanent. Let me also state that the current levels of violence in Iraq are still unacceptably high.

As Joe Christoff of the Government Accountability Office recently testified, this recent reduction in violence should be put into the proper context as it coincides with increased sectarian cleansing and a massive refugee displacement. Let me quote:

''You know, we look at the attack data going down, but it's not taking into consideration that there might be fewer attacks because you have ethnically cleansed neighborhoods, particularly in the Baghdad area. It's produced 2.2 million refugees that have left, and it's produced 2 million internally displaced persons within the country as well.''

Mr. Speaker, we must remember that the justification for the surge and the justification for the Bush military strategy in Iraq has always been to foster Iraqi political reconciliation. And there is precious little evidence of any such thing.

Over 10 months ago, President Bush said, ''A successful strategy for Iraq goes beyond military operations. Ordinary Iraqi citizens must see that military operations are accompanied by visible improvements in their neighborhoods and communities. So America will hold the Iraqi Government to the benchmarks it has announced.''

But, Mr. Speaker, as the GAO reported last month, ''Iraq has not yet advanced key legislation on equitably sharing oil revenues and holding provincial elections. In addition, sectarian influences within Iraqi ministries continue while militia influences divide the loyalties of Iraqi security forces.''

Mr. Speaker, the Maliki government continues to be corrupt, inept and without the support of the vast majority of the Iraqi people. When will the Bush administration live up to its word and hold the Iraqi Government accountable for its actions, or inaction?

The fundamental crisis facing Iraq remains the same: the inability of Sunni, Shiites and Kurds to agree to set aside their sectarian divisions and live in peace. As long as we remain there indefinitely, Mr. Speaker, there is no incentive for anything to change.

Mr. Speaker, our soldiers have already given so much to create an opportunity for the Iraqi Government, an opportunity that that government has squandered. So, today, we are saying we want a different course. We reject the President's vision of an endless war that will cost more lives and bankrupt our Nation.

Today, we will vote on a bill that requires the redeployment of U.S. troops from Iraq to begin within 30 days of enactment, with a target for completion of December 15, 2008. It would prohibit the deployment of U.S. troops to Iraq who are not fully trained and equipped. And it changes the mission of our forces.

It also extends to all government agencies and personnel the limitations in the Army Field Manual on permissible interrogation techniques, which means that torture will be absolutely banned, and anyone who engages in such practices will be committing a crime under U.S. law, no ands, ifs or buts.

Mr. Speaker, it is no longer acceptable for Congress to simply write yet another blank check. It is not acceptable for the President to simply run out the clock and hand this problem off to his successor.

This is a war that George Bush started, and this is a war that he needs to end. For the sake of our troops, for the sake of our country, we need to support this legislation. Enough is enough.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise to express my appreciation to my friend from Worcester for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as I listened to my long-time Rules Committee colleague, the gentleman from Worcester, I am reminded of a great speech that was delivered last Friday. Last Friday, our very distinguished colleague, the Senator from Connecticut, JOE LIEBERMAN, in an address, said something that I think encapsulates exactly what we just heard from my very good friend.

Senator LIEBERMAN, in speaking of the Democratic Party, and he is now an independent Democrat, sometimes I see him listed as a Democrat, I know he organizes with the Democrats, he is listed as an independent as well, he said, ''The Democrats are emotionally invested in a narrative of defeat.''

Mr. Speaker, I have got to say as I listened to the words of my colleague from Worcester, I can't help but think that Senator LIEBERMAN was right on target when he used that language, ''emotionally invested in a narrative of defeat.'' I was so struck with that when I heard it that I committed it to memory, and I think, again, it really takes on exactly what we have just heard.

It comes as no surprise that I rise in very, very strong, vigorous opposition to this rule and the underlying legislation as well. We have had 40 votes on Iraq policy, and today's bill brings us to vote No. 41. Not one, Mr. Speaker, not one of the withdrawal bills went through the normal legislative process. Not one, not one of these 41 measures is the product of a committee markup. Not one got its own hearing. Not one has been brought up under an even slightly open process, allowing for amendment, and consequently not allowing for any kind of real debate.

Mr. Speaker, most telling of all, not one has been enacted into law.

Now, we all know that the Democrats control both the House and the Senate, and still they cannot produce a single legislative victory on Iraq. Not once, not twice, not 10 times. Forty times. Mr. Speaker, 40 times we have gone through the motions of their failed, bankrupt strategy. I can't recall a more naked display of demagoguery.

Now we come to vote No. 41. It has all the hallmarks of the Democratic majority's work: no deliberation, no gesture towards bipartisanship, and no hope of being enacted.

But there is something different about the vote this time, and that is context. We are considering this vote in a much different context than we have the 40 previous votes that we have addressed on this. In fact, our colleague in the Senate, JOHNNY ISAKSON, Senator ISAKSON, said this debate was understandable in May. He said in July, it was questionable. He said now it is absolutely ridiculous.

For many months, the situation in Iraq has been very bleak. While there were many promising signs of progress, the turnaround in al Anbar province most notably, the overall picture was one of great challenges and struggles. I have argued repeatedly that a precipitous withdrawal would only create more challenges, and, Mr. Speaker, I have highlighted the signs of progress amid the struggles all along.

But today, the tide is turning in Iraq. We are seeing far more than pockets of success, as my friend has said. We are seeing a dramatic shift in the landscape. It began in al Anbar, as I have said. The Sunni sheiks there turned on al Qaeda, joined with the largely Shiite Iraqi army and with coalition forces, and reclaimed the province. Ramadi, its capital, the city that we have all heard of described as the most dangerous city in the world just a year ago, hasn't had an attack in 3 months. The city and the province are rebuilding. They are constructing small business centers so that the entrepreneurial spirit of Iraqis can flourish once again.

A delegation, including the Anbar governor, the Ramadi mayor, several prominent religious leaders and Ahmed Abu Risha, the brother of Sheik Sattar Abu Risha, the father of the Sunni Awakening, was just here in Washington a couple of weeks ago. They came here, Mr. Speaker, to spend several days receiving training in institution building, good governance, transparency and the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, these are Anbar's political, business and religious leaders, not coming here to seek security assistance, not seeking military assistance. They have achieved security in al Anbar. Now what they want, Mr. Speaker, is help from us in their quest to build a democracy. But, most important of all, they are serving as a model for the rest of Iraq.

Prior to their trip, they participated with Shiite leaders in a summit in Karbala. Sheiks from Karbala and Najaf, Iraq's two holiest cities for Shiite Muslims, reached out to their Sunni brothers in Anbar and asked for their help in combating al Qaeda. This comes at a time when Sunni and Shiite leaders in Baghdad are reaching out to each other to begin the process of reconciliation as well.

Baghdad's notorious Adhamiya neighborhood that we have heard so much about, formerly the site of some of Iraq's worst sectarian violence, is now a place where Sunni and Shiite sheiks are meeting regularly to discuss how to bring their people together, just the things that my friend from Worcester said are so imperative. They are taking place at this very moment.

Now, all of this has been possible, Mr. Speaker, because of the dramatic drop in violence brought about by General Petraeus' counterinsurgency strategy. This strategy, which included the surge, has resulted in months of plummeting IED attacks, plummeting American troop deaths, plummeting Iraqi civilian deaths, and plummeting sectarian attacks.

Many of my colleagues have pointed out that this has been the deadliest year for American troops yet in Iraq, and, Mr. Speaker, I will acknowledge that this has been the deadliest year for American troops in Iraq. And it is true over the past year we have tragically seen that great number. But that does not reflect what is happening now in this post-surge world.

□ 1745

The past few months have seen the most dramatic decline in the deaths of American troops because we have had a new strategy. Mr. Speaker, we have had a new strategy, and that strategy is working. And perhaps most important for all of us, that strategy has enabled our military commanders to begin a drawdown in U.S. troop levels.

Not because of artificial timetables. Not because of the micromanagement of Members of Congress from the comfort of our offices thousands of miles away from the front lines. But by empowering our commanders on the ground, they have created a stable security situation that is allowing for both the beginnings of Iraqi reconciliation and the safe withdrawal of our troops.

Mr. Speaker, the big question for today is this: Will the dramatic improvement in Iraq prove to be a true turning point or nothing more than a lull in the war? I don't know the answer to that. Neither outcome is a foregone conclusion. Whether it is a major turning point in the war or just a lull, no one knows for sure. What we do know now will profoundly affect the future of Iraq. Will we fund our troops and empower our commanders to continue to do what is best for our long-term interests? Or will we pull the rug out from under them now at the precise moment they have achieved what we have asked of them?

As one of my friends just said to me, it seems like our friends on the other side of the aisle want defeat before we can win.

For my colleagues who would resort to the latter option out of political expediency, Mr. Speaker, let me remind them of another war our men and women are fighting. Today our troops are also battling a very real enemy in Afghanistan.

We got a terrible reminder just a few days ago of the viciousness of that fight when six of our counterparts, members of the Afghan Parliament, were brutally targeted in the worst attack in Afghanistan's history, and I would like to express my appreciation for the bipartisan support that my colleague, DAVID PRICE, and I offered as leaders of the House Democracy Assistance Commission.

We have been working with those parliamentarians in Afghanistan, and we are hoping to work with those in Iraq as soon as possible. And we once again express our condolences to the people of Afghanistan who have suffered the single worst attack in their nation's history when a week ago yesterday six parliamentarians and 44 other people were brutally murdered.

Let me also remind my colleagues that this war that we are seeing in Afghanistan is not our first war in Afghanistan. Many of us were intricately involved in their war against the Soviets in the 1980s, many Members who are still here today. And what did we do after the Soviets were defeated? We withdraw and left the Afghans to fend for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot forget that democracy is hard work. For over a decade, unfortunately, in Afghanistan we indulged in the luxury of ignoring what was going on there. And then on a sunny Tuesday six Septembers ago, 3,000 Americans paid a horrible price for that mistake.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot refuse to learn from history or we are doomed to repeat it. Our support for our troops in Iraq has earned us a far more stable, secure situation. And yet what does the Democratic leadership propose to do? Their bill would reward our military commanders' success by cutting them off.

It would provide constitutional protections for terrorists, while leaving our veterans, including Iraq veterans, without funding. It would force the same disastrous, shortsighted withdrawal that led to the terrorist sanctuary in Afghanistan. It would do all of this at a time when we are achieving not just pockets of success in Iraq but broad-based improvements, and at a time when Republicans have been trying every possible means to get an appropriations bill for our veterans to the President, which he will certainly sign if we can ever get it to him.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic majority's priorities, foolhardy policies, and constitutional rights for terrorists have never been so out of whack. I suppose we can take comfort in the fact that this is all a meaningless charade that will never be enacted, because we all know this will never be enacted. But that is a hollow comfort when we consider our troops in harm's way and our veterans in need.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very cruel comfort for the families of those who have made incredible sacrifices in this war.

I often think of my good friend, Ed Blecksmith, a former marine and the father of JP Blecksmith, also a marine, who died in November 2004 just 3 years ago in the very famous battle of Fallujah. I have talked about the Blecksmith family here on the House floor many, many times. I didn't know JP, but from everything that I have read, and I have a recent article that has just come out about him, he was a very talented young man with a very bright future. He had so many opportunities before him, and he chose to be a marine because he wanted to serve as his father had done. His family proudly, but soberly, supported him. As a

former marine, Ed Blecksmith knew in a very real way the cost of war. JP Blecksmith would not return to his family, having made the ultimate sacrifice.

And his father said something to me that I will never forget. He looked me in the eye and asked me to make sure that we complete his son's mission in Iraq. He has said to me on countless occasions, You must complete the mission or my son JP will have died in vain.

Mr. Speaker, it is deeply heartening to see the beginnings of victory. And no, I am not saying ''mission accomplished'' or anything like that because we know full well that we have difficult days ahead. But it is deeply heartening to see the beginnings of victory in Iraq, for JP's sake and for the sake of all who have paid a very dear price.

We have a profound responsibility to allow our commanders to continue on this path.

Mr. Speaker, after 41, 41 wasted efforts, I can only hope that the Democratic leadership will finally abandon empty demagoguery for substantive legislation, meaningful debate, and a quest at bipartisanship so we can work with the President to come to an agreement. Until that time, I urge my colleagues to reject this closed rule and the terribly wrongheaded policy that it seeks to shield.

[From Details, Holiday 2007]

THE FALLEN: 2ND LIEUTENANT JP BLECKSMITH, 24

(By Jeff Gordinier)

On the night before 2nd Lieutenant JP Blecksmith shipped out to Iraq, after his family took him out for dinner in Newport Beach, California, his older brother, Alex, picked up a pair of clippers and shaved JP's head. When that was done and JP looked ready for combat, Alex gave his brother a hug. Then Alex climbed into JP's green Ford Expedition and drove it north, back to the family's house in San Marino, weeping part of the way. He had a feeling. So did his parents. A premonition. They didn't talk about it much, but two months later, in November 2004, when JP joined a wave of U.S. Marines roaring into the city of Fallujah as part of Operation Phantom Fury, the feeling intensified.

On the night of November 10, Blecksmith and his closest friend in Iraq, Lieutenant Sven Jensen, slept on a rooftop in Fallujah. It was, miraculously, a quiet night, and chilly. They got a decent night's sleep. They awoke just before sunrise and were amused to find a small pet bird with green wings and a yellow belly perched a couple of feet away from their faces. Jensen took a picture of the bird. There were other ones like it all over Iraq, because when U.S. troops were searching abandoned houses, they often found cages that had been left behind. The soldiers let the birds go free so they wouldn't starve to death.

Hours before, JP had sent a letter to his girlfriend, addressing it formally, as always, to ''Ms. Emily M. Tait.'' In it he wrote, ''By the time you receive this, you will know we have gone into the city. We've been preparing for it the last few days, and my guys are ready for the fight, and I'm ready to lead them. It'll be hectic, and there will be some things out of my control, but the promise of you waiting at home for me is inspiring and a relief.'' Now he was in the thick of it. Blecksmith and Jensen came down from the roof, ate their MREs for breakfast, and got their orders. Before the invasion the battalion commander, Colonel Patrick Malay, had given his men an analogy: '' 'Imagine a dirty, filthy windowpane that has not been cleaned in hundreds of years,' '' he recalls saying. ''That's how we looked at the city of Fallujah. Our job was to scrub the heck out of that city, and then take a squeegee and wipe it off so that it was clean and pure.'' Most of Fallujah was empty, and anyone left in the city was presumed to be an insurgent.

Blecksmith and the other members of the India Company of the Third Battalion, Fifth Marines Regiment, moved south through the city, with their blood types scrawled in indelible marker on the sleeves of their uniforms. The streets smelled terrible—a stubborn aroma of rotting food and bodies. Late in the day on November 11, things started to go wrong. A marine in Blecksmith's platoon, Klayton South, was shot in the mouth by an insurgent when he kicked open the door of a house. Blood gushed from his mangled teeth and tongue. The medics cut into South's throat to give him an emergency tracheotomy. (He survived. He's since had more than 40 operations to repair the damage.) ''It shook the platoon up,'' Jensen says now, ''and JP was the most in-control person I saw. He had a sector to clear, so he rallied his guys and said, 'Okay, we've got to continue clearing.' '' Blecksmith's and Jensen's platoons moved off in different directions, and the two friends shot each other a glance. ''I'll never forget looking at his eyes the last time I saw him,'' Jensen says. ''He turned and he gave me almost an apprehensive look, like, Oh, s-it, we've got some s-it going on. I wanted to say 'Hey, I'll see you later.' But I didn't say anything to him.''

Minutes later, Blecksmith led his platoon into a house and climbed a flight of stairs to the roof to survey the surrounding landscape. Shots came from a building across the street. Blecksmith stood up to direct the squads under his command, shouting at them to take aim at the enemy nest. He was tall, and was now visible above the protective wall. ''He was up front a lot, and he made a big target, and we'd talked to him about that,'' Colonel Malay says. ''He exposed himself consistently to enemy fire in the execution of his duties. He displayed a fearlessness to the point that we had to talk to him about the fact that nobody is bulletproof.''

As Blecksmith stood on the roof, a sniper's 7.62-mm bullet found one of the places on his body where he was vulnerable. It was a spot on his left shoulder, less than an inch above the rim of his protective breastplate. The bullet sliced downward diagonally, coming to rest in his right hip, and along the way it tore through his heart. ''I'm hit,'' Blecksmith said. He fell. He raised his head for a moment, and that was it. A Navy medic got to Blecksmith immediately, but he was already dead, and his men carried his heavy body back down the stairs. He was 24.

That night in San Marino, Alex Blecksmith came home from work and noticed that the house was dark. He opened the front door and saw his mother, Pam, sitting at the kitchen table with a couple of marines in dress blues and white gloves, and he heard the phrase ''We regret to inform you . . .''

The funeral was so magnificent, so full of pageantry, that at times it was difficult for Alex to remember that the guy being buried was his brother. The Marines do it right when it comes to honoring the fallen. They do it so right that you can get swept up in the ceremony and feel as though you're watching a parade. The funeral took place at the Church of Our Saviour in San Gabriel—the church where the most celebrated of San Marino's favorite sons, General George S. Patton, had been baptized as a baby. As the flag-draped casket was carried out of the sanctuary and into the California sun, a long, silent line of almost 2,000 people followed. There were marines and midshipmen and local firefighters in uniform. There was a 21-gun salute. Four World War II fighter planes swooped toward the cemetery in the ''missing man'' formation—just as they passed over the funeral, the fourth plane symbolically split from the quartet and veered into the sky. A bagpiper played a Scottish dirge. One of JP's old friends would later observe that the day, in all of its glory and pomp, made him think of Princess Diana's wedding.

As public support for the war in Iraq wavers, it's easy to forget that people like JP Blecksmith even exist. The American military is so predominantly blue-collar that we tend to assume that the sons and daughters of the rich never voluntarily die in warfare anymore. Blecksmith was born in September 1980, just weeks before his state's own Ronald Reagan was elected president, and he spent most of his youth in the small Los Angeles County town of San Marino during what felt, for many of its wealthy and conservative inhabitants, like something of a ''Leave It to Beaver'' golden age. To look at a photograph of him, blue-eyed and suntanned and grinning, is to understand the enduring magnetism of the word ''California.'' He stood six foot three and weighed 225 pounds. His chest was a keg; his biceps were gourds. His biography reads as though it were scripted by a Hollywood publicist: legendary quarterback on the Flintridge Prep football team, track star, graduate of the United States Naval Academy.

His father, Ed Blecksmith, who is 64, runs an executive-recruiting firm in Los Angeles. He and Pam met in the early seventies, while both were working in the White House. Along a wall leading into their kitchen hang framed Christmas cards from Dick and Pat Nixon. ''Here's a kid,'' Ed says, ''who didn't need to do this.'' It's as though JP were transplanted into our world from the Eisenhower years. Somehow, in an ironic age of Jon Stewart and ''South Park,'' the guy grew up in a kind of pre-Summer of Love bubble in which young men of strength and valor still yearned to distinguish themselves on the battlefield. He was groomed, in a sense, for something that no longer exists, at least not for guys who grow up in the wealthiest zip codes in the country. He believed in ideals of duty and sacrifice that have become, for many men, anachronistic and even unfathomable.

''I was in awe,'' says Peter Twist, Blecksmith's closest friend since preschool. Twist played wide receiver to Blecksmith's quarterback on the Flintridge Prep football team; a local newspaper called the duo ''Fire & Ice.'' Blecksmith was known for being fast, composed, smart, and unflappable, and his giant arms could propel the ball a good 80 yards down the field. If he had an athletic flaw, it was that he was aware of his own flawlessness. ''He had such personal confidence,'' says Tom Fry, a mentor to Blecksmith in high school and one of the assistant coaches on his team. ''He felt that if all the stars aligned, there was nothing he couldn't do—it was JP's world.'' When they graduated in 1999, Twist and a couple other teammates went off to the University of Arizona, where it's safe to say the prospect of partying was on their minds, while Blecksmith opted for the rigors and restrictions of Annapolis. ''I was stoked for the man'' says Twist, 26, who lives in Newport Beach and works in the mortgage business. ''Most of us are still trying to figure it out, but JP always had a goal.''

November 11, the date on which JP Blecksmith died, was noteworthy for other reasons. It's Twist's birthday. It also happens to be the birthday of General Patton, who grew up in San Marino and holds a prominent place in the town's history. This coincidence has only bolstered the mythology of JP Blecksmith—a feeling that it was his destiny to die in combat. The Blecksmiths have a statue of Patton on a shelf in their home, and it becomes clear in conversation that Ed, a decorated Vietnam veteran himself, sees a kind of mystical link between the fate of his son and the military, triumphs of the legendary general (who was a passionate believer, it just so happens, in reincarnation).

Indeed, JP Blecksmith fit the ''hero'' mold in such classic, square jawed American style that a kind of cult of JP has begun to develop in San Marino. They give out awards in his name at the local schools. On the Fourth of July, San Marino hosts a JP Blecksmith 5K run. A Marine Corps training center in Pasadena has been christened Blecksmith Hall. On a hot Sunday morning this past August, Alex parked his brother's Expedition in the cemetery and walked across the grass to the pale granite stone that says JAMES PATRICK BLECKSMITH. An elderly man wandered over to the headstone, hand in hand with a grade-school kid who had a blond Mohawk, and told Alex, ''I never met JP, but I go by here and show my grandson his grave''

THREE YEARS AFTER BLECKSMITH'S death, his bedroom still looks the way it did when he left for Annapolis in 1999. There's a Green Bay Packers poster over the bed, a dense forest of athletic trophies, toy race cars lined up on the dresser. ''This is all his stuff from Iraq that they sent over,'' Alex says, looking down at a cardboard box on the floor. ''We haven't gone through it, really.''

Ed Blecksmith walks into the bedroom, and within a few seconds his voice is cracking and his blue eyes are growing wet. ''It's still tough,'' he says. ''You see all these pictures and things . . .'' He insists on sitting down in front of the TV downstairs and watching DVD footage of that magnificent funeral, fighting back a sob at the moment when one of the eulogists, a Navy SEAL, describes JP as having been ''the best of the best.'' Ed has some Fox News footage, too. In it, you can see JP speaking to his men hours before the battle in Fallujah, and that's where you get a brief glimpse of the regular guy behind the mythology. Because there stands JP, in fatigues and a floppy Boonie hat, holding a map, telling his marines to ''expect everything you can possibly imagine.'' When he looks at the camera for a moment, he's smiling.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California mischaracterized my position and what I am invested in. I am invested in what is best for this country, Mr. DREIER. And I am invested in what is best for our troops. And I am opposed to this Bush policy of an endless war, and I think it would be a mistake for this Congress to give this President another blank check.

This is not a meaningful charade, Mr. DREIER. Those of us who are arguing for this legislation want to bring this war to an end.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, today's debate is not about political calculation. It is not about public appearance or ready-made slogans. It is not about approval ratings or polls.

Today's debate is about the very future of this country that each one of us loves so dearly. It is a fork in the road. It is a rare opportunity for each of us to chart the course of the Nation we serve by casting a single vote.

Today we can vote for the status quo in Iraq or we can vote for change. For me, this choice is simple. I will vote for change.

The war in Iraq has divided our country for nearly 5 years, longer than our participation in World War II. Its monetary cost has already reached dizzying heights. Measured in casualties lost, lives forever altered, the toll of this war is truly staggering.

That is why we must transcend politics and party loyalty when we vote today. An issue of this magnitude requires each one of us as Members of Congress to vote based on our conscience and obligation to represent our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, on this issue my conscience and my constituents speak loud and clear. They say, We must end this war. Bring our troops home and work to restore our international reputation.

I stand here today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation because it accomplishes each of these three goals:

Within 30 days of enactment, it requires an immediate and orderly redeployment of our military from Iraq. No more delays, Mr. Speaker.

With today's bill, Congress stands with the American people in demanding a swift and responsible conclusion to military engagement in Iraq.

I also support this legislation because of what it does in the long term. It recognizes that we have a moral and strategic obligation to help rebuild Iraq, to avoid leaving a country in shambles.

The legislation before us today requires a comprehensive, diplomatic, political, and economic strategy for Iraq. We must work with our international partners to bring stability to Iraq, and this legislation does so. A renewed commitment to diplomacy is not only the right thing to do to fulfill our commitment to the Iraqi people, it also begins restoring our Nation's standing in the world.

I urge all of my colleagues to stand with the American people by voting for the bill before us today. This legislation takes a strong step forward in ending this long and costly war. In doing so, it is worthy of this House, worthy of the constituents we all serve, and worthy of the sacrifices of our soldiers and their families.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as I prepare to yield 4 minutes to my distinguished friend from Redlands, I would simply say that my friend from Worcester never mentioned the word ''victory'' in his analysis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). The Chair advises all Members that prefatory remarks before yielding time will be deducted from their time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate the Speaker's help in this matter, but in the meantime, I appreciate my colleague yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the wheels have finally come off the appropriations process. One need only to look at the sorry state of affairs in which we find ourselves as we address these appropriations bills.

Earlier today, the House passed a Transportation-HUD appropriations conference report that is $3 billion over the budget request. The President has said he will veto this legislation.

Tomorrow the House will vote to sustain the President's veto on a bloated Labor-HHS bill that is $10 billion over the budget request. That will essentially send the bill back to the drawing board.

And if that is not enough, consider this. It is now 3 days after Veterans Day and there is still no sign of the majority moving to considered the MilCon-VA bill, a freestanding bill identical to the MilCon-VA conference report that was removed from the Labor-HHS conference report by a point of order in the Senate, by the way, in the other body.

That bill was introduced by Congressman WICKER this week. This legislation, which the President said he would sign, could be brought to the House floor today. It now appears that a Democrat majority has no intent of bringing this legislation to the floor before Thanksgiving.

The appropriations process this year has been reduced to what Shakespeare might refer to as ''a tale full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.''

For all of the time and energy put into these bills this year by Members and our overworked, highly professional staff, the end result thus far is all sound and fury and very little to show for it.

That leads us to the legislation we are now considering, the so-called bridge fund. Frankly, that legislation is so ill-conceived and damaging to our troops, I hardly know where to begin.

First, let me say that we learned that this bill would be considered by the Rules Committee while we were waiting for the Rules Committee hearing on the THUD conference report to begin last night. I was given no notice whatsoever, nor was I provided any opportunity to testify. It is a sad state of affairs when the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee isn't even given the courtesy of paper notice

to testify on legislation as important as this. I can't imagine the wails and screaming I would have heard last year if the ranking member had been put in that position.

The House is being asked to consider a funding bill that reflects the priorities of Speaker PELOSI and a deeply divided, extremely left-leaning Democratic Caucus. It attempts to bridge these widening divisions over the war in Iraq through providing funding only on the condition that troops are withdrawn beginning 30 days after the bill's enactment.

□ 1800

Our troops are badly in need of funding to continue their mission, but this legislation ties the hands of our Commander in Chief during a time of war, places military decisions in the hands of the politicians, and micromanages our combatant commanders in whom we place the ultimate responsibility for prosecuting military actions.

If the majority's goal is to end the war or withdraw our troops, then that should be addressed in separate legislation. The majority cannot have it both ways, pretending on the one hand to support our troops while on the other hand undercutting our ability to prosecute their mission.

Men and women of good conscience can disagree about the war in Iraq, but on one thing we must all agree: Our men and women in uniform must continue to receive our unqualified support and the resources they need to complete their mission successfully.

By appeasing the wishes of the Out of Iraq Caucus, the Democrat majority has chosen to place partisan politics above the lives and well-being of our troops in harm's way. This action is reckless and irresponsible. There is absolutely no reason why a clean bridge fund could not have been included within the DOD conference report which the President signed yesterday. Again, the Democrat majority chose to place politics ahead of our troops.

My colleagues, consider carefully the consequences of our actions here today. Passage of the bridge fund legislation in its present form will signal to the insurgents and terrorists that the United States doesn't have the political will to continue supporting the fledgling Iraqi democracy. Al Qaeda and other enemies of freedom will simply lay in wait until our troops are withdrawn. And with the collapse of this fragile democracy, our efforts, and the sacrifices of our troops, will have been for nothing.

There is no question that the President will veto this bill. In the meantime, our troops will face the uncertainty resulting from the majority's mixed signals and lack of a clear commitment.

I urge my colleagues to support our troops and oppose this legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the last person in the world I will take lectures from on the appropriations process is the gentleman from California. The fact is that when he was the chairman of the Appropriations Committee last year, they never bothered to send any veterans health care legislation to the President at all. They simply, after the election, shut down the Congress and went home without sending one dime to veterans.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Would my colleague yield?

Mr. OBEY. No, I will not. You've had your time.

Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate not being interrupted. It's a technique which they use on that side of the aisle time after time. I hope it comes out of their time, not mine.

The fact is that they never bothered to send a dime to the needy veterans of the country. And so it was only after the Democrats took control of the House that we added $3.4 billion to the veterans health care budget and sent it to the President, and then later in the year in the regular bill, we have added $3.6 billion more. So I will be happy to compare the record of this party with his party any time on the issue of veterans health care.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 19½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the bill because I believe it does two critical and important things.

First, it provides $50 billion to finance military withdrawal from Iraq, to be completed by the end of next year. I voted against the beginning of the war, and I have consistently tried to end America's involvement in the war. Saddam Hussein is gone, there were no weapons of mass destruction, and there was no Iraqi involvement with al Qaeda or with 9/11. Al Qaeda in Iraq is now in shatters and subject to attack by both Shiites and Sunnis and poses no ongoing threat to the United States. We have no stake in the Iraqi civil war, and it is time to end our occupation.

I signed a letter to the President back in July with over 60 of my colleagues vowing not to support any more money for the war in Iraq unless it was for the protection and redeployment of our troops. I believe this bill is consistent with that commitment. The time has come to end the war, and the money we provide should be used only for that purpose.

The second critical thing this bill does is to end torture by the United States Government. By including in this bill the American Anti-Torture Act, which was introduced by Representative DELAHUNT and myself, we are saying, once and for all, no more torture. The law now requires the Department of Defense to follow the Army Field Manual, which bars torture or cruel and inhuman procedures such as waterboarding. This bill extends these limits to every U.S. government agency, including the CIA, and ensures a single, uniform, baseline standard for all interrogations of people under U.S. control. In short, that means no more waterboarding, no more clever wordplay, no more evasive answers, and no more uncertainty with regard to what is allowed and what is not allowed. It is time to restore the honor of the United States and to force the administration to act in a manner consistent with the Constitution.

When this bill is passed, the President could have two options: He could sign this bill and help bring the war in Iraq to a speedy end. Or he could veto the bill, in which case he will have to explain why he is denying funds for the troops. But we will not vote for further funding without a requirement to withdraw the troops as in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, let's end this war and let's end torture. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 5 minutes to my very good friend from Columbus, Indiana (Mr. PENCE), a hardworking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule and the bill.

The tide is turning in Iraq, Mr. Speaker, but nothing changes on Capitol Hill. Here we go again. Another Democrat plan for redeployment from Iraq, tying some $50 billion in necessary combat funds to a Democrat plan for withdrawal.

With unambiguous evidence of progress on the ground in Iraq, the Democrats in Congress seem to have added denial to their agenda of retreat and defeat. And the evidence of our progress is unambiguous.

I have seen many different Iraqs in my five trips, some hopeful, some not hopeful. But the news coming out of Iraq just in recent days from independent and official sources is encouraging.

U.S. military fatalities are down sharply: 101 Americans lost their lives in uniform in June; 39 in October. Iraqi civilian deaths are down sharply: 1,791 casualties in August; 750 in October. Mortar rocket attacks by insurgents in October were the lowest since February 2006. Iraqi officials say they plan to reduce checkpoints, ease curfews, and

open some roads around Baghdad because of the improving security situation. And this weekend, the government of Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki said that sectarian violence between Shia and Sunni in the neighborhoods of Baghdad has declined by more than 75 percent in the last 12 months. And yet here we are again, another plan for retreat and defeat in Iraq.

And it is not just the official sources that say we have made progress. The Associated Press just reported, ''Twilight brings traffic jams to the main shopping district of this once affluent corner of Baghdad, and hundreds of people stroll past well-stocked vegetable stands, bakeries, and butcher shops.''

The Washington Post recently wrote, ''The number of attacks against U.S. soldiers has fallen to levels not seen since before the February 2006 bombing of a Shia shrine in Samarra that touched off waves of sectarian killing.''

And the New York Times noted just last week, '''American forces have routed al Qaeda in Mesopotamia, the Iraqi militant network from every neighborhood in Baghdad,' a top general reported today, 'allowing American troops involved in the surge to depart as planned.' ''

I urge my colleagues to reject again this Democrat plan for withdrawal as a part of the supplemental appropriations bill, but I urge my countrymen to give our soldiers a chance. Freedom and stability are beginning to take hold in Iraq. We cannot lose faith in ourselves or in our fighting men and women.

It would be Winston Churchill who exhorted his own people as follows: ''Nothing can save England if she will not save herself. If we lose faith in ourselves, in our capacity to guide and govern, if we lose our will to live, then indeed our story is told. If, while on all sides foreign nations are every day asserting a more aggressive and militant nationalism by arms and trade, we remain paralyzed by our own theoretical doctrines or plunged into the stupor of after-war exhaustion, then indeed all the croakers predict will come true and our ruin will be swift and final.'' So said the man who saved western civilization.

To my countrymen and to my colleagues, I say again: Reject this legislation, give our soldiers in a widening and undeniable success in Iraq a chance, and we will all, Republicans and Democrats, celebrate some day a free and democratic Iraq that will be a legacy for our children and our grandchildren for generations to come.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

The gentleman says give the Iraqi Government a chance. We are on our fifth year, Mr. Speaker. Three American soldiers lost their lives in Iraq yesterday, bringing the total to 3,858 deaths. I think we have given them more than a chance.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman for the time.

All of us in this Chamber and in this Nation support our troops. They have fought bravely, with love of this great country uppermost in their hearts. They have done all that we have asked them to do. They have done their job well. And now in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, we must do ours.

The President has indicated that he thinks this war will continue for another decade. But, Mr. Speaker, we must not concede to a 10-year war. Over 3,850 brave American lives have been lost; 163 Ohio soldiers have been killed; more than 28,000 of our Nation's finest have been wounded. The year 2007 has been the deadliest year for U.S. troops since this war began 4½ years ago.

Our troops have been stretched woefully thin, exposing this Nation to greater risk, not less. We have already spent over $450 billion on the war in Iraq. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the President's war policies could cost $2.4 trillion in the next decade. And the President insists in getting that money that it come with no strings, no oversight, no accountability, no questions asked. And, in return, he offers to the American people and to our brave troops no end in sight. It is time for a new direction. We must not proceed further down the road to a 10-year war.

This bill requires a transition in the mission of U.S. forces in Iraq from combat to force and diplomatic protection. It provides for targeted counterterrorism operations. And this bill prohibits deployment to Iraq of troops who are not fully equipped and fully trained. It prohibits the use of torture, as described in the Army Field Manual. And it changes direction from the 10-year war plan being offered by the President toward a responsible plan redeploying our troops, while providing our troops with the resources they need.

When I visited Iraq, I saw some of the hardships and the obstacles our troops face, and I also saw the commitment and dedication in each of those men and women. They truly took my breath away. They deserve a policy that is worthy of their commitment and their sacrifice.

The bill before us today gives our troops the support, the equipment, the training they need to responsibly redeploy. It repairs the readiness of our military and refocuses our efforts on fighting terrorism around the world.

Last November, people across the Nation cast their ballots seeking a change in direction. After more than 4 years and countless taxpayer dollars, this Congress has a responsibility to tell this President that the status quo is not acceptable. It's time to bring a responsible end to the war in Iraq and to focus on fighting terrorism and protecting the Nation.

□ 1815

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I will say to my colleagues that it's very interesting to listen to this debate, because as we've proceeded, I have yet to hear the word ''victory'' come from the other side of the aisle at all. I have yet to hear anyone interested in trying to build a democracy.

Now, we saw three elections take place in Iraq, as we all know, with a 70 percent voter turnout.

We know that there are problems there. My friend from Worcester correctly said that we have problems with corruption in government in Iraq. We've had corruption problems in this country as well. But the fact of the matter is we have seen dramatic improvement. There is no doubt about the fact that we've seen improvement.

And I've got to say, Mr. Speaker, that we continue to hear this term ''redeployment.'' That means one thing. It doesn't mean victory. It doesn't mean build a democracy. It means withdraw and lose. And I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, we are determined to ensure that that doesn't happen.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, some refer to this as a bridge fund connecting monies from one year to the next to finance this Iraq war.

A bridge is built to overcome an obstacle, and the obstacle here is George Bush. Granting this President 50 billion more dollars without reasonable restrictions to end this war is just building another bridge to nowhere.

Today, instead, we use this funding to build a bridge that brings our troops home by beginning a safe, orderly, phased redeployment from Iraq.

The President can no longer defy our Constitution as the sole ''decider.'' America has decided that he's wrong, dead wrong, too many deaths wrong, and it's elected representatives in this Congress are now declaring ''no more blank checks.''

Despite the sacrifices of our troops in this deadliest year of the war, this surge has failed completely to achieve its purpose of political progress. ''Retreat,'' you say; you've had a 5-year retreat from political reality. Progress, you say; not in Iraq, not in political reconciliation; progress, perhaps only in your self-defeating propaganda as you repeatedly waved your ''mission accomplished'' banner.

The continued cost of this war in hemorrhaged blood and $3 billion of taxpayer money every week is not acceptable or sustainable.

Mr. President, no more ''cut-and-run''. We will not cut these reasonable restrictions from this legislation, and we will not run from your veto threat.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). All Members are advised to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds, and I do so to say I still have yet to hear the term ''victory'' come from the other side of the aisle. I still have yet to hear anyone talk about the notion of building a democracy in Iraq so that self-determination and the rule of law and the building of democratic institutions can, in fact, have a chance to succeed. And there is no recognition of the fact that we have seen a tremendous number of reduction in IED attacks, and the number of overall attacks has dropped dramatically.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill to change the mission of the United States Armed Forces in Iraq and undertake their redeployment. It is time to set a real plan to end this war, fought courageously by our troops on the ground, but recklessly mismanaged by our administration at home.

2007 has been the deadliest year for American troops since the start of the war in Iraq; 860 U.S. casualties since January. And almost 1 year after the President announced a so-called surge, the Iraqi Government has made no progress toward political reconciliation and is nowhere near taking responsibility for security in all of its provinces.

Without any progress or end in sight, the cost of the war continues to rise. The recent Joint Economic Committee report estimates the cost of the war at $1.3 trillion from 2002 to 2008; yet just this week the President vetoed critical funds for education, job training and health care, and, yes, he vetoed the children's health care bill.

With its latest $200 billion request for wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the administration has asked for a total of $800 billion, all paid for with the government's credit card.

Mr. Speaker, with this bill we put forth a plan and a clear path toward change. We require the start of the redeployment of U.S. forces within 30 days of enactment, with a goal for completion of redeployment by December 15, 2008.

It prohibits the deployment of U.S. troops to Iraq who are not fully trained and fully equipped, and changes the mission of U.S. forces in Iraq to diplomatic and force protection, targeted counterterrorism operations, and limited support to Iraqi security forces. And notably, the bill prohibits torture once and for all.

We provide $50 billion to meet the immediate needs of the troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and defer consideration of the remainder of the President's request.

The President and his stubborn Republican allies in the Congress have acted recklessly in Iraq and with our Nation's standing in the world. And the American people pay the price. Our young men and women are paying the price.

The Bush administration rushed to war and never had an exit strategy. If we, in the Congress, do not provide one, who will?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I've still not heard the term ''victory'' or ''building democracy.''

I would inquire of the Chair, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 3¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 10¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. I think at this juncture I might reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I and everybody in this Chamber, hopefully, wants to see democracy flourish in Iraq. But the fact of the matter is that the status quo isn't producing that. And maybe, just maybe, the corrupt and inept Maliki government will get its act together if it finally realizes that we won't be there forever, that this will not be an endless war.

Our troops have sacrificed enough. They have sacrificed enough.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the American people get it. Over 50 percent of the American people believe that we should now begin a reduction of our troops.

As I listened here on the floor of the house, and I listened to my good friends on the other side of the aisle claiming the me-me's and the I-I's, I hear no one talking about victory.

Victory in what sense? So that we can pound our chests and brag about what this Congress and this President has done?

We're talking about lives here. We're talking about lives. And I am sick and tired of listening to people bragging about who can claim a victory.

Well, my belief is that the soldiers on the battlefield, the most deadliest year that we've ever had, 2006, we buried more than we could ever imagine. Those soldiers have already claimed victory. They took Fallujah. They took Baghdad.

And my concern is why have we not championed the victory of those soldiers? Why haven't we welcomed them home, given them accolades because they have been victorious?

Someone on the other side has not read this bill. This bill allows for a redeployment in an orderly manner, and it demands that the President use these dollars to redeploy.

I am not going to trample on the graves of dead soldiers and continue a war that has no end. That government has the ability in Iraq to diplomatically deal with democracy. We have died so they can deal with democracy.

It is time to end this war now and to bring our soldiers home with the dignity and victory they deserve.

Right now, in the Nation's hospitals, we are seeing the results of his victory. We are seeing soldiers with brain injury, soldiers with no limbs. And we have a broken health care system that can't even address the question of those soldiers with posttraumatic stress brain injury and otherwise.

My voice is gone, but I am tired of this question of victory because I believe, and I have a bill, and I ask my good friend from California to join it, the Military Success Act of 2007 that chronicles the victories of our soldiers.

We can bring them home with dignity. I am not going to tolerate one more dead body. And it is time to end this war and end it now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4156, introduced by my colleague, Mr. OBEY. I would like to thank him for his ongoing leadership as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and on this important issue in particular.

The legislation we are considering today provides our troops with the resources they need, but it does not give the President the blank check he has asked for to fund an endless combat operation in Iraq. Instead of his additional $200 billion, we are considering a $50 billion package, which institutes a redeployment timeline, as well as other critical directives designed to transition our role in Iraq and bring our troops home.

Madam Speaker, the funds provided by this legislation are, crucially, tied to a requirement for the immediate start of the redeployment of U.S. forces. It sets December 15, 2008, as the target date for the completion of the redeployment, and requires redeployment to begin within 30 days of enactment.

As lawmakers continue to debate U.S. policy in Iraq, our heroic young men and women continue to willingly sacrifice life and limb on the battlefield. Our troops in Iraq did everything we asked them to do. We sent them overseas to fight an army; they are now caught in the midst of an insurgent civil war and continuing political upheaval. The United States will not and should not permanently prop up the Iraqi Government and military. U.S. military involvement in Iraq will come to an end, and, when U.S. forces leave, the responsibility for securing their nation will fall to Iraqis themselves. However, whether or not my colleagues agree that the time has come to withdraw our American forces from Iraq, I believe that all of us in Congress should be of one accord that our troops deserve our sincere thanks and congratulations.

For this reason, I extremely please to have worked with the Democratic leadership to include language recognizing the extraordinary achievements of our men and women in uniform. Paragraph 2 of Title I reads, ''the performance of United States military personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan should be commended, their courage and sacrifice have been exceptional, and when they come home, their service should be recognized appropriately.'' I believe that the inclusion of this language makes it clear that we are proud of the accomplishments of our troops, and we look forward to commending them as they return safely home.

I also worked with the Leadership to include the language in Paragraph 3 of Title 1. This paragraph reads, ''the primary purpose of funds made available by this Act should be to transition the mission of United States Armed Forces in Iraq and undertake their redeployment, and not to extend or prolong the war.'' This language makes explicit that this legislation is providing funding for the safe and responsible redeployment of our troops, not for the continuation of combat operations.

This legislation protects our troops, by providing them with the funding they need to safely and successfully redeploy from Iraq. It also prohibits the deployment of forces to Iraq who are not fully trained and fully equipped. In addition, this legislation includes an extension to all U.S. Government agencies and personnel of the current prohibition in the Army Field Manual against the use of certain interrogation techniques.

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains important language that changes the mission of U.S. forces in Iraq to diplomatic and force protection, targeted counterterrorism operations, and limited support to Iraqi security forces. I firmly believe that we must make diplomacy and statecraft tools of the first, rather than the last, resort. We must seek constructive engagement with Iraq, its neighbors, and the rest of the international community, as we work to bring resolution to this calamitous conflict that has already gone on far too long.

Because of my deeply held belief that we must commend our military for their exemplary performance and success in Iraq, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 4020, with the support of a number of my colleagues, entitled the ''Military Success in Iraq Commemoration Act of 2007.'' This legislation recognizes the extraordinary performance of the Armed Forces in achieving the military objectives of the United States in Iraq, encourages the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe a national day of celebration commemorating the military success of American troops in Iraq, and provides other affirmative and tangible expressions of appreciation from a grateful Nation to all veterans of the war in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we have already expended 3,500 American lives and $400 billion in taxpayer dollars in Iraq. We have occupied the country for over 4 years. And our President continues to push a strategy devoid of clear direction and visible targets, while rejecting congressional calls to solidify an exit strategy.

Last November, the American people clearly stated that they did not want to see an endless conflict in Iraq; they went to the polls and elected a new, Democratic Congress to lead our Nation out of Iraq. I am proud to be a member of the Congressional class that listens and adheres to the will of the American people, as we did when both houses of Congress approved Iraq Supplemental bills that instituted a timetable for U.S. withdrawal. We need a new direction, because we owe our brave, fighting men and women so much more. Washington made a mistake in going to war. It is time for politicians to admit that mistake and fix it before any more lives are lost.

This Congress will not, as the previous, Republican, Congress did, continue to rubber stamp what we believe to be an ill-conceived war. As we continue to receive reports on the situation in Iraq, it is important that we continue to look forward, to the future of Iraq beyond a U.S. military occupation.

Despite the multitude of mistakes perpetrated by President Bush and former Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, our troops have achieved a military success in ousting Saddam Hussein and assisting the Iraqis in administering a democratic election and electing a democratic government. However, only the Iraqi government can secure a lasting peace. Time and time again, the Iraqi government has demonstrated an inability to deliver on the political benchmarks that they themselves agreed were essential to achieving national reconciliation. Continuing to put the lives of our soldiers and our national treasury in the hands of what by most informed accounts, even by members of the Bush Administration, is an ineffective central Iraqi government is irresponsible and contrary to the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Our Nation has already paid a heavy price in Iraq. Over 3,810 American soldiers have died. In addition, more than 27,660 have been wounded in the Iraq war since it began in March 2003. June, July, and August have marked the bloodiest months yet in the conflict, and U.S. casualties in Iraq are 62 percent higher this year than at this time in 2006. This misguided, mismanaged, and misrepresented war has claimed too many lives of our brave servicemen; its depth, breadth, and scope are without precedent in American history. In addition, the United States is spending an estimated $10 billion per month in Iraq. This $10 billion a month translates into $329,670,330 per day, $13,736,264 per hour, $228,938 per minute, and $3,816 per second.

For this huge sum of money, we could have repaired the more than 70,000 bridges across America rated structurally deficient, $188 billion, potentially averting the tragedy that occurred August 1 in Minneapolis, Minnesota. We could have rebuilt the levees in New Orleans, $50 billion, protecting that city from future hurricanes that could bring Katrina-like destruction upon the city. We could have provided all U.S. public safety officials with interoperable communication equipment, $10 billion, allowing them to effectively communicate in the event of an emergency, and we could have paid for screening all air cargo on passenger planes for the next 10 years, $3.6 billion. And, we could have enrolled 1.4 million additional children in Head Start programs, $10 billion. Instead of funding increased death and destruction in Iraq, we could have spent hard-earned taxpayer dollars on important progress here at home.

The Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am proud to be a member, has recently heard a string of reports from military and civilian officials about the political, military, social, and economic situation in Iraq. Two weeks ago, the Government Accountability Office, GAO, informed the Congress that the Iraqi government has met only 3 of the 18 legislative, economic, and security benchmarks. Despite the surge, despite increasing U.S. military involvement, the Iraqi Government has not made substantial progress toward stabilizing their country.

President Bush rationalized his surge, over opposition by myself and other House Democrats, by arguing it would give the Iraqi government ''the breathing space it needs to make progress in other critical areas,'' bringing about reconciliation between warring factions, Sunni and Shia. However, non-partisan assessments, such as last week's GAO report, have illustrated that escalating U.S. military involvement in Iraq is instead hindering that nation's ability to move beyond the devastation of war and death, to build a successful new government, and to create a stable and secure environment. In the 7 months since the surge began, increased American military presence has not been able to end the relentless cycles of sectarian violence that continue to plague Iraq. Nor have larger numbers of U.S. troops been successful in unifying and strengthening the Iraqi Government.

Instead, the security situation continues to deteriorate. Sectarian violence remains high, and even the Bush administration has noted the unsatisfactory progress toward political reconciliation. The Sunni-led insurgency continues, with insurgents conducting increasingly complex and well-coordinated attacks. The August 2007 National Intelligence Estimate cited ongoing violence, stating, ''the level of overall violence, including attacks on and casualties among civilians, remain high; Iraq's sectarian groups remain unreconciled.'' The report went on to note that al-Qaeda in Iraq, AQI, ''retains the ability to conduct high-profile attacks,'' and ''Iraqi political leaders remain unable to govern effectively.''

The ever-increasing sectarian violence is causing immense daily challenges for Iraqis. Millions have been displaced, and an Iraqi Red Crescent Organization has reported an increase of nearly 630,000 internally displaced persons from February 2007 to July 2007. The same organization predicts an additional 80,000 to 100,000 persons are displaced each month. The UN High Commissioner for Refugees has estimated that 1.8 million Iraqis are now refugees, with an additional 40,000 to 50,000 fleeing to neighboring countries each month. Iraq has become a humanitarian disaster, and one that continues to get worse every day.

The United States military is a skilled and highly proficient organization, and where there are large numbers of U.S. troops, it is unsurprising that we see fewer incidents of violence. However, it is our responsibility to take a longer-term view. The United States will not and should not permanently prop up the Iraqi Government and military. U.S. military involvement in Iraq will come to an end, and, when U.S. forces leave, the responsibility for securing their nation will fall to Iraqis themselves. And so far, we have not seen a demonstrated commitment by the Iraqi Government.

In addition, evidence suggests that not only is increased U.S. military presence in Iraq not making that nation more secure, it may also be threatening our national security by damaging our ability to respond to real threats to our own homeland. The recently released video by Osama bin Laden serves to illustrate that President Bush has not caught this international outlaw, nor brought him to justice. Instead, he has diverted us from the real war on terror to the war of his choice in Iraq.

The former Chairman and Vice Chairman of the 9/11 Commission, Thomas H. Kean and Lee H. Hamilton, share this view. In a recent op-ed, Kean and Hamilton note that our own actions have contributed to a rise of radicalization and rage in the Muslim world. Kean and Hamilton write that ''no conflict drains more time, attention, blood, treasure, and support from our worldwide counterterrorism efforts than the war in Iraq. It

has become a powerful recruiting and training tool for al-Qaeda.''

Our troops in Iraq did everything we asked them to do. We sent them overseas to fight an army; they are now caught in the midst of an insurgent civil war and political upheaval. I have, for some time now, advocated for congressional legislation declaring a military victory in Iraq, and recognizing the success of our military. Our brave troops have completed the task we set for them; it is time now to bring them home. Our next steps should not be a continuing escalation of military involvement, but instead a diplomatic surge.

Democrats in Congress will not continue to rubber stamp the President's ill-conceived war effort. Last November, the American people spoke loudly and clearly, demanding a new direction to U.S. foreign policy, and we here in Congress are committed to seeing that change be brought about. We are working to see the extensive funds currently being spent to sustain the war in Iraq go to important domestic programs and to securing our homeland against real and imminent threats.

President Bush and Vice President CHENEY have been given numerous chances and ample time by the American people and the Congress to straighten out the mess in Iraq. They have failed. It is pure fantasy to imagine that President Bush's military surge has created the necessary safety and security to meet economic, legislative, and security benchmarks. It is time for a new strategy, a new plan that will encourage Iraqis to take charge of their own destiny, seek constructive and sustained regional engagement, and substitute the ill-advised military surge for a thoughtful diplomatic one. It is time to be realistic and pragmatic, to recognize that our troops achieved what they were initially sent in for and that continued U.S. military engagement is not bringing about the desired results.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides our brave soldiers in Iraq with the resources they need, while requiring that the President begin to redeploy our troops. It keeps our soldiers safe, and it keeps our Nation safe. By bringing an end to this conflict, this Democratic Congress is making significant strides forward toward protecting and securing America.

I strongly urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting today's legislation, and in giving the troops the resources they need to safely redeploy from Iraq.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I'm very sorry that my friend wouldn't yield so that we could engage in debate. And I will say, victory means ensuring that our children don't face the threat of another terrorist attack like what we saw on September 11. We know that Iraq is the central point for al Qaeda, and I am absolutely determined to ensure that we achieve victory.

There have been tremendous achievements when it comes to democracy building. We can't ignore that. But we want to bring our troops home as soon as possible.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. And I also want to associate myself with the words of the lady from Texas who just spoke.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the bill. To date, President Bush has asked us for a total of $804 billion for fighting the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Yesterday, the Joint Economic Committee, the committee on which I sit, concluded in a report that the real economic cost of these wars is $1.6 trillion. However, there are numerous hidden costs that could potentially bring the grand total to $3.5 trillion.

In response to the President's failing new strategy in Iraq and wasteful spending, Congress has chosen instead to ensure strict accountability. We have heard the American people and have chosen to exercise fiscal responsibility by considering this vitally important legislation.

Namely, the bill limits funding in the amount of $50 billion, in comparison to the President's original supplemental request of $196.4 billion, to continue our military operations in Iraq, while ensuring that the responsible and strategic redeployment of our forces begins no later than 30 days from the date of enactment.

It also provides troops with the resources needed for continued protection from improvised explosive devices.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to exercise their responsibility to the American people, to over 3,800 brave soldiers, 71 from Maryland who have died and who have paid the ultimate price, and to more than 2.3 million Iraqis who have fled their homes, by supporting the rule and voting in favor of this legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is about whether or not we continue to fund the worst foreign policy fiasco in American history.

This is not about al Qaeda. In fact, if we had gone after al Qaeda when we had the opportunity, they wouldn't have been able to strengthen themselves in Pakistan and Afghanistan. But we've been diverted over to Iraq, where al Qaeda didn't even exist until our invasion gave them a recruitment tool and rallying cry.

And sure there's less violence in Baghdad, but the reason is because the Shiia have ethnically cleansed much of Baghdad. When we started, 60 percent of Baghdad was Sunni. Now, almost 80 percent of Baghdad is Shiia.

And the reason there's less violence in al-Anbar province is because the Sunni warlords have taken it upon themselves to drive out the al Qaeda insurgents.

Our military generals have told us this war does not lend itself to a military victory. The most we can do is to step up our diplomatic efforts.

But the fact is that we are supporting a government that doesn't deserve our support. It is not representative of the people of Iraq. It is endemically corrupt. And the reality is that when we look back and ask ourselves what have we accomplished, we are going to look at a government which is far more loyal to Iran than it is to the United States. That's what we've done, to empower our enemies.

We've created chaos throughout the Middle East. And isn't it time now to have a plan to start withdrawing our troops, to tell our military families that they have sacrificed as much as we could possibly expect of them?

But the reality is that this policy has never been worthy of the sacrifice of our soldiers and their military families.

□ 1830

And if you really believed in what you're doing in this war, you would support Mr. OBEY's attempt to pay for it. Not one dime of this war has been paid for. It's all been borrowed, borrowed from our children and our grandchildren. They deserve better and this bill is the best thing we can do for them right now.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

Let me just first say this has been an interesting debate and I do think that victory, a dramatic reduction in the number of attacks, the fact that reconciliation is, in fact, taking place in Baghdad is something that cannot be ignored.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today, before the House voted for the 12th time to allow the House to go to conference with the Senate on the Veterans Affairs funding bill, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) and I had a brief colloquy after which a Member on the other side of the aisle claimed that we had misrepresented the facts about this Congress's track record on getting the Veterans Affairs appropriations measure signed into law.

Well, I take this as akin to being accused of lying. Here is what we said, and, Mr. Speaker, I will say it again: The House passed the Veterans and Military Construction funding bill on June 15, 2007, by a vote of 409–2, with the Senate following suit and naming conferees on September 6. Unfortunately, the majority leadership of the House has refused to move the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations act to conference and has refused to name conferees.

So whether the majority likes it or not, that is a fact. Now, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from New York said that we were misrepresenting the facts. How is this so? For 68 days, Mr. Speaker, the message from the Senate requesting a conference has languished at the Speaker's desk without action. How is this fact disputable? Just look at the

calendar and count the days between September 7 and today, and you'll come up with 68. Every day the Democrats choose not to act to move this bill forward, our Nation's veterans lose $18.5 million.

Those are the facts surrounding this bill in this Congress. The gentleman from Texas went on earlier to malign Republicans for what we did or didn't do concerning veterans funding over the last 12 years, which begs the question, what does the last 12 years have to do with this year? Are Democrats trying to use past Congresses' shortcomings as excuses for their own failed policy? Otherwise, how is this even relevant?

I am sure that the gentleman from Worcester would stand up and attempt to deflect this plea by criticizing Republicans, just as his colleagues before him, and touting the increases in funding for our veterans provided by this Congress which all but two Members of this body voted for. The sad fact is that this Congress hasn't provided the funding that the gentleman has espoused. Why is that? That's because not one dime will flow from the Treasury to the Department of Veterans Affairs until the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill is signed into law, and in order to do so, this House has to go to conference with the Senate and send a bill down to the President to sign. So let's finally get that process started.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who is concerned about funding for our veterans must join us in voting against the previous question so that I can amend the rule and we can go to conference with the Senate on this much-needed and far-delayed funding measure.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD just prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me go back to the subject that we are debating here today, and that is the war in Iraq. Mr. Speaker, we have been fighting this war for nearly 5 years. That's longer than we fought World War II. My friends on the other side of the aisle have said over and over and over, just give the Iraqi Government a chance. Well, Mr. Speaker, after 5 years, I say, give me a break.

It is not us, not any of us in this Chamber who are in harm's way. But we have sent thousands and thousands and thousands of our fellow citizens to battle in Iraq. They are in harm's way. They wake up tomorrow in a situation where they are refereeing a civil war, and that, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, is wrong.

My friends on the other side of the aisle talk about al Qaeda. Well, we're all worried about al Qaeda, too. That's why we wish we were doing the job in Afghanistan better. That's why we wish we weren't so diverted from that mission in Iraq that we could actually have better results in Afghanistan than we're having right now. We are worried, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that al Qaeda is regrouping in Afghanistan, is regrouping in Pakistan. That should be a worry to every single Member in this Chamber. And yet we are stretched so thin, we are so preoccupied in Iraq that we have lost sight of what our central mission needs to be.

Mr. Speaker, victory is what is in the best interest of the American people. And this war in Iraq has not only diminished our standing in the world, it has spread our troops so thin that we can't complete missions like the one that we need to be completing in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, too often in this place we talk about numbers instead of the people behind those numbers. Yesterday, as I mentioned earlier, another three American soldiers lost their lives in Iraq, bringing the total to 3,858. Also yesterday, Mr. Speaker, CBS News reported that there is an epidemic of suicide among our soldiers and our veterans. Thousands and thousands of these men and women have taken their own lives. For too many, the war does not end when they return home. And behind each one of those numbers is a devastated family, a heartbroken father, a new widow, a child without a father. Mr. Speaker, we will be paying for this war for a very long, long time.

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle say we all want the war to end, we all want our troops to come home. Well, I say to my friends, here is your chance. You have a voice. Use it. You have a vote. Use it. You have the opportunity to change the direction of this policy. You have the opportunity to force the Iraqi Government to live up to its promises. You have the opportunity to finally, finally, honor the will of the American people and to safely redeploy our troops. I ask my friends to seize that opportunity and to support this bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. DREIER is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 818 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. The House disagrees to the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2642, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference requested by the Senate thereon. The Speaker shall appoint conferees immediately, but may declare a recess under clause 12(a) of rule I for the purpose of consulting the Minority Leader prior to such appointment. The motion to instruct conferees otherwise in order pending the appointment of conferees instead shall be in order only at a time designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within two additional legislative days after adoption of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

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 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 818, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 4120.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 185, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 1103]

YEAS—209

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

NAYS—185

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—38

Bono
Boozman
Burgess
Carney
Carson
Cleaver
Costa
Cubin
Cuellar
Davis (AL)
Doyle
Ellison
Feeney
Gordon
Holden
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
King (IA)
Knollenberg
Levin
Lowey
Mack
McHugh
Meeks (NY)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Oberstar
Paul
Ruppersberger
Schakowsky
Sessions
Tancredo
Tiberi
Towns
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wolf

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SOLIS) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 5 minutes remaining in this vote.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1856

Mrs. DRAKE, Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. KINGSTON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. CLARKE changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1103, I was unable to vote for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1103, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 190, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 1104]

YEAS—219

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel

Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—190

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Tom
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Abercrombie
Allen
Bachus
Bilirakis
Bono
Carson
Cubin
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Doyle
Gingrey
Hastert
Jindal
Jones (OH)
Levin
Mack
McCrery
Oberstar
Paul
Ruppersberger
Sessions
Weller
Wolf

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1902

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 for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1104, I was unable to vote for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1104, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

EFFECTIVE CHILD PORNOGRAPHY PROSECUTION ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4120, 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 gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4120.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 1105]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
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)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Boehner
Bono
Carson
Cubin
DeFazio
Doggett
Doyle
Gutierrez
Hill
Jindal
Levin
Lewis (CA)

Mack	Oberstar	Stark
Marshall	Paul	Weller
McCrery	Ruppersberger	Wolf
Myrick	Sessions	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1909

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1105, I was unable to vote for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during rollcall votes 1093 through 1105. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall 1093, ''yea'' on rollcall 1094, ''nay'' on rollcall 1095, ''yea'' on rollcall 1096, ''yea'' on rollcall 1097, ''yea'' on rollcall 1098, ''yea'' on rollcall 1099, ''nay'' on rollcall 1100, ''nay'' on rollcall 1101, ''yea'' on rollcall 1102, ''yea'' on rollcall 1103, ''yea'' on rollcall 1104, and ''yea'' on rollcall 1105.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3773, RESTORE ACT OF 2007

Mr. ARCURI, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–449) on the resolution (H. Res. 824) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3773) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3915, MORTGAGE REFORM AND ANTI-PREDATORY LENDING ACT OF 2007

Mr. ARCURI, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–450) on the resolution (H. Res. 825) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3915) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to reform consumer mortgage practices and provide accountability for such practices, to establish licensing and registration requirements for residential mortgage originators, to provide certain minimum standards for consumer mortgage loans, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ORDERLY AND RESPONSIBLE IRAQ REDEPLOYMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 818, I call up the bill (H.R. 4156) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4156

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

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—POLICY ON REDEPLOYMENT AND CONDUCT OF OPERATIONS IN IRAQ

SEC. 101. It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the war in Iraq should end as safely and quickly as possible and our troops should be brought home;

(2) the performance of United States military personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan should be commended, their courage and sacrifice have been exceptional, and when they come home, their service should be recognized appropriately; and

(3) the primary purpose of funds made available by this Act should be to transition the mission of United States Armed Forces in Iraq and undertake their redeployment, and not to extend or prolong the war.

SEC. 102. (a) No person in the custody or under the effective control of the United States Government shall be subject to any treatment or technique of interrogation not authorized by and listed in the United States Army Field Manual FM2–22.3 Human Intelligence Collector Operations.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any person in the custody or under the effective control of the United States Government pursuant to a criminal law or immigration law of the United States. Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the rights under the United States Constitution of any person in the custody or under the physical jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 103. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the following laws enacted or regulations promulgated to implement the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (done at New York on December 10, 1984)—

(1) section 2340A of title 18, United States Code;

(2) section 2242 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (division G of Public Law 105–277; 112 Stat. 2681–822; 8 U.S.C. 1231 note) and regulations prescribed thereto, including regulations under part 208 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations, and part 95 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(3) sections 1002 and 1003 of the Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–148).

SEC. 104. (a) The Congress finds that United States military units should not enter into combat unless they are fully capable of performing their assigned mission. The Congress further finds that this is the policy of the Department of Defense.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to deploy any unit of the Armed Forces to Iraq unless the President has certified in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives at least 15 days in advance of the deployment that the unit is ''fully mission capable''.

(c) For the purposes of subsection (b) the term ''fully mission capable'' means capable of performing a unit's assigned mission to the prescribed standards under the conditions expected in the theater of operation, consistent with the guidelines set forth in the Department of Defense's Defense Readiness Reporting System.

(d) The President, by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the deployment to Iraq of a unit that is not assessed fully mission capable is required for reasons of national security and by submitting along with a certification a report in classified and unclassified form detailing the particular reason or reasons why the unit's deployment is necessary, may waive the limitations prescribed in subsection (b) on a unit-by-unit basis.

SEC. 105. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act are available immediately for obligation to plan and execute a safe and orderly redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq.

(b) Within 30 days after enactment of this Act, the President shall commence an immediate and orderly redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq, which shall be implemented as part of the comprehensive regional stability plan described in subsection (g). The President shall endeavor to begin such redeployment with units of the Armed Forces that have been deployed in excess of 365 days, except to the extent those units are needed to provide for the safe withdrawal of other units of the Armed Forces or to protect United States and Coalition personnel and infrastructure.

(c) The reduction in United States Armed Forces required by this section shall be implemented in conjunction with a comprehensive diplomatic, political and economic strategy that includes sustained engagement with Iraq's neighbors and the international community for the purpose of working collectively to bring stability to Iraq.

(d) The goal for the completion of the transition of United States Armed Forces to a limited presence and missions as described in subsection (e) shall be a date that is not later than December 15, 2008.

(e) After the conclusion of the reduction and transition of United States Armed Forces to a limited presence as required by this section, the Secretary of Defense may deploy or maintain members of the Armed Forces in Iraq only for the following missions:

(1) Protecting United States diplomatic facilities, United States Armed Forces, and American citizens.

(2) Conducting limited training, equipping, and providing logistical and intelligence support to the Iraqi Security forces.

(3) Engaging in targeted counterterrorism operations against al-Qaeda, al-Qaeda affiliated groups, and other terrorist organizations in Iraq.

(f) Not later than February 1, 2008, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(1) The current plan for and the status of the reduction of United States Armed Forces in Iraq and the transition of the Armed Forces in Iraq to a limited presence whose missions do not exceed the missions specified in subsection (e), including the associated force reductions and adjustments and expectations with respect to timelines and the force levels anticipated to perform those missions.

(2) A comprehensive current description of efforts to prepare for the reduction and transition of United States Armed Forces in Iraq in accordance with this section and to limit any destabilizing consequences of such reduction and transition, including a description of efforts to work with the United Nations and countries in the region toward that objective.

(g) Not later than February 15, 2008, the President shall submit to the Congress in classified and unclassified form a comprehensive regional stability plan for the Middle East, which shall include a military, diplomatic, political and economic strategy that provides for the national security interests of the United States in the region and for the engagement of targeted counterterrorism operations. The plan shall include a detailed description of the projected United States military force presence in and around the Middle East region for the 5-year period beginning on October 1, 2008.

SEC. 106. The amounts appropriated by this Act are sufficient to fully meet the immediate needs of the United States Armed Forces deployed to Iraq. Congressional consideration of additional funding shall be deferred until the first report required by section 105(f) is submitted to the Congress.

TITLE II—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Army'', $713,700,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Navy'', $95,624,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', $56,050,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $138,037,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $27,429,490,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $2,071,560,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $2,429,323,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $3,582,560,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $1,330,540,000, of which not to exceed $333,000,000, to remain available until expended, may be used for payments to reimburse key cooperating nations, for logistical, military, and other support provided to United States military operations, notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided*, That such payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, in his discretion, based on documentation determined by the Secretary of Defense to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the United States, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $61,223,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve'', $47,500,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve'', $26,157,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $8,089,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $378,381,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $34,422,000.

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'', $500,000,000: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Commander, Office of Security Cooperation Afghanistan, or the Secretary's designee, to provide assistance, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to the security forces of Afghanistan, including the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, and construction, and funding: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this heading is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer such funds to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purposes provided herein: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds so transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this Fund, and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing upon the receipt and upon the transfer of any contribution, delineating the sources and amounts of the funds received and the specific use of such contributions: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 5 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation account, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report no later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal quarter to the congressional defense committees summarizing the details of the transfer of funds from this appropriation.

IRAQ SECURITY FORCES FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Iraq Security Forces Fund'', $500,000,000: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Commander, Multi-National Security Transition Command—Iraq, or the Secretary's designee, to provide assistance, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to the security forces of Iraq, including the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, and construction, and funding, and to provide training, reintegration, education and employment programs for concerned local citizens, former militia members and detainees and former detainees: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this heading is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer such funds to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purposes provided herein: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds so transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this Fund, and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing upon the receipt and upon the transfer of any contribution, delineating the sources and amounts of the funds received and the specific use of such contributions: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 5 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation account, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report no later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal quarter to the congressional defense committees summarizing the details of the transfer of funds from this appropriation.

IRAQ FREEDOM FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For ''Iraq Freedom Fund'', $3,168,000,000, to remain available for transfer only to support operations in Iraq and to fight terrorism: *Provided*, the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence shall, no fewer than 30 days prior to making transfers under this authority, notify the Committees on Appropriations in writing of the details of any such transfer made for intelligence activities: *Provided further*, That funds transferred shall be merged with and be available

for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation or fund to which transferred.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund'', $1,638,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization to investigate, develop and provide equipment, supplies, services, training, facilities, personnel and funds to assist United States forces in the defeat of improvised explosive devices: *Provided further*, That within 60 days of enactment of this Act, a plan for the intended management and use of the Fund is provided to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal quarter to the congressional defense committees providing assessments of the evolving threats, individual service requirements to counter the threats, individual service requirements to counter the threats, the current strategy for predeployment training of members of the Armed Forces on explosive devices, and details on the execution of this Fund: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein to appropriations for operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That upon determination that all or part of the funds so transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purpose provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 5 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer.

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Army'', $302,200,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army'', $1,574,217,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Army'', $154,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Army'', $1,976,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', $25,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Navy'', $88,281,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Marine Corps'', $729,232,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', $147,800,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', $42,125,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Defense-Wide'', $102,588,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''Defense Health Program'', $649,001,000; of which $599,001,000 shall be for operation and maintenance; and of which $50,000,000 shall be for research, development, test and evaluation, to remain available until September 30, 2009, only for peer reviewed research on traumatic brain injury and psychological health, including post-traumatic stress disorder.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Appropriations provided in this Act are available for obligation until September 30, 2008, unless otherwise provided in this Act.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 202. (a) Upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may transfer between appropriations up to $4,000,000,000 of the funds made available to the Department of Defense in this Act.

(b) The Secretary shall notify the Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to the authority in this section.

(c) The authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense and is subject to the same terms and conditions as the authority provided in section 8005 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2008, except for the fourth proviso.

SEC. 203. Funds appropriated in this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in or pursuant to this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414(a)(1)).

SEC. 204. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to finance programs or activities denied by the Congress in fiscal years 2007 or 2008 appropriations to the Department of Defense or to initiate a procurement or research, development, test and evaluation new start program unless such program or project must be undertaken immediately in the interest of national security and after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 205. (a) From funds made available for operation and maintenance in this Act to the Department of Defense, not to exceed $500,000,000 may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to fund the Commander's Emergency Response Program, for the purpose of enabling military commanders in Iraq and Afghanistan to respond to urgent humanitarian relief and reconstruction requirements within their areas of responsibility by carrying out programs that will immediately assist the Iraqi and Afghan people.

(b) Not later than 15 days after the end of each fiscal year quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the source of funds and the allocation and use of funds during that quarter that were made available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes of the programs under subsection (a).

SEC. 206. (a) During fiscal year 2008, funds available in this Act to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide supplies, services, transportation, including airlift and sealift, and other logistical support to Coalition forces supporting military and stability operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees regarding support provided under this section.

SEC. 207. (a) Supervision and administration costs associated with a construction project funded with appropriations available for operation and maintenance, Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, or Iraq Security Forces Fund, and executed in direct support of the Global War on Terror only in Iraq and Afghanistan, may be obligated at the time a construction contract is awarded.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term ''supervision and administration costs'' includes all in-house Government costs.

SEC. 208. Each amount appropriated or otherwise provided in this Act is designated as an emergency requirement and necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of section 204 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008.

SEC. 209. (a) Not later than January 15, 2008 and every 90 days thereafter through the end of fiscal year 2008, the Secretary of Defense shall set forth in a report to the Congress a comprehensive set of performance indicators and measures for progress toward military and political stability in Iraq.

(b) The report shall include performance standards and goals for security, economic, and security force training objectives in Iraq, together with a notional timetable for achieving these goals.

(c) The report shall include, at a minimum, the following specific provisions:

(1) With respect to stability and security in Iraq, the following:

(A) Key measures of political stability, including the important political milestones that must be achieved over the next several years.

(B) The primary indicators of a stable security environment in Iraq, such as number of engagements per day, numbers of trained Iraqi forces, trends relating to numbers and types of ethnic and religious-based hostile encounters, and progress made in the transition to Provincial Iraqi Control (PIC).

(C) An assessment of the estimated strength of the insurgency in Iraq and the extent to which it is composed of non-Iraqi fighters.

(D) A description of all militias operating in Iraq, including the number, size, equipment strength, military effectiveness, sources of support, legal status, and efforts to disarm or reintegrate each militia.

(E) Key indicators of economic activity that should be considered the most important for determining the prospects of stability in Iraq, including—

(i) unemployment levels;

(ii) electricity, water, and oil production rates; and

(iii) hunger and poverty levels.

(F) The criteria the Administration will use to determine when it is safe to begin withdrawing United States forces from Iraq.

(2) With respect to the training and performance of security forces in Iraq, the following:

(A) The training provided Iraqi military and other Ministry of Defense forces and the equipment used by such forces.

(B) Key criteria for assessing the capabilities and readiness of the Iraqi military and other Ministry of Defense forces, goals for achieving certain capability and readiness levels (as well as for recruiting, training, and equipping these forces), and the milestones and notional timetable for achieving these goals.

(C) The operational readiness status of the Iraqi military forces, including the type, number, size, and organizational structure of Iraqi battalions that are—

(i) capable of conducting counterinsurgency operations independently, without any support from Coalition forces;

(ii) capable of conducting counterinsurgency operations with the support of United States or Coalition forces; or

(iii) not ready to conduct counterinsurgency operations.

(D) The amount and type of support provided by Coalition forces to the Iraqi Security forces at each level of operational readiness.

(E) The number of Iraqi battalions in the Iraqi Army currently conducting operations and the type of operations being conducted.

(F) The rates of absenteeism in the Iraqi military forces and the extent to which insurgents have infiltrated such forces.

(G) The training provided Iraqi police and other Ministry of Interior forces and the equipment used by such forces.

(H) Key criteria for assessing the capabilities and readiness of the Iraqi police and other Ministry of Interior forces, goals for achieving certain capability and readiness levels (as well as for recruiting, training, and equipping), and the milestones and notional timetable for achieving these goals, including—

(i) the number of police recruits that have received classroom training and the duration of such instruction;

(ii) the number of veteran police officers who have received classroom instruction and the duration of such instruction;

(iii) the number of police candidates screened by the Iraqi Police Screening Service, the number of candidates derived from other entry procedures, and the success rates of those groups of candidates;

(iv) the number of Iraqi police forces who have received field training by international police trainers and the duration of such instruction;

(v) attrition rates and measures of absenteeism and infiltration by insurgents; and

(vi) the level and effectiveness of the Iraqi Police and other Ministry of Interior forces in provinces where the United States has formally transferred responsibility for the security of the province to the Iraqi Security forces under the Provincial Iraqi Control (PIC) process.

(I) The estimated total number of Iraqi battalions needed for the Iraqi Security forces to perform duties now being undertaken by Coalition forces, including defending the borders of Iraq and providing adequate levels of law and order throughout Iraq.

(J) The effectiveness of the Iraqi military and police officer cadres and the chain of command.

(K) The number of United States and Coalition advisors needed to support the Iraqi Security forces and associated ministries.

(L) An assessment, in a classified annex if necessary, of United States military requirements, including planned force rotations, through the end of calendar year 2008.

SEC. 210. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be obligated or expended by the United States Government 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 control over any oil resource of Iraq.

SEC. 211. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to provide award fees to any defense contractor contrary to the provisions of section 814 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

SEC. 212. During the current fiscal year, appropriations made available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance in this Act may, upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary to meet the operational requirements of a Commander of Combatant Command engaged in contingency operations overseas, be used to purchase items having an investment item cost of not more than $500,000.

SEC. 213. Section 3303(c) of Public Law 110–28 shall apply to funds appropriated in this Act.

This Act may be cited as the ''Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations Act, 2008''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 818, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 1 hour.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, because of unusual circumstances, I would choose at the floor well to yield control of the time to the former chairman of the committee, the ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee, BILL YOUNG of Florida.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida will be recognized.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we hear so many voices in this country and in this Chamber who are willing to fight to the last drop of someone else's blood. Those of us who are supporting this resolution today are being accused of being for ''precipitous withdrawal.'' I hardly think that seeing this war continue for another 14 months constitutes precipitous withdrawal.

Mr. Speaker, it is 56 months since the United States first launched its attack against Iraq. It is 4½ years since the President appeared before his ''Mission Accomplished'' banner on that carrier. It is almost 5 years since the administration ignored the advice of General Shinseki. It is 2½ years since Vice President CHENEY said that he thought the insurgency was in its last throes. Since that time, we have had 3,800 Americans killed and 28,000 wounded. We have had 8,000 Iraqi military personal killed and 38,000 civilians killed. We have had 4 million Iraqis displaced. 2.3 million of them have been displaced internally in the country. One and a half million have fled to Syria, 1 million to other countries. Not a pretty picture.

This war is the most colossal blunder in modern U.S. history. It is a mistake that has shattered our influence in the region, and it has made the one country in the region that we did not want to see strengthened, Iran, it has made them infinitely stronger in that region. We are in the process of borrowing $600 billion and we are not having the guts to pay the bill ourselves.

There is no sense of shared sacrifice in this country. The only families being asked to sacrifice are military families and they're being asked to sacrifice again and again and again and again. We aren't even willing to tax ourselves to pay for the cost of this war, so we're shoving off the cost to our kids. Shame on every one of us for making that decision.

In November, the public tried to send two messages to this Congress. The first was that they wanted a change in policy in Iraq. The second is that they wanted a change in domestic policy. And yet after blowing $600 billion in Iraq, after signing a Defense bill which adds $39 billion to spending levels over last year, the President has yesterday blocked our efforts to add $6 billion to pay for investments in education, health and medical research here at home.

□ 1915

The President is telling the American people, ''Forget what message you think you sent in November in the election.'' He is stiffing the American people. He is saying, ''Forget what message you thought you were sending to Washington; I am the 'Great Decider' and we are going to do things my way.'' That is what we are getting out of the White House. Instead of compromise and instead of searching for common ground, the President is making clear that he prefers to govern through confrontation, he prefers to go it alone, with one-third support in the country and one-third support in the Congress.

The same is true in Iraq. This is the same President who decided to go it alone, with almost no allies, who decided to go it alone when it came to evaluating intelligence, ignoring the caution alerts that were sent by the State Department intelligence people and the CIA analysts. He bulldozed through. When Baker-Hamilton was produced to offer an opportunity for change, the President simply used that as an opportunity to say ''full steam ahead, no change in course'', and he has deepened and intensified our involvement in Iraq.

At home, he insists that Congress cuts 50 percent out of vocational education; he insists that we cut 1,100 grants out of medical research at the National Institutes of Health; he insists that we cut rural health programs by 54 percent; he insists that we cut low-income heating assistance programs by 18 percent; he insists that we cut financial support for programs under No Child Left Behind that he mandated in the first place. He insists that we cut all of that, and yet he demands $200 billion more for Iraq. I say enough is enough.

He gave a speech to the American people which was designed for the purpose of public deception, in my view, because it was designed to leave the impression that the President intended to reduce steadily our troop commitment in Iraq, when in reality it was intended to assure that 6 months from now we have the same number of troops we have there that we had 6 months ago.

Mr. Speaker, the President is asking for $200 billion more, and as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I announced that I had no intention of providing that money, but I made it clear I'd be happy to provide it all, provided that the President would recognize that we needed a policy change and would get on board with the determination to have a goal of removing our troops from combat operations by the end of next year. That is hardly precipitous.

So what this measure does, instead of giving the President $200 billion to continue the war, it gives him $50 billion to shut the war down. Instead of having troops there for the next 10 years, as the President indicated in his speech, we want to have them out by December of 2008. It requires redeployment to begin in 60 days, and it ends the authority for any agency of the United States Government whatsoever to engage in torture.

We are mired, Mr. Speaker, in Iraq because of the self-important illusions of hopeless romantics in the administration. We hear tell these days that the President talks a lot about Teddy Roosevelt and Winston Churchill. If that is the case, he is harboring dangerous illusions. He ought to heed the advice of a statesman 80 years ago who wrote the following. I will read excerpts from this letter.

''I am deeply concerned about Iraq. The task you have given me is becoming really impossible. Incompetent Arab officials are disturbing some of the provinces and failing to collect revenue. We overpaid on last year's account, which it is almost certain Iraq will not be able to pay this year, thus entailing a supplementary estimate. . . I have had to maintain troops in Mosul all through the year in consequence of the Angora quarrel. This has upset the program of relief and will certainly lead to further expenditures. . . . I do not see what political strength there is to face a disaster of any kind, and I certainly cannot believe that in any circumstances any large reinforcements would be sent . . . In my own heart, I do not see what we are getting out of it. I think we should now put definitely to the assembly the position that unless they beg us to stay, and stay on our own terms in regard to efficient control, we shall actually evacuate before the close of the financial year. I would put this issue in the most brutal way, and if they are not prepared to urge us to stay and to cooperate in every manner, I would actually clear out. . . .

''I think I must ask you for definite guidance at this stage as to what you wish and what you are prepared to do. At present, we are paying millions a year for the privilege of living on an ungrateful volcano out of which we are in no circumstances to get anything worth having.''

That was the real Winston Churchill speaking in 1922 in a letter to Lloyd George. It seems to me that the President in the White House today ought to heed the words of Winston Churchill so long ago and at long last reconsider a policy change in Iraq. That is what this legislation is designed to stimulate.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the majority chairman of the committee bringing this bill before the House because we do need the money, not for our troops at home, not for the basic bill, because that basic bill was signed by the President yesterday. What we need is to make sure that our troops in the field have the equipment that they need, the force protection measures they need, the body armor that they need, the MRAPs that they need, the ammunition they need, whatever they need to take on the enemy to accomplish their mission, to protect themselves while they are doing it. So I want to speak directly to the bill rather than to the politics or the history of the political aspect of this legislation.

Fifty billion dollars is a good number. I wish it would have been a little higher because I don't think it takes us all the way to where we need to be for a supplemental next spring as far as what we are doing in Afghanistan and Iraq, but the $50 billion that is in this bill, the dollars are good. What is provided by those dollars is needed for our troops in the field. That has to be the important decision that we make tonight: Are we going to fight a political battle here on the floor while our soldiers overseas are facing the enemy of terrorism? I don't think that is what we are here for today. I think we are here to pass this bill.

The gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned a policy change; that this bill is going to bring about a policy change. There was a policy change earlier in the year. Most everybody referred to it as the surge, and many Members of this body opposed the surge. But if you listened to the briefers this afternoon in the Rayburn building, that policy change has produced a lot of very positive effects.

So there was a policy change. But, nevertheless, whether you still support the policy change or not, that is up to everybody's individual decision. Despite what your position is on the war, on the battle, you have got to be prepared to provide for the troops that are there, whether you like the fact that they are there or not. I want them home. I want them home as soon as we can get them home.

Along with Chairman MURTHA of the subcommittee, I have seen too many wounded soldiers and marines in our military hospitals. We have both attended too many funerals of our war heroes who were sent home after having lost their life on the battlefield. So I want this war over and I want our troops home as soon as we can get them home in victory; victory in a war that didn't start on September 11 and it didn't start in March of 2003 when we went into Iraq or Afghanistan. It started back in 1983, October 23 of 1983. Terrorists bombed our Marine barracks in Beirut. Those marines were there as peacekeepers, not as part of any other expeditionary force, other than to keep the peace, and 241 of our military marines and soldiers lost their lives there.

In 1993, the World Trade Center was bombed; in June of 1996, the home of the airmen in Saudi Arabia in the Khobar Towers were bombed, and 19 of our airmen lost their lives. In August of 1998, our embassies in Kenya and Tanzania were bombed by terrorists and 11 Americans lost their lives and hundreds of others were injured. In October of 2000, the USS *Cole*, on a peaceful mission off the shore of Yemen, was bombed by terrorists and 17 lives were lost. All this started before September 11, and of course I don't think anybody denies what happened to us on September 11. So this war started a long time ago, and this threat is basically the same threat that we saw starting in 1983.

I am pleased that sufficient funds are included for the Army operation and maintenance account to allow for 6 months of war operations. Other accounts would apparently allow for only 4 months of operations, however. The size of the package is secondary to the policy provisions that have been attached to the bill. Many Members have stated they cannot vote for war funding without language requiring a withdrawing from Iraq. The reality is most of them have already done that.

When we passed the Defense appropriations bill, the basic Defense appropriations bill for 2008, we provided transfer authority, large amounts of transfer authority so that if we didn't get a bridge fund passed, if we didn't get a supplemental passed, the Services could reach into their basic accounts to pay for fighting the war in Afghanistan and Iraq.

So those who voted for that bill have already voted to fund the war, whether they like it or not. That legislation has now been signed into law, so the money is there to borrow. We are going to start hearing about cuts in services at military bases here in the United States if we don't pass a supplemental or a bridge fund and the Services will have to borrow from their basic funds. We don't want that to happen. We don't want the Services to run short on anything that they have to do to provide for the security of our Nation.

So whatever your position on the war, whatever decisions are going to be

made about withdrawal from Iraq, this money, this $50 billion and more will be needed in the next 6 months and it needs to be passed.

This bill was only filed last night. Some of the provisions have not been sufficiently reviewed, in my opinion.

□ 1930

I have read this bill twice, word for word, and I am concerned about some of the sections of this bill.

Section 102 regarding interrogations says in part that ''nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the rights under the United States Constitution of any person,'' and I will repeat, ''any person in the custody or under the physical jurisdiction of the United States.''

Now, to me, that means that terrorists who we capture on the battlefield, who have been killing our own American soldiers on the ground, I read that to mean that they will be given the same constitutional protections as any citizen of the United States of America. And I object to that. I don't think they deserve the protection of the Constitution.

I wonder, does that mean we have to read the terrorists their rights under the Miranda ruling? Can they be released on a technicality? Can they get out on bail? Those are protections guaranteed to American citizens. Are we going to give terrorists that same right? Well, this bill says that we are going to give terrorists that same right. Terrorists go by no rules. They do not subscribe to the Geneva Convention and they do not deserve the same protection under our Constitution that our constituents enjoy.

I think this bill needs a lot of repair work before it can become law.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS).

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of this bill and the effort by this Congress to bring accountability to the war in Iraq.

This war is in desperate need of a new direction. For nearly 5 years, our brave men and women have valiantly toed the line for this administration, and I'm proud to say that they have had great successes in their mission. We have seen a terrible dictator overthrown, tried and put to death, and in his place the people of Iraq carried out free and open elections. For all of this, we owe our soldiers and their families a debt of thanks.

But today's debate is not about the purpose of this war. We are here to make a decision on how best to bring accountability to this engagement. Today's legislation will keep soldiers on the ground to oversee diplomatic missions, protect U.S. citizens, equip and train Iraqis to stand on their own and continue to engage in targeted attacks on terrorists as we seek them out. This is a responsible strategy that worked for Eisenhower in South Korea when troops remained to oversee the DMZ after major operations had ended, and it can work for America today in Iraq.

However, I have long felt that it is time to remove our men and women from the kill zones of Iraq. Our soldiers are trained to do the job of the United States military, not the job of police-on-the-beat for the nation of Iraq. We need to redeploy our troops so they can continue to carry out the work of defending America from terrorist threats around the globe. It is time for the Iraqis to occupy their own country with their own military and police force.

This bill begins the redeployment of our combat troops, while continuing to fund initiatives for our men and women that protect them from IEDs, traumatic brain injury and more. But the days of a blank check from this Congress must come to an end. The American people deserve a new direction in Iraq, and this legislation is an important step.

I would like to add that I bristle when I hear the other side talk of ''cut and run'' Democrats. The legacy of the Democratic Party is one of great wartime leaders. Andrew Jackson may have done the cutting at the Battle of New Orleans, but it was Colonel Packingham who did the running. It was President Wilson who convinced the American people to take on the oppressors in the First World War. It was President Roosevelt who said ''we have nothing to fear but fear itself'' before leading the charge into the battlefields of Asia and Nazi Germany. And it was President Truman who ended that war by dropping a nuclear weapon.

I am a member of a Democratic Party that has never cut and run, but has been responsible with our men and women in regard to their safety and families, as well as our national security. We need a change in Iraq and a change in course. This must happen.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague from Florida for yielding.

Let me just say that the gentleman from Wisconsin, the chairman of the committee, is a Member that I know well and have great respect for, and along with the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, they have spent over 30 years doing everything they could to support our troops. But if you think that the debate that we are having tonight is something that we have heard before, it is. Over 40 times this year, we have had votes and debates in this house on the issue of Iraq.

Let me just say that my colleague from Wisconsin is known for his famous statement about Members coming to the floor of the House posing for ''holy pictures.'' Now, if there has ever been a case over my 17 years here in Congress of people posing for holy pictures, it is over this issue of Iraq.

When I came to the Congress in 1991 as a brand new Member, my first vote in this Chamber was on whether to go to war with the Iraqis in Kuwait. I remember coming here as a brand new Member, Members in the well of this House who had been here 30 and 40 years, tears in their eyes, talking about this being the most difficult vote they had ever cast. It was a very difficult moment for me and all of my colleagues. But we went through that, and we went through it successfully.

So when we have the issue of war debated here on the floor of the Congress, there is no issue, no issue that is more personal, no issue that is of greater significance to our country, than all of us casting our vote on sending our young men and women into battle anywhere overseas. So I understand the passion that we have on both sides of the aisle over this issue.

But I think we all have to understand that we are in Iraq for a very important reason. We went there to get rid of Saddam Hussein. I think everybody understands that. We went there to make sure that the weapons of mass destruction were gone. They are gone. Where they went, I don't think we will ever know. We went there to set up a democratically elected government, and, frankly, we have succeeded.

It was al Qaeda 3 years ago that made Iraq the central front in their war with us. We didn't start this war with al Qaeda. They did. And as the gentleman from Florida pointed out earlier, it didn't start on 9/11, it started back in the early eighties. And it persisted through the eighties and the nineties, and America and the rest of the world looked up, looked away, and just hoped the problem would go away.

Well, it didn't go away. After 3,000 of our fellow citizens died on 9/11, what was America to do? Look up, look away and just hope the problem would go away one more time? No. So we went to Iraq. But it was al Qaeda and it was Iran who have made this the central front in their war with us.

America has no choice but to succeed in our efforts in Iraq. We all know what failure in Iraq will bring. Failure in Iraq brings a destabilization of Iraq itself, a safe haven for the terrorists to operate from, a destabilization of the entire Middle East, the end of Israel as we know it, and who doesn't believe that if we leave Iraq and we leave in failure, that the terrorists don't follow us home and that we have to deal with the problem here on the streets of America?

This is not what America wants. America wants us to succeed, and it is success that we are having in Iraq. You all know the statistics. You have all seen the headlines over the last several weeks and the last several months. Our troops in Iraq are doing a marvelous job on our behalf. They are succeeding. They are training the Iraqi Army to take our place. The Iraqi Army is more

out in front than ever before. The amount of violence in Iraq is down significantly. Our troops, our troops, are dying in less numbers each and every day. Why? Because we are having success there.

So we ought to thank our troops, thank our troops for the great job they are doing, because General Petraeus put forward a plan that is working.

Now, I understand that a lot of my colleagues on the other side have invested all their political capital over the course of this year in failure in Iraq. It hasn't happened, thankfully, because for the good of our Nation, not today, not tomorrow, maybe not next week, but for my kids and their kids, success in Iraq is critically important. And I think all the Members in this Chamber understand just how important success is there. We are taking on an enemy that is growing in all parts of the world, and if we are not willing to take them on in Iraq, if we are not willing to draw the line and defeat them, where will we draw the line? Where will we stand up for America, and where will we stand up for American values? Iraq is the place to do it.

The bill that we have before us goes back to the same old tired plan, the plan for failure, if you will. That is what the bill that we have before us does. It ties the hands of the administration, it ties the hands of our generals, it ties the hands of our people on the ground, and it will lead to nothing other than failure.

We have been down this path. We have been down this path all year long. And I will admit to my colleagues, we have had plenty of mistakes that have been made in Iraq. There has never been a war when there haven't been a lot of mistakes made. You can go back to the Civil War and look at all the mistakes that were made. The First World War, the Second World War, Vietnam, there were a lot of mistakes that got made in wars, and mistakes have been made in this war.

But, ladies and gentlemen, you all know that we have no choice, no choice, but to succeed, and the plan that we have before us, to fund our troops for the next 4 months, will lead to nothing other than failure.

So I am going to ask my colleagues, let's stop the political games. We all know what is going on here. It is another political stunt, another political stunt trying to trap the President, trying to trap the generals and putting handcuffs on them. Let's stop it.

I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle want us to succeed. Instead of playing these political games, what we ought to be doing is passing this bill cleanly. And we ought to be passing the Military Quality of Life Veterans bill, because our troops are coming home. We have got 3,000 troops that have been sent out of Diyala on their way home. We are going to have troops coming home all year. And if we don't pass the Military Quality of Life Veterans bill, the benefits they are entitled to, the services we ought to be providing to those veterans coming home will not be there.

So let's vote ''no'' on this bill. Let's find a way this week to make sure that the veterans bill is up on this floor and passed and in the President's hands.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the chairman of the Defense appropriations subcommittee.

Mr. MURTHA. As the gentleman from Florida said, we just passed a $459 billion bipartisan Defense appropriation bill, and it funds the troops, it funds the health care, it funds almost all the Defense Department. It does not fund the war in Iraq.

Now, when I spoke out 2 years ago, I said we need stability in the Middle East. All of us want stability in the Middle East. We can talk about Iraq, but it's not in isolation that you talk about Iraq. You have to talk about Pakistan and what's happening in Pakistan and why we haven't had an overall diplomatic success there. You can talk about Turkey, on the verge with tanks moving towards the border and might go into Kyrkystan, which would completely disrupt what is going on in Iraq.

You can talk about Iran and the policy that we have had in Iraq and how it has disappointed us with the influence that Iran has gained. When we were attacked, Iran was one of the first countries to come to the support of the United States with their concern about what had happened, their concern about al Qaeda.

What we are trying to do here today is stop torture. We do it by saying the Army Field Manual has to be the guideline for torture. If you're going to have prisoners, and I have talked to service people, Colin Powell agrees with this, Gates agrees with this, almost all the military understands if you don't have guidelines set by the Army Field Manual, it hurts our troops. It's pretty hard to argue. If you're for torture, I don't say you vote for this or you vote against this bill, but this stops torture by saying you've got to comply with the Army Field Manual.

The other thing we say in this bill is you have to have fully equipped and fully trained troops. Can anybody argue about that? Is there anybody that can say to me we shouldn't have fully trained and fully equipped troops? I don't think so.

□ 1945

The other thing, it sets a goal. And the goal is to start the redeployment out of Iraq and have them out within a year. That doesn't mean that we are going to necessarily get it, but we have to start it. At some time we have to convince the Iraqis that we need to change the direction and they are going to have to take responsibility. I think they have started that. I think we have backed off a little bit.

What we did in Vietnam was make the mistake that every time they made a mistake, we took over. In this particular case, we have to let the Iraqis continue to do their job.

Now, the government has let us down; there is no question about it. The government has not changed the policies. There has been ethnic cleansing. There have been 4 million people ethnically cleansed either by sending them out of the country or by moving them from Sunni areas into Shiite areas or vice versa.

This is one of the reasons that the military commanders have said over and over, the Iraqis are finally taking an interest. The al Qaeda has been defeated, according to what the military commanders are saying.

What is the point in us being there if al Qaeda has been defeated? I said a couple of years ago, there are only 2 or 3,000 al Qaeda, and the Iraqis know where they are and know what they have to do to take care of them.

I am convinced that this bill starts to force the Congress to have oversight. We are the board of directors, somebody said to me today. The President is the executive officer. We are the board of directors. When the board of directors sees the policies going in the wrong way, and actually, the people of the United States are the board of directors and we act for the board of directors by the people of the United States. If we think it is going the wrong way, we have to change the policy.

This is a change in policy. This holds the President accountable for the decisions he is making. It doesn't tie the commanders' hands. No torture. They are supplied with equipment and training. That is not tying the hands of the commanders. And we are starting to get them out already.

Al Qaeda has been defeated. The civil war has wound down. It is time to get us out. Let's remember, stability in the Middle East doesn't depend just on Iraq. It depends on Pakistan with nuclear weapons or the possibility of nuclear weapons. Stability depends on Iran. Stability depends on Syria. Stability depends on Turkey, our allies. We need a diplomatic effort.

As I said and the Chief of the Joint Chiefs said, we cannot win this militarily; it has to be won by the Iraqis and it has to be won diplomatically.

This helps us hold the administration accountable, and I would ask for all Members to vote for a bill that changes the direction of this Congress and this country in this effort in Iraq.

ORDERLY AND RESPONSIBLE IRAQ REDEPLOYMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT- 2008

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	RECOMMENDED
TITLE II--SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS	
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE--MILITARY	
Military Personnel	
Military Personnel, Army (emergency)	713,700
Military Personnel, Navy (emergency)	95,624
Military Personnel, Marine Corps (emergency)	56,050
Military Personnel, Air Force (emergency)	138,037
Total, Military Personnel	1,003,411
Operation and Maintenance	
Operation and Maintenance, Army (emergency)	27,429,490
Operation and Maintenance, Navy (emergency)	2,071,560
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (emergency)	2,429,323
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (emergency)	3,582,560
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (emergency)	1,330,540
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve (emergency)	61,223
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve (emergency)	47,500
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (emergency)	26,157
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (emergency)	8,089
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (emergency)	378,381
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (emergency)	34,422
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance	37,399,245
Other Operation and Maintenance	
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (emergency)	500,000
Iraq Security Forces Fund (emergency)	500,000
Iraq Freedom Fund (emergency)	3,168,000
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (emerg)	
Attack the network	498,500
Defeat the Device	900,000
Train the Force	200,000
Staff and infrastructure	40,000
Total, Joint IED Defeat Fund	1,638,500
Subtotal, Other	5,806,500
Grand total, Operation and Maintenance	43,205,745

ORDERLY AND RESPONSIBLE IRAQ REDEPLOYMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT- 2008

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	RECOMMENDED
Procurement	
Aircraft Procurement, Army (emergency)	302,200
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (emergency)	1,574,217
Procurement of Ammunition, Army (emergency)	154,000
Other Procurement, Army (emergency)	1,976,100
Aircraft Procurement, Navy (emergency)	25,300
Other Procurement, Navy (emergency)	88,281
Procurement, Marine Corps (emergency)	729,232
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (emergency)	147,800
Other Procurement, Air Force (emergency)	42,125
Procurement, Defense-Wide (emergency)	102,588
Total, Procurement	5,141,843
Defense Health Program	
Operation and maintenance (emergency)	599,001
Research, development, test and evaluation	
Traumatic brain injury and psychological health research (emergency)	50,000
Total, Defense Health Program	649,001
General Provisions	
Special transfer authority (Sec. 102) (emergency)	(4,000,000)
Total for the bill (net)	50,000,000
RECAPITULATION	
Military Personnel	1,003,411
Operation and Maintenance	37,399,245
Other Operation and Maintenance	5,806,500
Procurement	5,141,843
Defense Health Program	649,001
Total, Department of Defense	50,000,000

ORDERLY AND RESPONSIBLE IRAQ REDEPLOYMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT- 2008

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	RECOMMENDED
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	
INCREMENTAL WARTIME OPERATING COSTS	22,532,921
RESET (UNIT AND INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE)	3,920,014
SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	976,555
(COMMANDER'S EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM) (NA)	(500,000)
TOTAL, O&M, ARMY	27,429,490
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	
INCREMENTAL WARTIME OPERATING COSTS	2,071,560
TOTAL, O&M, NAVY	2,071,560
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	
INCREMENTAL WARTIME OPERATING COSTS	2,034,499
DEPOT MAINTENANCE	245,319
SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	149,505
TOTAL, O&M, MARINE CORPS	2,429,323
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	
OPERATING FORCES/FLYING HOURS	3,582,560
TOTAL, O&M, AIR FORCE	3,582,560
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	
SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	696,000
DLSA OFFICE OF MILITARY COMMISSIONS	1,540
DCSA COALITION SUPPORT	333,000
DCSA LIFT AND SUSTAIN	150,000
GLOBAL TRAIN AND EQUIP	150,000
TOTAL, O&M, DEFENSE-WIDE	1,330,540
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	
OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT	61,223
TOTAL, O&M, ARMY RESERVE	61,223
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	
MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	38,841
INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	31
MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	937
COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	2,233
COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	5,458
TOTAL, O&M, NAVY RESERVE	47,500

ORDERLY AND RESPONSIBLE IRAQ REDEPLOYMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT- 2008

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	RECOMMENDED
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	
BASE OPERATION SUPPORT	48
OPERATING FORCES	25,301
TRAINING SUPPORT	808
TOTAL, O&M, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	26,157
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	
PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	8,089
TOTAL, O&M, AIR FORCE RESERVE	8,089
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	
PRE-DEPLOYMENT AND POST-DEPLOYMENT TRAINING	378,381
TOTAL, O&M, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	378,381
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	
AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	32,274
MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	2,148
TOTAL, O&M, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	34,422
RECAPITULATION	
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	27,429,490
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	2,071,560
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	2,429,323
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	3,582,560
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	1,330,540
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	61,223
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	47,500
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	26,157
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	8,089
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	378,381
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	34,422
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	37,399,245

ORDERLY AND RESPONSIBLE IRAQ REDEPLOYMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT- 2008

PROCUREMENT

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	RECOMMENDED
SUMMARY	
ARMY	
AIRCRAFT	302,200
WEAPONS, TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES	1,574,217
AMMUNITION	154,000
OTHER	1,976,100
TOTAL, ARMY	4,006,517
NAVY	
AIRCRAFT	25,300
OTHER	88,281
MARINE CORPS	729,232
TOTAL, NAVY	842,813
AIR FORCE	
AIRCRAFT	147,800
OTHER	42,125
TOTAL, AIR FORCE	189,925
DEFENSE-WIDE	
DEFENSE-WIDE	102,588
TOTAL PROCUREMENT	5,141,843

ORDERLY AND RESPONSIBLE IRAQ REDEPLOYMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT- 2008

PROCUREMENT

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	RECOMMENDED
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	
LIGHT ARMORED VEHICLES (LAV)	
LAV PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (PIP)	23,000
LAV RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION (RAM)	33,600
MODIFICATION KITS	
MULTIPURPOSE TANK BLADE	2,200
TACTICAL CONCEALED VIDEO SYSTEM	400
5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	53,482
MARINE AIR COMMAND CONTROL SYSTEM (MACCS)	29,000
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	
ANGEL FIRE SENSOR PACKAGE	8,000
MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS	
MTVR ARMOR	60,000
EOD SYSTEMS	
CREW	172,800
PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	
GBOSS	340,000
FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	
FAMILY OF FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	6,750
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	729,232
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	
C-17 LAIRCM	72,000
C-5 DEFENSIVE SYSTEM INSTALLATION	11,700
TO EQUIP DEPLOYING AIRCRAFT	
F-15 ARC-210 BLOS COMMS UNR	39,700
F-16 SLOS UON	24,400
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	147,800
OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	
MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,500
HALVORSEN LOADER	13,500
VEHICLE COUNTER SNIPER PROTECTION KITS	1,625
AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	13,000
NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	2,500
REMOTE OPTICAL VIDEO ENHANCED RECEIVER (ROVER)	5,500
BLUE FORCE TRACKING (BFT)	2,500
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	42,125
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	
CV-22	52,200
C-130 MODS	6,400
SPEAR	1,000
TACTICAL COMBAT CASUALTY CARE KITS	4,964
SOF COMBAT ASSAULT RIFLE (SCAR)	4,593
AN/PVS-15A NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	1,057
MOUT RANGE CONTROL SYSTEM	3,316
GROUND MOBILITY VEHICLES	1,846
SUSPENSION UPGRADE TO TACTICAL GROUND MOBILITY VEHICLE	10,112
U-28 BLOCK 20 UPGRADE	17,100
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	102,588

ORDERLY AND RESPONSIBLE IRAQ REDEPLOYMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT- 2008

PROCUREMENT

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	RECOMMENDED
OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	
HMMWV RECAP PROGRAM	465,000
HIGH MOBILITY MULTI-PURP WHEELED VEHICLE (HMMWV)	427,000
HEMTT EXTENDED SERVICE PROGRAM	40,000
KNIGHT FAMILY	50,000
FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	80,000
TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	21,000
FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FTHV)	70,000
TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	29,000
GROUND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM	13,000
NIGHT VISION DEVICES	45,000
NIGHT VISION THERMAL WEAPONS SIGHT	11,000
MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEM	13,000
ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARM SYSTEM	11,000
GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	18,500
DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SUPPORT SYSTEM (DTSS) (MIP)	6,000
CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT ESP	4,500
DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	4,500
CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION	54,300
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH)	4,000
FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	3,500
TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	3,200
DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEM	9,300
SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)	3,400
ARMY GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AGCCS)	2,800
PROPHET GROUND (MIP)	4,600
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)	12,100
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	1,500
RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT SYSTEMS (INCL WARLOCK)	400,000
MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE EQUIPMENT (OPA3)	160,000
NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	3,200
ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER	3,000
ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	1,500
CI HUMINT INFO MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CHIMS) (MIP)	1,200
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,976,100
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	
GEN II MISSILE WARNING SYSTEM (COMMON ECM)	17,000
P-3 ISR UPGRADES (P-3 SERIES)	1,200
EP-3 ISR UPGRADES (EP-3 SERIES)	4,500
CH-53 AMARC (H-53 SERIES)	2,600
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	25,300
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	
UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES FOR EOD TEAMS (EOD EQPT)	37,000
BOARDING PARTY BODY ARMOR (PHYSICAL SECURITY EQPT)	3,100
EOD ROBOTS (EOD EQPT)	1,200
AIRCREW BODY ARMOR (AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT)	750
CREW (EOD EQPT)	35,400
WMD DETECTION (PHYSICAL SECURITY EQPT)	3,000
NCIS VEHICLES (PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES)	900
IN THEATER AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL (ATC EQPT)	6,111
MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	820
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	88,281

ORDERLY AND RESPONSIBLE IRAQ REDEPLOYMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT- 2008

PROCUREMENT

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	RECOMMENDED
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	
UTILITY FIXED WING F/W CARGO AIRCRAFT	5,000
UH-60M BLACKHAWK (MYP)	47,400
AH-64 MODS	113,600
CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS	120,000
COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	10,000
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	6,200
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	302,200
PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	
BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT	400,000
STRYKER VEHICLE	521,000
FIST VEHICLE (MOD)	30,000
BFVS SERIES (MOD)	48,000
IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD)	135,000
M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	200,000
ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	225,000
M249 SAW MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW)	8,700
M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS (GZ1290)	6,517
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	1,574,217
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	
40MM ALL TYPES	65,700
30MM ALL TYPES	40,000
25MM ALL TYPES	300
105MM ARTILLERY AMMUNITION ALL TYPES	10,000
MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS)	18,000
SHOULDER FIRED ROCKETS ALL TYPES	20,000
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	154,000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds just to point out, and I agree strongly with Mr. MURTHA's statement about torture. I don't think Americans want to be known as a Nation that do torture.

But we have put prohibitions on torture in our Defense appropriations bills almost from the beginning of the war, and so we have made it very clear that we are opposed to the use of torture. We just wish the other side would go by the same rules.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I want to also thank everyone who works on this committee and has spent so much time over the years working to prepare our military forces to be able to handle contingencies and wars around the world. We appreciate that, and you have lots of great experience.

But let me tell you, this provision in this particular bill is terrible for the warfighters. Let me talk about a small piece of it.

You have what I call a 15-day wait, notify and hold provision. That means before any unit can go into Iraq, a 15-day period, waiting period, has to expire after you have notified the Armed Services Committees and the Defense appropriations committee that unit is ''ready for battle'' and meets a mission-capability standard.

Now, the problem with that is we have a war against terror in which teams, whether they are special operations teams, medivac teams, EOD teams, special fire support teams like C–130, A–6 gun ships are constantly moving across the boundaries between Iraq and the rest of the world. Some of our assets come off of carriers. Some of them come out of Incirlik, Turkey. Some from Kuwait and some of them come from other places.

This idea that before a special forces team can move across a line you must have a 15-day notify and wait period is totally unworkable.

I want to give to you what Admiral Fallon, head of the Central Command, said when we asked him what he thought about the notify and hold provision. He said, ''I would ask for consideration that we not limit the flexibility of our commanders in allowing them to use forces that might be necessary to meet a situation or a mission which they might be asked to undertake. And so I would opt to allow our commanders to have the flexibility of making that decision rather than have some dictated requirement in advance.''

I would say to my good friend, Mr. MURTHA, who has several times stated that the administration should listen to its generals: Every team that goes into that warfighting theater goes in because one of the battlefield commanders has requested their presence.

I can remember talking to my son when he was in the battle of Fallujah as an artillery officer and he was inside the city as a forward observer. And I asked him what the most important platforms we had out there were. He said the A6 C–130 gunship. I said, Where are they? He said, They come and they go.

Ladies and gentleman, we move firefighting teams, all types of special operations crews and teams, EOD teams, A6 C–130 gunships across those borders constantly, and to have a requirement where you are going to have to give a 15-day notification and wait before you can move that unit in is devastating to our warfighting capability.

I would ask for a ''no'' on this measure.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, as one who opposed the invasion of Iraq and as one who has led efforts to end the occupation of Iraq, I rise today to support the Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations Act of 2007.

First, I would like to thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairmen OBEY and MURTHA for really crafting this historic legislation that takes the first step to end the occupation of Iraq. This bill's main purpose, main purpose, is to begin to fund the end of this occupation.

This is also the very first time that this Congress will explicitly tie funding to bringing our troops home. It mandates a start date for the President to begin redeployment of our brave troops within 30 days of his signature. It also once again puts Congress on record prohibiting the establishment of permanent military bases and United States economic control of Iraqi oil and also of torture.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not perfect. I strongly feel that there should be additional clarity on the numbers and nature of U.S. forces that remain for protection of diplomats and training of Iraqi forces. And given the President's determination to protect his legacy by allowing the occupation to continue indefinitely, we really must be wary of providing him opportunities to prolong or extend this war.

So we made sure in this legislation that this bill explicitly states that ''the primary purpose of this $5 billion should be to transition the mission, redeploy troops in Iraq, and not to extend or prolong the war.''

But I am also disappointed that the end date in this legislation is a goal no later than December 2008. But hopefully, the Senate will pass this and send it to the President.

This legislation does conform to what Congresswomen WATERS, WOOLSEY and myself have been working on all year. Earlier this year, we authored the Lee amendment that stipulates funding for Iraq should be used to fully fund, fully fund, the safe and orderly redeployment of our troops from Iraq. We did this way back in March. Now, 92 Members of Congress wrote to the President to put him on notice to this effect. So I am glad this remains the main purpose of this legislation.

This legislation represents for many of us a very important step forward to end the combat operations in Iraq. Otherwise, believe you me, I would never vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation does not give the President a blank check for his occupation. It provides a down payment on redeploying our troops from Iraq and ending the occupation. It clearly says these funds are to be used to begin to end the death, the violence, and the destruction that the Bush administration has brought on Iraq, which he has brought on our brave young men and women, and our country and the world.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, the former vice chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in strong opposition to this legislation, the process that brought it here tonight, but not to the money that is badly needed for our troops in the field.

For each of the last 3 years, the Defense appropriations bill, ably led by Chairman YOUNG and Chairman MURTHA, has included a straightforward bridge fund to cover the cost of ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Indeed, the continuing resolution we passed last month gave our military access to the bridge funding until November 16. This funding allowed our warfighters, all volunteers, the ability to fuel their Stryker vehicles and Humvees, restock their ammunition, resupply their mess halls, power the systems that allow them to keep in touch with their families at home, and even to ship their new MRAP vehicles to the battle zone so they may be better protected from IEDs. And yes, protect their fellow soldiers and innocent Iraqis.

But bowing to antiwar sentiment, the majority leadership pointedly chose to keep this important bridge funding out of the defense bill that we approved last week.

So while our brave warfighters are hard at work in Iraq in a hellish environment, they find they have to watch their own backs from those in Washington who want to choke off funding for their missions, both military and humanitarian.

I submit that this deliberate attempt to starve our operations in Iraq threatens the very safety of those troops and the lives of hundreds of thousands of innocent Iraqis. No, Mr. Speaker, we should be sending to the President a clean bridge fund that does not tie the hands of commanders in the field and allows them to build on their undeniable successes in recent months in Iraq. Cutting money does tie their hands, limits those commanders' options, as does the setting of date certain.

My colleagues, the ill-advised process this House started last week is not without its costs. While Congress deliberately procrastinates, and some say throws roadblocks in front of our brave warriors battling violent international terrorists every day, military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan will run out of money, causing the Department of Defense to borrow from other important programs to support their operations.

I am told this process could completely drain the Army's operations and maintenance accounts by the end of next January.

In fact, it is my understanding that the Deputy Secretary of Defense has warned that the military would have to start preparing in December, next month, to close domestic military facilities, lay off civilian workers, and delay contracts if the bridge funding is not provided. This could have very damaging consequences for those communities privileged to host a military installation.

Mr. Speaker, I am also troubled that this bill requires the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq and slaps restrictions on the mission of U.S. troops, again, both military and humanitarian.

This harkens back to what was recently described by the junior Senator from Connecticut as the ''narrative of defeat and retreat.'' As Senator LIEBERMAN said yesterday, and I quote, ''Rather than supporting General Petraeus and our troops in the field, antiwar advocates in Congress are instead struggling to deny or disparage their achievements, and are now acting, once again, to hold hostage the funding our troops desperately need and to order retreat by a date certain, regardless of what is happening on the ground.''

I would remind my colleagues that even the Iraq Study Group warned us against setting arbitrary deadlines. We should let the troops and their commanders do their work.

I have always maintained that our brave troops' service in Iraq should be as short and as safe as possible. This legislation does nothing to advance either of these goals. I urge rejection of this bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include tabular and extraneous material on H.R. 4156.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. I would say to my good friend from New Jersey, he voted for the $459 billion bill where we had a CR that fully funded the MRAPs, fully funded, $16 billion for the year. We are not holding up the MRAPs. And we provided the transportation.

□ 2000

We were very careful with this bill. The gentleman knows how careful I am in taking care of the troops. The gentleman knows how careful he is in taking care of the troops. None of us are trying to put roadblocks in the way. What we are trying to do is hold the administration accountable for what they have done. We want stability in the whole Middle East, not just in Iraq. So we have got to focus also on the future of the country. Russia is starting to come up, China is starting to come up. And in our bill, which the gentleman from New Jersey was a part of, we started to look ahead. Iraq is occupying us as well as we occupying Iraq.

So I have to say to the gentleman, I just want to make sure we keep the facts straight. We have fully funded the MRAPS, even though it's costing $150,000 per MRAP to get them overseas because of the lateness of the request.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Iraq supplemental bridge fund. While no one is declaring victory in Iraq, the tide is turning. But nothing changes here on Capitol Hill. And here we go again, by some estimates, the 41st effort by the majority to come to this floor and force a precipitous and reckless withdrawal of forces from Iraq, another Democrat plan for redeployment from Iraq tying $50 billion in necessary combat funds for our troops to a Democrat plan for withdrawal.

With unambiguous evidence of progress on the ground filling the newspapers of America, the Democrats in Congress seem to have decided to add denial to their plan of retreat and defeat in Iraq. And the newspapers speak for themselves.

The Washington Post last week wrote, ''The number of attacks against U.S. soldiers has fallen to levels not seen since before the February 2006 bombing of a Shia shrine in Samarra that touched off waves of sectarian killing.'' The death toll of American troops in October fell to 39, the lowest since March 2006.

And on Thursday last, The New York Times noted, '' 'American forces have routed al Qaeda in Mesopotamia, the Iraqi militant network, from every neighborhood in Iraq,' a top general said today, 'allowing American troops involved in the surge to depart as planned.' ''

The Washington Times would say, ''Responding to the good news, Speaker Pelosi has unveiled her newest legislative strategy to damage the war efforts. House Democrats this week,'' they wrote, ''will try to enact a bill calling for immediately beginning to withdraw U.S. troops from Iraq. The surrender language will be attached to a 4-month, $50 billion funding.''

''The contrast could hardly be more striking,'' they said. ''American soldiers performing heroically and successfully, risking their lives on the battlefield in Iraq, Speaker Pelosi and the Democrat leadership by contrast look for ways to advertise American weakness to the enemy.''

And I say from my heart, with great respect to the good and patriotic Americans with whom I differ on this point, I urge my colleagues to reject this Democrat plan for withdrawal. But I also urge my countrymen to give our soldiers a chance. I know things have not always gone as we had all hoped in Iraq.

In my role as the ranking member of the Middle East Subcommittee and before, I have traveled to this war-torn country five times over the last 4½ years. I have seen success and I have seen less than success. I have seen advance and I have seen failure. But today, we are seeing hope spring. Freedom and stability are beginning to take hold in Iraq. And I say from my heart, we cannot lose faith in ourselves. We cannot lose faith in freedom. We must reject this latest plan for retreat and defeat.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is almost the 250th time I have been down on this House floor to talk about Iraq in the last 2 years. I can't remember, so I say almost how many times it's been.

During that time, the American people have been demanding two things, that the Congress step up to our responsibility and bring our troops home, and that we take bold steps to face up to the President by using our power, the power of the purse, to hold him accountable for what is going on in Iraq.

Today, Speaker PELOSI is leading the House of Representatives in a bold direction. It is the first time so far that we have tied funding to redeployment. Ninety-two Members of the House have written a letter to the President demanding that no more funding for Iraq go forward without it, meaning bringing our troops home and redeployment.

This vote also leads to next year's appropriations where we can use the power of the purse and fully fund bringing our troops home in a very responsible and very timely and actually safe way.

This bill is not perfect. It is the boldest step yet, however, and we must support it. I would not support it if we were not tying the funding to responsible redeployment. I would not support it unless there was a start date for the President to begin the redeployment of our brave men and women in uniform. This bill is the beginning, but it is a bold beginning. I think we should consider everything that is in it, and then build on that for the future and get our troops home as soon as possible.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it seems like not that long ago, but it was a year or so ago, we heard repeatedly: We're losing in Iraq. We're losing in Iraq. We've got to have a policy change. We're losing in Iraq. We've got to have a policy change. And we got a policy change.

It's kind of refreshing to hear so many say we're winning, and a little bit surprising to hear we're winning, so we need a policy change. We're winning, so we need a policy change? We know if we pull out too quickly, we don't leave a stable area.

Hearing comments earlier about somebody won't listen to anyone else; they get no input. I thought they were talking about the Democratic majority. Just today on FISA, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, I'm told at 1:30 that we've got to have amendments in by 4 o'clock on a bill that we weren't even allowed to see. You want input? Let's start it right here on the floor.

I heard comments about Vietnam mistakes. The biggest mistake that history teaches us about Vietnam was that it was micromanaged from Washington. If you want documentation, go to Sam Johnson's book. After the carpet bombing finally took place and we went after and took it to them, the bombing stopped, we gave away the farm at Paris, and as the prisoners left the Hanoi Hilton, one of the leaders said, ''You know, you Americans are so foolish. If you'd have kept it up another week, we would have had to unconditionally surrender.'' But we were micromanaged from Washington.

We show the greatest reverence for those who have given their last full measure of devotion not by pulling out before we leave a stable area, but by seeing that we finish the job and leave a stable area so they will not have died in vain.

I leave with a comment of Travis Buford's mother as we stood there by his casket in Nacogdoches, Texas at the funeral home earlier this year. I said to his mother as we stood near his coffin, ''Is there anything I can do?'' She gritted her teeth and she said, ''Go back and tell the Congress to shut up and let the military finish their job.''

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, after that very thoughtful statement, I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN).

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of H.R. 4156 because people in Wisconsin want their country back.

This bill supports our troops and demands the President begin to move our forces away, away from Iraq and back after our real enemies, Osama bin Laden and his followers.

Iraq will forever be President Bush's war, an unnecessary war based on lies and deceptions. His poor judgment has written perhaps the saddest chapter in our Nation's history, wearing down our military and the endless, centuries-old Iraqi civil war.

The vote today will end not the hatred between the Shiites and Sunnis, but it will redirect our efforts away from Iraq as soon as humanly possible. A ''yes'' vote supports our troops by protecting them from a President who does not understand reality.

People in Wisconsin have asked me to deliver their message here, here on the House floor: I want my country back. I want my country back. Tonight, we will begin to move our country in a new direction, away from Iraq and back after Osama bin Laden and his followers.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in strong opposition to H.R. 4156, the so-called Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations of 2008, because in fact, Mr. Speaker, the bill should be called the Disorderly and Irresponsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations Act.

Let me be clear, Mr. Speaker. What we are debating tonight, disguised as a genuine bridge fund to sustain operations in the global war on terror, is nothing more than another defeatist measure intended to placate the Democrats' liberal base as we approach this Thanksgiving recess.

The Democratic leadership apparently has decided it's more to stand with the Out of Iraq Caucus, MoveOn.org and Code Pink than with our brave men and women in uniform. Rather than funding our soldiers' needs and delivering a decisive blow to the terrorist campaign in Iraq, the Democrats are again conditioning the funding on a date certain for withdrawal.

At a time of sustained progress by our forces, Mr. Speaker, it seems that what is great news for America and for our troops is consequently bad political news for a Democratic majority who has literally bet the farm on a defeatist agenda.

Just last weekend, Prime Minister Maliki stated that violence between Sunnis and Shias has nearly disappeared from Iraq, disappeared from Baghdad, with terrorist bombings down 77 percent.

The Washington Post reported that attacks against United States soldiers have fallen to levels not seen since the February 2006 bombing of the Shia shrine in Samarra. And an Investor's Business Daily article detailed that military analysts, including many who are opposed to the war, have concluded that the United States and its allies are on the verge of winning in Iraq. And, thankfully, United States casualties in Iraq are at their lowest level since March of 2006, Mr. Speaker. Now is not the time to risk impeding the progress we are making. Now is the time to continue building on the turnaround we have made, and to state unequivocally that we are on the verge of victory in Iraq and that we will finish the job.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot give in to the terrorists' extremist views and sinister plans for the Middle East and the world. And we certainly should not send a message to the terrorists that such a capitulation will begin in 30 days and will wrap up by December of 2008.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on tying funds for our troops to a date certain withdrawal from Iraq. I urge all my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this dangerous bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2156, the so-called "Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations of 2008." Because, in fact, this bill is a "disorderly and irresponsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations Act."

Let me be very clear, Mr. Speaker. What we are debating today—disguised as a genuine bridge fund to sustain operations in the Global War on Terror—is nothing more than another defeatist measure intended to placate the Democrat's liberal base as we approach the Thanksgiving recess.

The Democratic leadership has decided it is more important to stand with the "Out of Iraq Caucus," MoveOn.org and Code Pink than with our brave men and women in uniform. Rather than funding our soldiers' needs and delivering a decisive blow to the terrorist campaign in Iraq, the Democrats are again conditioning the funding on a date-certain withdrawal.

At a time of sustained progress by our forces, Mr. Speaker, it seems that what is great news for America and for our troops is consequently bad political news for the Democrat majority and their defeatist agenda.

Mr. Speaker, a July New York Times editorial authored by Michael O'Hanlon and Kenneth Pollack stated "We are finally getting somewhere in Iraq, at least in military terms. . . . The soldiers and marines told us they feel that they now have a superb commander in General David Petraeus; they are confident in his strategy, they see real results, and they feel now they have the numbers needed to make a real difference."

In September, General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker spoke optimistically about the future of Iraq citing concrete progress. Acknowledging we still had a long way to go, they recognized we had achieved tactical momentum and were building momentum toward local reconciliation. Indeed, local Iraqis were turning against extremists.

Last weekend Prime Minister al-Maliki stated that violence between Sunnis and Shi'ites has nearly disappeared from Baghdad, with terrorist bombings down 77 percent. The Washington Post reported that attacks against U.S. soldiers have fallen to levels not seen since before the February 2006 bombing of a Shi'ite shrine in Samarra. An Investor's Business Daily article detailed that military analysts—including many who are opposed to the war—have concluded that the U.S. and its allies are on the verge of winning in Iraq.

And thankfully, U.S. casualties in Iraq are at their lowest level since March 2006. Now is not the time to risk impeding the progress we are making. Now is the time to continue building on the turn-around we have made and to state unequivocally that we are on the verge of victory in Iraq, and that we will finish the job.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues of the consequences of giving up on Iraq: the collapse of a democratic Iraqi government, likely leading to mass killings and genocide in the nation; an emboldened al-Qaeda; regional instability; Iran and Syria setting the course of Iraq's future; and Israel being pushed into the Mediterranean sea.

The stakes are too high for political posturing. Ayman al-Zawahiri has said ''the Jihad in Iraq requires several incremental goals. The first stage: expel the Americans from Iraq.''

Mr. Speaker, we cannot give in to their extremist views and sinister plans for the Middle East and the world. And we certainly should not send a message to the terrorists that such a capitulation will begin in 30 days and will wrap up by December of 2008.

Mr. Speaker, never have I been so glad that we've got General Petraeus leading our troops in Iraq and not the Democratic leadership of this house. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on tying funds for our troops to a date-certain withdrawal from Iraq. I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I have had to listen as my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle have made comments like, give our soldiers a chance.

This is not about our soldiers. This is about a failed policy. I think we need to go over some of the facts again, the facts that 70 percent of Americans remember but my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle seem to have forgotten.

Number one. There were no Iraqis on the plane that day.

Number two. There were no weapons of mass destruction.

□ 2015

They weren't there. They were never found.

Number three. There was no al Qaeda in Iraq before the war, so it doesn't matter if we reduce the number. There were none before the war.

Number four. This could have been a war against terrorists, should have been a war against terrorists, not a war against the Iraqis.

Now we have almost 4,000 dead Americans. We don't even know how many dead Iraqis. It's a terrible tragedy in our Nation. And we're making decisions to spend billions of dollars in Iraq while we tell our people, sorry, we don't have money for education. Sorry, we don't have money for health care. Sorry, we don't have money to build bridges.

Bring these troops home. And this is what we are doing responsibly. We're saying ''no'' to the President and ''yes'' to the American people.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, before we vote on this measure, the American people need to know that U.S. troops in Iraq have achieved significant security gains. Violence against U.S. troops and Iraqi civilians has fallen dramatically, and forces of chaos have had their safe havens and supply lines systematically eliminated. In fact, it was recently announced that the curfew in Baghdad may soon be lifted.

Mr. Speaker, we can all agree that the goal is to end the war, but this must be done in a solicitous and strategic manner. While there is clearly military momentum in Iraq, the situation remains fragile and complex, and our work continues to be very dangerous and difficult. Establishing an arbitrary deadline for withdrawal of our troops would potentially undermine the stabilization of the country, especially in light of recent security gains.

However, I would submit that one area of potential agreement in this body involves a renewed spirit of diplomacy for the region. It is time for a diplomatic surge. The gains made possible by the steadfast competence of our troops gives rise to a new diplomatic potential in the effort to curtail regional destabilizing influences, promote political and economic progress, as well as provide for the safe and stable transition of refugees throughout the area.

The recent meeting in Istanbul, Turkey of countries neighboring Iraq, the upcoming meeting in Annapolis to further the Middle East peace process, and the United Nation's own recent reengagement in Baghdad are all positive diplomatic trends that should be aggressively supported and augmented by our efforts in this House to facilitate the rapid stabilization of Iraq, potentially empowering an even more rapid drawdown of our troops and a sustainable peace for the country.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE).

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4156.

For the last 4 years, President Bush has demanded more and more money from this Congress for the war in Iraq, draining funding from domestic priorities in the process. And this year's just no different.

True to form, in October the President casually requested an additional $200 billion to continue his failed policy.

Mr. Speaker, every time I travel back to my district, constituents plead with me to stand up to this President and end the war. Fortunately for them, the days of the rubber-stamp Congress are over. This bill before us holds the President accountable.

The bill provides only $50 billion of the President's $200 billion request, which serves to meet the immediate needs of our troops currently deployed, while the balance is dependent upon progress in Iraq.

The funding is also conditioned on the redeployment of troops from Iraq to begin within 30 days of enactment, with a target for completion by December of 2008.

Passage of this bill is the first step towards forcing a change of course in Iraq, shifting the mission from the combat forces to a comprehensive strategy.

I urge all my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 4156.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you advise us as to the time available on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 32¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 34 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to reserve my time at this point.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, leadership is about getting results. I want to thank our leadership for bringing a bill to the floor for the first time that gets results.

I've never voted for funds for this war, and I've been waiting a long time to vote for a bill that would bring our troops home.

On March 20, 2003, the United States invaded Iraq. It was a mistake then, and every day we've failed to correct this mistake costs us in cash, in credibility, and in lives. Every day we are not working to get out of Iraq, we make our Nation weaker and less safe. Every day that we do not get our troops out of Iraq is another day of mistakes.

The road out of Iraq starts with the first step. This bill is the first beginning. To start a withdrawal, this bill jump-starts that withdrawal. It starts in 30 days.

Passing this bill tonight makes clear that the U.S. House of Representatives has acted to bring our troops home, to end this war, and to put our country back on the right track. This leadership deserves your support.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, today I'm proud to join with a unified Democratic Caucus to cast my vote in support of H.R. 4156, the Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations Act. This legislation marks the first time redeployment language has been attached to funding, and includes the strongest worded language to date, by stating Congress's explicit commitment to end the war in Iraq as safely and quickly as possible and bring our troops home.

The letter my colleagues LYNN WOOLSEY, BARBARA LEE and I sent to President Bush stating that we would only support funding for the redeployment of our troops has grown from 70 to 92

signatories. As the letter stated, and as the title of this legislation echoes, we choose to support our military and look out for the best interests of this country by funding an orderly and responsible redeployment from Iraq.

While this bill is far from perfect, there's a lot in this bill to be proud of. This bill requires the redeployment of U.S. troops from Iraq within 30 days. It prohibits the deployment of U.S. troops not deemed fully trained, and it effectively bans the awful practice of waterboarding by any affiliate of a U.S. agency. I applaud the shared commitment of the Democratic Members in both the House and Senate to end the war in Iraq.

I share the public's dismay at the slow pace of Congress's action to end President Bush's failed war. It is, of course, the administration, not Congress, who ultimately deserves the blame for this terrible war. Before every major debate on the Iraq war, like clockwork, President Bush fires up the propaganda machine to twist reality and obscure the facts on the ground.

Those who stand in the way of real change in Iraq must be held accountable. They must not be allowed to quietly throw wrenches in the gears of change slowly rotating within this country.

A large and growing majority of Americans now believe it was a mistake to invade Iraq and that Congress should force a change in the President's irresponsible policies.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, before us tonight is yet another Democrat plan, a plan for failure. I guess it's really not quite so much a plan as just a schedule for failure.

It seems ironic to me that when there is actually success, the Democrats are having a hard time seeing the success. And that's, perhaps, because the success that is going on in Iraq is not a big government, Washington, D.C. beltway kind of success. It's not the Parliament in Baghdad where the success is going on. No, it's a uniquely American and a special success. It's the success that bubbles from the hearts of the very people that are involved, from the local communities, from the streets, and particularly from the sheiks. It's the kind of thing that happened in America where local communities stood up against the biggest military power in the world and defended our declaration in the same way these sheiks now are paying a tremendous price. One, Sheik Meshin al-Jamari, he was encouraged to come back from his safe haven in Jordan. He came back to take up responsibility for his tribal area just to the east of Fallujah. And what was the cost when he turned on al Qaeda? First, his daughter was killed, then his brother shot, and then his family rounded up inside a house in Karma, and the house imploded upon their heads. And yet, that sheik is standing firm because he does have a vision for the possibility that there will one day be an Iraq where people can be free.

Our General Allen was asked by some of the Iraqis in his tribe, they said, When the British left, they left us a big skyscraper. When America leaves Iraq, will you leave a skyscraper? And General Allen said, No. We'll leave the ideas that leave you a free people. And one day there will be Iraqis who come to us and they will say, Hey, GI Joe, we believe it too. We believe that there is a God that gives inalienable rights to all people, the right to life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and we will also stand with you because you have that hope.

It is my hope that the Americans and the Democrats will rediscover why we have always gone to war in America, because we do believe in our battle cry from years ago that there is a God that gives basic rights to all people and that we must have the courage to stand behind those things. I hope that the Congress will vote to reject a plan of defeat.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. The war in Iraq is a disaster and it's time to bring our brave troops, the men and women who volunteered to serve their country for the right reasons but were sent to Iraq for the wrong reasons. It is time now for them to come home.

For that reason, I support this bill which, for the first time, ties funding to the responsible redeployment of our troops out of Iraq, beginning within 30 days of passage and to end in December 2008.

I'm supporting this bill for another important reason. It establishes once and for all that the United States of America does not torture people. This bill is not confused about waterboarding. Waterboarding is clearly made illegal, as well as electric shocks and mock executions and every other gruesome interrogation method that is currently prohibited in the Army Field Manual.

The American people elected the Democratic majority in this House last November because they're done with the war. They're sick and tired of losing American lives in Iraq. And they're sick and tired of losing vital programs at home to continue to finance this tragic war.

This is a vote of conscience. I urge every one of my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard significant discussion tonight about al Qaeda. And people seem to think that Iraq, the Iraq war was necessary in order to tackle al Qaeda. Well, that's backwards.

I can recall being out at CIA headquarters after 9/11. I can recall sitting out at CIA headquarters watching the Predator aircraft as they flew over Afghanistan, transmitting pictures back here in the search for bin Laden and al Qaeda. And I remember what those CIA people out there said, and the frustration they expressed because half of their resources were being diverted from the search for bin Laden and al Qaeda to prepare for the attack on Iraq.

It isn't that the war in Iraq was necessary to get at al Qaeda. The war in Iraq diverted us from concentrating on al Qaeda and bin Laden.

□ 2030

And we are still suffering the consequences today.

So let's keep the facts straight. Let's keep history straight. And let's keep our heads straight. The fact is that Iraq got in the way of our effort to get at al Qaeda and we have been suffering from that fact ever since.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and appreciate his leadership in bringing this important legislation, the Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations Act.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, America honored our veterans, something that we do every day in our hearts but which we openly celebrated on that day. I am very proud that this year we could celebrate also the biggest increase in veterans benefits in the 77-year history of the Veterans Administration thanks to the New Direction Congress.

Yesterday, the President of the United States signed the Defense appropriations bill with the biggest increase in defense spending, made necessary because we must rebuild the capacity of our troops, which capacity has been weakened by the war in Iraq. And today, we bring before the Congress new direction legislation regarding the orderly and responsible redeployment of our troops out of Iraq.

This legislation is necessary because whatever you may have thought about the war or the conduct of the war or the origin of the war, whatever you may think about the performance of the Iraqi Government there, and I have my views on that subject, the fact is we can no longer militarily sustain the deployment in Iraq. Staying there in the manner that we are there is no longer an option.

Our troops have performed their duties magnificently, excellently, patriotically, and courageously. We owe them the deepest gratitude for their courage, their patriotism, and the sacrifices that they and their families are willing to make. But even as they tried

to create and had their military successes, God bless them for that, the secure framework was established to enable the Iraqi Government to make the political change necessary to end the civil war. Well, the sacrifice of our troops was simply not met by the actions of the Iraqi Government.

How much longer should we expect our young people to risk their lives, their limbs, their families, for an Iraqi Government that is not willing to step up to the plate?

This legislation today offers something fundamentally different from what President Bush is proposing, a 10-year war, a war without end, costing trillions of dollars at the expense of our military readiness. In fact, it offers something different than this House has done before. Indeed, it provides the tools to our troops so that they can get their jobs done with the greatest respect for that job. But it also presents a strategy that will bring them home responsibly, honorably, safely, and soon.

The legislation is different because it ties the funding to a strategy for redeployment. It is different because the funding provided is for the short term so that we can measure the administration's plan, if there is such a plan, to redeploy the troops on the schedule established in this bill.

We do have a military crisis not seen since Vietnam. Equipment is wearing out and needs to be replaced. Our troops, wherever they are, are only being trained for counterinsurgency in Iraq instead of a wider training for a full range of missions that they may be called on to perform. The deployment schedule of the Bush administration is wearing down our forces, plain and simple.

The distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee has made this readiness issue the cornerstone of his opposition to this war in Iraq. The distinguished chairman of the appropriations subcommittee on Defense has told us over and over again that this deployment in Iraq cannot be sustained without weakening our national security, without diminishing the capacity of our armed services to meet challenges to our national security wherever they may occur. As such, this readiness crisis poses a grave threat to America's national security.

Yet under the President's plan, and this was expressed by representatives of the administration on more than one occasion, the President's plan would bring 30,000 troops, the number of troops that were sent in for the surge, that 30,000 troops would be redeployed back to the U.S. by July of 2008. So let's understand this. This means that by July of 2008, we will have the same number of troops in Iraq as we had in November of 2006 when the American people called for a new direction in Iraq. Again, we cannot afford the President's commitment in Iraq. It traps us. It traps us, and we cannot, while we are in that trap, address our readiness crisis.

This redeployment, in addition to undermining our military capacity to protect the American people, is also unsustainable financially. According to a recent report by the Joint Economic Committee, this war could end up costing American taxpayers $3 trillion. We will pay any price, as President Kennedy said, to protect the American people, but without us going into the shortcomings of this war and the President's execution of it, $3 trillion, think of the opportunity cost of that money in our readiness, in the strength of our country, in our reputation in the world.

The legislation before us is important. Again, the title of it is the Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations Act. It would begin redeployment within 30 days of enactment and have a goal of completing the redeployment by December 15, 2008. The legislation requires a transition in the mission of U.S. forces from being in combat to diplomatic and force protection, to targeted counterterrorism and limited support for the Iraqi security forces. It would prohibit the deployment of U.S. troops to Iraq who are not fully trained and fully equipped. Thank you, Mr. MURTHA, for your leadership on that subject and on this one as well and so many others. It requires that all U.S. Government agencies and personnel abide by the Army Field Manual's prohibition against torture.

The legislation that Mr. OBEY has brought to the floor, and I salute your leadership over and over again on this subject and so many others, Mr. Chairman, the House must choose between the President's plan for a 10-year war without end, no end in sight, the longer we're there, the harder it is to come out, the longer we're there, the more severely it hurts our military readiness; or a Democratic plan for responsible, honorable, safe redeployment out of Iraq and soon.

Our troops have already paid too high a price for this war: 3,850 U.S. troops killed, 28,000 injured, thousands of them permanently. That is, of course, the biggest price to pay. But the price that we are paying in our reputation in the world for us not to be able to take our rightful place as a leader in the world to make the world safer, to make the region, the Middle East, more stable, and so many other challenges that the world faces, whether it's the eradication of disease, the alleviation of poverty, the curbing of global warming, keeping peace, ending the fury of despair that contributes to the violence in the world. The countries of the world are crying out for American leadership, and at the same time they disrespect us for what is happening in Iraq.

We must act now to provide a new direction because it is clear that the President has turned a blind eye to all of this. And in addition to what I said earlier, our troops paying the biggest price, our reputation in the world, the several-trillion-dollar price tag to the taxpayer, and the cost to our readiness, despite the fact that the President has turned a blind eye to the facts of Iraq and a tin ear to the wishes of the American people to take a new direction in Iraq and bring our troops home, we must act today. I hope that our colleagues will all support this legislation because in doing so and if it is enacted into law and if this policy is pursued, we can resume our rightful place in the world. We can refocus our attention, as Mr. OBEY said earlier, on the real war on terrorism, and we can make the American people safer by rebuilding and restoring the readiness and the capacity of our military to protect the American people wherever our interests are threatened.

All of us stand here and take an oath of office by pledging to protect and defend the Constitution. In that preamble, to provide for the common defense is one of our first responsibilities. Unless we do that, protect the American people, nothing else is possible.

So let us support this legislation which helps us honor our oath of office to defend the American people and to respect the sacrifice, the courage, the patriotism of our troops to make us the home of the brave and the land of the free.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this important legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of this resolution.

It's very important that we take a good look at where we are in the country of Iraq. It's important that we take a good look at the status of the United States military forces, in particular our Army, which is being stretched and strained nearly beyond recognition.

You can't help but have a great deal of pride in the young men and young women in doing the duty upon which they have been called. But it is important for us to turn the reins, give the baton over to the Iraqi forces, to the Iraqi Government. We cannot hold their hand there forever. It is important that we redeploy our forces in a responsible and reasonable manner so that their readiness is assured in case of some future challenge.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 1106]

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—377

Abercrombie	Alexander	Arcuri
Ackerman	Allen	Baca
Aderholt	Altmire	Bachmann
Akin	Andrews	Bachus

Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 2103

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). On this rollcall, 377 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

ORDERLY AND RESPONSIBLE IRAQ REDEPLOYMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 29¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 26½ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute simply to explain to the House that the intention is to have one remaining speaker on each side and then proceed to the votes.

With that, I yield back the remainder of my 1 minute and invite the gentleman from Florida to close.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the evening, we have heard some very, very interesting speeches. I listened with great respect to all of them. I agreed with some, I disagreed with some, I wasn't sure about some. Nevertheless, it was a good debate at a high level. I paid special attention to the very distinguished Speaker of the House because in her opening comments, she talked about how Monday, Veterans Day, America honored our veterans. She spoke about the Veterans appropriations bill in great, glowing terms. I agree with that. It is a really good bill. It provides a lot of benefits for the veterans. There are 400,000 veterans claims backed up. That bill provided money to hire additional adjudicators to get rid of that backlog and get the veterans what they need.

The problem is that as she spoke about the importance of this bill and what a great bill it was and great bill it is, she failed to say that the House passed it on June 15, the Senate passed it in September, and here we are in November still waiting to get that bill on the House floor.

I say, Madam Speaker, let's vote on the VA appropriations bill.

I mentioned the fact that there were great speeches. But, Mr. Speaker, tonight we will not be voting or be recorded on how those speeches went, or what those speeches said, or what those speeches included. We are not going to be voting on opinions. We are not going to be voting on politics. We are going to be voting on what is in this bill. What has been said about this bill is not necessarily what is actually written in the bill. But we are going to vote for what is written in that bill. We will be held accountable for our vote on what that bill says, not on what some speaker said about it.

One of the things that I mentioned in my opening comments that I was really offended by is that this legislation gives constitutional protection to terrorists, the same constitutional protection that all of our constituents enjoy. I refer to page 3 of the bill itself, ''Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the rights under the United States Constitution of any person in the custody or under the physical jurisdiction of the United States.''

Now, that gives terrorists the same protection that your constituents have. And that's just not right. By giving them that protection, do we give them for example, do we have to read them their Miranda rights if we capture them on the battlefield? Do we have to allow them to pay bail and get out of jail or get out of detention? What kind of rights will we be giving to terrorists with just this one sentence that says they shall have rights under the Constitution? These are terrorists, Mr. Speaker. These aren't even people who are signatories to the Geneva Convention. They don't play by any rules. They do whatever they must do, and they have killed thousands and thousands of Americans, and they have killed thousands and thousands of the Muslim populations.

Now, something about this bill, on page 6 of this bill, ''After the conclusion of the reduction and transition of United States Armed Forces to a limited presence as required by this section, the Secretary of Defense may deploy or maintain members of the Armed Forces in Iraq only for the following missions.'' Now, pay attention to this because this is what you will be allowing. For those of you that think you're getting troops out of Iraq, this is what this bill will permit. The Armed Forces in Iraq can be there for the following missions: ''Protecting United States diplomatic facilities, United States Armed Forces, and American citizens.'' We do that now. That is one of the things that we are doing right now.

So you think you're getting out of that. This bill keeps you in that. The next paragraph, ''Conducting limited training, equipment, and providing logistical and intelligence support to the Iraqi Security forces.'' We're doing that now. So if you think this bill is going to change anything, it doesn't because you are allowing them to stay

to do the same thing that they are doing now.

The next paragraph, ''Engaging in targeted counterterrorism operations against al Qaeda, al Qaeda affiliated groups, and other terrorist organizations in Iraq.'' Mr. Speaker, we're doing that now.

On page 12, we go to the Iraqi Security Forces Fund provided in this bill. ''For the 'Iraq Security Forces Fund', $500 million, Provided, that such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Commander, Multinational Security Transition Command-Iraq, or the Secretary's designee, to provide assistance, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to the security forces of Iraq.'' Mr. Speaker, we are doing that now. So if you think we're making a change here, read the bill.

It goes on to say, ''Including the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, and construction, and funding, and to provide training, reintegration, education and employment programs for concerned local citizens, former militia members and detainees and former detainees.'' Mr. Speaker, we're doing all that now.

So this bill doesn't make very many changes if you think this gets you out of Iraq. It doesn't. If you read the bill, you will see that it doesn't. Now, these are things that we would be allowed to do under this bill. But if this bill were successful, and it will not be because I have an idea the President would veto it in its present form, we would have to do all of these same things that we are doing today but with a smaller force, a smaller force, minus the surge, for example. The change in policy that we all demanded early on came about, and it was called the ''surge.'' The surge has had many positive effects. When you get to the point that The New York Times and the L.A. Times and the Washington Post are writing stories about the positive effects of the surge, you have to admit there is something real there in the surge. So do you want to go back and have to do all of the same things we are doing today with a smaller force? I don't think so.

We will have a motion to recommit. And if that motion to recommit is successful, we will have a bill that we can all vote for and that I believe the President would be willing to sign. So let's vote based on what is in this bill, not what the speeches say about it, not about the politics, not about the opinions, but let's actually vote on what is in this bill and let's support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and anywhere else in the world where they might be deployed. We owe them no less. This bill is not a good bill today. Let's vote against it tonight and vote for the motion to recommit.

□ 2115

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman yielded back his time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has yielded back all of his time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 26 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in strong support of the bill that is before us today. First and foremost, I want to point out that every Member on this floor, every Member knows that the brave men and women of our military have done a fantastic job, and every Member on this floor supports the brave men and women serving our country.

Mr. Speaker, too many of those brave men and women have been doing a fantastic job for way too many tours. Multiple tours. The last time I was in Iraq, I had lunch with a group of soldiers from California, one of whom was a firefighter from the North Bay in California, and he said, I used to have a house in your district, but I don't anymore. My ex-wife has it now. I said, I am sorry to hear that. He said, well, this is my fourth tour. I couldn't expect much else.

Our men and women have been put under a tremendous strain for far too long. Our military equipment has been depleted. Over $100 billion is needed to bring our military equipment up to standard. Our combat readiness has been depleted. This bill, this bill is about refocusing our area; to transition, transition our effort into force protection, diplomatic protection, counterterrorism, refocus our effort looking into the future for future problems that we may have. It's long past time to refocus our efforts; it's long past time to transition.

This bill does represent a change. We heard from the previous speaker that there wasn't much change. Mr. Speaker and Members, if there wasn't any change in this bill, we wouldn't be facing the opposition from the other side that we are facing tonight. This bill represents major change.

This bill represents a policy change that the American people are demanding. They demanded it in the November election; they demand it today. It's long past time for this transition to take place. This war can't go on forever. We know that on this side of the aisle and we know it on the other side of the aisle.

A lot of comparisons have been made tonight with Vietnam. I want to make just one. I served in Vietnam with the 173rd Airborne Brigade. I didn't do anything exceptional. I showed up; I did my job. But there came a time in past Congresses that it was known that we were going to leave Vietnam, and from the time that we knew that our colleagues, our past colleagues knew that we were going to leave Vietnam, until we actually left Vietnam, 21,000 Americans died.

They knew, our colleagues in past Congresses knew that we couldn't sustain that. We weren't going to be in Vietnam forever. They knew we had to leave. From the time they absolutely knew it on this floor until we left, 21,000 brave American men died in Vietnam. I was one of the lucky ones. I was only wounded. I lost a lot of friends. We lost a lot of fellow Americans.

We cannot make that same mistake. We know that the Iraq war cannot go on forever. We know that on both sides of the aisle. It's time for a major policy change. This bill represents that major policy change. I urge everyone to vote ''aye'' for the underlying bill.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, after my oversight trips to Iraq in July and August of 2006, I concluded we needed to encourage the Iraqi government, and specifically Prime Minister Maliki, to take stronger action to improve the situation in their country, and that the best way to do this was to set firm timelines for Iraqi security forces to replace our troops who are doing police work.

I believe a workable timeline will incentivize the Iraqis to make the hard choices necessary to ensure stability among the three primary sects—Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds. We need to motivate the Iraqis to set firm deadlines for provincial elections, reconciliation and amnesty, and a final drafting of their constitution.

During 2005, Iraqis set timelines to establish and ratify a constitution and hold national elections. They accomplished each benchmark successfully. I do not believe they would have achieved this success if we had not pushed Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds to resolve their differences and compromise in order to meet the timelines we helped set.

The United States went into Iraq on a bipartisan basis, with two-thirds of the House and three-quarters of the Senate voting to authorize the use of force. I believe we need to draw down the majority of our troops on a bipartisan basis, and have sought to achieve bipartisan solutions to improve our operations and reduce the violence.

While H.R. 4156 is by no means a perfect solution, it does propose a tight, but arguably reasonable, timeline for drawdown of troops in Iraq similar to one I proposed earlier this year. It should help bridge the gap between Republicans and Democrats on the most important issue of our time. The bill would require our commanders to begin a redeployment of our troops in harms way within a month, and set a target date of December 15, 2008, to complete the task.

For me, a better bill would have been to give Iraqis and our troops an additional six months to complete the drawdown, but given this bill sets a target date, rather than a withdrawal date, it gives needed flexibility to our military leadership.

I do not believe we have the force structure to maintain the number of troops in Iraq now, and certainly do not have the capacity to increase the force.

Our troops have performed extraordinarily well, but it is unreasonable for us to ask them to return to Iraq for a third or fourth tour. I also believe it was a significant mistake to extend

their tours from 12 to 15 months and would be unconscionable to consider extending their tours beyond 15 months. Based on our military's current manpower, we will need to begin to draw down our forces by the beginning of 2008, and it would be wise to let the Iraqis know now this reduction will take place.

While I support this bill, I am disappointed the majority still has not allowed a single amendment on any Iraq-related bill. As I have said before, it is pretty arrogant to think we would criticize Iraqis for not being able to compromise and find common ground when Republicans and Democrats are unable to compromise and find common ground on the most important issue facing our Nation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to call for the passage of H.R. 4156, the ''Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Act.'' The war in Iraq cannot be won through the use of military force or another troop surge. The majority of the American people do not support the war in Iraq; a recent study stated that nearly 7 in 10 Americans oppose the war. Since the war began in 2003, 3,859 brave U.S. troops have died in Iraq. In 2007 the death toll has already reached 860 soldiers who have lost their lives, making it the worst year yet for the American military in Iraq. Currently, 28,400 soldiers have been wounded in Iraq since the war began with 12,750 suffering injuries so serious they were prevented from returning to duty.

President Bush's failed Iraq policies offer a war with no end in sight. There is no progress on political reconciliation between Shiites and Sunnis in the Iraqi government. Just this week, it was reported that the U.S. effort to organize nearly 70,000 local Sunni fighters to solidify security gains in Iraq is facing severe political and logistical challenges as the central government resists in incorporating them into the Iraqi police and army. Last month, the Shiite political alliance of Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki called the U.S. military to halt the recruitments of Sunnis.

The bill in the house tonight will require the start of the redeployment of U.S. forces within 30 days of enactment, with a goal completion of redeployment by December 15, 2008. It will require a transition in the mission of U.S. forces in Iraq from primarily combat to force protection and diplomatic protection; limited support to Iraqi security forces; and targeted counterterrorism operations. H.R. 4156 will prohibit deployment of U.S. troops to Iraq who are not fully trained and fully equipped. The legislation also calls for an extension to all U.S. Government agencies and personnel of the current prohibitions in the Army Field Manual against torture. The bill will also provide to meet the immediate need of our troops, but defers consideration of the remainder of the President's nearly $200 billion request. At the current rate of expenditure, the additional funds will last 4 months.

Many insist that American troops cannot leave Iraq until we have achieved victory; and democracy has been established. History has shown us that civil wars and insurgencies are ended only through rigorous diplomacy, economic development, and national reconciliation between former enemies; not by a troop surge and an endless war. Diplomacy works, and now more then ever is the time to implement the recommendations of the Baker Hamilton Commission, and call for a regional peace summit in the Middle East.

Let's bring all parties who are involved in the conflict to the peace table, so they can begin to resolve their differences. If international diplomacy ended the intractable conflicts in Northern Ireland, the Balkans, the conflict between Israel and Egypt, and Rwanda; then international diplomacy can work in Iraq. Once we begin the strategic withdrawal of U.S. troops out of Iraq, and show the Iraqi people we do not wish to occupy their country, then and only then can we begin the real possibility of having an effective international peace conference.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the issue before the House today is straightforward. Do we think the President's Iraq policy is working so well that we should give him another $200 billion to continue it, or do we need a fundamental change in direction?

I truly believe we need to change an Iraq policy that is simply not working. From the beginning, the Bush administration has been wrong about the war in Iraq. If you set aside the administration's rhetoric, the reality is that the surge has not worked. The goal of the surge was to give the Iraqi Government breathing space to make the political decisions necessary to reduce the violence that is tearing Iraq apart. But 11 months into the troop surge, progress on political reconciliation continues to be all but nonexistent. Meanwhile, 2007 has already been the deadliest year for American troops since the start of the war in Iraq.

There is a clear choice before us. If you are satisfied with how the Bush administration has been conducting the war for the last 4½ years, you should oppose this bill. If, on the other hand, you believe the administration's strategy isn't working and want to require the President to change course, you should vote for this legislation.

Whatever small chance there is of the Iraqi factions coming together, it will not happen as long as the U.S. military commitment in Iraq remains open-ended. We need to change course.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the majority party's Iraq supplemental appropriations bill.

It is baffling that at the precise moment when the surge in Iraq is producing positive results, the majority party would like to pull the rug out from underneath our troops.

Violence is down. Sunnis in al Anbar have allied with U.S. forces against al Qaeda. Baghdad is regaining some sense of normalcy.

By no means can we declare ''victory'' but our troops can rightfully claim progress. Despite these positive developments, the majority party wants to withdraw our forces—as if the enemy won't follow us home.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: are they prepared to take responsibility for the disastrous consequences of an early withdrawal?

Are they prepared to witness the chaos and destruction in Iraq?

Most importantly, are they willing to pass this responsibility on to the next generation of Americans who may be forced to finish the job we did not have the courage to complete?

My colleagues are right: we have made a significant financial and personal investment in Iraq. Let us have the courage of our convictions to see it through.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and pass a clean supplemental bill that provides support to those who are fighting and dying. We owe them that much.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Iraq Redeployment Act which sets forth a realistic strategy for the responsible redeployment of our combat troops in Iraq. The Bush Administration has requested another $200 billion dollar blank check for the war in Iraq to pursue a flawed strategy that has no end in sight and which continually puts our brave men and women in the armed services in the middle of Iraq's civil war.

The indefinite presence of American forces in Iraq has allowed the different factions there to postpone making the difficult compromises necessary to achieve stability and political reconciliation. Our intelligence community has publicly concluded that the political situation in Iraq is getting worse, not better. We cannot ask our troops to remain in Iraq when the different Iraqi factions have refused to take the steps necessary to achieve a greater stability.

We must embark on a new direction in Iraq. That's what this legislation will do. It allocates $50 billion for the purpose of beginning to responsibly redeploy our combat forces out of Iraq by the target date of December 15, 2008. The troops that would remain in Iraq beyond that date would focus on the more limited missions of training Iraqi security forces, providing logistical and intelligence support for the Iraqi security forces, and engaging in targeted counter-terrorist operations against Al-Qaeda and affiliated groups.

As the legislation states, ''the primary purpose of funds made available by the Act should be to transition the mission of the United States Armed Forces in Iraq and undertake their redeployment, and not to extend or prolong the war.'' This bill also states that the reduction of our armed forces in Iraq ''shall be implemented in conjunction with a comprehensive diplomatic, political and economic strategy that includes sustained engagement with Iraq's neighbors and the international community for the purpose of working collectively to bring stability to Iraq''—a strategy recommended by the bipartisan Iraq Study Group that the Administration has failed to pursue with any vigor or urgency.

This legislation also prohibits the deployment of any troops not fully equipped or trained, and extends to all U.S. Government agencies and personnel the limitations in the U.S. Army Field Manual on permissible interrogation techniques. We must send a strong message to the world that we do not support or condone torture.

We are on the wrong path in Iraq. This bill provides a much needed change in direction that will strengthen our national security, improve our position in the region and bring our men and women safely home.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, one need look no further than the chaos in Pakistan or the deteriorating situation in Afghanistan to understand that troop levels in Iraq cannot be maintained—and that the surge, which I have always opposed, has done nothing to achieve political stability.

Today, with this bridge funding vote, Congress signals to the White House yet again that enough is enough, that the combat mission in Iraq must end, and that we will force that change.

No one in this chamber questions the courage or commitment of our brave women and men in uniform or their willingness to tackle

any challenge put before them. But we have sent them on an ill-defined mission with no apparent end point, and which consumes staggering amounts of our talent and treasure at the expense of countless other priorities.

This bill also redresses a glaring loophole in the Military Commissions Act—a bill I strongly opposed. By requiring that all U.S. Government agencies and personnel must adhere to interrogation techniques contained in the Army Field Manual, we send an unmistakable signal to the rest of the world that the United States—the world's oldest functioning democracy—does not permit cruel, inhumane and degrading practices, or torture, and complies fully with Federal law banning torture and our international obligations.

The Iraq Troop Redeployment Bill is good policy, and long overdue.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4156, the Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations Act. This bill will begin the long-overdue withdrawal of American troops from Iraq.

Yesterday, the President vetoed the Labor and Heath and Human Services-Education appropriations bill, which is the bill that provides funding for the National Institutes of Health, the Center for Disease Control, Low Income Home Energy Assistance, the Education Department, Pell Grants, and educational programs for the disadvantaged. He vetoed this bill because it contained a 2 percent increase over his request—an increase of $10 billion in a Labor HHS bill of roughly $600 billion. The President opposes even a 2 percent increase in the funding for these programs.

Meanwhile, the President has requested almost $200 billion more for his failed war in Iraq. That would make the total cost of the war in Iraq so far to over $600 billion and climbing, with no end in sight. President Bush's refusal to change course in Iraq is shocking, his failure to allow adequate rest for our soldiers between tours of duty is outrageous, and his demand for another $200 billion blank check for his war in Iraq while vetoing LIHEAP for the poor, education for disadvantaged children, Pell Grants for college students, and research into cures for life threatening disease is simply unacceptable to this House. What a misplaced set of priorities.

Instead of the blank check for an endless war, this bill requires President Bush to begin withdrawing American troops from Iraq within 30 days. Instead of unfairly sending inadequately equipped soldiers on multiple tours of duty, this bill prohibits the deployment of any troops who are not fully equipped and trained. And at the same time, this bill provides the necessary funds, in full, to our troops who are still in harm's way.

Our Republican colleagues must make a choice: will they stand with President Bush's attempt to throw more money and more young men and women into the mess in Iraq, or will they join with Democrats seeking a bipartisan agreement on redeploying American troops out of Iraq?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to specifically note a provision of this bill, which I wrote, to bar any funds in this bill from being used for the gruesome and indefensible practice of extraordinary rendition. I would like to commend and thank Chairman OBEY and Chairman MURTHA for again including this language, as they have in every defense appropriations and supplemental appropriations bill this year. Through the use of extraordinary rendition, as well as abusive interrogation techniques and extrajudicial incarceration of so-called ''enemy combatants,'' President Bush has largely forfeited the mantel of human rights champion which the United States has carried for so long. We must reclaim the international moral high-ground if we are to cure the root causes of terrorism around the world, and we can start by banning extraordinary rendition.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman OBEY for this strong and responsible bill, and urge all my colleagues to vote aye.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4156, the Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations Act.

The Iraq war is a failure and it's time for our troops to come home.

This bill calls for a responsible redeployment and provides for the checks and balances Congress is authorized to impose.

The administration does not have blanket authority and America does not have a bottomless checking account.

The President's policy in Iraq has been a complete failure, and Americans are calling for this war to end.

Our troops are now trapped in the middle of someone else's civil war.

Our military presence in Iraq is not making our country any safer.

Instead, this war has taken the lives of over 3,850 soldiers, including 13 brave young men from my District alone.

From Rialto, 37-year-old Staff Sergeant Jorge A. Molina was deployed in Iraq and died in hostile fire in the Anbar province.

From Rialto, 20-year-old, Specialist Luis D. Santos was deployed in Iraq and died of injuries sustained when a makeshift bomb exploded near his Humvee during combat operations in Buritz.

From Rialto, 22-year-old, Corporal Victor A. Garcia was deployed in Iraq and died by small arms fire in Baghdad.

From Bloomington, 25-year-old, Corporal Joseph A. Blanco was deployed in Iraq and died by small arms fire in Taji after sustaining injuries from a makeshift bomb.

From Fontana, 19-year-old Lance Corporal Fernando S. Tamayo was deployed in Iraq and died while conducting combat operations in Anbar Province.

From Fontana, 24-year-old Sergeant Bryan A. Brewster was deployed in Afghanistan and died after his helicopter crashed during combat operations in Afghanistan.

From San Bernardino, 22-year-old Corporal Nicanor Alvarez was deployed in Iraq and died in the line of fire in the Anbar province.

From San Bernardino, 19-year-old Petty Officer Alex Oceguera was deployed in Afghanistan, and died when a makeshift bomb detonated near his vehicle in Wygal Valley, Afghanistan.

From San Bernardino, 24-year-old Corporal Sean Grilley was deployed in Iraq, and died after being fired on by Iraqis during operations in Karbala.

From San Bernardino, 24-year-old Specialist Timothy D. Watkins was deployed in Iraq, and died when a makeshift bomb exploded near his vehicle during operations in Ar Ramadi.

From Ontario, 21-year-old Specialist Jose R. Perez was deployed in Iraq, and died by enemy small arms fire in Ramadi.

From Ontario, 31-year-old Sergeant First Class Rudy A. Salcido was deployed in Iraq, and died when an improvised explosive device detonated near his convey vehicle in Baghdad.

These are the true faces of the war. My deepest prayers go out to their families.

These soldiers are the reason why I am so adamant about bringing our troops back home, and why we must support this bill.

The President's failed policies on the Iraqi war effort must end. We are listening to America's concerns and will not stand by and watch this continue.

We need to bring back our loved ones and put our families here at home first.

It's time for America to put her priorities in order.

This Nation is in debt, but not because of domestic spending.

President Bush refuses to sign bills to pay for schools, children's health care, and to protect our workers.

However, he comes to us asking for another $200 billion to continue funding the Iraq war.

With just one week's worth of funding for the war, my District would never again face a shortage of teachers, of nurses, or of police officers.

As a veteran, I voted against this war in 2002 because no one could convince me why we had to be there in the first place.

The President believes Iraq is making our country safer.

The truth is, it is has put us at greater risk.

Our military is stretched so thin that we are at risk of not being prepared for any future emergencies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 818, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. In its current form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4156, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

(1) In section 101—

(A) strike paragraph (3);

(B) in paragraph (1), insert ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(C) in paragraph (2), strike ''; and'' and insert a period.

(2) Strike sections 102, 104 and 106.

(3) In section 105—

(A) strike subsections (a) through (f); and

(B) in subsection (g), strike the subsection designation.

(4) Redesignate sections 103 and 105 as sections 102 and 103 respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is a simple forthwith motion. That means a vote for this motion will allow the House to immediately vote tonight on a bill that can pass the Congress and be signed into law. That means that our troops in harm's way will get the funding they need before Congress leaves town for a 2-week Thanksgiving recess.

The motion would amend the bill to strike the provisions which have nothing to do with providing for our troops and are nothing more than political gamesmanship. The motion would strip the provisions that give our enemies a complete blueprint and timeline for troop withdrawal. The motion would strip the provisions in the bill which signal to our troops and our enemies that Congress will not provide any more funding for our troops, except for withdrawal. The motion would strip the provisions in the bill that substitute politicians' judgments on troop deployment for the judgment of our military commanders in the field.

At the same time, we leave intact the $50 billion in critical funding included in the bill. We leave intact the prohibition on torture, which has been adopted previously by this Congress and Congresses before. But we strip the new provisions which could give terrorists killing our soldiers and our citizens constitutional protections under our legal system.

We modify provisions to more clearly express Congress's commitment to our troops and to bringing them home safely in victory as soon as possible. We leave intact a new requirement that the President submit to the Congress within the next 3 months a comprehensive, long-term strategy to achieve stability in the Middle East over the next 5 years.

As events of the last few months have shown, the situation on the ground has, and we all hope will, continue to improve dramatically. Congress has and will continue to debate the proper course of the war, as it should. However, we should not and cannot vote to hold troop funding hostage to that debate. The only ones hurt by that are our troops and their families.

As we go home to enjoy the holidays with our families, how can any of us look our soldiers' families in the eye and explain to them that we are withholding their funding so that we can score political points. That is just wrong. Our soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen and their families deserve more from all of us.

I urge adoption of this motion.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Who wishes to claim the time in opposition?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that I have a great deal of affection for the gentleman from Florida. I think he makes as good an argument for a bad case as you can possibly find. Let me simply say that this recommittal motion is very easy to understand, which is why it ought to be defeated. It simply gives the President all the money in this bill, unconditionally. It is simply a down payment on business as usual. It simply strips the timeline from this legislation. It renews the authority for torture. It eliminates the requirement that interrogation activities follow the Army Field Manual. Outside of those problems, it's a terrific idea.

So I would simply urge a ''no'' vote on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. I want the Members to know I carry in my pocket the names of 18 people who have been killed from my district. Two years ago, I said this is a failed policy wrapped in illusion. I am absolutely convinced that there's more instability in the Middle East today than there was then.

This recommittal motion works against everything we are trying to do. We want a plan. We want a plan in Iraq. We want stability in the Middle East. We don't have stability. Pakistan, Afghanistan, and of course Turkey might even go into the Middle East. So when you talk about victory, you're talking about stability, which we don't have. It's absolutely essential to put a plan in place that holds the President accountable.

All this time the President has asked for things and we have given them to him. For 5 years we have said to the President of the United States, You need money, we are going to give to it you. Now we are saying we are going to have a new plan, and that plan is going to change the direction of this war, and we are going to bring those troops who fought so honorably home to their families.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and ask for a ''no'' vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced the noes appear to have it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 192, nays 231, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 1107]

YEAS—192

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—231

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Duncan
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Bono
Carson
Cubin
Doyle
Hastert
Jindal
Mack
Oberstar
Sessions
Weller

□ 2146

Messrs. MORAN of Kansas and LAMPSON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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—yeas 218, nays 203, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 1108]

YEAS—218

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

NAYS—203

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNulty
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Lewis (GA)

NOT VOTING—11

Bono
Carson
Cubin
Doyle
Hastert
Jindal
Mack
Oberstar
Pearce
Sessions
Weller

□ 2201

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. OBEY. 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 (Mr. BRALEY of Iowa). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

TIME FOR PAKISTAN TO STOP BEING A DICTATORSHIP

(Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, Thirty years ago, I was in law school studying, among other things, the Constitution and deepening my passion for freedom under law. With me at Santa Clara Law School was Munir Malik. That small Jesuit institution instilled in me a sense of duty to stand for principle that led me to this House. That same sense of duty led Malik to leave behind a lucrative career as a CPA and lawyer to return to Pakistan. Last year, he was named president of Pakistan's Supreme Court Bar Association. This May, he was the target of an assassination attempt. And, this month, he was arrested by our ally. Our ally? President Musharraf. His crime? Standing up for the rule of law.

Musharraf is liberating al Qaeda members in the western territories while arresting judges and lawyers who believe in law. Pakistan is using our money to do it.

It's time for Pakistan to tell us where Malik and the other lawyers are. Time for Pakistan to set them free. Time for Pakistan to stop being a dictatorship.

I include for the RECORD a letter from the faculty at Santa Clara Law

School asking for a return to the rule of law and the release of their former student.

STATEMENT BY MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY OF SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW ON GENERAL MUSHARRAF'S ABROGATION OF RULE OF LAW

We are deeply concerned about the abrogation of the Rule of Law in Pakistan. General Musharraf, in a brazen attempt to perpetuate his own rule, has used his state apparatus to disband the highest courts of the country. Thousands of lawyers, journalists, judges, human rights activists have been jailed. in many cases families have no idea of the whereabouts of the detainees.

Our own concern is particularly sparked by the arrest and detention of one of our graduates, Muneer Malik, the Immediate Past President of the Pakistani Supreme Court Bar Association. His fate is, of course, merely a small part of the overall tragedy taking place but as we know him to be a conscientious, industrious lawyer dedicated to the welfare of his country, and not in the least a threat to law and order; he symbolizes the injustice being practiced.

We, in fact, are not an organized political group. We have never before joined in a statement of this sort with each other. What brings us together in this plea is the fact that we are all professors of law who teach in the law school which graduated Mr. Malik and who share a respect for the rule of law. We deplore what has happened. We assume that many more people like him have been swept from public view. The Supreme and High Court judges have been locked in their own homes. Police have stormed into bar-association gatherings and have manhandled lawyers, some of them women, some of them septuagenarian! TV stations have been blacked out and police vans are carting off telecommunication equipment from private TV stations.

The U.S. must use all its influence and in no uncertain terms demand the restoration of the Supreme Court status quo ante Nov 2nd 2007. It must demand the immediate release of and accounting for all persons who have been jailed after the promulgation of the so-called emergency. It should be recalled that President Musharraf removed the Chief Justice once before, a short while ago, and that he was forced to rescind his order because of the pressure of world opinion. The embattled civil society in Pakistan must realize that America stands for the rule of Law and the liberty of all peoples.

Signed by:

George Alexander, Dean and Professor of Law Emeritus.

Patricia Cain, Inez Mabie Professor of Law.

Colleen Chien, Assistant Professor of Law.

Rev. Paul Goda, S.J., Professor of Law.

Allen Hammond, Phil and Bobbie San Filippo Professor of Law.

Ellen Kreitzberg Professor of Law.

Philip Jimenez Professor of Law.

Jean Love Elizabeth H. and John A. Sutro Professor of Law.

Gary Neustadter Professor of Law.

Michelle Oberman Professor of Law.

Robert Peterson Professor of Law.

Mack Player Professor of Law and Director, Center for Global Law and Policy.

Margaret Russell Professor of Law.

Catherine Sandoval Assistant Professor of Law.

Jiri Toman Professor of Law.

Gerald Uelman Professor of Law and Director, California Commission for the Fair Administration of Justice.

Stephanie Wildman Professor of Law and Director, Center for Social Justice and Public Service.

Nancy Wright Professor of Law.

Eric Wright Professor of Law.

David Yosifon Assistant Professor of Law.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRALEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

SOUTHEASTERN DROUGHT

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to call to the attention of Congress what is occurring in the Southeastern and Mid-Atlantic region of the United States. When you look at the statistics and look at the effects, there is only one word that can describe this drought—it is a total disaster.

This isn't a disaster like a tornado or a hurricane, where you have one big storm and it's over, or a big fire. This drought is a continuous process, and the impact adds up over time. The drought is the worst one on record in the Southeast and in my home State of North Carolina.

We know that this entire Southeast region has had about 19 inches less rainfall than we should have had this year, and some areas have received even less. You can see from this map what a large area of severe drought we now have.

The States that have been the hardest hit include Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Tennessee, South Carolina, and Virginia.

In North Carolina, our Governor has ordered citizens to halt all nonessential water use. This drought has affected our farmers to an extent so great that it is now affecting our rural communities. Plants are having their production levels cut to save water. Some communities have only a few months of water supply remaining. In my district, the Second District of North Carolina, nearly the entire area has been afflicted by what is called an exceptional drought, and this is the most severe level. Farmers have been struggling all year from this truly epic weather condition.

Mr. Speaker, I am working in Congress to provide some relief. Last month, the House Agriculture Committee held a hearing to shine a spotlight on this growing disaster, and the Governor of our State, Governor Easley, testified himself as to the magnitude of this crisis.

Many of my colleagues may have seen this week that in my neighboring State of Georgia, the Governor has even called a meeting and asked for prayer. I am all for praying for rain, but, my friends, it is going to take more than prayer.

I have written a letter to the President asking for assistance. This letter was signed by 54 of my fellow colleagues here in Congress from both sides of the aisle.

Farmers are some of the most resourceful and ingeniously productive people around, but there is just so much that you can do to grow crops, raise livestock or poultry without one of the essentials of life, and that is water.

Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to raise a greater awareness, because we all need to work together to help solve this problem. People need to realize how serious it really is.

I am concerned that some folks may think the crisis might be solved if we get just a little rain. Unfortunately, our farmers tell me the damage has already been done, and I can agree, having visited a lot of farms. Even if we had a nice soaking rain this week and next week and the week after that and the week after that, it has been said that we will need 25 inches of rain in the next 6 months just to get the water level back to where it was. We've lost our cotton, our beans, our corn, and many of the other crops, and they won't be able to grow this winter unless we get more ground water. The crop this year is now lost.

The problem today is that too many Americans think that the food that they eat comes from the grocery store. I want them to understand, that's just where they go to pick it up. That food comes from a farm. They forget that it's the farmer out in the field working every day of the year to make sure that Americans have the most bountiful and least expensive food supply in the world. It's hard work, it's a huge gamble, and for the farmers in the Southeast this year, they lost.

It's time that this Congress, Mr. Speaker, joined hands and helped these folks. They have always been there for us, and now we need to be there for them.

Our farmers in rural communities desperately need assistance. It is my hope that we can pass the relief package before this year ends and that the President will sign it and will help these farmers and their families in rural communities across the whole Southeast be back in the fields next year providing food and fiber for the American people.

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

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

WAR IN IRAQ

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Economic Committee of Congress

reported yesterday on the hidden costs of the occupation of Iraq. We learned that the true cost so far is $1.3 trillion, or nearly double the amount the administration has been talking and has requested. And the price tag could soar to nearly $3.5 trillion if we continue on the administration's reckless course in Iraq.

The hidden financial costs of our involvement in Iraq are staggering, but yesterday we also learned that there are hidden human costs as well that are truly, truly heartbreaking.

CBS News reported last night that the suicide rate among veterans is over twice as great as the suicide rate for the general population. In 2005 alone, there were at least 6,256 suicides among veterans in the 45 States that provided data to CBS. That is an astonishing 17 suicides per day for just that one year.

Those statistics are for veterans of all wars, and they are shocking. But the statistics for veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan are even more devastating. Veterans aged 20 to 24 have the highest suicide rate of all. For these young men and women, the suicide rate is two to four times higher than the suicide rate for the general population.

And yet another report published yesterday in the Journal of the American Medical Association found that the mental health problems of Iraq veterans are much greater than previously thought. It found that Iraq veterans are more likely to report alcohol abuse, family conflicts, depression, and posttraumatic stress disorder after being home for 6 months than immediately after their return. The suicide statistics tell us that the real Iraq death toll is significantly higher than the official count of just over 3,860. And the mental health statistics tell us that the real number of wounded is much, much higher than the reported number of around 28,000.

All of this terrible news means that we can no longer sit around and do nothing about the occupation of Iraq. We must take action immediately, and we must take it in two ways.

First, America must do a much better job of meeting the physical and mental health needs of our veterans. The administration has underfunded and ignored the Veterans Administration system, leaving veterans stuck in a bureaucratic nightmare that stops them from getting the health care that they need. Congress has passed a bill that would help veterans to get care much faster. It improves conditions at VA hospitals and invests in new ways to treat physical and mental problems caused by the war. The President needs to sign that bill as soon as possible.

And, second, we must move immediately to end the occupation of Iraq and redeploy our troops. That is why I voted today for H.R. 4156, the Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations Act.

While the bill is not perfect, it essentially says that funds authorized for Iraq will not be used to continue the occupation, but are to be used to achieve the safe and orderly redeployment of our troops out of Iraq.

That is what I and many others have been demanding, and that is what the American people have been asking. It is time to stop the death. It is time to stop the suffering. It is time to bring our brave troops home and do everything we can to help them and their families to rebuild their lives. Anything less is unacceptable and immoral.

□ 2215

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRALEY of Iowa). 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.)

AMERICANS ARE PRAYING FOR RAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Mrs. BOYDA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, tonight Americans across the Southeast are praying for rain. As drought conditions have stretched from weeks into months, residents face a stark reminder of how one of our most precious resources, water, can also be one of our most unpredictable.

The lessons of natural disaster all too familiar to the good folks back home in Kansas. In the past year, nearly every county in Kansas has suffered from disastrous conditions.

The weather has been hard on many of us, but especially on our farmers and ranchers, who depend on nature to earn their living. It's hard to find words to express their concern, their worry. Many have worked the same acreage for decades, and they've always trusted that if they treat their land right, if they plow its soil and they plant it carefully and tend it for many months, it will reward them with a crop that will earn their living.

But in so many counties, disaster conditions have slashed crop yields. Ranchers face their own problems as animal feed prices soar.

Kansas farmers and ranchers are good hardworking people, but lately they've found that the land and the weather are betraying them. That's why it's so important that earlier this year Congress passed a critical agricultural disaster relief package. These funds helped Kansans continue to farm and ranch in spite of the ever-present threats of drought, fire and other catastrophes.

Today I urge America to come together once again to show the same compassion to our brothers and sisters in the Southeast. Farmers are finding that no matter how much they care and the effort that they devote to their land, their crops simply won't grow. These hardworking families can't make ends meet and they need a helping hand from Congress.

I urge my colleagues to remember the struggles of farmers and ranchers in the Southeast, in Kansas and across America who continue to confront the challenge of this difficult weather.

And again, we're praying tonight for the rain for the Southeast, and it looks like we might get some rain, and we are just blessed.

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

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

THE ORDERLY AND RESPONSIBLE IRAQ REDEPLOYMENT ACT

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4156, the Orderly Responsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations Act, just passed.

Let me be clear about why I voted for it. This legislation is a compromise that I hate, but it's the only way to move the agenda of the American people forward. This legislation is anything but perfect, but it does make important strides.

It requires the President to use funding to begin to redeploy U.S. soldiers out of Iraq within 30 days of enactment and sets a goal for complete redeployment by December 15, 2008.

It requires the President to implement a comprehensive diplomatic political and economic strategy to bring stability to Iraq. For the first time, the President will actually have a plan in Iraq.

It requires the President to report to Congress. It will end the secrecy that has surrounded everything about this war.

And it requires the President to accept what the rest of us know, that waterboarding is torture. It is a crime, and this bill says it's not going to be used in the interrogation of prisoners.

After World War II, we prosecuted Japanese soldiers for waterboarding U.S. prisoners of war. But the President's new Attorney General is walking around wondering about whether waterboarding is a crime.

House Republicans who voted ''no'' said they're willing to sacrifice the will of the American people at the altar of blind political obedience to the White House.

If Republicans in the Senate filibuster this bill, they'll be telling the American people to go away because

they intend to follow the President over the cliff.

If this legislation should reach the President's desk, it just might finally force him to confront reality. But I don't expect any of that to happen.

The President intends to hand Iraq over to the next President. In the meantime, this President is waging an Iraq veto war relying on Republicans to act as mechanical robots and rubber-stamp his vote on every single Iraq policy the Democratic majority has brought forward.

The American people may not understand how badly they've been deceived and misled by this administration, but it's going to continue. Sometime next spring, the President will announce things in Iraq are going so well he'll bring home a few thousand of our troops. He'll have them arrive in the fall during the election, when Republicans are desperate to explain why they ignored the American people. He will not tell us that 100,000 soldiers will be permanently stationed in Iraq at 14 military bases the administration has so artfully called enduring bases. Of these, five are superbases: Camp Victory North, al Asad Air Base, Balad Air Base, Camp Taji, and Tallil Air Base. These are huge bases with everything from video stores to supermarkets and rental cars. They are so big that one of them, Balad, 40 miles north of Baghdad, is the second busiest airport in the world, second only to Heathrow in the amount of air traffic.

Building enduring bases stands for indefinite U.S. military involvement in Iraq, which is not something the Congress or the American people want or will stand for.

The President is running a war by veto. If we could have a vote on a no confidence motion, this war would be over. But in our democracy, the ballot box is the only vote of no confidence and, regrettably, we have another year to wait to get rid of the President.

That only reinforces the need for today's vote. If Republicans won't support something as mild as this, then the American people need to know the Republicans are stonewalling. Every time we force the debate out in the open, the American people see it for what it is.

If Republicans continue to prolong the war, the American people will take charge next November and unelect even more Republicans.

We call this legislation a bridge fund, meaning to build a way to bring our soldiers out of Iraq and home where they belong. We're trying, and we're not going to stop until the American people can declare the mission accomplished and the men and women of our Armed Forces are home.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MEN OUGHT ALWAYS TO PRAY AND NOT TO FAINT

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Luke records in his Gospel that ''men ought always to pray and not to faint.'' That's in Luke 18:1.

I believe in the power of prayer, and I should note that the power of prayer is beheld in the One to which we pray, God Almighty.

Yesterday, my Governor, Sonny Perdue of Georgia, hosted a special prayer service at the Georgia Capitol to pray that the Lord would provide rain for our drought-ravaged State. Governor Perdue wisely recognized that a request such as this must be made to a higher power, and I commend him for his humility and wisdom in calling on God to provide what man cannot provide.

One of my favorite verses in the Bible is Jeremiah 33:3, which states ''Call unto me and I will answer thee and show thee great and mighty things, which thou knowest not.''

The book of Hebrews, in 14:16 states, ''Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need.''

We are a needy people, in desperate need of God's mercy and grace. Throughout Scripture, we are commanded to pray and seek God's face, not as a last resort but as the first order of business.

My home State of Georgia is facing one of the most severe droughts in its history. Our rivers and reservoirs are at record lows, and many of our communities face water shortages that could challenge their ability to meet water supply needs in the near and distant future.

The situation has gotten so bleak that the Georgia Environmental Protection Division, EPD, has declared a Level 4 drought response across the northern third of Georgia, which prohibits most types of outdoor residential water use. In fact, many nurseries and outdoor plant suppliers are going out of business because of this.

Worse yet, many forecasters are calling for a dry, mild winter that could result in serious water supply problems by spring.

I've had the privilege and honor of working with my fellow delegation members in a truly bipartisan effort to come up with practical responses, such as conservation and water management, to Georgia's water crisis. Despite our best efforts in Washington and in Georgia, there's no legislative solution to this problem. The issue at the heart of our drought problem is a severe lack of rain, and there is nothing that government can do to change that.

The Apostle Paul tells us to make our requests known to God with thanksgiving, so I gratefully acknowledge what the Lord has done for us already and boldly call upon Him to show favor on us yet again by sending rain to my beloved State of Georgia. God has not failed us before, and I'm confident He will not fail us now in our time of need.

At a time when religion has been continually forced from the public square, I want to offer my sincere thanks to Governor Perdue for his bold and faithful trust in the Almighty. His efforts helped unite hundreds of Georgians from all walks of life, leaders and citizens from varying faiths and denominations, races and ages for this prayer service.

So I join the Governor and fellow Georgians in calling out to God to provide rain from heaven, and I pray that the Lord will give wisdom and discernment to the Governor and each of us in leadership positions to address the drought and its devastating effects on our State and our citizens.

So I pray, Lord, You are sovereign and completely in control of all things, and I acknowledge Your awesome power and authority.

All things are in Your control, and nothing is too small or too great to bring before You. When you walked on the Earth in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, You spoke and stilled the waves and calmed the winds. You spoke into the existence, the heavens and the Earth. You created man in your image, and I know you can alleviate the severe drought conditions we face in Georgia.

So Lord, I ask in the name of Jesus that you bring down rain from heaven and refresh our land, fill our reservoirs and dry lakes and streams. I pray that You will quench our parched land, and I implore You, Lord, to show mercy upon us and to see us through this difficulty and show Your awesome hand in moving nature to suit Your will and bless Your people that call upon Your name.

Thank You, Lord for all that You have done and will continue to do for us. And I pray this in the precious powerful name of our Lord and Savior, in the name of Jesus Christ I pray this. Amen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 2230

CONDEMNING VIOLENCE AGAINST PHILADELPHIA'S POLICE OFFICERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Last Wednesday, I attended the funeral of one of my constituents, a 25-year veteran of the Philadelphia Police Force. His name was Officer Charles Cassidy.

Officer Cassidy was shot and killed in the line of duty on October 31, 2007. He was 54, and he left behind his wife, Judy, and their three children, Jody, Casey and Cody.

I would ask everyone here tonight in the House of Representatives to join me in a moment of silence for Officer Cassidy and the 62 other officers killed in the line of duty this year in our Nation.

Thank you.

The pain I witnessed at Officer Cassidy's funeral, that of his family, of his fellow officers, and the citizens of the entire region is why I rise tonight to ask my colleagues to join me in condemning the significant and deplorable wave of violence against police officers across this Nation.

In the Philadelphia Police Department alone, in the past 2 months, five other officers have been shot while protecting our city.

They will all survive their wounds and continue to serve the citizens of the city of Philadelphia. They are:

Officer Richard Decoatsworth on September 24, 2007, who was shot in the face with a shotgun while making a traffic stop. He survived his injuries after 5 hours of surgery. I saw him at the funeral last week.

Officer Sandra Van Hinkel on October 28, 2007, was shot in the right leg during a gunfight near a nightclub.

And Officer Marino Santiago on October 30, 2007, was shot in the shoulder while responding to a shooting that left three people hospitalized.

And just last night, the city was once again shocked to learn that two undercover narcotics officers were shot while serving a warrant at a suspect's residence on Oxford Avenue not far from my Philadelphia district office.

And last May, I stood on this floor to remember another fallen police officer, another constituent, Philadelphia Police Officer Gary Skerski.

Unfortunately, Philadelphia is not alone in this battle against violent crime. Cities big and small are coping with the threat and the reality of violent crime. So far this year across the country, 63 officers have died from gunshots.

We cannot tolerate any more of this violence against our citizens or against our police officers. We, the political and civic leadership of this country, must commit our will to tackle the wave of violence and the lack of respect for the rule of law and law enforcement.

This means bringing all the forces we have within law enforcement and also within delinquency, criminal justice, human services, probation and parole, education, employment, mental health and drug addiction services to face the reality of what is happening and to say that this violence is no longer acceptable, that this violence must stop.

It also means that the President and this Congress must respond with action and the resources to enable Federal and local initiatives that will get illegal guns off our streets and put violent criminals behind bars.

Congress should quickly complete our work on the COPS Improvement Act and the Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill to help our communities and the officers who face these very real threats every day on the streets of our cities. And they need better technology, improved equipment and training, and they need more police officers on the street.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in the effort to push these bills to finalization and to do all that we can to stop this deplorable violence in our midst.

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

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

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

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE LIFE OF CATHERINE RORABACK

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and accomplishments of Catherine Roraback of Canaan, Connecticut. Ms. Roraback passed away on Wednesday, October 17 in Salisbury, Connecticut, and will be greatly missed by her family, by her community, and by her country.

Ms. Roraback was best known for successfully arguing the landmark case of Griswold v. Connecticut in front of the United States Supreme Court in 1965. This groundbreaking case overturned an 1849 Connecticut law that banned the use of contraception. And this historic decision established the right to privacy that exists to this day as the foundation of many of our most revered constitutional freedoms.

Ms. Roraback was the only woman in her graduating class from Yale Law School in 1948, and she quickly established a law practice dedicated to protecting the rights of those that she called the ''dissenters and the dispossessed.'' Her groundbreaking work in the Griswold case was simply an extension of her life's work, which included the founding of the Connecticut Civil Liberties Union and serving on innumerable boards and commissions to serve her community and her State.

Mr. Speaker, Catherine Roraback was a national figure. But where she shined the brightest was at her desk in her law office in northwestern Connecticut, where she worked out of for almost her entire career. She was always a caring and fiercely intelligent adviser and advocate to her neighbors and her clients, and she was a mentor to generations of community leaders and advocates, including my friend and her cousin, State Senator Andrew Roraback, with whom I had the pleasure of serving in the State Senate for 4 years.

I had the pleasure of getting to know Ms. Roraback just a little in the last few years, and though we only got to spend a brief few moments together, I feel so blessed to have had the fleeting chance to get to know one of Connecticut's true heroes. She was an incredible woman with an incredible drive and a never erring sense of right and wrong. I was deeply honored to be her representative for the last 10 months, and I will strive every day to live according to her example.

In these very trying days, I think it's incredibly important to remember the lessons that Catherine Roraback leaves with us, the motivation that underlied her entire work as a lawyer and an advocate, because Catherine Roraback taught us that the basic rights that we enjoy every day to live and to speak freely cannot be dependent on one's lot in life. She also taught us that these rights, these precious civil liberties that we enjoy, cannot and should not be taken for granted. We must fight for them, now more than ever.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers go out to Catherine Roraback's family, her friends, and her beloved community.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. FALLIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FALLIN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we saw a varying level of discourse and debate over an enormously important and I might say singularly important issue that is facing the American public, and that is the question of the war in Iraq.

No matter how you touch the hearts and minds of Americans, whether or

not they suggest that this Congress and this President is not paying enough attention to the domestic concerns, woven into the crisis of where we stand today is the conflict in Iraq.

I think Americans understand Afghanistan more than we might think they do. They know that this Nation was attacked on September 11, 2001. They know that when the Nation is attacked, the Commander in Chief, leaders of this government have the responsibility of defending the honor and the security of America. They see Afghanistan as defending that honor and that security. They know that the Taliban, Osama bin Laden, those who collaborated were the basis of the attack against the World Trade towers and other sites in this country. They know that our lives have changed because of the horrific tragedy of 9/11. And they are willing to accept that. They faced up against new laws that seem to undermine their liberties, and within reason they are willing to acknowledge that things must change. I am grateful, however, that there are those of us who understand that the greatest success of a terrorist is to cause you to terrorize yourself. So many of us have asked to modify and assess the PATRIOT Act. We are looking to redo the FISA law that deals with electronic surveillance. But mostly in debating this question, Americans understand that their lives have changed.

But the Iraq War continues to be a questioning action by this administration. All of us have tried to give respect to the basis and the reason of this direction that this government took in the fall of 2002. I, for one, was very hesitant to speak about a war for oil. I recognize that there might have been many deliberations that have occurred that might have caused this administration to make this unfortunate leap of preemptive attack.

I have come full circle now, however, and I am enormously disappointed in the thought process and the respect not given to the American people. For the American people, over 56 percent, want this war to end, want these troops to come home, want to see a troop reduction.

So this debate today was not a frivolous debate. And the leadership of the Democratic Caucus, the leadership of this Congress took great pains to try to address this in a fair and dignified manner. They worked very hard to bring a concise document that spoke to the safety and security of the troops, the respect of the troops, the acknowledgment of their hard work; but yet to insist that a plan be laid out by this administration to reduce the number of troops in Iraq while at the same time ensuring that if there are outstanding conflicts, firefights, terrorists to be fought, that we'd have the troops on the ground.

I believe that this has been the most misdirected war that history will record. I believe that it beats out the Civil War, the War of 1812, World War I, World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, Persian Gulf. For any of those who opposed those wars, and I was not there for all of them, if there was any opposition for reasons that I don't know, this has to be the single most dangerous and devastating action that this Nation could have ever taken. There is no sense for it. There is no basis for it. But if there was a case that you could make, you could make the case that the military has done every single thing that it was asked to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is why I was moved to write the Military Success Act of 2007. It indicates that Congress recognizes that the military, in the invasion of Iraq, as authorized by a resolution given to the President in 2002, going into Baghdad was probably one of the best executed military operations in modern history, alongside of the Persian Gulf. The armed services successfully toppled the regime of Saddam Hussein.

And as I close, it lists a whole series of successes. And then it indicates that every single aspect of the 2002 resolution has been complied with. And, therefore, that means that the task of the 2002 resolution has ended. And it calls then for the troops to come home, for them to be acknowledged, for them to be given free, with no attachment, $5,000 for each returning troop from Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, this was a difficult debate, but I think and know that we made the right decision. But we could do even more. We can affirm that these troops need to come home, and we can celebrate them for the heroes that they are.

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

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

THE 30 SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) is recognized for one-half the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

We are here tonight with part of the 30 Something Working Group, and we are going to talk about what this House has been doing this week. We are here, it's late into the evening, and we have been working throughout the day on a variety of issues, and we are going to be at work tomorrow. I wanted to talk with my colleagues tonight. And we are going to have a full house. We are going to be joined by Mr. MURPHY from Connecticut, Mr. MEEK from Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from Florida, and Mr. RYAN from Ohio. We are going to have a discussion about some of the things that this House has been doing.

We took several significant votes this week, including the vote that was just discussed on Iraq. And we are going to discuss the policy in Iraq and the vote that we took today.

I wanted to start by talking about the President's veto earlier in the week of the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. Now, the President has found his veto pen, something that on appropriations bills he had not used until this Congress. And I think it's instructive to begin this debate by reminding my colleagues, as if they needed reminding, that we are talking about an administration that took office after 4 consecutive years of record surpluses, 4 consecutive years of budget surpluses, that were forecast to continue as far as the eye can see. In fact, the 10-year projection for budget surplus beginning in 2001 was more than $5 trillion of surplus over that 10-year period.

□ 2245

Well, what have we seen instead of that? We've seen seven consecutive budget deficits in the 7 years of this administration, deficits that are forecast to continue as far as the eye can see. And instead of that $5 trillion in surplus, we've seen more than $3 trillion in deficits in just 7 years.

So, this administration that's now lecturing us on fiscal responsibility and vetoing our appropriations bills, criticizing us for spending, this administration saw more than $8 trillion flip from a projected $5 trillion surplus to $3 trillion in deficit and counting. So, that's the context of what we're talking about.

So, we sent to the President the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill, which includes programs like low-income energy assistance, home heating, the LIHEAP program. Now, I don't think there's anyone in this country that has not been affected by the price of oil. And home heating is something in the Northeast where I'm from in Pennsylvania, and in Connecticut where Mr. MURPHY is from, and in Ohio where Mr. RYAN is from, the price of home heating has continued to skyrocket. And we're going to get into some of the numbers, but that's one of the things that's in this bill. Well, I don't think that's excessive spending, to help people who would otherwise have their heat turned off.

We're talking about funding for community health centers. We're talking about funding for Head Start, a program for early childhood education. Is there anything more important in this country than early childhood education, making sure our children get off to a good start and begin their educational careers in a way that we're able to ensure that they get off and they're positioned to have the best start possible.

Now, what about medical research, the National Institutes of Health?

That's what we're talking about in this bill, funding for medical research. Is there anyone in the country that thinks we shouldn't be spending money to find cures and treatments for debilitating diseases across the board? That's what this bill is. That's what the Labor-HHS-Education bill funds, and the President vetoed that bill. And we're going to have a vote in this House to override that veto, and it's going to be a very close vote. We were two votes shy of having a veto override majority when the bill passed the House the first time. Two votes. That's what stands between us and overriding the President's veto.

And I would remind my colleagues as well that we were able to override the President's veto just last week. This is not something that can't be done. We had a Water Resources Development Act that had not passed in 7 full years. It's supposed to be reauthorized every 2 years. Congress after Congress, in recent years, has been unable to pass that bill, so we passed it. And we faced a Presidential veto; the President vetoed it. We were able to override that veto overwhelmingly, 300-plus votes in the House; they got 79 in the other body. And what's in that bill? That's another bill that the President, and I outlined his record on fiscal responsibility and he wants to lecture us on spending, for infrastructure improvements in this country. Building levees in New Orleans, does that sound like pork? Building flood prevention infrastructure all across this country.

There were projects in that bill in almost every congressional district in the country to prevent flooding, to help the waterways infrastructure in a way that we're investing for the first time in 7 years in flood prevention infrastructure. So we overrode that veto overwhelmingly. We do have the opportunity to do it again on the Labor-HHS-Education bill. And we're going to talk more about that.

At this time, I want to yield to my colleague Mr. MURPHY from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania, and I appreciate his promptness in being here as I share with him today. We trust that the other members of the 30-Somethings will join us here today, but it falls very often on the new members of the 30-Somethings to make sure that we are here to begin the sharing of good news with the American people.

And I hope there is good news, Mr. ALTMIRE. I hope that people throughout this country who see the President's veto of this incredibly important bill, and you laid out very clearly and very succinctly what the President has vetoed, what he has said no to. We're talking about health care for kids. We're talking about good schools. We're talking about Head Start, medical research, home heating assistance for the elderly. And these are the basic building blocks of a compassionate society, and the President has said, very firmly and clearly, no to those.

And as you said, we're not very far away from having the requisite number of votes here on the House floor to override that veto. And I know that's kind of inside baseball for a lot of people, whether we have two-thirds or three-fourths or whatever the percentage is that we need. But it's important because, as you said, the President has found his veto pen for the first time in his tenure in office. And I think it's important to try to figure out what's different this year than as was the case in the last previous 6 years of his Presidency? And it's kind of funny because, if you look at the record, as you said, Mr. ALTMIRE, it seems a little odd to be having lectures from this administration on fiscal responsibility because this President and the Republican Congress over the last 6 years have increased Federal spending by 50 percent, 50 percent just over 6 years. We've put $3 trillion on top of the deficit, on top of the debt that this country owes, as we've watched the President and this Congress continue to spend and continue to borrow. We've seen the amount of foreign-held debt, and you know, this is something that Mr. MEEK and Mr. RYAN have been talking about for years and years and years. We've seen the amount of foreign-held debt during that time double. This is all under a Republican-controlled Congress, both Houses, and a Republican administration. And during that entire time, the biggest piece of the budget that has exploded has been the funding for this war.

Now, those of us who paid attention when the President initially rolled out his plans to invade Iraq, his very rosy and optimistic projections of our success there and the cost of that war, well, remember that he told the American people, his administration told the Congress that he thought that this war wasn't going to cost more than $50 or $60 billion to get the job done? And also, if you remember, that the Iraqis were going to welcome the Americans as conquering heroes. Well, we know that that $50 to $60 billion was a figure of fiction, historical fiction now, Mr. ALTMIRE, because now the estimates are that this war has cost us not $50 billion, not $100 billion, not $500 billion, but $1.3 trillion. And if we look forward to the projections associated with carrying out a war for the next 10 years, as this President has told this country he's planning to do, or that his war planners intend to do, we're talking about a $3.5 trillion commitment before this is all done. Now, that is a number that is almost impossible to get our hands around. I mean, what does $3.5 trillion mean to anybody? Well, what it means is that we're going to borrow more and more and more. We are going to put our children and our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren into hock in this country.

And so, when we hear this President sitting down and telling the American people that he's going to get tough on spending, and the way he's going to do that is by denying education to kids and health care to the sick and heat to the elderly, well, during that time he and his Republican Congress have spent like drunken sailors when it comes to a very mismanaged and misguided war in Iraq, you can't help but wonder where his priorities are and where this Congress' priorities were for the last several years.

So, it's all got to be, I think, in relation, Mr. ALTMIRE, because we're making choices here, as we have for the last 6 years. We've chosen not to spend on American hospitals and American children. We've chosen not to spend to help our elderly get what they need in order to keep their house heated for the winter. And instead, we've chosen to build Iraqi buildings and Iraqi hospitals. We've chosen to put more and more troops in harm's way in a war that is making this country less safe in the long run rather than more safe. This is all about choices, and it's time that we started making some different ones.

And that's why we got sent here, Mr. ALTMIRE. We got sent here to start investing in this country, to start making sure that our priorities look to this country, to the United States of America, first. And that's what the Labor-HHS appropriations bill does. It is the foundation of that compassionate government that we all believe in. It's about medical research. It's about schools. It's about hospitals.

And I hope, as you said, that there will be enough Republicans here who will join us, and we only need a handful, so that we can reverse that and bring back some common sense to our spending priorities in this country, Mr. ALTMIRE.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I wanted to mention one other issue that was in that bill. We talked about home heating assistance. We talked about health care for children, medical research. We talked about the Head Start program, but it's the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. And one of the programs that's in that bill that the President thought was excessive spending was additional 200,000 slots for job training for dislocated workers. And I can tell you, coming from western Pennsylvania where we know about dislocated workers and the need for job training and people to readapt when companies move and with the loss of manufacturing jobs, those are critically important programs that the President considers to be excessive spending. That's what we're talking about with this bill. That's what type of spending we're talking about.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. ALTMIRE, if you would yield for a moment.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Yes, I would.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Really, when it comes down to it, the only thing that's different here is the party that's writing the budget. I mean, really, when you look at it over time, what's different about the last six

budgets that this Congress passed that over time expanded Federal expenditures by 50 percent and the budget that we've passed, which simply reflects the fact that it costs a little bit more to heat your home if you're a senior, that it costs a little bit more to run a school than it did last year? What's different? I mean, the fact is is that it seems like it's just base partisan politics in the end, that all that really is different is that the Democrats are writing this budget this year and the Republicans were writing the last six budgets. And it is not a coincidence that over the last 6 years we saw nary a veto from this President while his party was in charge of the Congress, and now all of a sudden we have seen a flurry of vetoes on bills that reflect many of the same priorities, we think adjusted to make a little bit more sense for our communities, many of the same priorities that were reflected in the budgets for the last 6 years. And I think to a lot of us that came here to change the culture of this place, as much as we care about resetting our priorities and putting funding back into our communities, we also were sort of hoping that there was a little bit of a message sent in this election to change the partisan rancor that has really enveloped this place, and the President, by vetoing bills very similar to ones that he has signed in the past simply because a different party controls the House, I think does a disservice to the process and a disservice to the mandates that a lot of voters sent us here with, Mr. ALTMIRE.

Mr. ALTMIRE. And the last thing for context, before I turn it over to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from Florida, you will remember, Mr. MURPHY and I both being freshman, the excitement of that first week in Congress and the things that we did that first week when we were first sworn in at the beginning of 2007. Well, perhaps the most important thing that we did was return to pay-as-you-go budget scoring, which is very simple. It's the same thing that we all do in our own checkbooks at home and the same thing every business in America has to do. It says that you have to have money on one side of the ledger if you want to spend it on the other, pay-as-you-go. If you want to decrease revenue or you want to increase spending, you have to find a way to pay for it, an offset, you have to find an offset. And every spending bill and every authorization bill that we have passed out of this House this year, every single one of them has been compliant with pay-as-you-go. It has paid for itself; it's been budget neutral.

So, the context of this debate with the President about his willingness to veto these bills and saying it's excessive spending, the American people should be aware of the fact that that's in the context of our returning to pay-as-you-go budget scoring. That's what led to the record surpluses of the 1990s that I referred to earlier. And the failure of this Congress to renew pay-as-you-go budget scoring in 2002 is what led to the record deficits that we're mired in today.

So, when you hear about the vetoes of these spending bills, please keep in mind that we're talking about bills that are compliant with pay-as-you-go budget scoring, bills that are budget neutral and that have the appropriate offsets when there are spending increases.

I would yield at this time to my good friend, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much, Mr. ALTMIRE. It is a pleasure again to join my colleagues in the 30-Something Working Group. And I'm so glad that our newest members of the Working Group, Mr. MURPHY and Mr. ALTMIRE, have been holding down the fort for the last little while talking about spending priorities, because that is actually the most glaring difference between the Republicans and the way they handled this institution and the Democrats and the way we are handling it.

Let's take the problem that we're facing here now that you've been talking about, and that is that the President vetoed the Labor Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill. And I am proud to sit as a member of the Appropriations Committee with Mr. RYAN. And I can tell you that the difference in the overall spending plan that the President put forward versus our 12 bills combined amounts to $22 billion. Now, $22 billion might sound like a big number, but let's put it in context.

□ 2300

Twenty-two billion dollars is approximately what we are spending in Iraq in 2 months. That's the difference between what Democrats in Congress are proposing to spend for all 12 bills combined, the difference between the President's proposal and the Democrats' proposal. That problem underscores the fact that the President only has one spending priority, and that is the war in Iraq. The problem is that the only spending priority that matters to President Bush is the war in Iraq. It's not even the war in Iraq and Afghanistan because he has so clearly shortchanged what was going on in Afghanistan when we started, which is where the war on terror, or the pursuit of bin Laden was ongoing that we abandoned when he shifted the focus of America to the war in Iraq, that it has blocked out the sun. His spending priority, his only one, the war in Iraq, has blocked out the sun and made it impossible for us to move forward on things like education, like expanding access to health care for children, like making sure that we can pass a stem cell research bill that the vast majority of this country supports.

I will just give you an example of one of the things that resulted from the veto of the Labor-HHS bill and that is the increase in Ryan White title IV funding for AIDS programs for families. We have an explosion of AIDS in this country. We absolutely need to make sure that we get a handle on it. There hasn't been an increase in title IV funding in years. Now that we are in charge and are making sure that we move this country in a new direction, we are focusing on the domestic priorities of Americans. Americans want us to withdraw our troops from Iraq in a responsible way and focus on things that they care about when it comes to their everyday lives. That is literally what the Labor-HHS appropriations bill does. It is an expression of our values. And our values reflect the needs of Americans when it comes to their health care, when it comes to their education, when it comes to their environment at work. And the priorities and values reflected in the Republicans' agenda is the war in Iraq.

Now, I think the American people clearly stated what their intentions were and what they wanted Congress to do last November 7, and we have repeatedly, and we did again tonight just before we came on the floor this evening for the 30-Something hour, they have repeatedly urged us in Congress to begin a responsible withdrawal of our troops, to stop sending the troops over for tour after tour, the same men and women, the same strain on their families, sending them over there without the equipment that they need, sending them over there without the proper training, with tours of duty that are beyond the appropriate length of time, stretching families, causing divorces, causing strain, psychological impact on children, but they don't care. It just doesn't matter. The President's priority is Iraq, and everyone else's opinion be damned.

I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is not just the President. It is enough Members of Congress on the Republican side primarily that are standing by the President. They have to go to the voters next year and say, in my last term in Congress, I stood by President Bush. The thing is that when you talk about the war funding, the waste, the no-bid contracts, the Pentagon losing billions of dollars and nobody knows where it is, you don't hear our friends on the other side, Mr. Speaker, come up and pitch a fit about that. But if you want to talk about $1 billion or $2 billion more in health, education, job retraining, all of a sudden the sky is falling. All of a sudden the party that raised the debt limit five times and borrowed $3 trillion under President Bush is now concerned with a shift in funding to college education, Mr. MEEK, to community health clinics, Mr. ALTMIRE, to Head Start, to these fundamental programs that this country has stood behind. And the kicker is SCHIP, $35 billion over 5 years, and the President says that's too much spending so we can't provide health care for 10 million kids, poor kids, but we can just turn

around without a blink of an eye and ask for $200 billion to keep the war going in Iraq, without any kind of deadlines or timelines or any kind of shift in the focus. That's the frustrating part.

Before I yield to my friend, I would just like to say there has been a pattern here. On September 11 or after September 11, Mr. MURPHY, it was go shopping. And then during the whole SCHIP debate, it was, well, they can go to the emergency room, these kids. Then during Katrina it was, ''You're doing a good job, Brownie,'' consistently these flippant remarks that the President tends to make that lacks an understanding of the seriousness of some of these situations.

So it is frustrating as we are trying to make some investments into the United States of America, into this country, and the President consistently, with a small band of Republican supporters, is able to veto this, and unfortunately, we don't have enough votes in the House yet to override these vetoes.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you so very much, Mr. RYAN, and I want to thank the Members and Mr. ALTMIRE for hosting this hour and anchoring this hour for us. It is always good to see Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. She has been busy. There are a lot of appropriations bills coming through the floor. And Mr. MURPHY has so much to offer to this 30-something.

Mr. RYAN, I appreciate the fact that you took us down Memory Lane, especially what this administration has done. Being one that pays attention to history and appreciates those that have contributed to this country, whether it be in battle or service in the military and those families that are waiting for their loved ones to come home, whether it be a son or a daughter or a sister or a brother or a mother, waiting, I think it is important for us to recognize right here in the moment, I can't help but think and reflect on the contributions of those Americans before me, the sacrifices that they have made that was just regular order that we call here in Congress, it was just another day. But these were heroes and sheroes that stood on behalf of this country and wanted to carry out the will of the American people. Sometimes we get caught up here in Washington about what we think. I think it's important to note that seven out of 10 Americans have a bad feeling about what is going on in Iraq, the direction that we are going in. This New Direction Congress has tried to steer this administration in the right direction, but I'm just going to put it on the lap of those that are in Congress. The President is not running again.

I actually got up pretty early this morning and had a chance to go down to Morning Journal and have a chance to sit there and take calls from the American people. As you know, you get a cross section of Democrats, Republicans, independents, what have you.

But I think it is very, very important for us to realize, four Republicans tonight voted in the affirmative on H.R. 4156, which is the Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations Act of 2008. I think it is important that people note that in that bill, it put forth $50 billion under the $200 billion that the President called for. And the veto that you were talking about a little earlier as it relates to the health centers, as it relates to the research that has to take place dealing with the illness that many Americans are facing, family members that have cancer right now that need that research, need those dollars. The President vetoes those dollars.

So I think it is important for the Members here on the floor and the Members that are listening to what we are saying here on the floor and the staff members that are listening and the Americans that are listening that we pay very close attention. Everyone has to be a part of this paradigm shift in Washington, DC. It just can't be the majority we have here in the House and the one majority we have in the Senate, because if we had 60 votes, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, we would be able to move the agenda that the American people call for.

So my contribution tonight would be to, well, one, to our Republican friends on the other side of the aisle that don't allow us to have enough votes to be able to override the President, that the American people will hold them in judgment. To the Members in the Senate that feel that whatever the reason may be to not allow us to override the President, because the President is not running again, but you are, that the American people, independent, Republican, Democrat, first-time voter will let their voice be heard in 2008. That's the good thing about this whole thing, the fact that I know in this democracy that people are paying attention to what is going on.

You cannot justify, ladies and gentlemen, when you look in the face of 10 million children that have to receive health care and say that, well, it's okay for the President to veto and for me to stand by the President and not by those children, it's okay for us to continue on in a war with no accountability, and then we have the Blackwater incident, and then we have other incidents that are there. So the only thing that I am excited about is the fact that the American people are paying attention. But if it was about politics, I would just sit in my office and allow the President to do what he does and a very small majority as it relates to Republicans standing by the President because I know one day the Americans will rise up and the American spirit will rise up and we will see a different America. That is what I am praying for and I am hoping for very soon.

Mr. RYAN, I think you are 110 percent right. I think we need to remind the Members of the past. We need to make sure that we recognize those Members that were once Members of Congress but decided to follow the President, and the American people took them out of office, and as far as I am concerned, if you don't want to stand on behalf of those that sent us here, then you are making a career decision. The bottom line is we have men and women in harm's way right now.

Mr. ALTMIRE. That is a perfect segue for what I wanted to get into right now, and we are going to, I think, conclude on this topic because this is certainly the most important issue facing the country today is the war in Iraq. I think anybody would agree. What this House did today is, as the gentleman from Florida talked about, try to get a handle on this situation and try to put a plan in place where none exists today on what our mission is going to be in Iraq.

I was going to talk a little bit about what we did today in the House, what the bill said, and I will turn it over to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ to go into a little bit more detail. H.R. 4156 requires the redeployment of U.S. troops from Iraq to begin within 30 days of enactment with a target for completion of December 15, 2008. It requires transition in the mission of U.S. forces in Iraq from primarily combat to force protection and diplomatic protection, limited support to Iraqi security forces and targeted counterterrorism operations.

The bill prohibits deployment of any U.S. troops not fully equipped and trained. Is there anybody who can disagree with that? Waivable with a presidential national security certification. So it gives the President the ability to waive that requirement if he feels it is necessary. It extends to all U.S. Government agencies and personnel the limitations of the Army Field Manual on permissible interrogation techniques. That means no torture, something that this House has voted on in the past. It is in the Army manual today. It just says you have to abide by what is in the Army Field Manual as it is currently written. And finally, as we discussed, it provides $50 billion to meet the needs of the troops in Iraq and Afghanistan but defers the consideration of the remainder of the President's nearly $200 billion request.

So this is a responsible course of action. The House passed it today.

I will yield to the gentlewoman from Florida at this point to give her views on this issue.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Mr. ALTMIRE.

Here is the bottom line. There is a dramatic and stark difference between the Republicans' priorities and the Democrats' priorities. There is one priority, and only one that you will ever hear from the other side, and that is to continue to fund the war in Iraq, continue to put our troops in harm's way, continue to have their families separated from them, continue for them to have longer and longer tours of duty,

more and more strain, more and more tours of duty.

Here are our priorities. We passed the largest increase in veterans benefits in the 77-year history of the VA. We passed legislation to increase the minimum wage. We passed legislation to expand access to health care for 10 million children. We passed legislation to cut the student loan interest rate in half. The list goes on.

And what do you hear from the Republicans? Nothing. You hear, let's put more money into the war in Iraq. Let's lengthen the time that the men and women fighting on our behalf spend there. Let's send them over there for more and more tours of duty. Do you ever hear anything from that side of the aisle in terms of an agenda, in terms of getting anything done? All I hear is ''no.'' All I hear is, ''not going to do that.'' All I hear, again, is, ''Yes, Mr. President. Whatever you say, Mr. President.''

Our criticism of them, Mr. MEEK and Mr. RYAN, if you remember, in the 30–Something Working Group in the 109th was that they were the bobblehead Republicans who did nothing more than shake their head up and down and do whatever the President said. And nothing has changed. Well, guess what. A year from now, which is just about a year from now, they will be called to account just like you said, Mr. MEEK, and we will see just how many fewer Republicans there will be here that serve in this chamber, because I think the American people have had it up to here.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I just want to make a point. It is not like we are out on a limb here. We just saw a poll that came out a few days ago from CNN that shows that seven in 10 Americans oppose this war. That is the highest number, 68 percent, 70 percent of Americans oppose this war, the highest number since the war began.

□ 2315

We are seeing almost by the week, by the day, new generals, new senior retired American military officials coming out and breaking with this President. We have already seen the Iraq Study Group, we have already seen dozens of foreign policy experts come out and plead with this President. Even many of his best friends, many of his father's advisors have pleaded for a new course.

The Democrats are on the side of the American public. The Democrats are on the side of the foreign policy community on Iraq. The Democrats are on the side of an increasing number of retired military generals and officials on this issue. As you said, there is just a very loyal, very recalcitrant block of Republicans who refuse to abide by the growing will of the American public on this issue. There will be a price to be paid for this.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If the gentleman will yield. What is clear here is there is a threat of panic running through the caucus on the other side of the aisle because we are up to 16 of their incumbent Members who have decided to bail and who recognize that the ship is listing and has been listing badly and is in danger of just completely going down. There doesn't appear to be any likelihood of the ship righting itself in the near future. They aren't expected and aren't expecting to get their act together and focus on an agenda that the American people support because they have been a one-note, tunnel-vision party for far too long.

So you have 16 that have decided to retire already, with, we are sure, more to come. It's just not surprising because they do not share the priorities of everyday working families, Americans who want the Congress to focus on a new direction and not give them more of the same.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It's interesting, and I think you made the right point. It seems like the President has one priority, and one and only one, and that is the funding of the war. What is interesting is when you look at the Labor-HHS bill, some of the other bills we are trying to pass that increase the Pell Grants and some of the other things, we are not getting the level of support we should.

These vets need those programs. These veterans that are coming back, it's not like they are making a lot of money, many of them with their kids they are trying to send to college. So why wouldn't this apply? The vets aren't just fighting for the Defense appropriations bill that passes out of the House or the VA benefit package that passes out of the House. The veterans are fighting for America. They are fighting for a strong country that does research and development. Veterans have family members who get cancer. So they are very concerned, I would think, Mr. Speaker, with investments at NIH to continue cancer research. They have kids that may need health care. They have kids that go to school. They may have a kid that wants to participate in a Head Start program. In each instance, Mr. ALTMIRE, our fearless leader in this 30-Something group tonight, these vets are fighting for what makes America great, and that is freedom, that is investment, that is a strong economy. Those are the kind of things we are investing in.

So to say your only priority is the war and spending what is now projected by the end of the year $1.3 trillion in the war. The President says, and a small group of recalcitrant Republicans say here in the House: We can't fund it because we don't have the money to put in the health care and everything else.

Mr. MEEK. Will the gentleman yield for a second? I know you're an appropriator and we are talking about appropriations. You and Mr. MURPHY are kind of throwing around these big words tonight. Let it be known that some of us in the room just want to break it down a little bit here in this Chamber.

I can't go back to my district and tell Ms. Johnson and Ms. Rodriguez or Ms. Jones who worked their entire lives that because the President decides to veto the Labor-Health bill, and I think it's important that we share this with the Members, we can't tell those individuals to suck it up. I am sorry that you weren't in the Defense bill. I am sorry that it had nothing to do with Iraq and Afghanistan, that we can't be for you.

One thing I can say here in this House is that we are for them and that we are standing for those individuals, and they are Republicans and they are Independents and they are Democrats and they are nonvoters and individuals thinking about voting for the first time. They are the sick and shut-in on that sick and shut-in list when people go to wherever they worship, or whatever the case may be. They are the individuals counting on this Congress to stand for them.

The Congress is doing what we are supposed to do, Mr. ALTMIRE. But the bottom line is that the President has to do what he has to do, and he has to be the President of the United States of America, not just to secure the issue in Iraq. We have Americans here right now that need our support and our help.

I am glad that we are here and I am glad that we are putting the pressure on the minority party to do the right thing on behalf of their constituents and the American people.

Mr. ALTMIRE.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Thanks to all my colleagues who participated tonight. Thanks, especially, Mr. Speaker for the time allotted to us. Please, to continue the discussion, anyone can go to www.speaker.gov and go to the 30-Something Working Group and we can continue this discussion by e-mail.

I thank the Speaker.

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the Speaker. The hour is late, the time is short. I do want to talk a little bit about health care this evening. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, in order to clear the air from the last 40 minutes, let's start off with a Bible verse. Let's start off reading from the Old Testament from the book of Habakkuk, Chapter 2. ''I will stand upon my watch, and I will set me upon the tower, and I will watch to see what he will say to me, and what I shall answer. And the Lord answered, Write the vision, make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it. For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak and not lie. Wait for

it, because it will surely come. It will not tarry.''

Mr. Speaker, I think those are important words. We are going to talk a little bit about the vision for health care, the future of health care in America. Sometimes we will have to wait for it, but it will come. It's a universal problem in this country. Some people think it has a universal solution; others disagree with that. But those two philosophies of health care, that that can be solved by the government or that that is better solved by individuals, those two competing philosophies are really going to be played out front and center over the next 18 to 24 months, both in this Congress and on the national stage in Presidential elections.

I may be oversimplifying the issue a little bit, but it underscores the basic arrangements. We sometimes appear to discuss health care only in the realm of insurance, government systems, third-party systems. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you recall back in 1993, when the attempt was made with the Clinton health care plan, a lot of us who worked in health care at the time were perplexed, we were concerned because at the time the plan seemed to be less about health care and more about the transactions involving health care, that is, more about insurance than actual health care.

You know, back not too terribly long ago health care meant you called your doctor, you saw your doctor, you paid your doctor on the spot. Now, we have this convoluted system of third-party payers, government payers, private employee and self-pay. It's a complicated plan. It works. Hardly can be described as efficient. But it does work.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to ask ourselves: Is our goal in reforming health care, is our goal indeed in transforming health care to protect our patients or are we here to protect that third-party system of payment? Is our goal to provide Americans with a reasonable way to obtain health care, a reasonable way to communicate with their physician, with their doctor, with their nurse?

We really need to proceed carefully because the consequences of any poor choices we make over these next 18 to 24 months, the consequences of those poor choices will reverberate for decades. Not just in our lifetime, but in our children's lifetimes.

Mr. Speaker, I often stress that the fundamental unit of production of this great and grand American medical machine, the fundamental unit of production is the interaction that takes place between the doctor and the patient in the treatment room. It is that fundamental unit of production which we must protect, we must preserve, we must defend. Indeed, anything we do to try to transform or reform the health care system in this country, first off, we need to ask: Is it going to bring value to that fundamental unit of production of the American health care machine?

The test before us is do we protect people or do we protect the special interest groups. Do we protect big government or do we protect individuals? Do we believe in the supremacy of the State or do we believe in the sanctity of the individual? An educated consumer makes for a better health care system. We need to make health care reform about patients.

Let me just spend a little time talking about what are some of the predominant plans that we hear talked about, some of those placed forward by the Presidential candidates, something that we hear talked about on the other side of the aisle here in this House. It's often referred to as a single-payer system or universal health care coverage. It's got a nice ring to it. It's almost seductive. Why shouldn't the world's strongest and best economy, the world's strongest and best health care system provide free health care to all? Well, perhaps the words of P.J. O'Rourke penned back in 1993 in the Liberty Manifesto, when he stated, If you think health care is expensive now, wait and see what it costs when it's free.

Mr. Speaker, the American health care system has no shortage of critics at home or abroad. But, Mr. Speaker, it is the American health care system that stands at the forefront of innovation, the forefront of new technology. These are precisely the types of systemwide changes that are going to be necessary to efficiently and effectively provide care for Americans in the future. There's no way we can pay for all the care we are going to need to buy if we rely entirely on today's systems and solutions. There have to be new systems and solutions developed for the future, and they will deliver on that promise. The price will come down, but only if we give the system the freedom to act and develop those measures.

Now, the New York Times, not something that I normally read, but just a little over a year ago the New York Times, renowned for its liberal leanings, published October 5, 2006, an article by Tyler Cowan, who wrote at the time, ''When it comes to medical innovation, the United States is the world's leader.'' Continuing to quote, ''In the past 10 years, for instance, 12 Nobel prizes in medicine have gone to American-born scientists working in the United States, three have gone to foreign-born scientists working in the United States, and seven have gone to researchers outside of this country.'' He goes on to point out that five of the six most important medical innovations of the past 25 years have been developed within and because of the American system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, comparisons with other countries may be useful, but it is important to remember that the American system is always reinventing itself and it's always seeking improvement. It is precisely because of the tension inherent in this hybrid public-private system that creates that tension and creates that impetus for change. A system that is completely and fully funded by a payroll tax or some other policy has no reason to seek improvement. Its funding and its funding stream is going to be reliable and predictable, occurring day after day. There's no reason to try to improve a system like that. It's always in complete balance, complete equilibrium, and faces stagnation. But if there does become a need in such a system to balance payments or control costs, where is that going to come from? We have already seen from our experience within our own Medicare system that is going to come at the expense of the provider. It always has, it always will.

□ 2330

The difficulties faced by providers within the Medicare system on an ongoing basis are truly staggering.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is the United States is not Europe. American patients are accustomed to wide choices when it comes to hospitals, physicians and pharmaceuticals. Because our experience is unique and because our experience is different from other countries, this difference should be acknowledged and embraced, maybe even celebrated. But certainly when reform, either public or private, is discussed in this country, we need to be cognizant of that difference.

That is one of the many reasons why a universal health care system, or a single payer system, translate that to ''the government,'' to me seems almost inadvisable, and certainly doesn't seem sustainable over time as an option. So let's think about some of the principles that really should be involved when we talk about changes and improvements to our health care system.

Three principles that I focus on, and I think really form the crux of the basis of all activities regarding health care reform or transformation of the health care system, are affordability, accountability and advancements. Three things fairly easy to remember, almost an iteration when you put them right together.

Under affordability, one of the things I think we oftentimes forget is what does it really cost to deliver the care? How do we assign those costs? How do we allocate those costs? The pricing for health care services really ought to be based on what is indicated by the market. But that isn't always the case. Oftentimes it is what is assumed by administrators, and consumers and even physicians are completely insulated, completely anesthetized as to what the care costs or what it costs to deliver the care.

Now, an article or an op-ed from the Wall Street Journal earlier this year by Robert Swerlick, a dermatologist from Emory University, the title of his column was ''Our Soviet Health System.'' He laments the difficulty in finding a pediatric endocrinologist, but in turn it seems so easy to find a veterinarian who specializes in orthopedics for his Labrador Retriever. So he can't

find a doctor for his child, but he has no trouble finding one for his canine acquaintance.

Now, the reason for that is the administrative pricing system that really is dictated by our Medicare system. And I think Dr. Swerlick really hits the nail on the head. He says, ''The roots of this problem lie in the use of an administrative pricing structure in medicine. The way prices are set in health care already distort the appropriate allocation of efforts and resources in health care today. Unfortunately,'' he goes on to say, ''many of the suggested reforms in our health care system, including various plans for universal care or universal insurance or a single-payer system that various policymakers espouse, rest on the same unsound foundations and will produce more of the same.''

He goes on to say, ''The essential problem is this: The pricing of medical care in this country is either directly or indirectly dictated by Medicare.'' We have a system of Federal price controls in medicine in this country.

Again, continuing to quote, ''Rather than independently calculate prices, private insurers in this country almost universally use Medicare prices as a framework to negotiate payments, generally setting payments for services as a percentage of the Medicare fee schedule.''

This is an extremely important point, Mr. Speaker, and one that I don't think Members of this body truly grasp. It is so important, we are going to revisit it again in a minute when we talk about Medicare pricing and what is happening in the physician realm. But remember that, because that is an extremely important point.

Medicare administrators set the prices. Private insurance companies in this country tend to follow suit. So when you say we have got a market-based economy in health care, really nothing could be further from the truth.

''And,'' as Dr. Swerlick goes on to say, ''unlike prices set on market conditions, the errors created are not self-correcting. Markets may not get the prices exactly correct all of the time, but they are capable of self-correction, a capacity that has yet to be demonstrated by administrative pricing.''

Again, he goes on to associate this with the system that was in place in the old Soviet Union, and in fact correctly relates some of the problems in the old Soviet economy to the reason the old Soviet Union is not with us any longer. So we really need to pay careful attention to that.

Transparency, I think that is something that we talk about a lot, but we don't spend nearly the time focusing on the issue as we should. Transparency between pricing for physicians and hospitals is essential. We want to go to a system where there is more consumer-directed health care, where consumers are more informed. But in order for consumers to be informed, they have to have the ability to go and get the data.

Right now, the opacity built into the pricing structure between physicians and hospitals is significant, and, as a consequence, it becomes very, very difficult for the patient, the health care consumer, to be able to make those determinations.

The other aspect that enters into it, of course, is the issue of physician quality. Sometimes that is an intangible. Sometimes that is something that is difficult to know just from visiting a Web site or checking data that may be available, and that may be the word of mouth type of information that is delivered from one patient to another. A wait time, for example, in one office that is much longer than in another office, you might be willing to pay a little bit more to wait a little bit less time, or you might be willing to wait a little bit more time if the care delivered in that office is truly exemplary.

Now, Texas has taken some steps to make this more of a reality. I think people would like the ability for comparison. In fact, they would like to be able to go on-line for that comparison. I think Travelocity For Health Care, wouldn't that be a powerful tool to put into people's hands.

An example in Texas is what is called Texas Price Point. There is a Web site, www.txpricepoint.org, which was created to provide basic demographic quality and charge information on Texas hospitals and to promote additional or ready access to consumer and hospital information and the appropriate interaction that could occur as a result of that.

The program is very new. The data sometimes is a little too sparse, but it is a program that will build on itself over time and one that will I think provide significant utility to patients in Texas. And I believe other States have other programs. I think Florida has a program that is up and running. These are going to be critical. Some insurance companies have developed their own programs, and that will provide a critical knowledge base for patients who are covered by those insurance companies.

One of the things that is going to affect affordability, even accessibility as far as physicians are concerned, is what I alluded to earlier with the Medicare pricing.

Mr. Speaker, we had reported to us from the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services the first of this month, not even 2 weeks ago, that the proposed physician payment cuts for next year will be just a little bit over 10 percent for doctors across-the-board in this country. That is untenable. Doctors cannot be expected to sustain that type of reduction.

There is no telling what it does to a physician's ability to plan. A physician's office, after all, is a small business, and if they are going to be facing this type of price reduction, it is very difficult to plan. Do you hire a new nurse, do you purchase a new piece of equipment, do you take on a new partner, when year over year the Medicare system visits this type of travesty upon physicians? And this Congress, through both Republican majorities and now Democratic majorities, and Democratic majorities that preceded 1994, have refused to deal with this issue in a way that corrects it once and for all and gets us past the problem.

The difficulty is that year over year, the physician pricing is set by a formula called the sustainable growth rate formula, and year over year for the past 5 years and projected for 10 years into the future, every year there is a cut to physician reimbursement.

Now, you might say that doctors earn enough money and it is the Medicare system, so what harm is there in that? Let's go back for just a moment to Dr. Swerlick's article about administrative pricing.

''Again,'' he said, ''the essential problem is this. The pricing of medical care in this country is either directly or indirectly dictated by Medicare, and Medicare uses an administrative formula, the sustainable growth rate formula, which calculates appropriate prices based upon imperfect estimates and fudge factors. Rather than independently calculate prices, private insurers in this country almost universally use Medicare prices as a framework to negotiate payments, generally setting payments for services as a percentage of the Medicare fee structure.''

So, let's think about that, Mr. Speaker. What happens on January 1 if this House does not take some action to prevent that 10 percent reduction in physician payments? What happens on January 1 is all of those insurance contracts that peg to Medicare reimbursement rates, all of those are going to be reduced by a factor of about 10 percent, or in some cases a little bit more. If a plan pays 120 percent of Medicare and Medicare is reduced 10 percent, that plan will reduce a concomitant amount, which will be a little bit in excess of 10 percent for their pricing on their physician services.

Again, it has ripples and effects far beyond, far beyond what it would be affected just by the Medicare system. And it leads to a problem, it leads to a problem of what happens with the physician workforce.

Now, just a little over 2 years ago, when Alan Greenspan, the former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board here in Washington, DC, was retiring and sort of made a tour around the Capitol, sort of a one last victory lap around the Capitol, and came and met with a group of us one morning, the question was inevitably asked, what do we do about Medicare? What do we do about the liabilities, the future liabilities in Medicare? How are we going to meet those obligations?

The chairman thought about it for a moment and then said, you know, I think when the time comes, Congress will take the action necessary and that the Medicare system will endure, will

be preserved. There may be some difficult choices and trade-offs that have to be made, but Congress at the correct time will make those choices.

He stopped for a moment and then went on to say, what concerns me more, is will there be anyone there to deliver the services when you require them?

And that really comes to the crux of the matter here. If we have a system within our Medicare reimbursement schedule for physicians where within the whole Medicare system itself, parts A, B, C and D, if only part B is affected by this, part A, which is the hospitals, they have a cost of living adjustment, part C, which is HMOs, they have a cost of living adjustment, part D, which is prescription drugs, they have a cost of living adjustment, if the only ones living under this onerous formula are the physicians, what happens over time?

Well, what happens is people will retire early, people will restrict their practices so they no longer see Medicare patients, physicians will restrict the procedures that they offer Medicare patients, perhaps preferring office procedures to surgical procedures that tend to be more labor intensive and time intensive.

It certainly has an effect on the law of supply and demand, if you will, as far as physician services are concerned within the Medicare system itself. For that reason, for that reason, it has a significantly pernicious effect on the physician workforce.

Remember, I started out this talk and I said we always want to focus on are we delivering value to that doctor-patient interaction in the treatment room? Well, I will submit if you don't have a doctor there for that doctor-patient interaction in the treatment room, it is impossible to deliver value of any sort, if you don't have the physician there in the first place.

So that is a critical part. A critical part of establishing and creating value for the patient is ensuring that there is indeed a capable and trained and caring physician there for that patient in the treatment room. And I worry that what we are providing for physician compensation within the Medicare system, which has ramifications throughout the entire private pay structure through the health care system, I do worry if that is a condition that can indeed be sustained.

Now, one of the other things that I think we oftentime lose sight of when we talk about affordability, we always talk about the number of uninsured that exist in this country. Sure enough, it is too big a number. The number varies, depending upon who you read.

But if we talk about the number today, we are probably going to talk about a number of around 47 million uninsured. And we always stop there and say, well, we have to do something about the 47 million who are uninsured, as if that was one homogenous population and one solution would work for everyone who is caught up in that category.

But the reality is, one of the large insurance companies in this country did a little investigating to see who makes up, who is involved in this population, this universe of people who are uninsured.

□ 2345

It turns out 10 percent are university students. If you say we have 47 or 48 million people uninsured, 10 percent of that is 4.8 million, nearly 5 million, are university students. Students who may arguably have health coverage available through their university or college. But even if they don't, this is a group of people that is pretty easy to insure. It is pretty inexpensive to insure.

So a solution for that group would be vastly different than some of the other groups identified. Twenty percent of that population is already eligible for Medicaid or the State Children's Health Insurance Program. Why States with outreach efforts have not identified those individuals, I don't know. Perhaps we ought to make it incumbent for States to do that work.

If we are providing Federal funds at all sorts of levels, maybe we ought to make it incumbent on States to do that outreach work so those individuals are enrolled in Federal programs to provide that. Again, think about it: 20 percent of 47 or 48 million people, that is almost 10 million people that could be taken off the rolls of the uninsured tomorrow because the programs already exist to take care of them. You don't need to create a new program or do something different from what you are doing right now. Current Medicaid, current SCHIP will cover 20 percent of that population.

And 20 percent earn almost $80,000 a year. That is not a huge sum of money, but certainly a group of people that might be considered to be able to provide something toward their own health care. I am not a fan of mandates. I don't think you get anywhere by telling people what they have to do. But if we allow insurance companies some freedom to create the types of programs that would be of value to that segment of the population, that would be affordable to that segment of the population, if we would perhaps remove some restrictions, maybe remove some mandates, or decide what are those things that are going to comprise a basic package of benefits so we can make it affordable and marketable to that group of individuals who arguably have some disposable income that they could use towards their health care rather than creating a huge, new Federal structure to bring them in. Maybe that is a tactic that could be taken.

Mr. Speaker, we don't like to focus a lot of time and energy on this, but we have to talk about it, and that is 20 percent of the people who fall into the category of the universe of uninsured people in this country are individuals who are in the country without the benefit of a Social Security number. Again, that is something that we as a country and we as a Congress do need to deal with. Whether that is increased efforts at controlling who is coming into our country and increased efforts at controlling our borders, but this is part of the problem that we as a Congress have yet to really face and deal with.

We made some efforts, to be sure, in the current State Children's Health Insurance Program. One of the recent legislative proposals that came through Congress and was passed by Congress that is still tied up in negotiations wanted to relax the verification required for someone being able to document or verify that they are in this country legally. I don't know. I think this body needs to decide what direction it wants to go on this. I don't know that is a terribly useful activity from my perspective. It might engender more people wanting to come into this country to get benefits, but that is something that this Congress has to take up and face no matter how difficult it is.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked about 10 percent university students, 20 percent already eligible for Medicaid or SCHIP, 20 percent who earn nearly $80,000 a year and 20 percent who are noncitizens. If we add those all together, that is approximately, 10, 20, 30, plus 5, so 35 million out of 47 million uninsured. We may have some solutions that are really just at our fingertips if we would expend a little bit of effort. And this is very frustrating to me. We never seem to want to do the effort to break down who is included in the population.

We are all too content to take the number 47 million uninsured and use it as a political bludgeon to beat each other over the head, but we are never willing to do the work that a private insurance company did in a relatively short period of time. We never seem to be willing to do the work. With all of our Federal agencies and bureaus that count numbers and people, we never seem to be able or willing to do the work to get this number, break it down into the smaller subsets, the smaller populations where, in fact, we may be able to provide some significant benefit.

Now, one of the things that I think we do need to talk about is on the aspect of accountability. First off, in any system that we talk about devising or implementing, we surely have to keep freedom of choice. We want to see the doctors we want to see when we want to see them. When hospitalization is required, freedom of choice has to remain central.

One of the things that oftentimes gets lost in the discussion when you look at the breakdown of how health care expenditures occurs in this country, approximately half is paid for by the Federal Government. When you look at the Medicare and Medicaid programs, we heard some discussion of the

HHS appropriations bill, $680 billion, almost $700 billion spent by this country every year by Medicaid and Medicare. Add to that the money spent in the veterans health service and add to that the money spent in the Indian health service and add to that the money spent in the Federal prison system, and you come pretty close to 50 cents out of every health care dollar that is spent in this country has its origin here on the floor of this Congress. So that is a pretty big chunk that comes from the Federal Government already.

The other half is not entirely private insurance, but certainly there is a large portion accounted by private or commercial insurance in this country. A portion, a portion is paid for by the patient out of their pocket.

I would include the growing number of people who are covered by health savings accounts in this group. Health savings accounts being a high-deductible insurance policy where a person is able to accumulate dollars, pre-tax dollars in a savings account dedicated to their health care. Those dollars are owned by the individual. They are dollars that would, if something happened to the individual, they would stay in the family. They don't go back to the Federal Government like Social Security. These are dollars that would stay around and be there to help your family. They would be there to help someone when they transition into the Medicare system.

Mr. Speaker, I had a medical savings account back in the 1990s when I was in the private practice of medicine back in Texas. I thought it was a great thing, not so much because of the money I was accumulating in this medical IRA. I thought it was a great thing because that was the time when HMOs were making big inroads into our medical practice in north Texas, and I liked the idea of being in charge of my health care decisions because I owned my own health insurance policy. As an individual policy, I felt I had much more power over what decisions were made for my health care and my family's health care.

So the whole concept of ownership, owning that medical IRA and being allowed to accumulate those savings to offset future medical expenses, that is a fundamental desire of many Americans. And I think that is a desire that should be encouraged and embellished. Why not be able to accumulate a few dollars dedicated toward your future health care needs? That is a pretty powerful tool to put into people's hands.

Again, for me the issue was being able to be in charge of my own health care, that individual freedom that comes with increased sovereignty. That was critical for me when I went out and looked for a medical savings account when they were first offered back in 1996 or 1997.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, whenever we talk about accountability within the health care system, independence of the patient, the patient as an independent agent is something that must be preserved. That preservation of autonomy for the patient or the patient's designee if a medical power of attorney is exercised, but that is who should be responsible for the care, to be able to accept care, to be able to decline care if a particular medical intervention is either sought or someone wishes to not participate in the medical intervention that is offered. That is a fundamental right that we really should not take away from people.

Advancements within the system. Again, the science of our medicine here in the United States is superior to that anywhere else in the world. You might say that our system of allocation or delivery system needs work, but no one can argue about the science that is present in the medical system in this country.

So, high standards. We want to keep those high standards. The underpinnings of the American medical system has always been that we have high standards and we enforce standards of excellence, and nothing in the future should change that or undermine that. In fact, pathways to facilitate future growth in excellence should be encouraged.

When you talk about expanding the role of the Federal Government in health care, you look at some other places where the Federal Government has a really big footprint, like our Social Security system, or the IRS. Are those systems administered with the highest standard? Or is it lowest common denominator? That is certainly a question worth asking before we increase that segment that is taken over by the Federal Government.

As far as innovative approaches, American medicine has always been characterized by embracing innovation, developing new technologies and treatments. The transformational times we have had in medicine in the last century, development of anesthesia and blood banking in the 1910–1920 time frame, development of large-scale production of antibiotics and anti-inflammatory agents in the 1940s, the development of antipsychotic and antidepressant medications in the 1960s, development of newer hypertensive agents in the 1960s, the beginning of the development of medicines or the recognition that elevated cholesterol levels could lead to disease, and the beginning of medicines that would begin to impact that in the 1960s, all of those transformational events. And during those same times, in the 1910 to 1920 time frame, you had a congressional investigation or commission to investigate the vast discrepancy between curricula in medical schools in one part of the country versus another, and the standardization of medical school curricula which was so critical for establishing that knowledge base of science that was going to carry us forward through the last century.

In the 1940s, you are the introduction of employer-based insurance because of a reaction to wage and price controls that were in existence in the 1940s. And finally in the 1960s, you had the interjection of Medicare and Medicaid, for the first time the Federal Government having a big footprint in paying for health care.

So all of those transformational times were where the science changed rapidly and the public policy changed rapidly. I think we are on the cusp of such a time right now. Things are going to be changing in the realm of the whole arena of personalized medicine. The threshold of that stretches just before us.

The whole concept of far earlier prevention than anyone has thought possible. We have all heard that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Well, we are going to get to use those ounces of prevention because of the studies and work that has gone on with studying the human genome and the whole phenomenon of genomic medicine. We are going to be able to get that ounce of prevention administered so much earlier. So we will get the equity from that pound of cure in so many ways that really we can't even fathom them at this point.

What is critical is that this Congress not get caught up in the transactional, not always get caught up in the insurance and the Medicaid and the Medicare. Don't be so caught up in the transactional that you block the transformational because that is the real tragedy. That is the real difficulty. That is the real danger to the generations for a decade from now, two decades from now, three decades from now.

That is why this Congress needs to be so focused on this issue. That is why all of us on both sides of the aisle need to make ourselves students of health care policy. We need to find out as much as we possibly can about it. We need to come to this floor every day and every night prepared to debate this on the merits and science. Leave the politics on the side. This is one of those issues that is too important to leave to politics.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SESSIONS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SCHWARTZ, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LAMBORN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOEKSTRA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FALLIN, for 5 minutes, today and November 15.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on November 8, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3043. Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on November 9, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3222. Making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, November 15, 2007, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4112. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Asian Longhorned Beetle; Additions to Quarantined Areas [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0127] received November 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4113. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Housing Choice Voucher Program Homeownership Option; Eligibility of Units Not Yet Under Construction [Docket No. FR-4991-F-02] (RIN: 2577-AC60) received November 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4114. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule — Truth in Lending [Regulation Z; Docket No. R-1284] received November 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4115. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule — Consumer Leasing [Regulation M; Docket No. R-1283] received November 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4116. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule — Truth in Savings [Regulation DD; Docket No. R-1285] received November 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4117. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule — Equal Credit Opportunity [Regulation B; Docket No. R-1281] received November 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4118. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule — Electronic Fund Transfer [Regulation E; Docket No. R-1282] received November 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4119. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Academic Competitiveness Grant Program and National Science and Mathematics Access to Retain Talent Grant Program [Docket ID ED-2007-OPE-0135] (RIN: 1840-AC92) received November 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

4120. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revisions to Landowner Notification and Blanket Certificate Regulations [Docket No. RM07-17-000; Order No. 700] received November 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4121. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 13-07 informing of an intent to sign the Weapons Effects and Protection Technology Project Agreement between the United States and Singapore, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4122. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Export Licensing Jurisdiction for Microelectronic Circuits [Docket No. 070426097-7099-01] (RIN: 0694-AE02) received November 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4123. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Expanded Licensing Jurisdiction for QRS11 Micromachined Angular Rate Sensors [Docket No. 0612242561-7519-01] (RIN: 0694-AD92) received November 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4124. A letter from the Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report that the Department intends to impose new foreign policy-based export controls on QRS11 Micromachines Angular Rate Sensors, under the authority of Section 6 of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, and continued by Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001, as extended by the Notice of August 15, 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4125. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles and services to the Government of Saudi Arabia (Transmittal No. DDTC 086-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4126. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2007 to September 30, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4127. A letter from the Executive Director, Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, transmitting pursuant to the Accountability of Tax Dollars Act, the Foundation's Form and Content Reports for the year ended September 30, 2007, as prepared by the U.S. General Services Administration; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4128. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4129. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4130. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4131. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4132. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4133. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting a list of the eight audit reports issued during fiscal year 2007 regarding the Agency and the Thrift Savings Plan, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 8439(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4134. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Regulatory Management Division, Office of the Executive Secretariat, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Receipt Requirement for Certain H and L Adjustment Applicants Returning From a Trip Outside the United States [CIS No. 2420-07; Docket No. USCIS-2007-0047] (RIN: 1615-AB62) received November 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4135. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2006 Biennial Report on the Effectiveness of Grant Programs under the Violence Against Women Act, pursuant to Public Law 106-386, section 1003; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4136. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2005 annual report on the STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program, pursuant to Public Law 106-386, section 2004(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4137. A letter from the Deputy Director of Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States Navy Restricted Area, Key West Harbor, at U.S. Naval Base, Key West, Florida — received November 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4138. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2007-91] received November 7, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4139. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 417. —— Definitions and Special Rules For Purposes of Minimum Survivor Annuity Requirements (Rev. Rul. 2007-67) received November 7, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4140. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Qualified Alternative Fuel Motor Vehicles (QAFMV) and Heavy Hybrid Vehicles — received November 7, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4141. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Department's final rule — 26 CFR 601.204: Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting. (Also Part 1, 446, 481) (Rev. Proc. 2007-67) received November 7, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4142. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Foreign Tax Credit: Notification of Foreign Tax Redeterminations [TD 9362] (RIN: 1545-BG23) received November 7, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4143. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Industry Overview Series Motor Vehicle Industry [LMSB Control Number: LMSB-04-0507-043] received November 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4144. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's report on Multilateral Development Banks' Assistance Proposals likely to have substantial adverse impacts on environment, natural resources, public health and indigenous peoples, pursuant to Public Law 100-202, section 537; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Appropriations.

4145. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification that the Department intends to use FY 2008 IMET funds for Sudan, pursuant to Public Law 110-5, section 520; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

4146. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2008-2, waiving and certifying the statutory provisions regarding the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Office; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 824. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3773) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–449). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ARCURI: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 825. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3915) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to reform consumer mortgage practices and provide accountability for such practices, to establish licensing and registration requirements for residential mortgage originators, to provide certain minimum standards for consumer mortgage loans, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–450). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MOORE of Kansas:

H.R. 4172. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 to restore the estate tax and repeal the carryover basis rule and to increase the estate tax unified credit to an exclusion equivalent of $3,500,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 4173. A bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to promote the participation of absent overseas voters in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 4174. A bill to establish an interagency committee to develop an ocean acidification research and monitoring plan and to establish an ocean acidification program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FORBES, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 4175. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to data privacy and security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BAKER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. POE, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. AKIN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. KELLER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. DENT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. REICHERT, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. RENZI, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. LINDER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BUYER, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. BONNER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. KINGSTON, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. BONO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. WAMP, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. PICKERING, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HASTERT, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MICA, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG):

H.R. 4176. A bill to enhance national security by restricting access of illegal aliens to driver's licenses and State-issued identification documents; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 4177. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to designate Federal special security zones at airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 4178. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to remove an impediment to troubled debt restructuring on the part of holders of residential mortgage loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. CLARKE (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CUELLAR, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 4179. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish an appeal and redress process for individuals wrongly delayed or prohibited from boarding a flight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 4180. A bill to allow United States citizens to bring civil actions against persons who fail to perform an act or duty under the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 4181. A bill to reform Social Security retirement and Medicare by establishing a Personal Social Security Savings Program to create a safer, healthier, more secure, and more prosperous retirement for all Americans and to reduce the burden on young Americans; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, the Budget, Energy and Commerce, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (for herself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 4182. A bill to suspend the running of statutes of limitation for criminal prosecutions of individuals holding the offices of President and Vice President while they hold those offices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. DENT, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Ms. CLARKE):

H.R. 4183. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the National Urban Search and Rescue Response System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 4184. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey 4 parcels of land from the Bureau of Land Management to the city of Twin Falls, Idaho; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SOLIS (for herself, Mr. BACA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HERGER, Ms. LEE, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 4185. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11151 Valley Boulevard in El Monte, California, as the ''Marisol Heredia Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 4186. A bill to repeal the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 4187. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for an additional judgeship for the western district of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 4188. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to permit a prevailing party in an action or proceeding brought to enforce the Act to be awarded expert witness fees and certain other expenses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself and Mrs. SCHMIDT):

H.R. 4189. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to provide for the re-enrichment of certain uranium tailings, and the sale of the product of such re-enrichment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE:

H.J. Res. 64. A joint resolution clarifying that the use of force against Iran is not authorized by the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002, any resolution previously adopted, or any other provision of law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H. Con. Res. 258. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to correct the enrollment of H.R. 1429; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself and Mr. DELAHUNT):

H. Res. 823. A resolution condemning the imposition of emergency rule in Pakistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. POE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BACA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WATT, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCCRERY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. SHAYS):

H. Res. 826. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the hanging of nooses is a horrible act when used for the purpose of intimidation and which under certain circumstances can be a criminal act that should be thoroughly investigated by Federal law enforcement authorities and that any criminal violations should be vigorously prosecuted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. JONES of Ohio (for herself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. REGULA):

H. Res. 827. A resolution honoring and recognizing the achievements of Carl Stokes, the first African-American mayor of a major American city, in the 40th year since his election as Mayor of Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 46: Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 138: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 178: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 211: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 269: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 373: Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 374: Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 405: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 481: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. GINGREY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. FOXX, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 543: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 549: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. BONO, Mr. HONDA, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 550: Mr. LUCAS and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 627: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 661: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 741: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 758: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 760: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 772: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 821: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. SOLIS, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 849: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1043: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 1072: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1105: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1127: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 1169: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1275: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1283: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1289: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1350: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 1366: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 1497: Mr. WU.
H.R. 1509: Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 1553: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1576: Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 1691: Mr. WU.
H.R. 1711: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1738: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 1843: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 1845: Mr. TERRY and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1930: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1937: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1975: Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 1992: Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. REYES, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2015: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 2052: Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 2063: Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 2067: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2070: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 2073: Mr. FORTUÑO.
H.R. 2108: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 2158: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2166: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2205: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 2241: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2287: Mrs. BONO and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2290: Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 2303: Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 2395: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 2449: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 2464: Ms. HARMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 2523: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2548: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 2549: Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 2702: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2744: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WU, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2878: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 2885: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 2894: Mr. HONDA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 2914: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 2933: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 2990: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. FALLIN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3098: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 3099: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 3115: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3223: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3234: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 3251: Mr. WALSH of New York.
H.R. 3257: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 3348: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 3360: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 3380: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 3381: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3402: Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 3453: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 3457: Mr. PORTER and Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 3533: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. EDWARDS.
H.R. 3544: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 3547: Ms. HARMAN and Ms. BEAN.
H.R. 3582: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3609: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 3616: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 3629: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 3636: Mr. WU, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 3637: Mr. WYNN and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 3645: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 3646: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. SHULER.
H.R. 3660: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 3663: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 3674: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 3679: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 3689: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3691: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 3700: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 3780: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 3812: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 3825: Mr. COHEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 3829: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 3833: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3852: Mr. HOBSON and Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 3882: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. FARR, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. SHULER.
H.R. 3888: Mr. WICKER.
H.R. 3955: Mr. HONDA, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 3960: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3981: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. REYES, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 4014: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 4015: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 4016: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 4063: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4088: Mr. BAKER, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 4104: Mr. JINDAL.
H.R. 4107: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 4114: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 4121: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4139: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
H.R. 4141: Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 4160: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.J. Res. 54: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. WALSH of New York.
H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. WICKER.
H. Con. Res. 195: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 235: Mr. FORBES and Mr. STEARNS.
H. Con. Res. 239: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 240: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. DUNCAN.
H. Con. Res. 244: Mr. PETRI, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. SPACE.
H. Con. Res. 247: Ms. WATERS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WATSON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Con. Res. 250: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SHADEGG, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. WAMP.
H. Con. Res. 254: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HELLER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. WICKER, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CARTER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PUTNAM, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. FOXX, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. PEARCE.
H. Con. Res. 255: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. MACK, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H. Res. 71: Mr. HARE.
H. Res 111: Mr. LAMPSON and Mr. HELLER.
H. Res 338: Mr. STEARNS.
H. Res 353: Mr. REGULA.
H. Res. 356: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mrs. DRAKE.
H. Res 537: Mr. COURTNEY.
H. Res 695: Mr. FORBES.
H. Res 756: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. FOXX, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PITTS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. Fortuño, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SALI, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. KUHL of New York.
H. Res. 769: Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 783: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.
H. Res. 795: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H. Res. 815: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. KELLER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. HOLT.
H. Res. 819: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. BERRY.
H. Res. 821: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H. Res. 822: Ms. ESHOO.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative Frank of Massachusetts or a designee to H.R. 3915 the Mortgage Reform and Anti-Predatory Lending Act of 2007, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI.